

MEDFORD TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 159 33 North Fir St. Ph. SP 2-9141
ROBERT W. RUEL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GEO. LATHAM, Business Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper Entered as second class matter at Medford Oregon under Act of March 3, 1879
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail—In Advance Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 8.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. 4.25
Sunday Only—One year \$4.25
By Carrier—In Advance Copy 10c
Ashland, Central Point, E. A. Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent, and on motor routes: Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 10.00
Carrier and Dealers—copy 10c
All Terms Cash in Advance

Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International
Full Leased Wire
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

Advertising Representatives
WEST-HOLIDAY CO. INC., Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, E.C.

1958 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
Nov. 11, 1948 (Thursday)
Bugles and bagpipes, drums and drum majorettes plus representatives of over two dozen civic and patriotic organizations march through town to celebrate Armistice day.

E. H. Hedrick, superintendent of schools, reports to the Medford school board on building needs arising from present congestion.

20 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1938 (Friday)
One of the largest parades in recent years marks the start of the American Legion's Armistice day.
From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "Veterans celebrate and quite a few look nice in the uniforms that were too big for them in 1918."

30 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1928 (Sunday)
Several rural rovers have been trained to meet Mail Tribune paper carriers and carry the evening paper to their owners.
All veterans of the Civil war, Spanish-American war and World War are urged to march here today.

40 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1918 (Monday)
GERMANS SIGN ARMISTICE - Mail Tribune headline.
Medford's celebration starts with the blowing of the fire whistle, then ringing of the fire bell, then firing of many guns of all calibers - and crowds began swarming through the streets.

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

- 1. The Gulf of Bothnia lies between what two countries of northern Europe?
- 2. In the romances about King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table, who were the parents of Sir Galahad?
- 3. Which ship will sail the shorter distance - one that leaves from Seattle or one that leaves from San Francisco, both with destinations at Yokohama, Japan?
- 4. The play "You Can't Take It With You" was written by two authors: George S. Kaufman and who else?
- 5. Who was George Fox?
- 6. Name the cartoonist who draws "Lil Abner."
- 7. Name the mountain range that separates European from Asiatic Soviet Russia.
- 8. What does Shakespeare call "the green-eyed monster"?
- 9. Name the limestone cone that forms below a stalactite.
- 10. Under what document did the American States operate prior to the adoption of the Constitution?

Answers: 1. Finland and Sweden. 2. Launcelot and Elaine. 3. The one that leaves from Seattle. 4. Moss Hart. 5. Founder of the Society of Friends. 6. Al Capp. 7. Ural. 8. Jealousy. 9. Stalagmite. 10. Articles of Confederation.

Veterans Day

This day—November 11—originally was set aside to mark the armistice which ended the first World War on that date in 1918.

It is a day with special meaning to veterans of that war, which for many years was simply known as "The World War." That was the war to end wars, and the war to make the world safe for democracy.

There has been a lot of revision in our thinking since those days, a revision which was forced by a resurgent and militaristic Germany, its fellow dictatorship in Italy, by the coming to power of a new imperialistic Russia, and a newly Communist China.

SINCE World War I, we have seen a greater and more terrible World War II, a "police action" in Korea which was worse than most full-fledged wars before that, and a dozen incidents around the world which proved that peace is an uneasy thing.

The words "Armistice Day" thus lost their meaning, except by furnishing wry proof that the hopes of that day for everlasting peace were doomed to failure.

The day was renamed. It is now Veterans Day, and it is in honor of Americans who have served their country during times of peril in the armed forces.

THAT is why the day is observed as a holiday. To the younger men who are classed as veterans the date itself lacks the significance that it does to the doughboys of '17 and '18.

But the day, now in honor of all veterans, still carries with it the pride of service to country, and the poignant but still strong hope that, in truth, the day may come when wars will end and democracy will be safe.—E.A.

Centennial Thoughts

Nolan Skiff, a member of the staff of the Pendleton East Oregonian, recently sat down at his typewriter and started putting down on paper some of his thoughts about the state of Oregon, and about the 100th anniversary of its statehood, which we celebrate next Feb. 14, and for the rest of 1959.

After some general description of the Centennial itself, how it is to be celebrated, and so on, Skiff got started talking about Oregon.

His thinking is so persuasive, and so similar to that of a lot of other thinking Oregonians, who have paused to consider just what Oregon is, that we would like to let Mail Tribune readers share it.

HERE is what he said:

It is said with truth that one can find nearly every type of climate and soil and agricultural opportunity in Oregon; and, fortunately, to go with this, one also may expect schools, churches and general living conditions of the highest standards. Oregon people as a rule are not satisfied to have something "fair to middlin'" good—they want the best, and perhaps this is the keynote of the state's character. And they like to let the world know Oregon has the best.

