

Toward Independence

One of the most conservative newspaper editors in Oregon is Giles French, crusty and outspoken editor of the weekly Sherman County Journal in the little town of Moro.

Sherman county this Friday will vote on a Home Rule Charter. It is not exactly the same as the one which will be voted on here this Friday, but is very similar.

Here is what French has to say about it: "There has been but little discussion of the proposed county charter."

"The details of the charter seem unimportant to us. Like charters being voted on in other counties, such details can be changed right here in the county when desired.

It has, as a matter of fact, become the most controversial thing on the ballot, in the eyes of many.

Be that as it may, we rather like Giles French's calm analysis of the Sherman county charter.

Adoption of a county charter would be a step toward independence.

WE CANNOT, of course, say that "there has been but little discussion of the proposed charter" in Jackson county.

Incidentally, apropos of a letter in the Communications column today, we don't believe that anyone has ever advocated the elimination of "politics" from county government.

What has been advocated by some, including this writer, is the elimination of partisan politics, wherein the structure of the two political parties tends to muddy up local issues by injecting partisan rivalry into matters which should be debated on their merits.

There are some areas of public life which should be insulated as much as possible from the pulling and hauling of politics, as defined as the art and practice of government, but county government certainly is not one of them.

POLITICS is the very essence of self-government, and in state and national affairs, where broad matters of policy are to be decided, the two-party system is the best one yet devised.

But on a county level, where road building, irrigation, sewers, water, police and fire protection, parks and recreation, and similar mundane but important matters are at issue, partisanship only confuses things.

If nothing else, the debate over the Home Rule Charter proves one thing: People ARE interested in their local government. Which is a good thing.—E.A.

One of the more interesting political figures to come onto the Oregon scene recently is a professor of speech at Oregon State University by the name of Harold Livingston, Ph. D.

His advent is, in some ways, reminiscent of that of Wayne L. Morse, who was dean of the law school at the University of Oregon prior to entering the political arena.

Dr. Livingston was a last-minute candidate for the Republican nomination for U.S. Senator. He is opposing Sig Unander and Edwin R. Durno, and other lesser-known candidates.

His home-town paper, the Corvallis Gazette-Times, a staunchly conservative G.O.P. paper, is supporting him. So is the Albany Democratic-Herald, likewise conservative Republican.

He has been mentioned favorably by the Portland papers, and eyed with interest by others. Some rather acute political observers declare that he would have a better chance of defeating Senator Morse in the fall than either Unander or Durno, inasmuch as he is aggressive, articulate and politically attractive.

EDITOR Charles A. Sprague of the Salem Statesman comments: "Livingston has flashed bright in the political sky because as a professor of speech, he is a gifted speaker—he is eager to debate Morse."

With this sort of attention, gathered after only a few weeks of limited campaigning, one gathers that Livingston will be a name to be reckoned with in time.

Even if defeated in the primary (as he may well be), here is a new star in the Oregon G.O.P. firmament which will be heard of more in the future.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"GEE, HAVENT YA EVER HEARD A THUNDERSTORM BEFORE, JOEY?"

Communications

EDITOR'S NOTE: A letter in Monday's Communication column, signed by M. F. Robinson, Box 18, Talent, states: "The State Police have said that Home Rule gives too much power to too few people."

It has been your policy to rail against people you term extreme, hysterical, suspicious of change, etc., without offering to explain or clarify.

Why the Opposition? To the Editor: Considering the opposition to Home Rule, first one must look for the spark, namely the majority of county candidates and their followers, who will not admit the good in the Charter because it does not serve their selfish interests.

Were the county departments manned with temporary help, as the department heads are now, how efficient would they be? A successful business does not hire temporary help of uncertain ability for the key jobs.

Of those opposing the Charter we have three distinct groups: (1) The people that are against any change at any time regardless of need or benefit.

(2) The people that have a chance of personal gain through maintaining the county elective offices as they are now.

(3) The people that have listened to the objections of the opposition and not approving of a section or portion thereof, in the Charter, and have condemned it as a whole, without admitting that ample provision is made for change and revision as it's found to be needed, and approved by the majority of voters.

For those swayed by the orations against Home Rule, I ask, did anyone ever present the whole truth when half truths would serve them better? You will have to decide the answer for yourselves.

He bases his challenge on this statement: "Since virtually all newspapers are incorporated, the question is whether a newspaper endorsement is 'anything of value.'"

HE RAISES an interesting question: Let's put the answer to it like this: If a newspaper's endorsement of a candidate or a measure to be voted on by the people has any value, it is because the readers of the newspaper have confidence in the INTEGRITY of the newspaper making the endorsement.

That brings up an interesting episode in our history. Opposition in and out of congress to the Constitution, in that it was not sufficiently explicit as to INDIVIDUAL and state rights, led to an agreement to submit to the people immediately after the adoption of the Constitution a number of safeguarding amendments. Twelve amendments were submitted. Two

failed of ratification by the necessary number of states. The two that failed had to do with apportionment of representatives and compensation of members.

