

Medford Mail Tribune
Published daily except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c...

National Health Plan

The doctors of America (and we personally know of only one exception) are violently against any form of national (government) health insurance.

They are against the principle of administering a health service for the elderly through the existing mechanism of Social Security.

Their stated reason for this is that it is an opening door to "socialized medicine."

OUR position (and that of what appears to be to be an overwhelming majority of non-doctors, if polls, questionnaires and letters-to-congressmen are any criteria) is that the best way of financing medical care for the elderly is through the Social Security mechanism.

This would provide for pre-paid health insurance, utilize an agency which is already in business and set up for the job, and avoid the pauper-charity connotations of welfare health services.

The differences in opinion appear to be irreconcilable. And it is a rare doctor, indeed, who will dare to open his mouth to support government-sponsored health programs, even if he thinks that approach is proper.

WE KNOW of one, however. He isn't an American; he's a Canadian. His bona fides are substantial.

Dr. Harry Paikin, M.D., is a G.P. in Hamilton, Ontario, where he is a member of the board of education and the board of health, former chairman of both. He is president of the Ontario Urban and Rural School Trustees' association, and a member of the American Academy of Dermatology and Syphilology.

He thus qualifies as an experienced M.D., as well as a man who knows his way around in government.

In the Aug. 27 issue of Maclean's Magazine he is the author of an article entitled "A Doctor's Case for State Medicine." It is prefaced by this statement:

"The medical profession's bitter fight against prepaid government medical plans is a losing battle for a wrong cause, an angry doctor contends. State medicine has to come, he says, for everyone's sake - including the doctors."

BECAUSE this is a live issue, not to say a hot one, in the United States today, we quote rather extensively from his article:

"... If a government operated prepaid medical plan will be the best thing that ever happened to the doctors themselves—especially if they have the wit to join enthusiastically in its planning."

"Doctors who spent their time and money fruitlessly to fight (against it) seem to believe they're standing up for their rights. In a sense, they are. They're standing up for:

"The right to spend much of their time acting as unpaid investigators for private medical-insurance companies, by answering endless questions that probe the patient's ability to work—keeping for this purpose mounds of otherwise useless records."

"The right to work 60 or 70 hours a week while most people work 40, and to enjoy vacations without pay."

"The right to pursue uninsured defaulting patients through the frustration and embarrassment of the collection agency and the small claims court."

"The right to be asleep on their feet and only half-efficient at day's end, largely from doing work that nurses and technicians could do."

"The right of young doctors who lack connections to starve before building up a practice."

"And the traditional inalienable right to feel that all this somehow makes them dedicated, although what they're dedicated TO is questionable."

"In short, under the system they dismiss as socialized medicine, among the lives the doctors save will be their own ..."

"Myopically, they persist in seeing medicine as a business, where you sell so much healing skill for so much recompense, instead of as a public service to which every citizen has a right, like education and police protection ..."

"Some specialists in England are actually earning more today than they ever did without socialized medicine. But will even the average ... practitioner find himself less secure financially under a pre-paid medical plan? Look at him today. He doesn't have the low-cost insurance and pension benefits available to nearly any factory hand; he has no minimum work week; no guarantee the patient will pay him promptly, or at all, and no job security ..."

"In addition to what a government-operated plan will guarantee patients, it must contain guarantees for doctors. In other words, it's time the doctors stopped fighting socialized medicine and started demanding that it be brought along quickly, and with them in mind."

"Of course, doctors will protest that they LIKE their current working conditions, that they love filling out all those repetitive forms, that they delight in losing 50 cents on a \$5 house-call fee because a private insurance carrier is so top-heavy with clerical costs ..."

"Education and health, freely available to all, are the two pillars that will support ... the ancient ideal of healthy minds and healthy bodies. We've built two-thirds of the educational pillar—free compulsory schools and free secondary schools ..."

"This would make it easier to build the second pillar of universal health, on which we've made hesitant beginnings with our medical welfare plans, our hospital insurance, our free tuberculosis x-rays and our free Salk shots. A young doctor assured of security, who hasn't had to endure grinding penury as student and intern for eight or nine years, will surely be more likely to remember one of the high concepts of his profession: NON MAGISTER SED MINISTER—Be not master but the servant of humanity ..."

