

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO., 23 North Fir St., Ph. 2-6141

ROBERT W. KUHLE, Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Managing Editor
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., News Editor
CARL H. ADAMS, Advertising Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Tel. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
C. ST. ARCHER, Women's Editor
DAN E. CRICKSON, Circulation Manager

A 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 \$4.25

By Carrier — In Advance, Copy 10c
Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent and on motor routes, Daily and Sunday — 1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday — 6 mos. 8.00
Daily and Sunday — 3 mos. 4.25
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
D.P.I. Telephone News Service

MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

Advertising Representatives:
WEST HOLIDAY CO., INC., Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Louisville, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

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
April 9, 1951 (Monday)

Proposed cigarette tax considered by state legislature.

Expected upswing in seasonal jobs reported for March, despite heavy snows early in month.

20 YEARS AGO
April 9, 1931 (Wednesday)

Preliminary petition filed in Salem to refer cigarette tax to voters.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Snug Pot" column: "The Missouri draft director has ruled that draftees who have been pulled to avoid wearing a uniform must wear one."

Continued the first World War report: "You're going to fight — not bite 'em."

30 YEARS AGO
April 9, 1921 (Thursday)

Heavy snows at Diamond Lake will delay opening two or three weeks.

Mushroom picking season begins in valley.

40 YEARS AGO
April 9, 1921 (Saturday)

Orchardists in valley enjoy good night's sleep for first time in a week, there being no orchard heating last night.

Former cashier at Bank of Jacksonville sentenced to 10 years in state prison.

50 YEARS AGO
April 9, 1911 (Sunday)

Federal bureau of census reports for 1910 show Medford population at 8,840; Ashland, 9,920; Jacksonville, 785; Central Point, 761; Gold Hill, 433.

Sisters of Providence to submit plans this week for new \$100,000 hospital on "Nob Hill."

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. Where is Fenway Park?

2. When angry, a porcupine has the ability to throw his quills; true or false?

3. Ocean passengers are called "pollywogs" if they have never crossed the equator; what are they called when they have crossed it?

4. Against whom did Charles Evans Hughes run for the presidency in 1916?

5. After his defeat at Waterloo, to what island was Napoleon Bonaparte exiled?

6. Osteology is the science which treats of what?

7. Is West Point's mascot a goat or a mule?

8. Does sound travel faster at freezing temperatures or at room temperature?

9. Is a stereoscope something through which to hear, see or speak?

10. Name the large island of the West Indies which has been called "Pearl of the Antilles."

Answers: 1. Boston, 2. False, 3. "Shellbacks," 4. Woodrow Wilson, 5. St. Helena, 6. Bones, 7. Mule, 8. Room temperature, 9. See, 10. Cuba.

EAT NOW, PLAY LATER

Phoenix, Ariz.—UP—Arizona Republicans have adopted the installment plan. Sponsors of a fund-raising "Dinner with Barry Goldwater" said party members low on cash could pay the \$100 tab at \$10 down, \$10 a month. For the loyal party workers who find that too steep there is a "Brunch with Barry" at \$10, for \$1 down, \$1 a month.

Land Use Debates

The National Parks are the subject of increasing debate these days. So are the National Forests.

The debate concerns the best way in which our great publicly-owned outdoor resources of forests, streams and mountains should be managed for the maximum benefit of the people, both now and in the long years ahead.

Take the parks, for instance. They are in the middle of a monumental squeeze.

On one hand, increasing population, greater mobility of people, more leisure time, and a greater interest in outdoor recreation, has put the Parks under tremendous pressure from hordes of visitors.

BUT the basic law governing the management of the parks says distinctly that they shall not only be made available for public use, but shall be "preserved" as much as possible in their natural state for the benefit of generations yet unborn.

The first pressure has resulted in some developments which some feel are deplorable—acres of asphalt parking lots, motels burgeoning inside the park reservations, more roads cut through what were originally designated as wilderness areas, and other evidences of people in the form of litter, dirt and carelessness, which do much to destroy the intrinsic value of the parks.

