

Medford, Ore. TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
23 North 5th St. Ph. BR 4-4141

Subscription Rates
By Mail—In Advance Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$13.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$8.25
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$4.50
Sunday Only—1 year \$4.20

Flight 'o Time
Medford and Jackson County
History from the files of The
Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40
and 50 years ago.

20 YEARS AGO
Aug. 16, 1939 (Tuesday)
A man and woman are to
appear in Medford municipal
court today to answer the first
two jay-walking citations in
the city's newly-launched
crack-down on that offense.

20 YEARS AGO
Aug. 16, 1939 (Wednesday)
The Medford city council
votes to abandon the old Jackson-
ville railroad right-of-way
between the Medford and
Jacksonville city limits.

30 YEARS AGO
Aug. 16, 1929 (Friday)
The Medford airport is to be
ready for all planes within 10
days.
The county picnic is to be
held at the Elks grounds Labor
Day.

40 YEARS AGO
Aug. 15, 1919 (Saturday)
The Medford youths who
swiped mileposts on the road
to Oregon Caves are forced to
put them back.
More workers are needed to
harvest the pear crop here.

50 YEARS AGO
Aug. 16, 1909 (Monday)
Jack True with a 16-man
crew is improving the road
from Central Point to Bybee
bridge via Agate.
A total of 2,000 persons
have visited Crater Lake so
far this year.

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

- 1. Unscramble the following
names of States - Thadotak-
ron, Danidrosheh.
2. What river forms the
boundary between Ohio and
Kentucky?
3. Does an average child, six
years old, measure about 34,
44, 54, or 64 inches in height?
4. Name the man recently
re-elected by the U. S. Senate
as Secretary of Commerce?
5. Into what body of water
does the Jordan River empty?
6. What sort of animal is a
"Kerry Blue"?
7. Which of these is the
least used letter of the English
alphabet - z, n, z, or q?
8. Is the Atlantic terminus
of the Panama Canal east, or
west of the Pacific terminus?
9. The Comptroller General
of the U. S. heads the G.A.O.;
what is the G.A.O.?
10. To what does the term
"Julian's Folly" refer in
American history?
Answers: 1. North Dakota,
Rhode Island, 2. Ohio river,
3. About 44 inches, 4. Lewis
L. Strauss, 5. Dead Sea, 6.
Dog, 7. z, 8. West, 9. General
Accounting Office, 10. First
steamboat - Clermont.

What to Show Khrush?

Upon his arrival in the United States Sept. 15, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev will spend three days in Washington and another 10 days on a tour of the country.

What do we show Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev? To some extent the Soviet Communist party boss has answered the question for us: we show him what he wants to see. It is known he has made certain definite specifications. He wants to visit Washington, naturally, and New York, Chicago and San Francisco—always a favorite with foreign visitors.

Less specifically, he wants to go to California, Texas, Florida, and some farm state in the Middle West. And he would like to see something of small town life—say President Eisenhower's boyhood home of Abilene, Kansas.

Other stops on the itinerary will be worked out between the State department and the Soviet embassy in Washington. So many invitations have been tendered that this intrinsically unwanted guest begins to appear a social lion. Foy D. Kohler, the veteran Foreign Service officer given the job of "coordinator" of Khrushchev's tour, is scarcely to be envied.

KHRUSHCHEV'S desire to see an example of American agriculture could well be satisfied by an invitation to the Coon Rapids, Iowa, farm of Roswell Garst, who has twice visited Soviet Russia and says of Khrushchev, "It's his turn to come to our house." The Soviet Premier will see America's farms at their booming best, despite the brakes of government controls. He will see lush fields of high-yielding corn, cattle at a record peak in numbers, hog production at a peacetime high, bins crammed full of surplus corn, the most highly mechanized grain harvest in the world.

Khrushchev also wants to see U.S. industry, and the State department is considering two of the nation's heaviest industrial complexes, the Pittsburgh and Detroit areas. Here again he will see capitalism booming, with industrial production—at a new peak at mid-year—65 per cent greater than the average of the three years immediately prior to the Korean war. A settlement of the steel strike would make a welcome addition to the picture of overall prosperity.

What might, indeed, most impress Khrushchev would be a flight over one of our great industrial areas, with thousands and thousands of automobiles—worker's automobiles—packed tightly inside plant parking lots.

Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy said on Aug. 6 that he was eager to show the Soviet premier some U.S. bomber bases and missile test centers to "inform" him of the nation's military capabilities. But Khrushchev already has indicated that he has no interest in visiting bases.

