

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
 "Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
 Published Daily except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
 33 North Fir St. Ph. SP 2-6141
 ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor
 HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
 GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
 ERIC W. BLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
 EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
 HARRY CHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor
 RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
 OLYVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
 DALE FRICKSON, 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 \$13.95
 Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. 8.00
 Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 4.25
 Sunday Only - One year \$1.20
 By Carrier - In Advance - Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent and Union River
 Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$13.00
 Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. 7.50
 Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 4.50
 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. Telephone Newsletters
 MEMBER OF ASSOCIATION OF PUBLISHERS OF OREGON
 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

Compassion—and Waste

Compassion is a noble emotion. Sometimes, however, compassion can cloud good clear judgment.

The Edmond, Oklahoma, Sun recently had an editorial (reprinted in the Roseburg News-Review) which bewailed this situation.

Too long, it declared, the concern and sympathy of society has been devoted exclusively to "the selfish, the lazy, the crafty and the confused," and not enough attention has been given to "the industrious, the able, the honest and the morally strong."

THE Sun has a point. It added:

"What would happen if we stopped psychoanalyzing the chicken-chested punk who knows only to sneer, and paid some genuine attention to the squares who have never stabbed a teacher or mugged an elderly woman?"

"Think of the millions of dollars we've spent trying to find out what makes the delinquent. Think of the time our sociologists have spent trying to analyze the alcoholic, betray the broken home, and comprehend the criminal."

"We've taken the good guy for granted so long in this country that we apparently know nothing whatever about him. Is he religious? Sometimes—but quite often not. Was he properly whaled by his parents when he was a kid? Again sometimes—but quite often not. Was he a sheer joy to his teachers? Not always—often he was the lad who turned their hair prematurely gray. But do we know about the bad guy? You bet we do. We know he is misunderstood, misguided, misdirected and miserable—a victim of his environment. We know we must pity him and pamper him and pay for his rehabilitation."

"We must at all costs . . . be nice to him. I say nuts to him and to our national fetish of the overwrought and discontented neurotic personality . . . the upset psyche . . . and the complex complex . . ."

WITH much of this we agree.

But a little thought will reveal why society has focused so much attention on the sub-standard human, rather than the average or superior one. It is for two basic reasons:

1. The average or superior person, by and large, gets along without too much help.
2. We cannot indefinitely afford the costly waste of human talent and potential represented by the sub-standard, the criminally inclined, or the radically maladjusted.

We do need to find and encourage our best talents. But, too, and compassion entirely aside, we must continue the "salvage job" of helping the others to become productive members of society, rather than a drag and expense on everyone else. We can't afford not to.—E.A.

Opposition Mounting

Reaction to Gov. Mark Hatfield's sweeping governmental reorganization plan is beginning to be heard.

Frequently, it goes something like this: "Oh, I'm in general agreement with the overall objectives, BUT . . ."

And then the speaker goes on to disapprove one or more of the specific suggested changes. This is the type of reaction which can be expected, in a score or more different fields. And the cumulative effect will amount to massive and widespread opposition to the radical changes proposed.

EXAMPLES can be cited:

Just the other day, the travel advisory committee, made up of a number of Oregon newspapermen who are consulted on plans of the travel information division of the highway department, issued a statement objecting to the inclusion of this department in a proposed new department of commerce.

And the parks advisory committee of the department is objecting to the proposal that it be included in a department of natural resources, due in large part to its intimate relationship, historic, financial and otherwise, with the highway department.

Governor Hatfield's own appointee as secretary of state, Howell Appling Jr., has indicated he does not agree fully with the Governor on the latter's proposals for institutions, and the future of the office of secretary of state.

Opposition has developed to the proposed merging of the fish and game commissions—again into a department of natural resources.

And so it goes.

Undoubtedly other objections will be heard, as the scope of the reorganization proposals sinks in. And, also, undoubtedly there are many state employees at top administrative levels who have strong objections but hesitate to voice them because of the Governor's stand. But their opposition will be potent when it comes to making changes.

WE REPEAT that there should be no theoretical objection to consideration of proposed changes on an individual basis.

Many of the proposals would, indeed, make for increased efficiency and administrative common sense.

But two considerations deserve mention.

One is that it must be recognized that major reorganization of the state involves a complete rejection and repudiation of Oregon's long history of citizen participation in government through its highly successful, clean and admirably administered boards and commissions.

Another is that piecemeal consideration of the proposed changes could well keep the legislature in session month after month after month as differing views are threshed out.

Meanwhile, there's no need for undue hurry, even though Governor Hatfield, an ambitious man who likes the feel of political power, would like to see the changes made while he is still governor.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"OH, YOU POOR PEOPLE! I CAN LEAVE NOW, BUT YOU HAVE TO STAY HERE WITH HIM! . . ."

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.

The Best Advice . . .

To the Editor: The best of advice, though sadly needed, is ill-received and little heeded.

There are exceptions but woefully few and far between. Also hard to fathom is the urge to keep on giving same. Like my well intentioned letter some years ago to the Saturday Evening Post that concerned their full-page whiskey ad, obviously aimed at the west coast logging fraternity. But their derisive laughter and four letter word remarks should have been heard by the ad-makers than by me, field editor of the old Timberman logging-sawmill journal.

