

MAIL TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Sundays
33 North St. Ph. SP 2-6141
ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor
JERRY GEE, Advertising Manager
GERRARD LATHAM, Business Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Circulation Mgr.
Managing Editor: H. Adams
City Editor: Harry Chipman
Tele. 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 \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 9.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. 4.25
Sunday Only—One year \$4.20
By Carrier—In Advance—Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent and on motor routes.
Daily and Sunday—1 mo. 1.50
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-Service Wire
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
Advertising Representatives:
WEST HOLIDAY CO., INC. Of Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.
1959 PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
Flight 'o Time
Medford and Jackson County
History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

Congress Under Fire

Criticism of the 86th Congress is mounting, particularly among the "liberals" who are disappointed in the record made so far, and particularly in view of the broad program of social and economic betterment so freely promised before last November's election.

The National Committee for an Effective Congress, a nominally non-partisan group which is identified with liberal causes, declares that "Congress has not kept pace with the historical requirements of the times." And it adds:

"It has not supplied the new national direction, the sense of movement, which optimists expected after the 1958 election. Confronted with the erosion of America's world position, Washington lies beamed, as one commentator says, 'in the collision of planned drift and masterly inactivity.' Even the housekeeping assignments are not on schedule."

THE respected Courier-Journal of Louisville, comments:

"Washington's urge to stall nearly everything on dead-center has been noted in these columns before, with credit apportioned both to Congress and the Administration . . ."

Walter Lippmann, one of the most perceptive, if not always the most far-sighted, of commentators, finds the Democratic majority trapped between its recession-born promises of last fall, and the stone-wall choice of deficit spending or higher taxes. They are thus, he says, immobilized. Few Democrats (Sen. Richard L. Neuberger is among them) are willing to propose tax increases to pay for the developments they think are needed.

JOSEPH ALSOP, with different perspective and political orientation, comments similarly. He is more concerned with the immediate political implications of the impasse, whereas Lippmann is more inclined to deal with the long-range aspects of a government which is balking at the cost of preparing the way for continued growth and development.

Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National committee, and the Americans for Democratic Action, likewise assail the Democratic leadership in both houses. For the ADA to slap at Democrats is unusual; for the Democratic chairman to do so is startling.

Leftward-leaning Democrats in the Senate itself, notably Proxmire of Wisconsin and Morse of Oregon, also have criticized the leadership for taking its cue from the White House.

WHAT are some of the things the "liberals"—the "spenders"—want? Well, adequate defense comes first—with everyone.

But beyond this requirement, which is the major money-eating federal program, those who believe the federal government has a role to play in the development of the country, economically and socially, have in mind such things as these:

A revived highway program (the present one is in danger of coming to a screaming halt for lack of funds); an accelerated job of getting the national forests ready for the demands of the next 100 years; recreational development, including the protection from despoilage many areas which the American people need in which to spend their increasing leisure hours.

THESE are not things which, except to a limited and piecemeal extent, lend themselves to solution on a local or even state level. They need attention nationally, and the federal government is the only agency with the size and the resources to perform them.

That isn't the end of the list, either. Thoughtful educators, eyeing the tremendous increase in population, actual and to come, and existing deficiencies in the nation's educational establishment, see a need for a revolutionary increase in educational spending and organization.

Police authorities, judges and juvenile workers, to say nothing of parents and teachers, see the need for a nationwide attack on the causes of crime, in general, and juvenile delinquency in particular.

AMERICA'S health standards are high, but many diseases remain on the unconquered list—notably mental illness, cancer, and cardiovascular ailments. Too many Americans now die who could, with expanded research, still live.

A far-seeing program of foreign economic aid, while not a very popular project in some domestic quarters, would furnish the best hope for the growth and peaceful development of many areas of the world where now near-starvation and unrest reign.

The world is now too small for us to be complacent about the "backward" nations. It is to our own self-interest to see that they are given a hand in their march forward. The alternatives are unpleasant—communism, or chaos.

THESE then are some of the things that America needs or should have—or at least what many people think it needs and should have.

It is, at any rate, an idealistic list of projects. Can the United States afford it, or any part of it? Some people would phrase the question differently: Can the United States afford NOT to do these things?

