

MEDFORD TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

33 North Fir St., Ph. SP-24141

ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor; HERB GREY, Advertising Manager; GERALD T. LATIAM, Bus. Mgr.

ERIC W. ALLEN JR., Mng. Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor

HARRY CHAPMAN, Teleg. Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor

OLIVE STARBUCK, 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 15c

Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00

Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$9.00

Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$4.25

Sunday Only - One year \$4.25

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 year \$18.00

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 Leased Wire

U.P.I. Telephone Newsictures MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

Advertising Representative: WEST HOLIDAY CO., INC.

Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

Flight o' Time

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

10 YEARS AGO Jan. 21, 1950 (Saturday)

A hangar roof at The Dalles collapsed from weight of snow and demolished five planes.

One Ashland youth was given a 90-day jail sentence after he and four others were accused of stealing items from a wrecked plane in which a man was killed.

20 YEARS AGO Jan. 21, 1940 (Sunday)

Russia warns Finland it will declare war unless Finland return weapons stolen from Red troops on Finnish territory.

Russia has been bombing Finnish cities for two months but never yet declared war.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "A poll in Portland shows men (the brutes) are the best auto drivers, and the women (the smoothies) admit it."

30 YEARS AGO Jan. 21, 1930 (Tuesday)

Local co-ops need more turkeys for shipment to Boston and more hogs for shipment to Portland.

Dry enforcement chief rules "sanctity of the home must be observed in all dry raids."

40 YEARS AGO Jan. 21, 1920 (Thursday)

Expert tells people at Page theater last night that Trigon oil well will be producing oil in Medford within a year.

City police arrest three high school boys for smoking and controversy rages.

50 YEARS AGO Jan. 21, 1910 (Friday)

The 640-acre Dunlap place east of Talent has been sold for \$80,000; will be planted with fruit trees.

Official of Pacific and Eastern railroad predicts Medford's population will reach 25,000 by 1914.

What's Your I.Q.?

Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. Who was left at a river's brink in a basket made of papyrus?

2. Does the monotype machine cast one letter at a time?

3. Is a chimpanzee a monkey?

4. Who is the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives?

5. A polygon is another name for a tadpole; true or false?

6. What young girl led a French Army against the English?

7. Which of these does not have wings: mosquitoes, fleas, flies, bees?

8. In what country is the Thames River?

9. Who sought the Golden Fleece?

10. Was Thomas Jefferson President of the U.S. before, or after, John Quincy Adams?

Answers: 1. Moses. 2. Yes. 3. No (an anthropoid ape). 4. Sam Rayburn. 5. False. 6. Joan of Arc. 7. Fleas. 8. England. 9. The Argonauts. 10. Before.

A Sharp Contrast

There is a startling contrast between the thinking shown in pieces printed elsewhere on this page.

One is the article by Walter Lippmann, one of America's most distinguished and best informed men, in which he cautions against the drift of this nation toward second-class status, or worse.

He quotes Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, as saying, "The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

MR. LIPPMANN'S point is that this nation is falling behind Russia in its rate of development, and as a major force in the world.

And this is happening, he says, because the nation as a whole is not devoting the necessary share of its economic wealth to the purposes of national power and development.

Instead, it is devoting a greater share to private comfort, convenience and desire.

He says: "That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States."

THE other writing, which is in such contrast, is from Wallace L. Lee, Portland, president of "Volunteers for Constitutional Government of Oregon, Inc."

He is a supporter of the so-called 23rd amendment, which has been discussed on this page recently. His letter is printed in full, despite the fact that it exceeds our usual limitation, so that our readers may judge for themselves the validity of his arguments.

It seems to us the supporters of the amendment portray, with exquisite accuracy, the ultimate in the sort of thinking which Mr. Lippmann deprecates, which boils down to personal greed above national welfare.

CAN private enterprise forge the national purpose and the national power which is needed in today's cold world competition?