THE ten amendments that were adopted have come to be popularly known as the Bill of Rights. The first of these ten amendments reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech OR OF THE PRESS; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Which is to say: Our Founding Fathers had confidence in the ability of the people to judge for themselves as to the INTEGRITY of the press.

A THOUGHT in conclusion: The despots who have arisen in recent years to destroy the liberties of the people and to take into their own hands supreme and despotic power—the Lenins, the Stalins, the Mussolinis, the Hitlers, the Mao Tsungts, and so on—have paid ample tribute to the importance of a free press in preserving the liberties of the people.

ABOUT the first act of these despots, upon coming into possession of supreme power, has been to DESTROY the free press and to set up in its place a press—newspapers, magazines, radio, television, etc.—operated by hell-dogs and yes-men who will do the bidding of the despot.

There is nothing a despot fears as much as a FREE press.

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

Communism's Sin, Thinking for Oneself, Pursues Milovan Djilas Through Prison

By PHIL NEWSOM: UPI Foreign News Analyst. In a courtroom located in an old three-story building beside a church in Communist Belgrade, a handsome, graying man with burning eyes played out a familiar role.

But in that year also he wrote a series of articles which suggested that the Communist party no longer was essential to the final victory of socialism.

For that sin, he was stripped of his government and party positions. In 1955, he declared that

hope of better things to come. Furthermore, throughout the whole course of a very long interview, the aged but still incisive Chancellor kept returning to the theme that any emphasis on Western differences would only aid the cause of the enemies of the West.

For both these reasons, all details of this talk with Adenauer were off the record, except the single, inescapable admission that German-American communication had been almost wholly interrupted, at least for a while.

After the famous Bonn leak of the American proposals for a Berlin bargain, Secretary of State Dean Rusk sent German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder a telegram of protest whose violence of language was only exceeded by the self-righteousness of its tone.

ONLY a little while after the meeting at which this admission was so grimly offered, the word came through that U. S. Ambassador Walter Dowling had requested a meeting with the Chancellor to present a personal message from the President.

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

Communist party no longer was essential to the final victory of socialism. He had become influenced by Western thought, particularly that of the British Labor party.

For that sin, he was stripped of his government and party positions. In 1955, he declared that

hope of better things to come. Furthermore, throughout the whole course of a very long interview, the aged but still incisive Chancellor kept returning to the theme that any emphasis on Western differences would only aid the cause of the enemies of the West.

For both these reasons, all details of this talk with Adenauer were off the record, except the single, inescapable admission that German-American communication had been almost wholly interrupted, at least for a while.

After the famous Bonn leak of the American proposals for a Berlin bargain, Secretary of State Dean Rusk sent German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder a telegram of protest whose violence of language was only exceeded by the self-righteousness of its tone.

ONLY a little while after the meeting at which this admission was so grimly offered, the word came through that U. S. Ambassador Walter Dowling had requested a meeting with the Chancellor to present a personal message from the President.

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

IN THE strict and narrow sense, all this is the business of the British. But the implications are immense for us here in the United States. For Macmillan is the very symbol of a middle-road philosophy which is far closer to our own dominant national philosophy than the British Labor party—which will be the winner if Macmillan loses

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

"ALL MUST BE LEARNED": Bonn - "All must be learned."

Bitterness, nostalgia for another time, the irony that is one of Konrad Adenauer's trademarks, even a kind of self-mockery, which is very much less characteristic

Alsop - all these could be detected, intermingled and in conflict, in the strange single sentence. The Chancellor spoke with doom-like finality, almost as though he were pronouncing an epitaph.

Thus he replied to the question, whether "communications had completely broken down" between the German and American governments. The question was prefaced by a reference to the unflinching trust which formerly prevailed. When the Chancellor answered with those four words, he was in fact admitting a total breakdown of German-American communications; and the manner of his admission was in truth a kind of epitaph on the close partnership of the past.

ONLY a little while after the meeting at which this admission was so grimly offered, the word came through that U. S. Ambassador Walter Dowling had requested a meeting with the Chancellor to present a personal message from the President. That fact alone was enough to revive

in England—could ever be. Labor's top leader, Hugh Gaitskell, is himself a perfectly sensible and responsible man. But he is constantly pressed by a powerful left wing. These are authentically and hot-eyed socialists, where he is only nominally so. And they are deeply attracted by cold-war neutralism, not to mention anti-Americanism, though these are in no way his own feelings.

If we think here that Macmillan's government has been too ready to propose overly-hopeful approaches to the Soviet Union—some of us do—we won't have seen anything yet until Labor comes to power in London.

GAITSKELL as Prime Minister would do his best to uphold a policy of strength in the Western Alliance. But while giving him full marks for his intentions, it is unrealistic to suppose that he could altogether check the ban-the-bombers and all the rest who would come to power along with him.

