

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., Ph. 2-4141
ROBERT W. RUEL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHAPMAN, Tel. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STEINER, 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 \$4.50
By Carrier - In Advance - Medford
Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Beach, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent and other routes, Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$12.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$6.50
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 Length News Pictures
U.P.I. Telephone News Pictures
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, B.C.
NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFRICANA NEWSPAPERS

Sweetland on Government

Monroe Sweetland is a man with some pretty definite ideas. When in college, he was a "flaming liberal," and still is counted among the more liberal of the Democratic leaders in the state. But he has grown and matured, and with the responsibility of public office, his ideas have grown and matured along with him.

IN RECENT weeks he has been speaking to various groups in many parts of the state. They have been quasi-political talks, and can't really be separated from his campaign for secretary of state.

But they have not been political in a partisan sense. He has been outlining his ideas about government and its responsibilities and what it should perform for the people it serves.

Education is one of the things he supports most strongly, and in recognition of his long record of support he was named "Education's Man of the Year" for Oregon not long ago.

LAST week he discussed government, and the ideas some people hold about it. "Government is not evil," he said. "Some detractors would have us believe we would be better off with no government at all. Yet without government, our civilization would crumble just as surely as if it had been bombarded with hydrogen bombs."

He made the additional point that "violent, irresponsible and subversive" criticism of "responsible, enlightened and progressive government" is dangerous. And he added:

"The anti-government calamity howlers are the present-day reincarnation of the 19th century anarchists. And what's more, they are far more numerous. They do not resort to the extreme of violence employed by yesterday's anarchists. Instead they use the more devastating weapons of denunciation and character assassination which undermines the confidence of people in the social purposes of government."

IN THESE United States, the Founding Fathers provided a framework of government which is responsive to the needs of the majority, while protecting the rights of the minority.

In our system, it is the purpose of government to preserve and guarantee the "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" assurances of the Declaration of Independence, and the welfare clause of the Constitution.

And Sweetland made the point that, through government, "we are able to improve the organization of society, increase our economic production, enrich our social relationships, and secure peacefulness and law and order."

AND he added these thoughts: "We must not forget that democratic government is established by the people to meet their own needs. The most important need today is to counter the threat which communism poses to our democratic institutions. To meet this threat, all levels of government must perform adequately to show the world that our system is capable of attending successfully to the demands of human welfare in housing, education, economic progress, civil rights, conservation and national defense."

"The democratic one-third of the world must convince the uncommitted one-third that our way of life is preferable to that of the totalitarian one-third."

Sweetland knows what he's talking about, he's right, and he says it well.

We wish it were possible to convince the violent detractors of government—today's nihilists—of the truth of Sweetland's views.—E.A.

We Can Achieve

Along the same lines, Harold Cook brought a reprint from the Monthly Newsletter of the Royal Bank of Canada in to the office last week. The article's summary said:

It is better to participate in the creation of good things than to boast of their possession. Since the beginning, men and women who grouped themselves together in communities have been faced with many problems. In seeking solutions, they have been handicapped by ignorance, prejudice, and mental inertia. Despite all this, man has, over a few thousand years, succeeded in improving his environment and has had an enjoyable time doing it.

It is, indeed, a poor rejoinder to say about a suggestion for community betterment "our fathers got along all right without all this fuss". Because of the planning and work that they did we are given today's opportunities. But we cannot be merely onlookers at the pageant of life.

New conditions have brought new needs, and only the community whose people are guided by intelligent awareness of its needs and a determination to meet them can preserve the goodness it has. This is a job for people with faith that even the most threatening situation can be handled successfully by coordinated effort; that even the best they can imagine for their community can be achieved.

In the words of the old song, "accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative."—E.A.

Misnomer

The state fair's teapot tempest over "traditional" vs. "modern" art continues. Mrs. Rachel Griffin, of the Portland Museum of Art, has resigned as a state fair art judge because the state fair board succumbed ingenuously in the face of demands from the "traditionalists" that a "traditionalist" judge be appointed in addition to three competent, professional judges.

Actually, "traditionalist" vs. "modernist" is a misnomer for the hassle. The "traditionalists" are really amateurs without background, training or competence in art, while the "modernists" are in fact following the true artistic tradition of creativity, experimentation, and freedom to seek beauty and meaning without being hide-bound by arbitrary standards.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



WHATCHA GOT THAT COTTON IN YOUR EARS FOR, MR. WILSON? HUH, MR. WILSON? HEY, MISTER WILSON....

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.

Tings to Remember

To the Editor: Some years ago, Aye paid \$5 for der book entitled, "How to remember tings." Der vun ting Aye remember best vas—Don't do it again.