Can it compete with the "major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources" which are now directed towards "specialized industrial, military and national power goals"?

The questions are self-answering.

In our view, the 23rd amendment is nothing but a political phrasing of the age-old, unthinking complaints against government, which in this nation still (thank God) is the people—as Lee himself concedes—rather than a faceless master.

WE DO not intend to comment on Mr. Lee's letter, except in regard to one or two points. He says:

"You make the false charge that this amendment to the Constitution would eliminate foreign aid. This is absolute nonsense."

Now, whom shall we believe—Mr. Lee, or Mr. Willis Stone, the author of the amendment?

In Portland, Ore., on Sept. 8, 1959, Mr. Stone delivered a speech in the Scottish Rite Temple. In this speech he said (and the quotation is exact):

"As the proposed 23rd amendment would also prevent the taxing of the American people to pay tribute for foreign powers, this would terminate the so-called foreign aid programs which have produced such hatred of Americans around the world . . ."

Is "private enterprise" going to take over this world-wide program, Mr. Lee, and do it better? Or would this nation simply abandon its friends and allies?

IT IS apparent that those who have been "sold" on the amendment are not entirely in agreement on what it would do.

Each likes to believe it would do what he wants done.

Mr. Lee would like to see the United States government end its role as "absentee landlord" of 53 per cent of the land area of Oregon.

Does he mention that most of this land is administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management? That it is designed for the long-range welfare of the people of this state and of the nation? That it is a major contribution to the wealth and economic stability of all of Oregon?

And that it MORE than pays for itself? He also says this land was "confiscated." Doesn't he read history?

HIS other arguments are equally specious. And all blink the fact that each citizen of this country owes a responsibility to it.

We happen to believe that a patriot pays his taxes to support his government in what it is trying to do, and does it willingly, even if he happens to disagree with some of the details.

We do not see it as patriotism to support a so-called amendment which would emasculate the government in its role as a world power—the ONLY world power still able to face up to the threat of Communist totalitarianism.

THE 23rd amendment, if ever enacted, would end all income, estate and gift taxes.

Well, who wouldn't like to have that money jingling in his own pocket?

But isn't it better to live in a strong, secure nation, and pay these taxes, than it would be to have that money jingling in the pockets of a citizenry of a has-been, bankrupted nation?

As a former Republican governor of Oregon wisely commented on the proposal, "23 Skiddoo."—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I GOTTA EAT AN' RUN! SOME PEOPLE ARE MOVIN' INTO THE NEW HOUSE AN' THEY GOT A COLOR TELEVISION!"

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE SECOND-BEST

The President has been true to the principle he laid down in his first budget, which was submitted on Jan. 21, 1954. "We will reduce," he said six years ago, "the share of the national income which is spent by the government."

He has done that. Although the Federal government is spending on the purchase of goods and services more than it did six years ago, this is a smaller share of the much increased national income. Even when we add the very considerable increased amount spent by local and state governments, the total is still a smaller SHARE than it was in 1953, when the President was preparing his first budget.

So the President is entitled to say that he has been faithful to the principle he laid down when he began. During his term of office the American people have been enjoying a larger share of a greatly enlarged national income. Never before in all history have so many people in any country had so much money to spend privately and as they saw fit.

THIS would be an unalloyed delight were it not for the disturbing fact that during these years of private prosperity, the President has been presiding over the loss of American primacy among the greater powers of the world.

There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union. But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the life-giving principle of national power.

Why has this happened? Why are we challenged in this way when, in fact, the Soviet Union has a gross national product which is less than half of ours and a standard of living about a third as high as our own? Why is this richer country being pressed by a poorer country?

The reason, at bottom, is that in this period of cold war, the President has adhered to a principle which would probably no longer be suitable even in a time of total peace. He has adhered to a principle which puts private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his seven years in office reducing the SHARE of the national income devoted to public purposes. The challenge of the Soviet Union has been demanding an increase, not a reduction, of the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run.