Whether or not it can, the prospects, at the present writing, appear dim for any such sweeping program—or even any major part of it. The Congress seems determined to avoid any new extensive deficit spending, and appears in no mood to consider a higher level of taxation.

Somehow, it seems too bad that the wealthiest nation on earth (that's what we call the nation that spends more for liquor and cigarettes than it does on education) can't pay the bill for a happier, more secure future.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I LEFT 'EM OVER AT TOMMY'S WADIN' HOOD! I DIDN'T BRING 'EM 'CAUSE I'M GOIN' RIGHT BACK!"

Washington Report

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

BUTLER AT ODDS

Washington—National Democratic Chairman Paul Butler is moving with unexampled self-assurance to control the 1960 Democratic convention for purposes that are quite clear but in behalf of men whose identities are not clear at all.



William S. White

His central motives are plain enough. He wants to discredit the party's "moderate" elected Congressional leadership—and inevitably the record of the Democratic Congress itself—both within the party and in the eyes of the country.

He intends to destroy that leadership's influence at the convention and thus to open the way to the nomination for President of some person deemed by him to be "liberal" enough in his definition. He is attempting not only to drive from the convention all the conservative Southerners, but also to make powerless even the party's moderates—Northers as well as Southern.

THE conservative Southerners have long been fair game to nearly every Democratic faction outside the South, and understandably so.

For these conservatives for years have brandished the threat of party bolishes to force their way, even as a minority.

But Mr. Butler has now gone far beyond these favorite Southern whipping boys. In attacking the Democratic Congressional leadership and record in terms as harsh as those used even by the Republicans, he is serving this notice: no degree of dissent from his view of the proper liberalism will be tolerated in 1960 if he has his way.

He is hitting, in a word, not merely at the top Congressional leaders from Texas, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. He is also striking at many powerful non-Southerners, among them the Democratic floor chief of the House, Rep. John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, and such Senate hierarchs as Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana.

And he is also cutting, if more obliquely, at four of the five present real Democratic Presidential "possibilities": Senators John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, Stuart Symington of Missouri and Johnson. For if the Democratic Congressional performance is as poor and timid as he says it is, no man who is a part of that record can escape some measure of blame for it.

A collateral effect of Mr. Butler's clamors is, of course, to put increasing pressure on the three liberals, Senators Kennedy, Humphrey and Symington, to open fire on the moderate, Johnson. This kind of Senate in-fighting would hurt not merely Johnson but them all.

Two large unanswered questions, however, remain: In whose convention interests, precisely, is Butler operating this curious campaign? And how does he feel qualified to take the whole conduct of the party into his own hands?

As to the first question, the suspicion is wide among national Democratic politicians that Butler is running an operation in aid of a third nomination for Adlai E. Stevenson. This is assumed mainly because Butler is much influenced by politician Paul Ziff of California, who is supposed to be a "Stevenson

man." Even this explanation, however, is not too plausible. For Stevenson as titular party head was ready to discharge Butler as national chairman in 1956 until he went to be kept on—and until one of his present chosen victims, Rayburn, interceded for him.

(One consequence of Butler's present activity would be to deny to Mr. Rayburn in 1960 his traditional honor as permanent chairman of the convention.)

THE second question—how does Butler think he alone is competent to dominate the convention?—is a good one even if the Democratic Congressional leadership is worse than he says it is. That leadership, after all, has presided over three successive Democratic victories in Congressional elections. Butler presided over a catastrophic Democratic Presidential defeat in 1956. And in 1958 he was repudiated in his home state of Indiana in trying to block the successful Democratic Senatorial candidate, Vance Hartke.

No one can say absolutely that Mr. Butler is not alone right about party matters now. But no one can gainsay that never in memory has a salaried, unelected employee of a national party sought to grasp so much personal power in such enigmatic circumstances.

There is room for one larger, and final question: Who, on balance, are benefiting most of all from the Butler strategy? Answer: The Republicans—and well they know it.

(Copyright, 1959, by United Features Syndicate, Inc.)

Koslov Trip to U.S. Seen Indecisive; Talks Peace, Trade—and Red Missiles

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign Editor
The man-of-the-week: Soviet 1st Deputy Premier Frol Koslov.