ALL this, of course, smacks of a doctrine which doctors will find subversive or seditious, if not actually treasonable.

But there is some sense to it. And, note, Dr. Paikin is talking about Canada, not the U.S., and he is talking about a total health plan, not the very limited one proposed for the elderly in this country.

Maybe someday the United States will begin to catch up with Canada, Britain, Germany, Denmark, Norway and Sweden in exercising its responsibilities for the health of its citizens.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"GEE WHIZ! WE HAD VEGETABLES LAST NIGHT!"

... 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 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.

Why Wait?

To the Editor: I went to see the first two Medford High school football games. I was pleased with the outcome of both games. There was practically SRO at both. Now is the time to build another grandstand at the field. It has been suggested before that the old stand should be removed and replaced. I'd suggest the new stand be at least 120 yards long, extending from the end of each end zone and at least as high as the present new stand.

The first cry we will hear is that it will cost too much. Wait for lower prices, or just wait. Some of us have spent our entire lives waiting, but for what? Let's roll up our sleeves and get the job done.

Another suggestion on the same subject. Let us (Medfordites) put away our "masks" and turn in our "shootin' irons" to the local "marshal" and have the Medford-Ashland rivalry confined only to athletic contests, and then just as the participants. Let's invite SOC to have all their home games at Medford High field. Let's set up a FAIR rent for the stadium use, either percentage or flat, and invite them to help pay for this project. The same could of course be extended to Crater, which is scheduled to play Grants Pass this year.

Shall we get started on this project. Or shall we wait another 10 years?

Robert L. Brantley, Route 3, Box 59-B, Medford.

Didn't Do Any Good

To the Editor: It was evidently your intention to stir up the ill feelings for the veteran at White City, against your fair city of Medford. This was evident by your recent editorial against the veteran. Unprovoked editorial at that. It is my belief that you have succeeded well and that you have done neither yourself, nor your advertisers, any good.

Malemute Sigh (Edwin C. Gearhart Sr.) White City, Ore.

Gentlemen Candidates

To the Editor: Mr. F. J. Clifford's letter under the caption of "What is Fair?" generates more heat than it does facts or logic. The best that he is able to say for candidate Nixon is that he is a "gentleman."

Not knowing what Mr. Clifford's definition of a gentleman is, we cannot argue that point. By the same token we infer that he implies that Candidate Kennedy is not a gentleman, nor fair. We are in no position to argue that either.

If Mr. Clifford wants to say name calling is fair or logic he may.

What we would like to know is: What point does he wish to establish? Is it that his conception of a gentleman is better presidential material than that of someone else?

This writer will concede that both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kennedy are gentlemen. Both are honorable men. Both are patriotic men. Both are religious men. Both are opportunistic men. Both are politicians. Both want to be president. Both are in this to win.

As for getting hot and bothered about tactics pursued or to be followed by the two candidates is a matter of choice with them. This is America. We live under a Capitalist economic system and a welfare social system. That is a "class" social system.

Our president of the United States fights with his golf clubs, our vice president and

Kennedy have relative views on our economic and social systems. Mr. Nixon chooses to adhere to the term conservatism, which implies that he favors the political ideas in the upper strata of our social system. Mr. Kennedy is a member of that upper strata, and he chooses to dub himself a liberal, which implies that he is willing to throw a few crumbs to the lower strata of our society; especially those who are about to die.

As far as ridiculing and castigating our political leaders that have gone before, from Grover Cleveland to our president at this time—well, all of us have our convictions, and they are determined by our knowledge, and economic and social circumstances. Therefore it is the conviction of this writer that more serious thought, and less emotional heat will better solve our critical social problems, both at home and abroad.

The Democrats, including Mr. Kennedy, realize that we have fallen into second place in the family of nations, and want to do something about it. As to what, no one is quite clear; at least they don't say.

But the Republicans and Southern Democrats are hopeless. We will vote Kennedy.

Walter Reese, Galice Rd., Merlin, Ore.

Facts Compatible

To the Editor: In light of Senator Kennedy's most recent statements in regard to his belief, complete separation of Church and State, one would think that this so-called religious issue would be silenced once and for all.