Oregon is a state with character, and its citizens have no greater asset to show to the visiting world next year during its Centennial. No Oregonian need apologize for his state, its economy, its political past, present or future, its industrial growth, its agricultural might, its people and their cities, and its achievements in general.

This is the state which became the Nation's Valentine back on Feb. 14, 1859, and which has its official bird the gentle meadow lark; but which has ever prided itself upon the high percentage of volunteers for defense of the Union during wartimes.

This is the state which in the opening sentences in the Bill of Rights in its Constitution, declares "that all power is inherent in the people," and which adopted both the initiative and referendum laws and the primary election laws in the first two decades of the Twentieth Century.

This is a state which provides nearly a fifth of the nation's green peas, about three per cent of its wheat, apples and pears known the world over for their delicious flavor, a superb brand of cheese, and livestock that command premium prices in national markets.

This is a state known for its great timber resources, and whose sawmills and allied plants provide lumber, plywood and furniture used throughout much of the world. It also is a state where reforestation is largely practiced so that it always will be an asset to the nation because of its timber products.

This is a state with a fine system of highways—and one which is being constantly improved with more modern express and freeways added each year. This is a state which boasts of no sales tax and which outlaws slot machines and other gambling devices.

This is a state of many, many accomplishments, of many, many superlatives—too numerous to mention in this comment. The point to remember, however, is that Oregon is a state in which we citizens have deep and inherent pride, and we should reflect this pride in our homeland to our visitors.

Our Centennial year should not be regarded as a period during which we seek to enrich ourselves at our visitors' expense.

Rather, we should look upon it as a year in which we should make every effort to sell the fine things of our state to our guests. We have so many assets it would be a crime to keep them hidden under a blanket of modesty.

And perhaps if we do a good job of presenting them to our guests, many of them will elect in time to become Oregonians—and what greater boon could we confer upon the visitors within our gates?

THAT'S mighty persuasive talking. And it keeps the thing in perspective, too. The Centennial year isn't (or certainly shouldn't be) a time for cheap carnivals or hip-hip-hooraw doings which have no bearing on the essential worth of the state — of its fields and mountains and forests, and its people.

The way we see it, it should be a time when Oregonians can get better acquainted with the lovely state in which they live, and share it with others.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"Boy, if that wasn't me, I'd laugh!"

Washington Report

By William S. White

COLLISION IN '60? Washington—The national political community is full of forecasts of a coming Nixon-Rockefeller collision for the 1960 Presidential nomination just like the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio had in 1952 with Dwight Eisenhower.

These predictions are that history will repeat itself with Vice-President Richard M. Nixon as the young pro grapple with a popular amateur, Gov.-elect Nelson Rockefeller of New York, as old-pro Taft grappled with a similarly popular amateur, Mr. Eisenhower. Some see the script for this drama as already written. It is complete with parts not only for the stars, Nixon and Rockefeller, but also for all the supporting players. The "Wall Street" Eastern Republicans are seen marshalling on one side of the stage ready to feed the socko lines to Rockefeller. The Midwestern regular Republicans are moving up on the other side of the stage to do their dramatic bits for Nixon.

There is plausibility in this picture. It is indeed probable that there will be another great contest within the Republican party between the Rockefeller "moderns" and all the rest of the Republicans put together. It is unlikely, however, that any really exact reproduction of 1952 can occur. True, Nixon and his party wing may corresponded roughly to Taft and his party wing, and Rockefeller and his wing may correspond to Eisenhower and his wing. But there will be significant differences in the plot of 1960 from that of 1952.

The Vice-President is both more and less than was Taft. His leadership of the regular Republican organization is more sure than was Taft's at the comparable pre-convention period of eight years ago. He is an immensely more capable practical "operator" than Taft ever was. Heavy-handed mistakes by lieutenants at state conventions compromised Taft's candidacy for him before the national convention, even opened. And it was characteristic of the Senator's awkward but moving grandeur as a man that these mistakes remained unrebuked.

NIXON lieutenants will make no such mistakes. At the first sign of even potential ineptitude they would be ex-lieutenants. Nixon, in a word, now has a harder grip on the regular party mechanism than Taft ever had. Moreover, though no one knows what the case may be two years hence, Nixon as of now certainly is not so vulnerable as was Taft to the old cry: "He can't win."

This is so mainly because he is immeasurably less vulnerable on another count. Terribly damaging to Taft was a hopelessness on foreign policy; that he was some sort of isolationist Nobody could rationally make that accusation against Nixon. First, his record simply would refute it. Second, he is much more gifted explaining himself to the people.