Der book vas about vun yackrabitt vot got scared of a hounddog, and yumped ofer der fence, ran down der highway, skidded under der truck, viggled through der culvert, tore across der airport, yumped on der railroad track and lost der cotton pickin' pants on der cow-catcher. Der vords you vas supposed to remember vas: Yackrabitt, hounddog, fence, highway, truck, culvert, airport, railroad track, cotton pickin' pants and cow-catcher. If you wanted to remember more vords, yust have der yackrabitt hop around some more. It vas easy to learn der vords, but it still wouldn't tell you ven der license plates on der old Yalopy vas going to expire.

Dot vas vun for der Police. It cost me \$5.51 for me to take der slip of paper to der Yudge. Vun cent for der expiring parking meter and 50c for der expiring parking meter vot expired ven Aye vas talking to der Yudge about der expired license plates. Der \$5 vas for der highway up-keep. Dot vas vot you would say, "an expiring day."

If you ask me—Der Police got vun heck of a better book to teach you—How to remember tings. It works.

Everett Acklin Ashland, Ore.

She'd Like Some Benches

To the Editor: It is about time Medford vas made "Less Beautiful" and "more Comfortable" for the people, especially the old people and the disabled.

The small businessmen along Main St. should band together with the owner of the city bus and demand the right from the city council to put benches in front of their places for the tired and elderly to rest.

Medford is supposed to be a "Haven" for retired people. It is too far to walk up to the city park from the main business center to get a chance to sit down.

It doesn't matter what kind of benches. They can be made of wood, iron or concrete and should be of a permanent nature.

It seems the larger the city grows the less is done for the "Little People."

It would be much nicer to have a bench to sit on while waiting for a bus instead of leaning on a window. I saw five people leaning against a window for support for their backs, waiting for a bus to take them home. I am sure the owner of the drug store would much rather have a bench than have to replace a broken window.

So, Medfordites, let's begin to think of the old as you and I cannot forever stay young. Let's do it now. Time is a-wasting.

Mrs. Lillian Green 2411 Sunset Court Medford.

Liked Care

To the Editor: I would like this letter published to thank the staff of Sacred Heart hospital. I would like to thank my doctors, Dr. Stephenson, Dr. Meyerding and also staff members who cared for me during my hospitalization.

I received fine treatment and care and it is my opinion that the service at the hospital is of the best. Thanks again.

Officer Roy Erickson, Member of the Medford City Police Department

Sound in the Night

To the Editor: Back in the palmy days of 1924 when Gold Hill boasted of having a brass band and "ate high on the hog," there vas also a smelter boom among the townsmen and a rather spirited element of the last remaining old hard rock miners.

Gold claims were staked all around the surrounding hills for miles and then some. A chemist at Gold Hill, along with a friend and myself, knowing of an abandoned mine of years ago, set out to do the assessment work, which necessitated the three of us to work at a late hour of night. The chemist friend had a big collie dog that always tagged along.

One night on the mile long trail, there were heavy foot sounds tramping directly across about 50 yards in a dark canyon, headed the same way we were walking down a steep grade. Whatever the heavy beast was, it caused the hair on the collie to stand straight out and almost to walk between our legs until we reached the end of the trail. At that moment everything vas silent. We never did hear any more night prowling after that, but it vas a rather eerie feeling to experience and not having any means for protection.

Bert Kissinger, 320 Boardman St., Medford

League on Security

To the Editor: With interest and appreciation, the members of the League of Women Voters of Medford read your editorial, "Mutual Security," on June 8.

For the last two years, 1097 local Leagues have been studying United States foreign policy and have concluded that long-range, adequately financed programs carried on through the development loan fund, technical assistance programs and multilateral arrangements are essential to the well-being of this country as well as to the overwhelming support for the economic aspects of the Mutual Security Program, and feels that President Eisenhower's request for an appropriation of \$4.2 billion should be granted by Congress.

On May 4, Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, sent the following telegram to President Eisenhower:

"The national board of the League of Women Voters of the United States wholeheartedly applauds your effort to obtain the full amount of your request for funds for economic assistance as expressed in your May 2nd address to the nation . . ."

On May 14, the League submitted a statement to the house appropriations subcommittee on foreign operations in support of the Mutual Security Program for economic development and technical assistance.

The Medford League wishes to thank the Medford Mail Tribune for its efforts in creating active community support for this urgent legislation.