However, it appears that this will not be the case. All reasonable questions which the American voter had the right to ask in regard to the Democratic candidate's stand on this issue have been unequivocally answered. Therefore, I suggest that any further discussion is nothing less than a calculated attempt by some people in this country to discredit the Catholic Church itself.

I for one would like to go to the polls in November with a clear and objective mind. However, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain any degree of objectivity in the face of these attacks on my religion.

Granted, the intelligent American who has taken the trouble to investigate will not be affected by this type of bigotry. Yet there are those fair minded people among us, who, having seen a statement or article in print, believe it to be absolute truth.

The resultant suspicion and distrust can only lead to further disunity at a time when all of us must be ready to stand behind our next President, whether he is Mr. Nixon or Senator Kennedy, Protestant or Catholic, Republican or Democrat.

I am an American; I am also a Catholic—two facts of which I am equally proud and which I find are completely compatible.

Mona Austin (Mrs. Alex J. Austin) Route 4, Box 369-B, Medford.

Teddy, HST or Abe

To the Editor: It is with a good deal of shame that I write these lines. In the M.T. of Friday we see a woman from our embassy in Cuba being held by Castro. Never in our history have we paid tribute to an arrogant dictator, such as this.

Our president of the United States fights with his golf clubs, our vice president and

Question of Red China's Joining U.N. Remains; Balance Shifts in Membership

By PHIL NEWSOM, UPI Foreign Editor

For 10 years, largely due to the efforts of the United States, Red China has been banned from membership in the United Nations.

But from this day on, the United States may be fighting a rear-guard and losing action.

Ironically, the new or under-developed nations which have the most to fear from aggressive Communism probably will be the ones to open Red China's way into the world organization.

Last year, with the help of European, Latin American and some Asian states, the United States successfully staved off for the ninth time Red China's membership bid.

This year, Cuba has broken the solid Latin American front and 14 new African nations are now scheduled for UN membership.

Most of the latter can be listed in the neutralist bloc and all of them have been assiduously wooed by the Reds.

Their membership could bring about a decisive change in the voting which last year was 44-29 against Red China.

Arguments Still Good

Neither in the United States nor among its allies is there unanimity for the U.S. stand. But the arguments against Red China remain as valid now as they ever were.

The United Nations charter adopted in 1945 in San Francisco begins with a brave statement of determination "to save succeeding genera-

tions from the scourge of war."

It provided membership for all "peace-loving states which accept the obligations of the charter and which are capable and willing to carry out these obligations."

It also provides that any member which consistently violates these obligations may be expelled.

In arguing its case last year, the United States charged that the Peiping regime had massacred "thousands" of Tibetans and had "kept itself in power by bloody purges and by the liquidation of some 18 million Chinese in nine years."

It also accused Red China of promoting six foreign of civil wars—Korea, Tibet, Indo-China, the Philippines, Malaya and Laos.

The argument asserted that to admit such a country to the UN would "make a mockery of our charter and rob it of all ... moral authority."

Those arguments, valid a year ago, still are valid, with the added emphasis that once more Red Chinese-supported Communist guerrillas are attempting to take over Laos.

About the most effective argument used by those who favor Red China's membership is that it is a force in being, controlling the lives of 600 million people, and that no world organization can hope to function effectively and ignore it.

The question is not so much whether the UN can properly function without Red China. It is rather, can it function with Red China and still pretend to adhere to its own charter?

Mr. K Says Both Are 'Lackeys'

By LYLE C. WILSON, Washington—UPI—Nikita Khrushchev has a word for Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Sen. John F. Kennedy. The word is "lackey."

He has called them "lackeys who make a pair."

"We have no choice," told an amused audience last month at a Hungarian exhibition in Moscow. He meant that Kennedy was about as bad as Nixon so far as the Kremlin was concerned.

Both candidates, therefore, may relax a bit from anxiety lest the visiting Russian jolt the presidential campaign by expressing a choice between them. They probably will not relax, however, because Khrushchev is unpredictable. He might reverse himself on the candidates. That possibility could keep the two young men awake at nights. Neither could afford to be loved by Khrushchev.