Why? The ad pictured a hick climber topping an intended spar-tree. He was shown rudely-faced and grinning as he relaxed arm-free in his life-line. Without exception, these tuffies are humped back against their life-line with hands as well as feet braced against the tree-trunk to take the whip-lash as the still big top kicks off on its some 100 feet plunge earthward.

But the insult that so riled the loggers was the limbing. Instead of being axed off flush to the bark, stubs 8 to 12 inches long were left on. Just how, we inquired, would the hick climber flip his life-line up or down in rigging the half-ton bull-block in place, rig up back-line, high-lead, top and buckle guy-lines without being constantly swished on the limb-stubs? To which we got an ivory-towered reply that all such is the responsibility of the advertising agency, period. Even our suggestion that the hick climber must have took too long a pull at the gaily colored whiskey bottle, was pointedly ignored.

All this was high forgotten till we viewed the astonishing number of people employed in getting out a daily paper, also the lovely picturing of

Method To Speed Tax Refund Told

Salem—The Oregon tax commission said Thursday that taxpayers getting a refund on their state income tax this year can speed up the process by writing the word "refund" in the lower left corner on the outside of the envelope.

The speedup is possible, the commission said, because refund requests have priority during the filing season from Jan. 3 through April 15. Returns marked "refund" will be quickly sorted from the huge volume of mail and processed faster.

In the past year some 600,000 returns were received and of this number 57 per cent were granted refunds.

The sooner a taxpayer files the sooner he will receive his refund, if he has one coming.

Thornton's Wife Confined at Home

Salem—Mrs. Robert Y. Thornton, wife of Oregon's attorney general, has been confined at the Thornton home here since the Nov. 8 election with a painful eye ulcer, Thornton said Thursday.

She was unable to attend the swearing in ceremony Thursday afternoon at which Thornton began his third term as attorney general. She served as her husband's campaign manager during the last election.

Yugoslavia Study in Contradictions, as It Weaves East-West Ideological Path

By PHIL NEWSOM

UPI Foreign News Analyst

For those who can take in large doses the contradictions of world affairs, let us consider Yugoslavia.

Last month, a manifesto issued at the close of a summit meeting of world Communist leaders in Moscow roundly condemned Yugoslavia for activity damaging to "the unity of all the peaceful forces in the world."

Chief instigator of this blast was Red China which accuses Yugoslavia of threatening the "ideological purity of Communist doctrine."

But scarcely had the delegates left for home, than nations of the Soviet bloc put on a display of friendship for Yugoslavia in unprecedented visits by Nikita Khrushchev's vice to Belgrade in 1955.

On the occasion of the 15th birthday of Marshal Tito's Yugoslav government, Tito and Khrushchev exchanged warm messages looking toward continued friendly relations in the "interests of world peace."

This week, Tito mounted the rostrum of the Yugoslav General Assembly.

He placed the blame for the summit manifesto's unkind words on Red China but then questioned the morality of any

others who would sign such a "downright untruth." This was a crack at Khrushchev.

He said he agreed with Moscow on most issues, and then turned his fire on the West where he held "certain bellicose people" chiefly to blame for world tensions.

One day later it was announced that the United States and other Western nations

would loan Yugoslavia a whopping total of \$275 million dollars to carry out trade and currency reforms.

Out of this welter of contradictions two thoughts emerge.

One is that temporarily at least Moscow has decided it is necessary to maintain at least a front of Communist unity, despite Tito's refusal to

permit Moscow to dictate doctrine.

The other is that apparently the West has decided that some Communists are more Communist than others.

Or, put another way, it is willing to make a \$275 million gamble that eventually Tito can be weaned away from communism and the influence of Moscow.

Washington—Fidel Castro and the Cuban shambles will be pebbles in the shoe of the next President of the United States. No doubt about that.

The Dominican Republic is likely to become another pebble in the shoe. Dominican dictator

Rafael Trujillo is one of the bad guys of the Western Hemisphere against whom the good guys are ganging up.

There is not much to be said in favor of Trujillo except this: He is not in cahoots with the Kremlin and his successor may be.

When dictator Fulgencio Batista was running Cuba and

Castro was promoting revolution in the Cuban hills, there wasn't much to be said in favor of Batista either, except this: Batista was not in cahoots with the Kremlin.

If politicians and administrators can learn by experience, President-elect John F. Kennedy will consider developments in the Dominican Republic in the light of experience in what used to be the Cuban Republic.

Castro Posing as Anti-Red

Castro came to power in the disguise of a democratic opponent of dictatorship, Communism and the oppression which accompany both. Castro ballyhooed himself as a non-Communist and enjoyed powerful echoes of his ballyhoo in the United States. Batista fled Cuba on Jan. 1, 1959. The United States recognized Castro's revolutionary government six days later.

Recognition was the decision of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. It is possible but not likely that Eisenhower and Dulles would so quickly have recognized Castro if informed of the background of the Beard.

Incredible as it may seem to the taxpayers who pay for the mistakes of their government employees, it is reasonable to believe that neither the President nor the secretary of state had the facts in the case.

The alternative to that incredible situation would be even more incredible. It would be that the U.S. intelligence agencies were unaware of Castro's background and, therefore, were not competent to warn Eisenhower and Dulles against him.

These alternatives raise some questions.

Were the intelligence agencies unaware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency and/or the FBI submit reports in volume to the appropriate executive departments and, if so, who accepted them?

Were the intelligence agencies aware and, if not, did Eisenhower and Dulles have full access to all intelligence information?

</