INVITATIONS continue to come in from hamlets, from villages, and from counties as well as from cities, many of them from Chambers of Commerce inspired by local pride. At least one plea has been made—by Sen. Richard L. Neuberger (D-Ore.)—that Khrushchev be shown "the gentler, more compassionate, and more human side of America."

Neuberger says he believes the Communist leader would be more moved by American school children or by an American seeking an answer to the grim riddle of cancer than by a "panorama of American weapons and factories." To those suggestions could be added many other kinds of individuals and groups who make up our diverse society—labor unions in the meeting hall, Granges, PTA's, college students in the healthy frenzy of a football rally. The list is endless; only the brevity of Khrushchev's time here imposes the discipline of selectivity.—E.R.R.

Tito and National Communism

The 10th anniversary today of the diplomatic break between Yugoslavia and the USSR finds Tito still very much the Fallen Angel of a Communist "Paradise Lost."

Tito's initial crime was dissent from Stalinism, but Titoism quickly became the heresy of national communism. For a time after Stalin died it looked as if Tito might be brought back into the fold. That was during the halcyon "separate roads to socialism" days of 1955-56. Then came the Poznan riots and the Hungarian slaughter, and Tito once again was consigned to outer darkness.

NOW the process may be repeating itself. Less than a month ago, during a visit to Poland, Premier Khrushchev told the Plawace Collective near Poznan: "Every nation has the right to act according to its national characteristics, customs and social peculiarities."

In Red China, too, there appears to be a second softening up in prospect. In June, Tao Chu, Communist leader in Kwangtung province, swung back toward the discredited "hundred flowers" doctrine, saying: "We should allow everyone to air his views freely as long as the views are based on the spirit of promoting Socialist construction."

Yugoslav and Hungarian experience, however, suggest that the bloom of tolerance withers with the first frost. There is still no reason for discarding Joseph Schumpeter's incisive observation, in "Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy," that "The religious quality of Marxism... explains a characteristic attitude of the orthodox Marxist toward opponents. To him, as to any believer in a faith, the opponent is not merely in error but in sin."—E.R.R.

Dennis the Menace



"AIRMAIL! AN HE WASN'T EVEN HURRYIN'!"

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

The President's Adventure

In less than two weeks the President will be off to Europe, on the first stage of an extraordinary adventure in personal diplomacy. We have seen no such display of energy and initiative since the early days of his first administration. For years the present Eisenhower has been quiescent, as it were submerged. But what we see now is not a new Eisenhower. This is the old authentic Eisenhower with his liking for large gestures which sweep aside the concrete details that more worldly statesmen and professional diplomats worry about.

This authentic Eisenhower has for years been throttled down by diffidence, by a lack of confidence in his own political know-how, by his illness with their aftermath in a kind of regulated invalidism, and by the authority of his advisors. The world has been surprised now because he looks so active, and because he so much enjoys being on his own. No doubt he is himself as agreeably surprised as are the rest of us.

But this is by far the most difficult task he has ever undertaken. At Gettysburg yesterday he did his best to play it down and make it seem unimportant. But he cannot make the exchange of visits unimportant in fact. They mark a new phase of the cold war, and he is the central figure of the drama. He will not have an easy time.

AS SUPREME Commander during the World War, he had to work with a coalition of allies and their strong-minded generals. But it was wartime and his bosses were Churchill and Roosevelt. Now, he is the leading figure in a coalition composed of nations which have many, often divergent, purposes besides wanting to win the cold war. However, he is not dealing with a suicidal maniac like Hitler, but with a practical politician of great resourcefulness who is operating from a powerful ideological and an enormous material base.

The problems which the President has now undertaken to discuss with our allies and with our adversary arise out of confrontation of vital interests. There could be no greater illusion than to suppose that these problems can be solved by the techniques of public relations, of advertising, of propaganda, or of electioneering. Yet it is disconcerting to see how many there are among us who think that if only Khrushchev sees with his own eyes our skyscrapers, and how many automobiles there are to make traffic jams in our streets, and all the things that can be bought in shops, and what large factories we have, he will be so impressed that he will give in to us on West Berlin, German reunification, Formosa, Korea, and what not.

NOR SHOULD we imagine that Mr. K. does not know about the military power of the United States, that he does not know that if he seized Berlin, there would be a war. Mr. K. has no doubt many illusions about who pulls the strings inside the United States. But his illusions do not obscure the fact that the United States is a great military power and that it is quite capable of being provoked into becoming fighting mad.