That may have been in the mind of Paul M. Butler last June when he told a Milwaukee audience that he had spotted Khrushchev's candidate for president of the United States, Butler then was chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Butler said Mr. K. wanted they will neither campaign nor vote for him unless Christian Herter is impeached.

L. C. Powell, 316 S.E. Eighth st., Grants Pass, Ore.

Elephant Language

To the Editor: I have some bad news for the lady who is a good Democrat and who plans on voting for Dr. Durno. I am a good Democrat too and I'm for Porter, so my vote will nullify hers. I'm glad, though, she wrote the letter, as by showing it to friends four Republicans have decided to support Porter. If "Ole leapin' Lena" doesn't blow a fuse or run outa gas, I'll get a lot more converts.

The doctor has been quite lavish in his criticism of Mr. Porter's interest in foreign affairs, and in so doing he is, in a round-about way, admitting that Mr. Porter's clear-cut evaluation has placed him far ahead of the administration in pin-pointing coming hotspots, where an ounce of Teddy's extinguisher would put the fire out before it burst out of control. The administration, including the vaunted CIA, in its blindfolded, evasive approach, using money, soft soap and diplomatic garble, only made matters worse.

I'm surprised that the doctor hasn't figured a way to blame Mr. Porter for the "warm" reception Nixon received on his South American tour. That will probably come later.

Mr. Porter is for the Forand-Morse bill giving medical benefits to retirees. The doctor is against it, saying that such a "compulsory" tax is un-American. Just wonder what he calls the taxes we now pay. Probably a free-hearted, generous expression of gratitude to the administration for its sincere efforts to improve our living standards.

I suggest the doctor forget the rosy picture he saw when sitting atop Jumbo, come down to earth, and scratch out some grass root sentiments. I don't understand Elephant language, but from the patient, docile expression, it's plain that Jumbo was saying, "Folks, I'm not here willingly. I'd like to pack my trunk and go back to the big tent where I can sail under true colors!"

Claude M. Hall, 2860 Hartley lane, Grants Pass, Ore.

Candidates Can Rest Easy, as Mr. K Says Both Are 'Lackeys'

Nixon. The Russian believed, according to Butler, that Nixon would be the easiest for the Communists to handle. At that time Butler generally was regarded as an active advocate of Kennedy's nomination by the Democrats.

The chairman said it was Khrushchev's strategy to say that he disliked Nixon on the assumption that Americans would react by voting for the vice president. Khrushchev would be capable of that, no doubt, but there was little supporting evidence for Butler.

About the time Butler was talking in Wisconsin, the Communist newspaper, the Worker was discussing various potential presidential nominees. The paper especially denounced Kennedy and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller as supporters of "the bankrupt Eisenhower-Dulles, Truman-Acheson policies, the cold war policy, the policy of war preparations."

There was no kind word in the Worker for any of these statesmen, all being indicted as wrong-headed war-mongers. Khrushchev has said nothing to qualify the impression that Nixon and Kennedy are lumped with the others as unfit and undesirable. The Worker was not wholly so negative in that issue, however, in its approach to the presidential election.

The Worker believed that it would be best to nominate Adlai E. Stevenson.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

Washington—Our eminent uninvited guest, Nikita S. Khrushchev, most probably has not just one, but three important meetings on his immediate schedule. After making his usual constructive contributions to the interna-

tional Zoo at the U. N., he may well go to Cuba for a cozy week end with Fidel Castro. And in October, he is expected to meet with Mao Tse-tung in North Korea.

Among these dates which the demagogues think Khrushchev has on his calendar, the one that will make the least immediate noise, the meeting with Mao will surely be the most significant if it takes place.

The point is that the relations between the Soviet Union and Communist China are now so tense that there is a clear possibility of an open break between the two giant powers of the Communist bloc. The obscure evidence for this view, gathered from intelligence sources and from the Communist press, has already been summarized in a previous report in this space.

IT IS enough to say, here, that the evidence pointing to a Soviet-Chinese break is far stronger today than all the warning evidence that was available before the Soviet-Yugoslav break. Although Khrushchev will no doubt belittle for admission of Communist China to the United Nations, this will be a ritual gesture. The reality will still be the possibility of a break.

