

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North W. St. Phone 2-4141

ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERRARD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
HARRY CHILDS, City Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARKER, Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
Full Rate (International)
P.O. Telephone Newspapers
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

1962 PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

"...Serve His Own Time"

We sat in Detective Lieutenant Lyle Perkins' office in the Medford city police station for an hour or so one afternoon recently, and listened to him interrogate a burglary suspect who had been arrested early that morning as he and a companion prowled the city.

It was a fascinating experience. The burglary suspect seemed a pleasant enough chap; he spoke well, had a diffident manner about him and, on the surface at least, appeared most cooperative. Lt. Perkins was questioning him about his past activities (this was the first time he had been arrested in Medford), and in the course of the conversation, the man casually said something that sat us up straight.

HE HAD been in prison in California a number of times and spoke with a knowledgeable familiarity about the character and personality of the various institutions.

He recalled that one time several years ago, confronted with the mandatory choice of a transfer to one of two different prisons, he had asked to be sent to Chino prison, an institution set up to house felons in their late teens and early 20's.

Shaking his head a bit sadly, he said that had been a real mistake. We asked him why.

He thought for a minute and then he said, "There's a saying among the older cons that every man must serve his own time. The young ones, who haven't learned what life is all about yet, all want to serve everybody else's time."

And there it was: every man must serve his own time.

THE man gave no evidence of realizing the import of what he had said, but the impact of those few words—with the enormous truism about life that they expressed—has been with us ever since.

In an era in man's development in which committees spawn indiscriminate subcommittees, when group activity has supplanted individual initiative, when collective compromise and "cooperation" too often win out over rock-firm principle, that man's statement came like a haunting reminder of a bygone glory.

How instantly was evoked the pale memory of the view of life held about a hundred years ago by men like Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Their basic tenets—that the individual is paramount, that there really is such a thing as a "majority of one," that a rugged independence and self-reliance are to be vigorously cultivated, that man must bear the responsibility for his own actions and deeds—are concepts as seemingly out of date as a suit of medieval armor.

THIS is not weltchmerz. It is frighteningly true.

Modern man—does he not?—grabs for aspirin at the first sign of a headache, phones quickly for a plumber when his faucets begin to leak, listens to demagogues to find out what he should think, gratefully submerges his identity in a committee, a lodge, a political party.

National observers who rant about the drift of this country toward the welfare state do perhaps have a piece of a point. While we would be hard pressed to disagree with many pieces of social legislation passed in the last few decades, in toto it does seem there is a danger that, in wanting to help our fellow man, we may be inviting him to help himself less.

We seem at last to be discovering this in our foreign policy. We have come to the costly conclusion that "dollar diplomacy" is a failure; one simply can't buy friends—not real friends. We would hazard the estimate that the current approach—that of offering to match, in general, funds raised by a country seeking our aid in its effort to improve—will be eminently more successful.

WE don't really digress. These examples are germane.

The point is that while, finally speaking, it is impossible to ever stand completely alone (no man—no nation—is an island), we must, none the less, strive toward that ideal.

We don't derogate cooperation or collective activity per se. It is inconceivable that much worthwhile could be accomplished without it. And surely it is vital that each of us learn to work in harmony with others for the over-all welfare of society.

But sometimes when we see a child in school assigned to a committee of his classmates to make a report on something—from which experience he is certain to become familiar with only a fragment of the whole area of knowledge being examined—we cannot help but feel how much better the youngster might be served if he were given the entire responsibility for an individual piece of work.

True the child is part of the group, but he is also a separate entity, who will someday come face to face with the reality that he will succeed or fail as a result of his own individual efforts and initiative.

THE unfortunate man who sat in Lt. Perkins' office, once again in serious trouble with the law, had learned only a limited application of what he had said.

Contemporary man as a whole seems unable—or unwilling—to apply the principle to his way of life.

But the truth of it remains. Each man must independently live his own life. Each man must serve his own time.—G. H. B.