The place: Detroit.
The quote: "If our two countries live in peace, then peace will be secure in the whole world."

It was the farthest away from home the graying, broad-shouldered Koslov had ever ventured and what he really thought of the results of his two-week "goodwill" trip to the United States remained locked behind his quick smile and his easy recovery from embarrassing moments.

But for the 50-year-old Koslov, the man with the rather arbitrary designation as successor to Premier Nikita Khrushchev, there had been moments of strain.

One had come early in the trip when he repeated once too often the myth that American famine relief sent to the Soviet Union in the early 1930's had to be paid for in gold. Vice President Richard Nixon knocked that one down with proof that the charge was false and Koslov retired from the field.

Meets Two Rebuffs
To this lesson in history was added a rebuff by the citizens of California who showed an almost total lack of interest in his presence and the Mayor of Detroit who had suggested it might be better if Koslov did not come to Detroit at all.

It was at about this point that Koslov requested a "private day," especially to be free of newsmen.

In Detroit, he met Gov. G. Mennen Williams and let his irritation come to the surface after the governor disclosed the contents of their remarks in a press conference.

The governor's press conference, Koslov said, "violated a rule."

What gains, if any, either the United States or the Soviet Union made as result of Koslov's "goodwill" visit remained debatable.

What was not debatable was Koslov's carbon-copy echo of Khrushchev's unyielding stand on international issues dividing the two nations.

Newsman lost count of the number of times the word "peace" appeared in Koslov's sentences.

To industrialists he held out the promise of billions of dollars to be gained in trade with Soviet Russia.

Missile Might Boasted
But whether he spoke of peace or dollars, it was against the background of Russia's boasted missile might.

Koslov was born too late to be a member of the elite Bolsheviks who plotted against and overthrew the czars. He

was born in 1908 near Ryazan in central Russia and, as many of his contemporaries, was the son of a "poor peasant."

But he joined the Communist Youth Organization at the age of 15.

He had just passed the age of 35 when his industry and ambition came to the attention of the Central Party lead-

ership in Moscow. There are indications that at this time the mentor was Georgi Malenkov, who inherited briefly Stalin's mantle as 1st Secretary of the Communist Party and Premier.

It is a tribute to Koslov's adroitness that he escaped the anti-party purge, of which Malenkov was a victim, and

now in turn has become a favorite of Khrushchev.

On his American visit he has been described as urbane, pleasant, shrewd and tough. Said Governor Williams of him:

"I think it will take a Yankee trader to beat him. I think we have some such Yankee traders."

Ike Uses 'Lame Duck' Limit To Enhance Political Image

Washington—President Eisenhower's political image should be aligned with an especially favorable glow this week.

The old soldier did quite a job of politicking at his Wednesday news conference. What he did was to

conceive a substantial asset out of a condition which generally is regarded as a liability for him and for the Republican party.

That condition is the constitutional prohibition against

Eisenhower being re-nominated and reelected to succeed himself. He frequently is called a lame-duck President, meaning that his political future is behind him.

This is a political liability in the sense that all hands are aware that the great powers of the presidential office must in a matter of months pass to another. These are the great powers of reward and punishment.

Gobble-de-Gook Word
At his news conference, Eisenhower capitalized on his inability to succeed himself.

He was asked about his vetoes of congressional legislation. Specifically, a questioner wanted to know whether legislation might not create in the public mind a negative image of the Eisenhower Presidency. "Image," as used this way, is a gobble-de-gook word meaning the added-up, collective opinion of the citizens on the basis of the ob-

servable performance of their public servants. Pretty good word.

Eisenhower did not think his veto performance caused the citizens to judge him to be a merely negative or destructive force in public affairs. In fact, he was not much concerned with images, but with the public good.

"I call your attention again," Eisenhower said, "that I cannot be running for anything; I am finished with political life when my next, I guess it is 18 months, are over."

"It seems to me that if any man has almost the compulsion to think only of the United States of America and its citizens, rather than any political image or political ambition, well, then, I should be, or any President who is in his second term today, should be such an individual. What I am trying to do is to get legislation passed that will benefit the United States. . . ."