Soviet foreign policy is not, I believe, based on the notion that if we are threatened with

war, we will give in and give up. Soviet policy is based, as I understand it, on the calculations of what is possible by measures that are short of war—on measures that, while they are politically effective, need not be imposed by war and cannot be resisted by war.

WHAT we need in West Berlin is a new agreement which guarantees the security of West Berlin. But we do not know whether such an agreement can be obtained and, if so, at what price. There is no public evidence that Mr. Gromyko ever answered these questions at Geneva. What we do know is that if a new agreement can be had, the price will surely capitalize upon the obvious strategic inferiority of the West in relation to West Berlin. The price will, therefore, be higher than Dr. Adenauer, who has thus far controlled Western policy about Germany, has ever been willing to agree to.

The President will be in Bonn for a day and that is much too short a time to work out with Dr. Adenauer a negotiable position on Germany. This will make it difficult for the President to enter into serious talks about Germany when Mr. K. comes to Washington. If the President has to talk from the same brief that Secretary Herter had at Geneva, the German problem will remain frozen.

(c) 1959 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

More on the Khrushchev Visit

Washington—The President's invitation to Nikita S. Khrushchev is such a great event that every explanatory detail has true historic interest. Here, then, is another well-authenticated installment of the background story. President Eisenhower himself, it can now be stated, was the first to think favorably of a visit by the Soviet leader. He had of course known for many months that Khrushchev wanted a personal meeting with him. He seems to have become inclined to give Khrushchev what he wanted rather early in the Berlin crisis.

The idea of a Khrushchev visit was very much in the President's mind, at any rate, long before the tragic death of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. After Dulles had retired from the State Department, but when he was still well enough to give advice and counsel, the President talked to him more than once about the desirability of inviting Khrushchev.

Dulles was properly conscious that final responsibility had passed to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter. He refrained from taking an extreme position. Yet he always disliked summit meetings of any sort, and he particularly disliked the kind of two-man summit that is now to occur. The plain truth is that he thought the President altogether too good and high-minded for face-to-face negotiations with the crafty and unscrupulous Khrushchev. Hence Dulles gently but rather firmly discouraged the President from asking Khrushchev to visit this country.

PERHAPS Khrushchev would not now be coming to America if Dulles were still here to function as the President's special advisor. Yet it seems more probable that Dulles would have responded, as Secretary Herter responded, to the subsequent development of the problem. Herter had concurred with Dulles' advice to the President, when this advice was given. He was forced to change his mind by events.

To be specific, Herter's mind was changed by the interminable first round of the Foreign Ministers' meeting at Geneva. As will be recalled, this was advertised as the prelude to the larger, more formal type of summit meeting that was held in 1954. But Dulles, and Herter after him, had repeatedly laid down the rigid condition that the Foreign Ministers must provide "justification," before the President could take the summit road. And instead of

fering "justifying" concessions at Geneva, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko stonewalled from start to finish.

MACMILLAN had always insisted that the Western nations could not proceed to the final, terrible test of will and strength over Berlin, without one last attempt to find a way out at the summit. Berlin could not go along, he had said, if war was to be risked without first trying what talk could achieve. Therefore Secretary Herter, having little hope of further progress by the Foreign Ministers, was forced to make one of three choices:

First, he could prepare to go it alone on Berlin, defying Khrushchev on Berlin without the support of Britain.

Second, he could prepare to eat his own words about the need for "justification," and then satisfy Macmillan and Khrushchev too, by consenting to a 1954-style summit conference.

Or third, he could find another way out, which escaped the danger of the first choice and the humiliation of the second. Since an informal, two-man summit had not been considered except by the President, it had not been hedged about with requirements for "justification." It could even be presented as a kind of jolly week end party. It was the best way out, and the President, already inclined to invite Khrushchev, took this way out as soon as Secretary Herter advised it.

HERTER further decided to make an empty exercise of the second round at Geneva, by sending the President's invitation to Moscow before the Foreign Ministers reassembled. The purpose was to avoid the appearance of inviting Khrushchev in panic and under duress, when the second round was breaking up in failure. This decision was shortly justified, when Prime Minister Macmillan began pressing Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd to sponsor an "interim agreement" on Berlin that was as full of holes as a colander.

It was only at this point, finally, that Herter told the other allies that Khrushchev would probably be coming to Washington. Contrary to previous reports, they had not been consulted in advance; but they approved the action taken with varying measures of good grace. Like Herter, they had no better alternative.

(c) 1959 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Washington Report

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

TICKING PACKAGE

Washington - Nikita Khrushchev's forthcoming journey here is being approached by most elected politicians as though it were a ticking package arriving in the mail with foreign writing on the wrapper.