There are many, and their number is growing, who feel this is not in line with the mission assigned to the National Park Service.

WE WERE delighted to note the other day that the new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, is apparently fully aware of this problem.

He was quoted as saying:

"The easing of the visitor flood at the national park gates is absolutely essential in solving the problem of passing on the national park system, unimpaired to future generations."

"Personally, I am a strong believer in wilderness preservation, and you can depend on me to scrutinize all programs and activities of the National Park Service with this viewpoint clearly in mind."

"On the other hand, I feel very strongly that the people do have a right to visit their parks."

WHAT is the way out of this dilemma? There are several. One of them is construction of visitor facilities just outside of parks—not inside.

In most parks, the lodges and other facilities were constructed back in the days when it was a day's journey just to get there. Today, with modern cars and roads, there is less justification for putting housing facilities in the parks themselves.

If adequate accommodations can be provided (by private enterprise, be it noted) near but not in the parks, part of the solution is at hand.

ANOTHER is a more adequate degree of developed recreational facilities in National Forest areas.

Many of the people who visit parks do so for the inspirational scenic grandeur of these splendid areas. They should have no impediments put in their way.

But a great many more visit the parks simply because they are available, as outdoor recreation areas. There is a good question as to whether the parks were or are designed to accommodate these people, who would, in all truth, be just as happy, if not more so, to take their outdoor enjoyment at other spots, perhaps not quite as grand scenically, but certainly better adapted to handle the outdoor recreationalists in their boating, hiking and camping activities.

THE Forest Service has long operated under the philosophy of "multiple purpose use" of the areas under its jurisdiction, giving weight to recreational values as well as to consumptive use, watershed management and so on.

The Bureau of Land Management has been coming closer and closer to this concept in recent years, and now, with Secretary Udall in office, it is adopting a similar concept for land management.

In western Oregon particularly this is important, since so much of the area is in O & C lands, administered by the BLM.

TIED in with this whole discussion is the subject of wilderness lands.

Few people, if any, will dispute the "wilderness principle," for even lumbermen, avid for supplies for their mills, say it is valid, and that they support the principle.

The dispute is largely how much land shall be preserved in its untouched-by-human-hand character, and how strong shall be the safeguards set up for its preservation.

There is only a comparatively small amount of wilderness area left in this country, and pressures are strong to chop it down to an even smaller percentage of our land area.

WE FEEL strongly that a maximum of wilderness should now be set aside, and that the strongest possible safeguards to prevent its despoliation should be enacted.

If it is found that "too much" wilderness has been set aside, action can always be taken to surrender it to economic use.

But once it is gone, it is gone forever. The decision is irrevocable.

God knows mankind has done enough to sully his environment. We should leave some of it as it was created for the benefit of our sons and daughters, forever. —E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I GOTTA QUESTION, MR. WILSON: IS IT 'STAR LIGHT, STAR BRIGHT' OR 'STAR BRIGHT, STAR LIGHT'?"

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

DAY AT VANG VIENG

Vang Vieng, Laos—The veteran French pilot stops talking about his garden, stubs out his strong smelling cigarette, and concentrates on his job. At 2:30 p.m.—Gen. Kouprasith's headquarters is more animated. The Captain of the flank company who reported the parachute drop yesterday has been called in and sternly cross-questioned. He has brought eye-witnesses—the aged village headman speaks for them all. Their stories are consistent. The American working with Gen. Kouprasith is still dubious, but there is no time for argument. A plane from Vientiane has come and gone, evidently bringing major news. At any rate, a planning session begins behind closed doors in the General's makeshift office, and from time to time battalion and company officers come in for orders.

AT 4:00 p.m.—The afternoon's somnolent silence is broken by the hum of another aircraft, bringing a liaison group from Vientiane. One of them, an American, is a sad-faced man who parachuted into France behind the lines with this reporter's brother before the Normandy landing—and has been doing the same sort of thing ever since. He has spotted troops moving in the next little valley-bowl, just over the hills to the northwest where the parachute drop was reported.