Marion M. (Mrs. Fred T.) Burich, Foreign Policy Chairman, League of Women Voters Medford

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

MR. K. AND THE DEMOCRATS

Mr. Khrushchev's sustained fury against Mr. Eisenhower is more than a case of bad temper and bad manners. It is, it seems to me, a calculated campaign, addressed primarily to the Communist world. Its object is to destroy the image of President Eisenhower—of the benevolent like who is the bringer of peace to mankind—and to purge Mr. K. himself of his association with it.

The President's own image of himself has been that of the victorious General who became a Peacemaker. Until May 16 this was also Mr. Nixon's and the Republican party's image of the election campaign of 1960. The outlines were sketched in a year ago, beginning with Mr. Nixon's visit to Moscow. The full picture was to be completed this month, when it would become incandescent with a triumphant tour of peace and good will to Moscow and Tokyo.

To the making of the promotion of this image of like the Peacemaker, Mr. K. has during the past year been a powerful contributor. The Soviet Union is at a point in its internal development where it has a vital interest

in a detente, Mr. K. chose to base the tactics of his policy to achieve the detente on the belief that he could reach a personal understanding with Mr. Eisenhower, and, in the face of skepticism, criticism, and opposition from the orthodox Communists, he played Eisenhower as his trump card.

HIS prolonged fury against Mr. Eisenhower personally must be related directly to the size of his investment in the personality of Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. K. had done something which is most un-Marxist, something that no other Communist leader has ever done before. He had staked his prestige upon the personality of the anti-Communist state, a deeply conservative General presiding over a highly capitalistic administration. After the U-2 affair—when the President had justified the overflights as necessary national policy—Mr. K. was in a position which is intolerable for a dictator. He had been made to look ridiculous, glib, and weak, in the presence of the Communist world.

Accordingly, I do not share the view of those who say that the U-2 was merely a pretext, that the Western desire to stand pat in Berlin, was the real reason why Mr. Khrushchev broke up the summit meeting. For him the U-2 affair was a far more serious threat to his power and his prestige than would have been an inconclusive negotiation about Berlin followed by an agreement to continue the negotiation at another summit meeting. In my view, after the U-2 affair Mr. K. did not dare to negotiate with Mr. Eisenhower. He had been his chief sponsor to the Communist world, and without an enormous loss of face, he could not sit down with him and negotiate.

STRICTLY speaking, what Mr. K. has done is to break relations with President Eisenhower personally, and to suspend serious negotiations during his term of office. Mr. K. has done nothing about Berlin except to proclaim a moratorium good at least for another eight months. He has refused to accept the President's personal assurance that the overflights are suspended. He has delivered an ultimatum to all our allies that he will attack any base from which an illegal flight takes off. He has focused his quarrel on Mr. Eisenhower personally and on his heir, Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Khrushchev's quarrel with the Republicans is embarrassing to the Democrats. For he has said that there can be no serious negotiations until there is a Democratic administration. No political party likes to be endorsed by a foreign government, least of all by a Communist government. No party likes to be endorsed during a propaganda campaign in which by the insults to the man, the office which he holds is defamed.

That, it seems to me, is a fair question. We Americans want to know. If our military program is inadequate, it is OUR lives and fortunes that are at stake.

IN his now celebrated statement, Mr. Rockefeller urges a faster rate of economic growth . . . meaning, presumably, an accelerated rate of growth FORMED by government. He wants federal aid for school construction. He wants increased medical aid for the aged under social security.

All of these SOUND like endorsement of the philosophy of the spenders. They seem to suggest that in Mr. Rockefeller's opinion the Republican party should pledge itself, if returned to power this fall, to SPEND MORE THAN THE DEMOCRATS HAVE BEEN SPENDING.

WE must remember, of course, that we do not have before us the full text of the Rockefeller statement. We have as yet only the digest of its principal points that has been provided for us by the news services.

Before we can draw accurate conclusions, we must have the FULL TEXT. We must study it carefully. We must balance one statement against another. Before we can arrive at an accurate judgment of what Mr. Rockefeller proposes, in the event that the Republican party takes him at his word and DRAFTS him as its nominee for the high office of President, we must have the full text of his statement so that we may study carefully, even prayerfully, what he is proposing in his dramatic entrance into the political arena.

On the face of what we are able to see so far—

A lot of us will feel a sense of disappointment in Mr. Rockefeller.

in a detente, Mr. K. chose to base the tactics of his policy to achieve the detente on the belief that he could reach a personal understanding with Mr. Eisenhower, and, in the face of skepticism, criticism, and opposition from the orthodox Communists, he played Eisenhower as his trump card.