THE Soviet economy is growing at a rate which, estimated conservatively, is 6 per cent per annum. Our economy has been growing at a rate of less than 3 per cent. The Soviet economy is half as big as ours but it is growing twice as fast. This means that this year's increment of increase is about \$12,000,000,000 in the U.S.S.R. and about \$15,000,000,000 in the U.S.A.

But, as this is the crux of the matter, the U.S.S.R. will use most, not all, of the \$12,000,000,000 increase for national purposes, for armaments, for productive investment for foreign aid, and for national education. We, on the other hand, are acting on the Eisenhower principle, and are spending a greater share of

our \$15,000,000,000 increase for private purposes, for the making of consumer goods and of the factories and facilities connected with the making and use of consumer goods.

That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States.

I HAVE taken this analysis of figures from several sources but chiefly from the brilliant and notable testimony before the Joint Committee of Congress given last autumn by Prof. W. W. Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The analysis is confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Allen W. Dulles, based on the findings of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. Dulles's statement is one that we must all ponder and take to heart. It says, "The major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed towards specialized industrial, military and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of consumer type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our respective gross national product nor of our respective industrial production is a true yardstick of our relative national power positions."

"The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

I HAVE emphasized the last sentence of Mr. Dulles's statement because it states, so it seems to me, the fundamental issue which the country must meet. The President's controlling principle—that the government should spend a smaller share of a growing national income—as its consequence, in this age of cold war and national rivalry, that the country will have a smaller position of influence and power in the world. While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what must not be allowed to end is our parity with the greatest powers. For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

Nobody can say as yet when the nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency.

The voices that will serve this country, and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things. They may not as yet do well in the Gallup polls. They will be listened to sooner or later. For they will shatter the belief, now so prevalent among us, that affluence is greatness. It is not. In the history of human society it has not seldom been the case that when riches were devoted to luxury it was the mark of their decline.

(c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Stayton Police Chief Candidate for Sheriff

Salem - (UPI) - The police chief of Stayton, Everett Norfleet, announced his candidacy Wednesday for sheriff of Marion county.

He is the third person—and third Republican—to file for sheriff. Others are incumbent Sheriff Denver Yung and H. (Tex) Shively, Salem.

23rd Amendment Advocate Calls Editorial 'Arrogant, Condescending'; Support Told

To the Editor: Your editorial concerning the proposed amendment to the Constitution, currently known as the 23rd Amendment, has been forwarded to me by friends and supporters in your city.

In your arrogant, condescending attitude you use such descriptive words as silly, absurd, asinine, unlikable. I can think of no better words to describe your editorial dealing with a subject about which you know so little.

After Willis Stone had given his testimony before a Congressional Committee, Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn of New York stood before his colleagues in Congress and made this statement: "I have found no one in Congress or Government who can dispute Mr. Stone's testimony."

Democratic Governor Hickory of Wyoming and Democratic Governor Daniels of Texas are enthusiastic supporters of this Amendment. Both houses of both of these State Legislatures supported the passage of this Amendment. The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons heartily endorse this Amendment. Do you call the

members of this fine group of citizens silly, absurd and asinine?

You make the inference that only the Federal Government can sail ships, build dams, conserve the soil—doing everything that the American people have always done better and cheaper in the American way. Now what is the Federal Government? THE PEOPLE. What is the Sovereign Independent State? THE PEOPLE. What is Private Enterprise? THE PEOPLE. Now if people can do these things through the Federal Government, then they can do the same things through their State Government and through Private Enterprise.

Experience proves that people work together and do things together better within their Sovereign State and among themselves in Free Enterprise than when directed by Federal bureaucrats. A Federal Government that becomes so big and powerful that it can give us everything we want is also big and powerful enough to take everything we have.