Unfettered, Gen. Kouprasith tells his flank company to move forward. The conference behind closed doors is resumed. Then the command radio starts chattering. The flank company has run into a sharp fire. The office doors open. The General emerges grinning. Another order is quickly given. The 105's shatter the afternoon's peace, firing furiously beyond the nearest hill to the area indicated by the flank company commander.

AT 4:30 p.m.—The closed conference ends. The General and his visitors walk down to the liaison plane. The American who had doubted the parachutists' existence remarks wryly, "I guess the intelligence was right after all, for once." Kouprasith asks to be flown over the area where the parachutists have been located, "so that I can see for myself."

There follows a surreal half-hour. This neighboring valley-bowl is smaller than Vang Vieng and the surrounding needle peaks are even higher. Gen. Kouprasith bounces about at the rear of the plane, wildly pointing and shouting, "Fly there."

BUT "THERE" is always another soaring crag, so it is often difficult to remember the highly practical rule that it is better to look at a book than a mountain when you seem to be flying straight into the mountain. Between glimpses of swiftly looming crags and snatches of Middle Eastern history (which are somehow not very gripping), there are also passages over the valley-bowl. These are made with the plane heeled clear over on its side and Gen. Kouprasith braced over the open door to get a better look.

At length the aerial mountain-dodging ends. Descending from the plane, the General says rather peevishly, "Didn't see a thing—it's always like that in this miserable war."

Then he adds more cheerfully, "But I found out they have no anti-aircraft guns, which was what I really wanted."

So he goes off to push his men forward as rapidly as he can. At dawn the next morning, a very big and novel operation is to be attempted, and the General's outfit is to participate. A lot depends on it. How it may turn out, no one can predict as these words are written. But one wishes all the participants all imaginable luck as dusk suddenly envelops Vang Vieng.

(Copyright, 1961, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)

Drummond Reports

(Walter Lippmann is in Europe. Roscoe Drummond reports from Washington in his absence.)

PITFALLS IN LAOS

Washington — It is dangerous to assume that a "peace" conference will bring peace to Laos.

Of course negotiations are desirable. But in light of our experience in Korea and in Indo-China, we face a long, tortuous road before we know whether the freedom of Laos can be secured at the conference table.

There is no evidence that either the Soviet Communists or the Chinese Communists really want an independent, neutral Laos. We need to bear in mind that the Soviets use a conference as a tactical device to achieve their ends one way instead of another. The most revealing statement of Communist intentions is the recent Moscow manifesto and Premier Khrushchev's speech expounding the manifesto.

HERE is what they said:

1—"Wars of national liberation," as in Korea, Vietnam, Algeria, and Laos are "sacred" wars, are justifiable, desirable, and never ended until there is a Communist government.

2—"The Communists see the anti-colonial movement as inseparable from the 'class struggle for Communism.'"

3—"Any non-Communist regime is per se illegitimate and therefore should be overthrown. This means that the Communists view the elected government of Laos as illegitimate. Their aim is to overthrow it with pro-Communist rebel forces supported by Soviet arms."

4—"The Khrushchev version of 'peaceful co-existence' does not accept the 'status quo' until a Communist regime is part of the status quo. Therefore, the Soviet-backed effort to bring down the elected government of Laos is, to Moscow and Peking, not a violation of 'peaceful co-existence' but an expression of it."

The "differences" between Moscow and Peking on these matters is that the Chinese Communists may be willing to take more risks.

OFTEN you hear people comfortably say, "As long as you keep them (the Communists) talking, they're not fighting." On this point Dean Acheson rightly warns in his article in the "Saturday Evening Post":

"Nothing could be more untrue. They are fighting. They are adopting a tactic specifically prescribed by Lenin to delay the crises while demoralizing and weakening the enemy. To our minds international negotiations are so completely a means for ending conflict that we are blind to the fact that they may be, and in the hands of experts are, equally adapted to continuing it."

There is every danger that the conference on Laos will be used by the Communists exactly as Mr. Acheson warns. We will need to be extraordinarily alert and firm to prevent it.