He can handle the simplicities—and sometimes even the over-simplicities. But Taft always assumed that "intelligent people" would grasp what he meant; if not, then so much the worse for them. For the views of the "unintelligent," he couldn't have cared less.

THERE is, however, an important other side of the

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

A TALK WITH MR. K (PART I)

During the last two weeks of October, my wife and I were in the Soviet Union, although we had discussed our visit with the Soviet Embassy in Washington and it had been agreed in advance that my purpose would be to understand Soviet foreign policy in relation to the United States. Except for a bit of sightseeing in Leningrad, we did not go anywhere else in the vast expanses of the Soviet Union, and I know nothing at firsthand about the internal condition of the Soviet Union. But from a long interview with Mr. Krushchev himself, supplemented by talks with Soviet officials and Soviet editors, I think I came to understand better than I had before what are the main springs and the controlling ideas of Soviet foreign policy.

I shall begin this series of articles with an account in two parts of the interview with Mr. K. I have to divide it because the account is long. For the interview covered much ground and lasted for two hours. I must set down the circumstances. For the first week of our visit in Moscow there was no definite appointment. Mr. K. had been away in the south and when he came to Moscow he was involved in the negotiations with Field Marshal Amerigo, representing President Nasser, negotiating the agreement which deals with the Aswan Dam and no doubt with many other things. Between the departure of the Field Marshal and the scheduled arrival of Mr. Gomulka and the Polish delegation, Mr. K. had, it appears, a free day. An appointment was fixed for that day at 11 in the morning in his office in the Kremlin.

WE were told to be ready at our hotel 20 minutes in advance and that an official from the State Committee for Cultural Relations for Foreign Countries would come for us in a car. Tourists cannot drive into the Kremlin precincts but after our car had been identified, we were led by a police car to the door of a building in one of the inner courts of the Kremlin palace. There we were met by an officer who escorted us to an anteroom next to Mr. K.'s office. There was no one else in sight. Unlike the offices of any other chief of government that I have ever visited, there were no guards, there were no other people waiting, there were no secretaries carrying papers around, there were of course no newspapermen and there was none of the hustle and bustle which usually prevail in the outer rooms of busy and important officials.

Somewhere and somehow Mr. K. must do a great deal of work and must see a great many people. But there was no outward sign of it. When we were shown into his office, which was on the dot of 11 a.m., he was quite relaxed, had none of the symptoms of a busy and preoccupied man, and indeed he acted as if he had all the time in the world. In the course of the interview it was evident that he wanted to talk about Soviet-American relations and about nothing else. But on this subject he seemed ready to talk as long as I wanted, provided I kept ideas could conceivably be more suitable to this day and age.

I am not acquainted with the Dark Hollow road. However, anyone else who is interested of a few places where the Butte Falls highway from Crater Lake highway to Butte Falls and from Butte Falls to Willow Creek bridge and beyond could be surveyed for much better results with the naked eye or possibly a piece of chalk line. I would be ashamed to admit I couldn't do a better job myself.

Several persons have told me that "we will never have decent roads in this county until Mr. Rynning leaves the office." There was a considerable bit of work done on the Butte Falls highway this summer, but it is very little, if any, wider than it was before. It would have cost very little more to have added two more feet to either side.

Mr. Keating stated last spring in an interview with me that "this road (the Butte Falls-Fish Lake road) is very good." He probably didn't notice, or didn't want to, the boulders protruding above the surface of same. The whole trouble with our road department is at the top.

Floyd R. McCabe, Mt. Pitt Star Route, Butte Falls, Ore.

be no change of frontiers by military force. He illustrated this by saying that in the cases of China and of Vietnam the issues between the two parts of the country were internal and "civilian"—and, therefore, were not to be treated as international questions. In the case of the two Germans and the two Koreans, changes of frontier—presumably by the union of the two parts—were to take place only by "mutual consent."

I shall come back to the German question later on. But first, I must set down what is the more important part of his conception of the "status quo." In his mind, the social and economic revolution now in progress in Russia, China, and elsewhere in Asia and Africa is the status quo, and he wants us to recognize it as such. In his mind, opposition to this revolution is an attempt to change the status quo. Whereas we think of the status quo as the situation as it exists at the moment, he thinks of it as the process of revolutionary change which is in progress. He wants us to recognize the revolution not only as it is but as it is going to be.