Allied high policy would surely be put into at least some degree of disarray. And, almost as bad, the growth of the highly unattractive New Britain which has emerged from World War II would be sadly accelerated. This is the Britain typified by the angry young men of literature, by scorn for the good as well as the bad of the past, by a new form of class hatred.

Not the least of Macmillan's achievements has been to check with tact and tolerance the decline of the old Britain in the emergence of this new and grasping and largely mannerless Britain. He knew the old had to go; he has only tried very hard to preserve what was good in it for so long as he could.

HIS patience at this melancholy task of presiding over the liquidation of the kind of Britain Churchill knew—while the United States in its wisdom presided over the liquidation of the last of Britain's colonial power—has been a memorable thing. It has been moving, too, to all who have had the privilege of knowing the Prime Minister—and who are unlucky enough still to value the traditions of a gallant gentility of the past.

It will be doubly said when Macmillan goes: for more than Macmillan will be going. Going, too, and perhaps forever, will be an England of half-fond, half-exasperating memory. That England was arrogant, but also had the courage of a special nobility. That England was complacent, but also was enduringly faithful to freedom and honor. That England muddled and fuddled languidly in any peace-time, but died with unexampled bravery and "good taste" in any and every war.

A three-year prison sentence followed, but in the very next year came "The New Class" which continued Djilas' indictment of communism and added seven more years to his prison term.

When Yugoslavia released him from prison in January, 1951, he promised to refrain from activities which would bring him into conflict with the nation's law. In April, as result of his new book he was arrested again under a law passed only a month before.

To a warning that return to prison impended, he is supposed to have replied: "Do what you will, I write what I have to write."

The last eight years of Djilas' life have marked a sharp change in this idealistic man who as a youth served a prison term as a revolutionary and who fought for communism as determinedly as he now criticizes it.

Djilas' sin is that he demands the right to think for himself. In the Communist book, it is a cardinal sin.

Not long ago, I served as the moderator of a panel discussion sponsored by the local society of architects. It was part of an all-day conference on the problems of urban living. What distinguished this session from so many others was that the participants were not only architects, but also city planners, housing officials, land economists, designers, builders, developers, and mortgage bankers.

This sort of cross-pollination is badly needed in every profession. Too often, members of a profession (or business, or craft) spend most of their time talking to one another, mutually stroking their egos, or emitting futile complaints, which nobody really listens to.

So many trade conferences, professional convention, and assemblies are a colossal waste of time for all involved—exactly because there is no effective communication between the group and related groups. The different stands, for instance, taken by the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association indicate the lack of understanding between groups even in closely related fields.

In some colleges and universities, there is now arising a movement often called "interdisciplinary studies." All this formidable phrase means is that you don't really know your subject if you know only your subject—that a real grasp of one's subject involves knowing how it relates to other subjects and how they all fit together to make a sensible whole.

Architects sometimes give the impression of caring little about the places and purposes of the building they construct. Planners often seem to think more of geometry than of people. Developers and mortgage bankers tend to think of "value" exclusively in terms of money. Yet it is impossible to have a flourishing and stable community unless all these factors are judiciously balanced and sensibly inter-related.

This insularity reminds me of a story I heard many years ago about the three men who were arguing the merits of their respective professions—a doctor, an architect, and an economist.

"Mine is the most venerable of professions," exclaimed the doctor. "It's obviously the oldest—in the Bible, Eve is created from a rib of Adam, which was the first surgical operation."

"That's nothing," retorted the architect. "Long before that, in the Book of Genesis, it says that 'order was brought out of chaos.' An architectural feat, of course."

The economist merely smiled and inquired bleakly. "But, gentlemen, do you think was responsible for the chaos?"

Not long ago, I served as the moderator of a panel discussion sponsored by the local society of architects. It was part of an all-day conference on the problems of urban living. What distinguished this session from so many others was that the participants were not only architects, but also city planners, housing officials, land economists, designers, builders, developers, and mortgage bankers.

This sort of cross-pollination is badly needed in every profession. Too often, members of a profession (or business, or craft) spend most of their time talking to one another, mutually stroking their egos, or emitting futile complaints, which nobody really listens to.

In some colleges and universities, there is now arising a movement often called "interdisciplinary studies." All this formidable phrase means is that you don't really know your subject if you know only your subject—that a real grasp of one's subject involves knowing how it relates to other subjects and how they all fit together to make a sensible whole.

Architects sometimes give the impression of caring little about the places and purposes of the building they construct. Planners often seem to think more of geometry than of people. Developers and mortgage bankers tend to think of "value" exclusively in terms of money. Yet it is impossible to have a flourishing and stable community unless all these factors are judiciously balanced and sensibly inter-related.

This insularity reminds me of a story I heard many years ago about the three men who were arguing the merits of their respective professions—a doctor, an architect, and an economist.

"Mine is the most venerable of professions," exclaimed the doctor. "It's obviously the oldest—in the Bible, Eve is created from a rib of Adam, which was the first surgical operation."

"That's nothing," retorted the architect.