In his quarrel with the Chinese, moreover, Khrushchev has no free options. The Kremlin cannot back down in this quarrel, without compromising Moscow's claim to be the New Rome of Communism. It is Mao Tse-tung who has to decide whether to back down or to accept the break. And as yet there is no evidence at all that Mao Tse-tung is getting ready to back down.

In these circumstances, the point of issue in the quarrel has great potential importance. Superficially, it is doctrinal. The Chinese have called the Soviets "blasphemous" for asserting that the holy Lenin believed in the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the capitalist powers. The Soviets have called the Chinese "blasphemous" for saying that the holy Lenin believed in the inevitability of war with the capitalist powers, as a necessary prelude to the world triumph of the Communist cause.

But this superficial, doctrinal dispute undoubtedly conceals a far more crucial dispute about a concrete issue. As one dispute must also reflect the other, the concrete issue is all but certain to be Chinese insistence upon a warlike adventure which the Soviets regard as altogether too risky. If Mao Tse-tung finally accepts a break on this issue, it must mean, in turn, that he is prepared to launch his desired adventure without assurance of Soviet support.

Such is the logic of the Sino-Soviet quarrel. Other points are involved, but the war-vs.-peace conflict is fairly central. If a break comes, therefore, it will knock into a cocked hat one of the absolutely basic and most comforting assumptions of Western policy makers—the assumption that the Soviets can always be counted on to retain a power of veto over Chinese adventure involving any military risk.

The collapse of that long standing assumption is an ugly thing to contemplate. Yet a Chinese challenge to the Soviet power of veto is about the only way to make sense out of this Sino-Soviet quarrel. There is nothing else that could drive Khrushchev to consider a break with Mao, as he is obviously doing, unless Khrushchev believes that internal strains in China are so great that the Chinese regime itself is in danger from within. The two factors may interact, in truth, but their internal strains would naturally produce a desperate Chinese hankering for external military success.

ONE question remains: Where on earth can the Chinese hope to gain a nationally unifying military success without full Soviet support? There is, unhappily, a possible answer. There is the exposed position on the offshore islands of the Formosa Strait, that the Soviets authorized the Chinese to make a carefully limited assault two years ago.

That assault failed, partly because of American action, but mainly because of the sheer military incompetence of the Chinese effort. In particular, the Chinese Communist artillery, which ought to have interdicted all access to the offshore islands, instead altogether failed to establish an effective blockade. Since that time, little has been done to strengthen the offshore islands. But since that time, according to the best informed estimates, everything has been done to strengthen the Chinese Communist artillery preparation.

For these reasons, the possibility of a Sino-Soviet break, which ought only to raise the hopes of the West, is also causing considerable Western apprehension.

(c) 1960, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

NEWSPAPER 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.

10 YEARS AGO Sept. 20, 1950 (Wednesday) There are now some 11,484 students enrolled in Jackson county's 25 public and two private schools.

20 YEARS AGO Sept. 20, 1940 (Friday) The public has been asked by Medford's National Defense committee to take part in a sendoff of local soldiers who are going to Ft. Lewis tomorrow.

30 YEARS AGO Sept. 20, 1930 (Saturday) The Owen-Oregon mill here plans to operate one shift throughout the winter.

40 YEARS AGO Sept. 20, 1920 (Monday) More signatures are needed on petitions seeking transfer of the county courthouse from Jacksonville to Medford.

50 YEARS AGO Sept. 20, 1910 (Tuesday) Jackson county is approximately \$130,000 in debt this year despite a state statute which limits county debt to \$5,000.

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

- 1. Was the prohibition amendment (18th) repealed in 1933, 1934, or 1935?
2. Name the patron saint of Ireland.
3. A motorist drives his automobile 40,000 miles, equally using all five tires; how many miles has each tire traveled?
4. Are the remains of Abraham Lincoln buried in the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D. C.?
5. What color is the antithesis of black?
6. In which State is the Erie Canal?
7. Are there a total of 32, 64 or 98 squares on a checkerboard?
8. In which country was the famous Maginot defense line built before W. W. II?
9. Bogota is the capital of which South American country?
10. Name the New York Herald reporter who greeted a Scottish missionary in deep Africa with the words, "Dr. Livingstone, I presume!"