Dennis the Menace



"ALL YOU SAID WAS KEEP MY CLOTHES CLEAN!"

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

Friday, I tried to describe how the relations between the English-speaking nations and the Common Market (officially known as the European Economic Community) are affected by the American nuclear monopoly and British connections with it. There lies the fundamental difficulty confronting the grand project of British membership in and of American partnership with the European Economic Community.

For we must bear in mind that while the Common Market, as established by the Treaty of Rome in 1957, deals only with economic relations, it has been agreed by all six members that they will soon sign another treaty, which is now being negotiated, to establish a political union.

Their object is to create a new great power which is to be known as France or Germany but as "Europe." It is in the formation of this new political entity that the issues of the British-American nuclear connection arise.

ALL of this is not, however, the subject of the formal negotiations which have just begun in Brussels. They are concerned, we may say, with whether and how Britain can be admitted to the Common Market. They are not avowedly concerned with British membership in the new political entity which has still to be created. Nevertheless, the political and strategic issues are, I feel sure, controlling, at least in France, and how they are to be resolved no one now knows.

We can be sure that, unresolved, these problems will not make it easier to solve the economic issues which in themselves are very difficult indeed. To understand the nature of the economic difficulty, around which the Brussels negotiations revolve, we must realize what is the basic compact of the Common Market.

It is a bargain between French agriculture and German industry. The key to this bargain is that French agriculture is being modernized and is becoming increasingly productive. At bottom the Common Market enables France to sell the bulk of the basic food—wheat and meat—protected against Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine, and the United States by a common variable levy which would prevent imports, no matter how low in price, from competing in the European market. In return, German industry primarily, but also Italian, Belgian, and Dutch, have the privilege of free trade within the market and protection against the rest of the world by a customs union.

I might say that the reciprocal relation between French agriculture and German industry is comparable with the economy of our own political union. The United States is a common market in which there is an economic compact between the industrial Northeast and the agricultural South and West. On a smaller scale, of course, the Common Market in Europe rests on a similar system of reciprocal advantage.

NOW we can see why the British application to join the Common Market raises such difficult questions on both sides of the negotiating table. For Britain buys most of her essential food outside of Europe. The food comes into Britain at the low world

price and there is no significant tariff imposed upon it. As a result, the British people enjoy the advantage of cheaper food than do the continental people. The French pay their farmers \$2.25 a bushel for wheat which brings only \$1.60 on the British market. Thus, in Britain wheat flour costs at retail about 18 cents per kilogram (2 1/5 pounds); in France, Germany, and Italy the wheat flour costs about 21 cents. Beef costs the British at retail about \$1.66 a kilogram; it costs the French and Italians about \$2.16.

The biggest economic issue in the negotiations arises from the fact that France and what might be called the fundamentalists of the Common Market in Brussels, Bonn, and Rome, say that, to be admitted, Britain must open her market to French agriculture and in effect close it to Australia and New Zealand, North and South America. Britain must impose, probably after a transitional period of about seven years, the common agricultural tariff of the Common Market. If Britain does not do this, she may be excluded and then her industrial exports must face the common industrial tariff of the Common Market.

THIS poses a very hard choice both in Paris and in London. How much the French will wish to sharpen the issue depends, as I have been saying, on great political and strategic questions. But there are powerful economic interests in France which, leaving all political considerations aside, will press for very hard terms. France is in the midst of the same kind of agricultural revolution which has created our own farm problem. For example, the yield of wheat per acre has increased by more than half over the pre-war levels. France is able not only to feed her people but she also has surpluses to export. In the years 1959-60-61 France exported about one-eighth of her total wheat production of 32 million tons. About a third of that total export went to Germany.

The French farmers, like our own, are a powerful political force. They are interested in exports at high prices, and Britain seems a natural market for French agriculture. French and other continental industrialists view higher food prices for British workers as a wage-equalizing factor. It would thus be most difficult for any French government to allow Britain to enjoy cheap food from overseas, thus excluding French exports to Britain, and at the same time to enjoy a free run of the big common industrial market.