HIS prolonged fury against Mr. Eisenhower personally must be related directly to the size of his investment in the personality of Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. K. had done something which is most un-Marxist, something that no other Communist leader has ever done before. He had staked his prestige upon the personality of the anti-Communist state, a deeply conservative General presiding over a highly capitalistic administration. After the U-2 affair—when the President had justified the overflights as necessary national policy—Mr. K. was in a position which is intolerable for a dictator. He had been made to look ridiculous, glib, and weak, in the presence of the Communist world.

Accordingly, I do not share the view of those who say that the U-2 was merely a pretext, that the Western desire to stand pat in Berlin, was the real reason why Mr. Khrushchev broke up the summit meeting. For him the U-2 affair was a far more serious threat to his power and his prestige than would have been an inconclusive negotiation about Berlin followed by an agreement to continue the negotiation at another summit meeting. In my view, after the U-2 affair Mr. K. did not dare to negotiate with Mr. Eisenhower. He had been his chief sponsor to the Communist world, and without an enormous loss of face, he could not sit down with him and negotiate.

STRICTLY speaking, what Mr. K. has done is to break relations with President Eisenhower personally, and to suspend serious negotiations during his term of office. Mr. K. has done nothing about Berlin except to proclaim a moratorium good at least for another eight months. He has refused to accept the President's personal assurance that the overflights are suspended. He has delivered an ultimatum to all our allies that he will attack any base from which an illegal flight takes off. He has focused his quarrel on Mr. Eisenhower personally and on his heir, Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Khrushchev's quarrel with the Republicans is embarrassing to the Democrats. For he has said that there can be no serious negotiations until there is a Democratic administration. No political party likes to be endorsed by a foreign government, least of all by a Communist government. No party likes to be endorsed during a propaganda campaign in which by the insults to the man, the office which he holds is defamed.

That, it seems to me, is a fair question. We Americans want to know. If our military program is inadequate, it is OUR lives and fortunes that are at stake.

IN his now celebrated statement, Mr. Rockefeller urges a faster rate of economic growth . . . meaning, presumably, an accelerated rate of growth FORMED by government. He wants federal aid for school construction. He wants increased medical aid for the aged under social security.

All of these SOUND like endorsement of the philosophy of the spenders. They seem to suggest that in Mr. Rockefeller's opinion the Republican party should pledge itself, if returned to power this fall, to SPEND MORE THAN THE DEMOCRATS HAVE BEEN SPENDING.

WE must remember, of course, that we do not have before us the full text of the Rockefeller statement. We have as yet only the digest of its principal points that has been provided for us by the news services.

Before we can draw accurate conclusions, we must have the FULL TEXT. We must study it carefully. We must balance one statement against another. Before we can arrive at an accurate judgment of what Mr. Rockefeller proposes, in the event that the Republican party takes him at his word and DRAFTS him as its nominee for the high office of President, we must have the full text of his statement so that we may study carefully, even prayerfully, what he is proposing in his dramatic entrance into the political arena.

On the face of what we are able to see so far—

A lot of us will feel a sense of disappointment in Mr. Rockefeller.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

If an editor has a low boiling point he is likely to explode every morning when he opens his mail. You should see some of the mail that comes to an editor's desk. It's like a lot of the junk mail you get (addressed to Occupant) only it's worse and there's a lot more of it.

The senders of much of it are so careless that they haven't corrected their mailing lists in years. We get mail regularly that is addressed to people who have not been at the East Oregonian in many years.

You're probably wondering why we bother to look at the stuff. We do so because it is possible to detect from the appearance of many envelopes what is inside them. Some of the stuff is worth taking a look at. And some editors who shoveled all of it into the waste basket later upon inspecting it learned later from the business office that they threw out some checks.

A few years ago, the co-owner of The Bend Bulletin, Henry Fowler, became so irritated with all the junk mail that came to his desk that he prepared a form letter which he sent to the junk mail dispensers. He told them he didn't want to get any more of their stuff. It reduced the flow of the junk a little, but not much.

The letters that irritate an editor most are those that come from companies that do no business in the editor's town but nevertheless request that he give them some publicity in his newspaper. Much of the stuff is plainly advertising, for which anybody but a fathead press agent would expect to pay the newspaper.

There's a "touch" that goes with some of this stuff that is the straw that breaks the editor's back. The press agent asks you to send him a copy of the paper in which his story appears. Of course he doesn't send along a stamp to cover mailing of the paper. No editor with all his marbles is going to print the press agent's stuff. By asking that

a copy of the paper in which he expects it to appear be mailed to him the press agent insults the editor beyond the limits of decency.