True, some powerful men in both the Senate and House have unhesitatingly welcomed this new cold war diplomacy. These for the most part, however, have been in two categories: (1) Those who felt that public responsibility, simply required them to back President Eisenhower in this enterprise. (2) Those whose constituents include no overwhelming numbers of the nationally known groups, primarily the Poles, which have most suffered from Soviet tyranny.

It is true, too, that Vice President Richard Nixon's part in arranging the Soviet Premier's exchange of visits with Mr. Eisenhower is looked upon as a brilliant political stroke, certainly for the short run. As of now he has measurably improved his chances for the 1960 Presidential nomination. But the real consensus among the pros has another and a little-known side. This that Mr. Nixon has taken the greatest risk ever run by a Presidential aspirant in tying himself so closely to high-level cold war conversations he can never for a moment shape or control.

THE Vice President himself, in this correspondent can testify, was aware of at least a great element of risk before he went to Moscow.

The real responsibility, of course, is the President's. But Mr. Eisenhower is leaving office. If things go wrong it will be the man nominated to succeed him who must bear

the heat. And if this nominee is Richard Nixon he will be wholly unable to avoid the consequences. He is associated both with the decision to deal with Mr. Khrushchev and the arrangements that brought the visit about.

Even those politicians who believe we simply had to break the ice with the Russians are just as happy that they were not the ones to break it. For they remember two facts of life. One is that the public may first strongly cry support for a bold and dangerous foreign policy and in a moment turn bitterly upon the leaders who did what the public first wanted.

ANOTHER is that no real or alleged political sin has been punished so savagely as the sin of being "wrong" in world affairs. No one could have believed it after the opposition had turned its guns upon "Truman's war." But Congress almost unanimously approved when President Truman first sent forces into Korea. So did the public, as the Congressional mail of that period made plain.

But later, when the casualty lists began to mount and the war to widen, all this changed. The Democratic party itself, too, was repudiated. So, too, was Mr. Truman—who was leaving office then, as Mr. Eisenhower is now. But so, too, was Mr. Truman's nominated successor, Adlai E. Stevenson.

Again, Franklin Roosevelt's Yalta meeting with Josef Stalin was not widely denounced at the time. But in that meeting—and it, too, was an effort to "get along with the Soviets"—some nationality groups became convinced that they had been betrayed. Primarily, it was, again, the Poles, whose gallantry in their war was exceeded only by their incredible sufferings as a people.

FOREIGN policy is a thousand times trickier

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Piano playing has its ups and downs in places other than the score sheet.

Last week a tunesmith at one of the nicer liquor libraries in town got up and left his piano-bar to the two sports fans whose chatter about baseball finally drowned out his music.

He returned shortly and sat down but once again his songs couldn't be heard over the conversation about who'll win the pennant, so he got up a second time.

The next time he sat down he laid it on the line.

"Look, gentlemen," he said. "One of us will have to stop making noise. Can't I entertain you with a request?"

"Sure!" came the inspired answer. "Can you play 'Take Me Out to the Ball Game'?"

Whoops, there he goes again.

A local theater by grotesque coincidence last week was showing a movie that began with a gigantic, bigger-than-life, technicolor forest fire.

We left after the first scene, partly because of the movie gave promise of becoming a cinematic disaster (as Time magazine would say) but mainly because we had the real thing just down the road a piece.

Or, as we heard someone remark, "Now you know why they call it Ash-land."

A local attorney, we're told, was chatting with an incorrigible punster.

After a lengthy exposition by the attorney, said punster asked, "I notice you used both the words 'unlawful' and 'illegal.' What's the difference?"

"Oh, there is none," the attorney said. "I was using them to mean the same thing."

"That's funny," said the punster. "I always thought that 'unlawful' meant 'against the law' but that an illegal was a sick bird."

And we always thought that a sick bird was a tern for the worse.

And turning to verse, we present a poem with a moral (with apologies to Joyce Kilmer):

I think that I shall never gaze Upon a sight like Ash-land's blaze; It burned up all the trees it left And left a bunch of blackened wood. Poems are made by fools, you see; But what is he who'd burn a tree?

A couple of exuberant boys hooked a trout from a bridge over the Rogue up on the Crater Lake highway. "I got one! I got one! the boy with the pole cried. "I'll net him! Don't lose him!" shouted the other, and he took off down the river bank.

"Bring him in closer!" he yelled when he got down. "Do you have him yet?" the one on top screamed.