FOR the British, the terms for admission present a truly agonizing decision. If the British must shut out the old dominions, which are the producers of temperate agricultural products such as wheat and meat and butter, the old political and human allegiance of the empire and the commonwealth will suffer a rude and painful, if not a fatal, shock.

The issue is deep, momentous, and highly charged with sentiment. No solution of it is now in sight.

To find a solution, the continentalists will have to move into a much more generous and flexible position than General de Gaulle and Dr. Adenauer now occupy. The British are not so hard-pressed that they can be brought to a kind of unconditional surrender to Paris and Bonn. Thus the immediate fate of the grand project depends primarily on Paris and Bonn.

I KNOW that this sounds gloomy. For the short run the prospect is gloomy. If we

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE PRIME MINISTER'S PICKLE

London—With ostentatiously stiff upper lip, Edward Heath, the able minister charged with securing Britain's admission to the European Common Market, has now returned from the practical negotiations in Brussels.

Despite Heath's public refusal to be discouraged, it is transparently obvious that the Brussels meeting was extremely discouraging. All the Europeans reacted badly to some of the British proposals for safeguarding the Commonwealth. Furthermore, the French, supported by the Germans, rather openly resorted to delaying tactics.

On the highest level of the British government, the ugly fact is just beginning to be faced that General de Gaulle is positively hostile to British entry into Europe. The further fact is also beginning to be faced that although the French may not be able to close the door of the European club in Britain's face, they can at least keep the entrance fee so high that it will be almost impossible to pay.

FOR Prime Minister Macmillan, these newly dawning facts are exceptionally unpalatable. On the one hand, he could hardly lead Britain into Europe on the basis proposed by the French, which is that "Britain must either give up the Commonwealth—or give up Europe."

If Macmillan tries to do so, the leader of the Labor party, Hugh Gaitskell, will make the vote a party matter; and only two score Conservative defections will then defeat the Prime Minister in the House of Commons.

On the other hand, the Prime Minister and the Conservative leaders who are closest to him not only regard entry into Europe as essential to Britain's future. They have also been counting on their entry into Europe as the

expect a full solution in which Britain "joins" the European Community of General de Gaulle and Dr. Adenauer. This is so difficult that we may count ourselves fortunate if the negotiations are not broken off and if a way is found to continue them, perhaps for some years.

For in the long run, the grand project will, I believe, be realized. There is a very large popular momentum behind it, based on the manifest economic advantages of union and on the great hopes of peace and security which go with union.

For ourselves, we shall be dealing with the bigger realities if we keep our hopes and our policies bound up with the will to get on with and to achieve the grand project. For the Europe of 1962 is not the permanent and final shape of Europe. It could change in a few months.

In tomorrow's article, which will conclude this series, I should like to return to some of the political conditions in Europe which are of special interest to this country.

big coup, the grand restoration, the powerful shot in the arm, which will revive the Conservative party's waning fortunes in time for the next British election.

The urgent need for a powerful political restoration has been sharply underlined by the series of defects and setbacks the Conservative party has suffered in the last month. The Prime Minister, in sum, is in an ugly pickle, which is made all the worse by the problem of timing.

THIS is an acute problem, in the opinion of the British leaders, because they see their present attempt to enter the new Europe as a last chance. They may perhaps be wrong in this, certain wise American observers hold the opposite view. But the British believe that it is now or never, because they think that if they do not manage to get in now, General de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer will soon mold Europe to their own ends, with no one to stop them. And a Europe molded in the de Gaulle-Adenauer image would leave no room for British entry later on.

These being the main factors of the problem—so strangely unforseen in London or Washington until just the other day—unusual interest attaches to Prime Minister Macmillan's scheduled meeting with General de Gaulle at Champs early in June.