The Federal Government with only two of its agencies has confiscated (sic) more

than 40 per cent of the land area of America. This absentee landlord owns 53 per cent of our State of Oregon. Our Governor is the Governor of the State.

Do you like that? Would you like it better if he were reduced to being the Governor of only 27 per cent of the State? When the Federal Income Tax was passed the American people were promised that the tax would never be more than 1 per cent on incomes over \$3,000 and would never exceed 5 per cent on incomes of \$300,000 and over. Now it starts at 20 per cent on incomes \$600 and goes up to 91 per cent on higher incomes. Isn't this confiscation by big Government?

The bureaucrats take their cut off the top and tell the citizens to get along the best way they can on what's left, forcing every citizen who employs people to become their tax collectors. In the thinking of any sane and sensible person this is socialism going rampant. Do you like that and is that what you want? Well, we don't and that's why there is going to be a rough and militant political contest in 1960 and Oregon will be in

the front ranks.

You make the false charge that this Amendment to the Constitution would eliminate Foreign Aid. This is absolute nonsense. The American people have always believed in foreign aid to people. We have done more to relieve the suffering of people all over the world than people of any other nation. Our founding fathers never intended that the Constitution should be so misinterpreted as to force the American people to support Communist and Socialist Governments, enabling these governments to reduce their public debt while we increase our national debt by billions. We are hated by other people of the world and are beloved no less than the Socialist governments that we have built up. The 23rd Amendment will put foreign aid on a people to people basis rather than politician to politician, who are trying to build each other up in a frantic effort to make Socialism work.

You take out of context from the 8th Section of Article I of the Constitution "General Welfare". How can you arrive at such a ridiculous conclusion that our founding fathers deliberately set up for future generations a political convenience for evil men to make possible the same circumstance for which they were forced to fight a revolutionary war?

You sit safe, snug and secure behind the freedom guaranteed to you in Amendment I of the Bill of Rights, a guarantee of freedom of the press. Yet you maliciously attack an Amendment to the Constitution that spells out and gives the same force and affect in granting the same freedom to others. Who buys your papers, who pays for your advertising, making it possible for you to be in business in order that you can insult so many of the good patriotic people of your community and continue to enhance the socialist schemes of bureaucratic planners.

Yours very truly, Wallace L. Lee, President, Volunteers for Constitutional Government in Oregon, Inc. 406-407 Governor Bldg. Portland 4, Ore.

Editor's note: See comment in editorial column. For those who may have missed the amendment, here is its text:

Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

Section 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

Section 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purpose of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

Section 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts.

Newer, Deadlier Weapons in Plans of Both U.S.S.R., U.S.

By PHIL NEWSOM UPI Foreign Editor

Hand-in-hand with talk of world peace goes the drive for newer and deadlier weapons.

Within the last several days, the two most powerful nations on earth, the United States and Soviet Russia, unveiled some of the details of their armament plans for 1960.

Neither intended that settlement of world tensions was just around the corner.

President Eisenhower disclosed a military spending

plan totalling close to \$41 billion, slightly more than last year. In the budget were three more nuclear-powered, Polaris-firing submarines, final-stage development of the 6,000-mile ICBM Minuteman, and an increase in the number of B-52 heavy jet bomber wings from 11 to 14.

In Moscow, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev boasted of a "formidable" new weapon of "fantastic" strength.

He sugar-footed that announcement that Russia would reduce its present military force of 3,623,000 men by 1-200,000 "in the course of one or two years."

The reduction, assuming it is carried out, would place

the U.S. and the Soviet Union about on a par in the number of men under arms. The U.S. plans to have 2,488,000 men in uniform by mid-1961, just about the present level.

President Eisenhower also asked for \$2 billion, an up of \$700 million, to arm the U.S. NATO allies with new weapons.

The thinking behind the armament plans of the two nations has important similarities.

Both are in the transition period from conventional armament to the new concept based on rockets and nuclear power.

The manned bomber and fighter is taking a place of decreasing importance.