There was no reason to be surprised about the Soviet response to the proposal for a cease-fire and negotiation. It was familiar; they wanted to turn it around—negotiate and then maybe a cease-fire. Even if the Soviets approve a cease-fire, there is no assurance that the pro-Communist forces in northern Laos will cease fighting. This is what the Communists did in Korea on the eve of the Panmunjom negotiations. This is what the Communists did in Indo-China on the eve of the Geneva

va negotiations.

There are other pitfalls. The Soviets may agree to a cease-fire which the Red Chinese take over the fighting. This may look like a conflict of interest between Red China and the Soviet Union, but it will more likely be a pattern of concerted conquest.

The Soviet airlift of arms to the pro-Communist rebels must halt as part of any meaningful cease-fire. Otherwise, the negotiations will be a cover for a military build-up. It is to be hoped that a real cease-fire can be brought about. But the cease-fire will have to be thoroughly policed by mutual agreement and we should be prepared to break off negotiations if the cease-fire is violated.

(Copyright 1961 New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

From Salem:

A proposed amendment to the Oregon constitution that would lower the voting age from 21 to 18 years has been rejected by a 25-34 vote in the house of representatives.

Representative Katherine Mussa, of The Dalles, sponsor of the 18-year-old voting resolution, told the members of the house that youngsters of today are better qualified to vote than were persons much older 30 years ago.

This was contradicted by Representative Ken Maher, of Portland, who argued that "youths under 21 are not sufficiently mature to comprehend the issues they would be called on to decide in these modern days."

WHO is right?

Who is wrong? There is considerable truth on both sides. But the Maher debate raises an interesting question.

At what age ARE people qualified to vote in these days?

IT IS true that the average level of education is higher now than three decades ago. But, in voting, education isn't EVERYTHING. Experience has a lot to do with it.

WHAT is experience? Let's take a look at the dictionary definition. Mr. Webster says:

Experience is "the actual LIVING through an event or events; actual enjoyment or suffering; hence the effect upon the JUDGMENT or feelings produced by personal and direct impressions, as to know by experience. State, extent or DURATION of being engaged in a particular study, or work, or in affairs; the sum total of the conscious events which compose an individual life."

LET'S put it this way:

Voting consists in studying proposals, evaluating the evidence on both sides and then MAKING A DECISION. Experience helps in making decisions. Experience, as Webster says, is the actual living through events. The longer you live, the more experience you accumulate.

So, presumably, the older you are, the better equipped you are to make WISE decisions. Representative Maher presented a rather sound argument.

The debate in the legislature was merely academic. But it does raise some interesting questions. Questions that deserve a lot of thought.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

We're very high on Dick Moody this week.

Dick, as you undoubtedly know, is the personable fellow who handles local news for KMED. We don't know whether he ever was a Boy Scout or not, but he can take credit for a good deed.

Last week Dick and our own man, Greg Nokes, were at the country club to cover a meeting at which doctors were being given the latest dope on a variety of heart massage—a life-saving measure used in emergency cases. Dick and Greg sat together, and as the evening progressed, Greg became ill. He asked Dick to come outside with him for a breath of fresh air. As the two got outdoors, Dick saw Greg was pale and leaning against a post. He turned around to get a chair, but before he could, Greg collapsed.

He was, frankly, quite a mess. But since Greg is up and around and fit again, we can record that he smashed his glasses, cut his face open in several places, and badly bruised his chest.

There's one advantage to covering a meeting of this kind. Dick hurried inside and called, "Is there a doctor in the house?"

As one man, the audience stood up.

Pretty soon, however, it narrowed down to a couple of M.D.s. The first one to get to Greg leaned over him, and popped out a contact lens. (There's more than one happy ending; the lens was found again on Greg's jacket.)

Well, Dick took our boy to the hospital, where he spent the night, and later in the week he underwent a series of tests to see what made him pass out.

Right now he and his charming bride are taking it easy over at the coast, lucky people.