Obviously, the Prime Minister will try to win the French President over to a more friendly stance. But except for his personal charm, Macmillan has virtually no cards to play but one. The British already possess the nuclear know-how which General de Gaulle passionately wants for his French nuclear program but has been unable to obtain from Washington.

TO BE sure, the British are pledged to the American government not to pass on to any third party any of the data obtained from the U.S. as a result of their special classification in the McMahon Act. It will be a very terrible step for the Prime Minister to take, immediately jeopardizing the revived Anglo-American partnership, if he offers to share with de Gaulle the data he is pledged not to share. But what if this appears to be the only way of persuading the unyielding de Gaulle to permit British entry into Europe on acceptable terms?

The question, which is downright agonizing, is already under debate in London. No one can now predict the outcome of this debate—whisperers at the top level of the British government. Even if the final decision is to try and buy off de Gaulle, no one can predict whether the French President will prove to be purchasable. In his Machiavellian and somewhat sadistic way, he is perfectly capable of encouraging a British offer and then returning a glacial refusal.

But the mere fact that this should be the present stage of the European problem is, in itself, immensely indicative. It indicates, in blunt truth, that American policy on this side of the Atlantic is in very serious disarray.

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

"MY ONE AMBITION is to live to be 100," an old gaffer in Stroudsburg, Pa., told his doctor. "Okay," said the doctor. "No more smoking, drinking or gambling from this day forward." "Will that make me live to be 100?" asked the old man. "Who knows?" shrugged the doctor, "but it certainly will seem like it."

Suggestion for crossing a busy street in a Vienna newspaper: "In Italy, traffic will stop promptly if you cross the street with a shapely blonde; in England, if you have a dog on a leash; in America, if you are accompanied by at least three children; in Germany, if you are wearing the uniform of a general."

Overheard: a coy little blonde between acts in the lobby at "No Strings" whispering to the elderly Mr. Moneybags who was acquiring her: "Mama warned me there were men like you, but I never dreamed I'd be fortunate enough to meet one!"



Now he's broke.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In the headlines these days of the burgeoning saga of Billie Sol Estes is beginning to push Laos into the background. Wheeling and dealing in the government's fantastic farm program operations, he ran a shoostring into a fifty million dollar fortune.

Whether the service was of such a quality as to deserve a special reward. Hotels, along with other business establishments, don't like to do things that are resented by their customers.

Any way the situation dragged along until it resulted in a strike.

NOW for the humorous aspects. Willing but inexperienced accountants, secretaries, clerical workers and EXECUTIVES stepped into the breach and gave their all. Conrad Hilton, the big boss of the Waldorf and the whole Hilton hotel chain, shed his coat and waded in. He moved behind the bar in the world-famous Starlight Roof and poured a Bourbon and water for Edwin L. Meacham, New Mexico's winsomely youthful and handsome governor.

The treasurer of the Hilton hotel chain, Frank Conidine, filled in as a waiter and later as a bartender. The national chain's sales representative handled the emergency sandwich production line that was set up to stay the hunger of the guests. The registered guests... 1600 of them... pitched in and loded their bags and kidded the upper bracket volunteer help. A good time seems to have been had by all.

HOW will it come out? Here's a guess. If and when the waiters and such get the 12 per cent automatic service charge added to the bill, to be later distributed share and share alike to everybody concerned, the guests will grumble and pay it, but will go right on tipping those who give them good service and pleasant treatment.

At least, that's the way it works all over the rest of the world.

THE Waldorf management balked—contending, presumably, that the giving of a gratuity for services rendered is a private matter between the giver and the receiver thereof. There are many people who LIKE to reward good service. It gives them pleasure to do it. But they like to be the judge as to whether the service is good or bad and tend to resent being nicked for tip money regardless of their opinion as to the excellence and the courtesy, or the lack of it, on the part of those who provide the service.