THERE is another very important component in his conception of the status quo. This has to do with the balance of military power. Judging by what he said, and by what was implied in what he said, I would describe his view of the existing military balance of power as follows. It rests, I feel reasonably certain, on his confidence that the Soviet Union has mastered the intermediate and short range missiles to a point where it can dominate with them Germany and Western Europe, Turkey and Iran. I do not know, of course, whether his confidence in these missiles is justified. But there is no doubt that he assumes their existence in his thinking, and that they have now become, as the saying goes, a principal instrument of Soviet foreign policy.

On the other hand, nothing that he said implied that he thinks the U.S.S.R. has long range missiles which have broken, or are about to break, the existing military stalemate with the United States. His conception of his military position in relation to the United States is that neither country can defeat the other in a direct conflict, but that the American forward positions, particularly in Germany and Turkey, can, because of the development of the rocket, no longer be defended. He feels, therefore, that American policy rests on an obsolete estimate of the existing balance of power.

I AM now resuming the story of the interview itself. After he had talked about the status quo, and about no changes of frontiers by force, and about the need of mutual consent in the German question, I asked him whether he would agree to free negotiations between the two Germans and whether, as one of the four occupying powers, he would accept an agreement negotiated by the two Germans themselves. To this he replied quickly—too quickly as it developed—that he would agree to this, and that it would be best if the troops of the occupying powers were withdrawn before negotiations were concluded. This would bring about "a more normal condition."

I was not convinced that he had meant what he had said, perhaps because he had not fully understood what a Westerner would mean when he talks about free negotiations between the two Germans. So I asked him whether he really meant that the occupying powers would accept unconditionally the result of negotiations between the two

German governments. To this he replied that the occupying powers would, "of course," abide by the Potsdam Agreement which states, he said, that Germany should never again be in a position to disturb the peace. He left me with the reasonable certainty that if the Western powers proposed a free negotiation by the two Germans, the Soviet government would not be willing to accept it.

His mention of the Potsdam Agreement brought him quickly to his complaint that the United States is violating the Agreement by contributing to the remilitarization of Germany. This carried with it the implication that there could be no remilitarization of the two Germans as long as West Germany was to be once again a military power.

This led deeper into the German question. He discussed it at length and with more passion than he showed on any other subject. Out of it came what was for me a very interesting disclosure of how his mind works on the German question. Describing what he said, we must read it in the context of his military assumption that the Soviet Union has now mastered the intermediate range missiles.

Americans, he began, seemed not to realize the danger which their present policy of rearming Germany may well bring down upon them. What is this danger, I asked? It is, he said, that if a new war is unleashed—what shall come later to his conception of how a new war might be unleashed—Germany might once again turn to the East against the West. Why? Because if Western Germany engaged in a war against the East, the U.S.S.R. could quickly destroy Western Germany—with its missiles. But if the Soviet Union encouraged Germany to turn against the West, the Germans alone will be much stronger than England, France and Spain combined.

THIS led him on to say that the situation was much like that on the eve of World War II. How? Much is said in the West about Munich. But the Western peoples do not understand Munich. They think that Czechoslovakia was sacrificed at Munich in order to appease Hitler and keep him from going to war. But in fact, said Mr. K. with passionate conviction, Munich was arranged by British and French conservatives who wanted Hitler to attack Russia. To induce him to do that, they gave him Czechoslovakia, which is "an arrow aimed at the heart of Russia." The Soviet Union, he said, had been ready in 1938 to join in the defense of Czechoslovakia against Hitler, and had actually alerted its army.

After Munich, said Mr. K., Stalin realized the danger in the U.S.S.R. as a result of the Western action. Hitler, too, saw what this action meant to the Russians and, believing that he could finish off Britain and France if the Soviet Union were induced to remain neutral, Hitler offered to make a deal with Stalin. He intended, of course, to attack Russia when he had finished with the West. But Stalin, for his part, saw a chance to weaken Hitler before the coming attack on Russia by encouraging him to make war in the West. The point of Mr. K.'s historical explanation, which he volunteered without being asked any questions about it, was that another German-Soviet pact was at least as possible today as in 1938—indeed more probable since a German attack on the Soviet Union had now become "suicidal."

(To Be Continued)
Copyright 1958, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

AT THE next interval I seized the chance to ask Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!

Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!

Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!

Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!

Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!

Mr. K. to tell me what he understood by the "status quo." The answer to this crucial question, it soon appeared, is in his mind a complex one, and the bulk of the interview which followed was a gradual unfolding of what the phrase means in his mind. It will, I think, help the reader if at this point I interrupt the narrative and summarize what, as I reflected on the whole interview afterwards, seemed to me to be the main elements in his conception of the "status quo."

The simpler part of his conception is that there should

Never!