"Reel in some more! I can't reach him!" "DO YOU HAVE HIM?" After five minutes of noise like only ten-year-olds can make, the trout was flipping weakly in the net.

Our theory is that the trout wasn't caught. We think it was screamed to death.

And speaking of young boys, don't think we wouldn't like to be one again. Last week a sack of wheat fell off a truck driving down Fir st., just under our news-room windows.

The sack split and the wheat spilled out.

There were a handful of carrier boys on the sidewalk and we watched them watching the spilled wheat. One finally walked out in the street and picked up a handful of it.

Then the second one did the same.

Then they all made a dash and in a minute the wheat was gone from the street and was distributed in a number of small clenched fists.

And then came the big problem: what were they going to do with it?

They couldn't throw it away after all the fuss they went to getting it.

And they certainly had no use for it.

So mothers, if a handful of wheat spilled out of your son's jeans when you went to wash them, there really is an explanation for it.

Boys will be noisy; boys will be curious. But most of all, boys will be boys.

We suppose a sick bird could also be a blue jay.

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 initials for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

On Saving Time

To the Editor: I note in your editorial for this evening that we the people must vote on "Daylight Saving Time" (better expressed as Confusion Time or Fools Time).

It seems the proponents of "Daylight Saving Time" haven't the intelligence to understand from the ballot count of past elections that the majority of us prefer, to leave things as they are.

I've been told by some proponents that by using "Daylight Saving Time" that they get more daylight. Of all the idiotic nonsense! There are exactly 24 hours in one day, no more, no less. If the lazy so and so's want more daylight they need only turn the alarm back and forget about that extra "40 winks."

Personally I intend to leave the clock alone.

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

Disgusting Habit

To the Editor: We were glad to see an expression from some one come out against the disgusting and dangerous habit of some of our curiosity stricken citizens, as voiced in Mr. von der Hellen's letter of Aug. 11.

His letter concerning the recent disastrous fire in the Ashland vicinity, and the trouble wrought by curious onlookers blocking traffic and hindering those combating the fire, voiced my opinion exactly; and my ire had raised to a very unhealthy pitch while listening to officials and newsmen pleading earnestly for onlookers to stay back; the mere fact that grown up people had to be told was bad enough.

My grandson was driving a lowboy loaded with fire fighting equipment to the scene of the fire, and said he had never experienced more difficulty getting through traffic, and only because curious people would not stay out of the way.

My husband remarked it was too bad there couldn't have been a bill, among the 600 the legislature recently passed, that could force the curious, following fires, to help combat the fires or be placed under arrest. This might do some good.

Mrs. O. T. Wilson 431 North Second St. Central Point, Ore.

No Valid Excuse

To the Editor: It may be, as Potpourri suggests in her Tuesday column, that some still find solace for guilty consciences by offering as an excuse for dropping the atom bomb on Hiroshima the fact that we were at war with Japan. To such individuals war, whenever it exists, affords a valid excuse for every species of savagery, but to many thinking people, there is no valid excuse for war.

As old-time Quakers phrased it, (it is) our unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our Divine Lord and Lawgiver, and with the whole spirit and tenor of

Camera To Probe

Depths of Ocean

Boston - (Science Service) - An automatic underwater camera that can withstand pressures of eight tons per square inch and take photographs at depths up to six miles has been developed by the scientific instrument firm of Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier, Inc., here. Housed in a tempered steel casing, the camera can take up to 500 photographs at 10-second intervals and record the time at each exposure directly on the 35mm film.

His Gospel, and that no plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar, can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe unto Him who hath said "Love your enemies."

It was disturbing to discover in the current issue of Reader's Digest that Pearl Buck should have been willing to lend the prestige of her name to the perpetuating of the military myth of the necessity for dropping "the bomb," and of the alleged fact that it shortened the war and thus saved many lives.

Even this recently after the deed, contemporary history has established the contrary and all our efforts at rationalization are futile.

Grace N. Pearson, Route 2, Box 50, Jacksonville, Ore.

Praises Editor

To the Editor: The Prospect fire department truck, driven by Billie Grieves, is certainly due a lot of praise and congratulations for the way the fire at our mill camp was handled this past week.

The fire had gained such headway before it was discovered, and the mill cabins of such dry lumber, crowded together as they are, made the job look like almost an impossible one to save a one of the cabins. Yet the fire department's Billie Grieves got here and held the fire to the one cabin.

I wish people could drive out here and look at this, they would surely realize what a fire department is worth. Mrs. Paul Struck, Molston Mill, Prospect, Ore.