Heavy emphasis is being placed on the nuclear submarine, a floating submerged base for rockets almost impossible to detect and possibly the most fearsome weapon of all.

Remains Uneasy World

The U.S. expects to have the first of 15 submarines armed with a 1,500-mile missile combat-ready by this fall. A recent Swedish report said that Russia has a 2,500-ton nuclear-powered submarine now operating in the Baltic.

Out of all this comes the obvious conclusion that, despite all talk of peace and world disarmament, this remains an uneasy world in which potential antagonists intend to negotiate only from positions of strength.

For with all Khrushchev's breath he threatens a separate treaty with East Germany which would cut off free West Berlin, and leave a disarmed West powerless to defend it. The Communists respect strength but they have never hesitated to take advantage of weakness. Korea was a classic example.

And there has been no sign of yielding on the Communists' part to Western demands that disarmament must be accompanied by adequate inspection.

'Spin the Democrat' Is Dick West's New Election Year Game

By DICK WEST

Washington - (UPI) - This seems to be the season for thinking up new political games. Mine is called "Spin the Democrat." It is a variation of the old game "capture the delegate."

The game is played on a board on which a race is drawn. The track is divided into lanes with crossing lines which form squares. In the center is a numbered wheel.

Four can play. Each player selects a campaign button labeled "Kennedy," " Humphrey," "Symington" or "Johnson." The buttons are placed on the starting line,

which is formed by a row of question marks.

The players take turns spinning the wheel and moving their buttons forward the number of spaces indicated by the pointer. This continues until they reach the square marked "news conference."

The first two players to reach this square pick up cards marked "front runner" and follow an arrow pointing to "primaries." The other two pick up cards marked "dark horse" and follow an arrow pointing to "draft."

Can Challenge

The two players on the "primaries" lane continue moving their buttons until one reaches the square marked "New Hampshire." This entitles him to "challenge" the other player.

The other player may accept the "challenge" and move his button onto the "New Hampshire" square. Or he may bypass "New Hampshire" and move on to the square marked "Wisconsin."

The player on "New Hampshire" is then entitled to pick up a "delegate" card.

If two buttons land on the same primary square at the same time, one must go back five spaces and forfeit his "front runner" card.

Meanwhile, the two players with the "dark horse" cards continue to move their buttons along the "draft" lane. If they land on squares marked "opinion poll" or "grass roots," they may pick up a "delegate" card.

Must Forfeit Cards

But if either player stops on a square marked "Stevenson," he must forfeit all of his "delegate" cards and is out of the game.

The play continues until all the buttons reach the last square, which is marked "convention." Now three of the players must try to "block" the player holding the "front runner" card. They move their buttons into a circle marked "smoke filled room."

The three players stay in the circle until one gets possession of all of the "delegate" cards held by the other two. This entitles him to leave the circle and pick up cards from the "favorite son" stack.

The player holding the "front runner" card may now exchange it for a "bandwagon" card, which is equal to three "favorite son" cards. This completes the rules of the game. All you have to do now is figure out who wins.

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 brevity and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Editorial Liked

To the Editor: It was with considerable interest that I read an editorial from your paper dated Dec. 20, 1959. The title of the editorial was "There Was Music." Certainly this fine report typifies the positive actions of an outstanding music department in an outstanding school district. When so much attention is being given to education in general, quality education, it is strengthening to read where thoughtful people are giving music education its due credit.

Jerry Wesley Harris, Editor, Oregon Music Educator, 2865 S.W. 120th, Beaverton, Ore.

Morse To Deliver Demo Keynote Speech

Salem - (UPI) - The keynote speech for the Oregon State Democratic platform convention here will be delivered by Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.).

Morse will open the convention Jan. 29th at 1:30 p.m. in the Marion hotel.

Advertisement for Chapel Mortuary, featuring a circular graphic and text: "Service IS AN UN