It might almost be worth . . . No, never mind.

And many thanks for your good help, Dick Moody.

As someone said once, from the ridiculous to the sublime — the sublime in this case, being Mrs. John F. Kennedy, about whom much discussion is heard these days.

And what's that you say? What is the opinion of the Potluck editor?

Mrs. K, he thinks, is fine. But his first choice is Caroline.

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

A COUPLE were driving their 5-year-old son home from a day at the beach when suddenly the car ahead stopped short without warning; the father drove smack into it. Nobody was hurt, but the man in the car ahead was shaken up a bit. He turned out to be a mid-get from a sideshow on the boardwalk.

The 5-year-old remained discreetly silent during the entire proceeding. It was only after he got home that he asked his father, "Hey, Pop, was that man we hit as tall as you before the accident?"

A venerable Australian Archbishop was interviewed on his sixty-sixth birthday. "To what" he was asked, "do you ascribe the fact that you have reached the age of 96?" "Primarily," smiled the Archbishop, "to the fact that I was born in 1895."



Mammoth Vise Closing on Latin America

By ERIC SEVAREID

Trinidad, B.W.I. — Prime Minister Macmillan has moved gracefully from Trinidad through the other islands of the British West Indies, congratulating the descendants of imported slaves on their intelligent progress towards federation and self-government — they should have independent, Dominion status in another year — and their leaders have replied in tones of graceful gratitude.

But there is a giant joker in the deck for this carefully supervised political new deal. This transaction, inevitable and right, bears a not too far-fetched resemblance to the inevitable and right emancipation of the American slaves a century ago, who were set free to breed in squalor, beg for work and migrate to distant regions in desperate search for a livelihood.

Macmillan promised that Britain would continue economic assistance, but a slight chill ran through many in his Trinidadian audience when he added the comment that the United Kingdom's ability to help is not unlimited. How they can help them-

selves, how they could meet the terms of a British equivalent of the new Kennedy Latin-American aid program, with a quid from the receiver for each quid from the giver, is very hard to see. Nothing very far short of the bold, driving industrialization thrust of the United States in Puerto Rico is likely to save these islanders from the final ravages of a blight already well advanced.

On Trinidad itself sugar cane workers have been striking for a living wage. A near riot occurred when three thousand Trinidadians lined up to apply for a handful of jobs at a migratory farm workers in the United States. Three hundred women jammed a street in front of the office where three dozen were to be selected for jobs as domestic servants in Canada.

From my window nearby I could see each evening the weary plantation workers trudging home through the dust, past the clusters of the unemployed idle squatting before their shacks. The farm workers had earned approximately a dollar and seventy-cents apiece that day, and prices for the important things they must buy are by no means low. (When a newly established American plant provided free shoes and medical care for his work-

force, the latent anti-Americanism that seems to exist in every British territory boiled briefly on the surface.)

If the problem were morally and economically tidy — white exploitation of black — it would be far easier than it is to rectify. But the exploiters themselves are in trouble, and that invariably means the exploiters are in double trouble. The foundation for these islands rested on cocoa, coconut and coffee, as well as sugar. Total world consumption of cocoa is now 850,000 tons each year while total production is 1,050,000 tons. Already prices are virtually even with production costs, while Ghana, Nigeria and New Guinea push strongly into this field. Much coconut rots on the ground and many coffee growers this year are not bothering to pick their crop. All over Trinidad itself the signs are up, advertising plantations for sale.

Hundreds of Jamaicans pour into London from the Southampton boat trains every month, creating a new Harlem in north London. Leaders of the West Indian Federation are organizing pressures to enlarge their immigration quota to the United States, now held to 1,000 a year, and they demand this as a matter of moral right.

The story of the West Indian population of these West Indies will be doubled in 30 years. Commensurate education facilities, jobs and homes are not even in sight among the most vigorous and hopeful planners. For Latin America as a whole, today's 200 million people will become 300 million, 14 years from now. Time is short. A mammoth vise is closing.

(Distributed 1961 by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.)