We continue to open all of it, although it's hard on the blood pressure. We're sure many editors dream of the tortures they would inflict upon the press agents who send out tons of that stuff every week if they only could get their hands on 'em.—"Of Cabbages and Kings" column, in Pendleton East Oregonian.

Who was out on a limb the other morning? Our Out On A Limb editor. Why? Because his sink at home had stopped up. What did he do about it? He brought his shaving gear to work with him, and shaved in the newsroom's men's room. "He had a 6:30 a.m. shadow," a co-worker remarked.

We found this note on our desk last week: "A local hospital administrator claims that hospitals can't be compared to hotels—not costwise, anyway. "Not service-wise, either, apparently. At a hotel you can find out if a person is in, or has checked out. At a hospital it seems you learn a person has checked out either after calling home, or reading the obituary notices in the newspaper the next day."

"Ask a staff member—who frantically tried all day at frequent intervals to find out when his wife would be permitted to leave the hospital."

Our Phoenix friend got such prominent display in this space last week that we hesitate to mention him again for fear that he may get to feeling indispensable. But he had a point in his weekly missive—enclosing a clipping about the "coupe" that overturned the Menderes government in Turkey. And he asked, "Does this mean that Menderes was AUTOMATICALLY overthrown?"

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

NO TRIVIAL MATTER Washington—The United States is in a much worse bind than almost anyone imagines, as a result of the voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests

that was proposed by Nikita S. Khrushchev and agreed to by President Eisenhower.

We cannot violate our pledge by holding weapons

in while the moratorium is in force. But no less a person than the able chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, John A. McCone, is already holding secret tests, as already reported in this space. And if McCone is correct, this is no trivial matter.

The plain truth is that the means for secret testing either exist already or can be rather easily created; and the incentive for secret testing is enormous. On these points, public opinion, including a wide spectrum of expert opinion, is still grossly misinformed. The facts need to be placed on the record in the clearest terms.

As to the means for secret testing, they are nothing more complicated than large underground holes, such as the holes washed out of salt domes which American oil companies have long used for storing natural gas.

AS ALSO reported in this space, even the ever-optimistic British experts now admit that tests up to 150 kiloton power can be concealed from the proposed Geneva detection system. But there is no Geneva detection system in being. Hence if the Soviets have suitable underground holes, they have the means of most any power they choose. Chairman McCone thinks they already have such holes; although most experts do not. In any case, one must assume they are scooping out the holes by now, because of the incentives for secret testing.

The enormity of the incentives for secret testing is the point of primary importance. Almost everyone, including almost everyone in the U.S. government, still supposes that it is impossible to conceal nuclear tests of any magnitude, even by testing underground. The vast majority of military theorists are also more and more doubtful of the value of tactical, small-yield nuclear weapons. The gain from secret testing would not be great, if cheating were really limited to small-yield weapons.

BUT THIS widely held belief is utterly without foundation in fact. The big hole system of cheating, as noted above, permits development of weapons in the strategic power-ranges. Furthermore, there is no factual foundation whatever for another widely held belief, that existing H-bombs represent a sort of ultimate in strategic weapons development, rendering further development fruitless.

As everyone knows, the missiles-of-the-future are more dependable, more mobile, and generally more flexible, solid fuelled missiles, like our medium range Polaris, and our long-range Minuteman. As very few people know, the warheads planned for the Polaris and Minuteman are well below the optimum power, simply because these rockets will not have enough thrust to carry the weight of bigger warheads.

In short, solid fuelled missiles, having less thrust than liquid fuelled missiles, create an urgent need for warheads of the smallest possible weight with the greatest possible power. The better the weight-for-bang ratio of the warhead, the smaller the missile can be. The real ultimate is a strategic deterrent that will be totally invulnerable because it will be totally mobile. If the deterrent's constituent missiles are small enough to be continuously moved about, the other side will never know where the deterrent is, and will therefore be unable to destroy it. Such a deterrent will be far ahead of the Polaris-Minuteman system we are now building.

MERELY because of the requirement established by the Polaris and Minuteman, the American weight-for-bang problem is already serious. For the Soviets, it is much more serious. The weight-for-bang ratio of their warheads is known to be very substantially poorer than our ratio. This does not matter to them in their present phase, because of the enormous thrust of their liquid fuelled rockets. But if they are aiming to push onwards to the ultimate deterrent, as they must surely do to do, the inferiority of their weight-for-bang ratio is a really desperate matter for the Kremlin.

Such is their incentive for cheating. If they cheat, and we do not test at all over a long period, they can reach the stage of the ultimate deterrent, while we lag far behind. Right there, is the reason for Chairman McCone's opposition to an indefinitely prolonged moratorium on tests without adequate polling.