'Good For The Country'
Some questions later, Eisenhower had another go at the same idea:

"I am having a really very busy, hard time because I think there are too many people who are not looking at the broadest possible way. I stick by that, I am trying to do what will, I believe, be good for the country."

That seems to leave the congressional Democrats among the "too many" who are not looking at these problems in the broadest possible way. Eisenhower's contrast was deliberate and plain—he, the man with no further political ambitions; they, the party with a White House to win next year.

If congressional Democrats have their political futures before them, so do the congressional Republicans. Eisenhower easily can set himself apart from the world of political schemes and strategy. In so doing, he can enhance his presidential image, and the public will applaud. Other Republicans, however, must play politics—or else.

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.

Are We Ready?

To the Editor: "Drop Shown in Juvenile Delinquency" our paper reports. That's good news. The stated fact that so many youths are repeaters is not. It shows a weak spot in our penal system and our society. An offender is someone who needs help and he isn't being given that help. Likely, he only needs a little love and to know somebody cares.

Few youths reach maturity without having a few misdemeanors. Luckily, they aren't caught by the police. Loving parents or friends have shown that they cared. Not in the offense but in the integrity of the offender. Thus they were helped to get on the right track before there was a position.

The state department paper was too broad, also at fault in "principle." It should be altered and corrected.

Fee Clifford Esteb, P. O. Box 1413, Medford.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

From Havana: Premier Fidel Castro's revolutionary regime is armed with the DEATH PENALTY for a major onslaught against opposition to his land reform program.

Castro has proclaimed the land reform program as the fundamental law of his revolution and has defied every effort to slow it down or modify it.

WHAT is his program? Basically, he proposes to expropriate the holdings of big landowners, paying them for it with Cuban bonds whose value would be doubtful in view of the fact that his expropriation program would upset Cuba's economy, thus limiting her ability to levy and collect the taxes to pay off the bonds.

The expropriated lands would be distributed among the Cuban people in small tracts.

ON ITS face, of course, it sounds alluring. It conjures up visions of a happy and contented people, with each family living in its own palm-fringed cottage, under its own bougainvillea vine, with its own banana tree in its own back yard and its own pineapples growing in its own garden.

There was a time—in the day of the hoe and the hand shovel and the homespun garment woven on the home loom and tailored by the hands of members of the family—when it might have worked. But times have changed. Industry has changed. Especially Cuban industry, which is based on sugar and tropical fruits. These require huge expenditures of capital and the supervision of trained minds.

If Cuba's great sugar industry is wrecked, Cuba's econ-

omy will suffer seriously. There will be tourists and gambling to fall back on, but they are not very solid foundations on which to base a nation's economy.

LET'S take a look at our own area, whose economy is based on timber almost as extensively as Cuba's is based on sugar.

If its full economic benefits are to be realized, timber requires huge investments of capital in sawmills, pulp and paper plants, woodworking factories, and so on. Sugar production requires immense investments in sugar mills.

Much of our timber is blocked into large holdings—the big timber and lumber companies, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, etc. Suppose our government expropriated the private timber holdings, threw its own Forest Service and BLM and National Park service holdings of timber into the pot and divided it all up among all the people in small tracts.

WHAT would happen? We all know what would happen. The economy of our timbered area would be wrecked. You can't EAT timber. It has to be manufactured into useful articles.

Our timber payrolls would vanish—and with them would vanish the prosperity of our area. That is about what will happen to Cuba if Castro's land redistribution plan goes through.

NO REASONABLY well informed person can fail to look upon Castro's land program with a jaundiced eye. The probable result of it would be to wreck Cuba's economy and throw the island into the hands of the communists.



THIS CAR
SIMCA Elysee
CAN SAVE YOU HUNDREDS OF DOLLARS IN GASOLINE ALONE!

It's the great new SIMCA from Paris! The car that saves you money on every count. SIMCA costs much less than it should, because everything in the book is included as standard equipment. Heater, defroster, automatic choke, electric windshield wipers, and even a 2-level horn. And SIMCA's engine is up front, for perfect balance, hence greater road stability, and easier control. Test drive the new SIMCA today.

SIMCA prices start at \$1994⁷⁵ delivered in Medford

SIMCA
DICK KNIGHT COMPANY
33 South Riverside Phone SP 3-6247