The Waldorf management's story is that the addition of a blanket charge for service above and beyond the call of duty is RESENTED by the customer, who likes to feel that HE is the judge as to

My, that was a fine election. (Yawn) A lot of us stayed up (YAWN) late to count the returns. Most of us are (YAWN) sleepy. So I don't think the Potluck editor has enough energy today to write a (YAWN) column... ZZZZZZZ.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

My, that was a fine election. (Yawn) A lot of us stayed up (YAWN) late to count the returns. Most of us are (YAWN) sleepy. So I don't think the Potluck editor has enough energy today to write a (YAWN) column... ZZZZZZZ.

move by the millions to the suburbs. Inflation, however, is universally felt and understood, subject to dramatization, "coast to coast," which is why the President could do what he did to the steel companies and increase, not diminish, his general standing with the people in the doing.

What this President faces is a wide mosaic of vital, but semi-detached problems; he cannot deal with this mosaic except with an extensive, balanced program of action. This is realistic, but not in its nature dramatic. What he is really asking from the nation as a whole is not sacrifice at all but an intellectual grasp of the whole structure of problems and his whole structure of answers to them.

Answers that are, as they must be, essentially sectional and minority-group in their effect, are easily delayed or rebuffed in the conglomerate of interests that any Congress represents. The President's party majority in the House of Representatives may be increased still further next November. But, judging by the record, unless the newcomers are not just Democrats but "Kennedy Democrats"—a phrase we shall hear more and more—the President's program will do no better next year than this.

(Distributed 1962, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.) (All Rights Reserved)

National Apathy Bogs Kennedy Program

By ERIC SEVAREID

The Congress is now coming into the home stretch. What it does in the next couple of months will determine whether this is a triumphal year for President Kennedy or the year of the strangest presidential defeats on record. He had marked out this year on his calendar of action as the year of fundamental domestic reforms, but, save for the job-retraining bill, his dramatic and dramatized—proposals have gotten virtually nowhere with the Congress. The concept of an Urban Affairs Department is dead, the move to abolish racial discrimination through literacy tests is dead, the school-aid bill is moribund, the enormously complicated renovations of transportation, conservation and farm support programs can hardly be dealt with in this session.

Congress traditionally gets down to actual legislation as the dog-days of summer close; in this, after all, an election year, the pressures of which are just beginning to be felt, and if the tax and medical care bills go through, the President will have rea-

son for satisfaction. If the historic move to re-organize America's foreign trade should also win out, the President will have accomplished wonders and the other 30 or so "urgent" measures he has thrown at the Congress can be over as the campaign issues so many of them were probably intended to be from the beginning.

If he gets no more than the tax or medical care legislation, however, the year would have to be accounted a legislative failure by the kind of standards this administration has set for itself.

It would be a strange failure because it would be the failure of a President who enjoys overwhelming popular approval, whose party has an overwhelming majority in both houses of Congress, a President who is in personal and intellectual command on every sector of his wide front, who has organized an administrative branch of remarkable energy and dedication and who absolutely dominates the Washington news, day after day.

The entire stage is set for a sweeping presidential triumph—and yet the whole effort, of almost the whole effort, may well fizzle and fade.

Mr. Kennedy is one of our boldest presidents on record. Boldly, he asked for the spirit of sacrifice from his countrymen in his inaugural speech. But what has been happening

is what DeToqueville saw happening with bold American leadership more than a century ago: "...with immense exertion he raises them for an instant, but they speedily escape from him and fall back, as it were, by their own weight."

The reasons the people are "falling back" in spite of their great liking for President Kennedy, whereas they did not fall back under the leadership of FDR, to whom Kennedy has been likened, are rather simple, it seems to me. Roosevelt had two great issues to face: unemployment and the world Fascist threat which, unlike the present Communist threat, obviously had to be met primarily by arms. It was not merely that both of these challenges were simpler than most issues to deal with but that both were of universal application; ALL Americans were affected, and intensely so.