

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday at MEDFORD, OREGON, under Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00, 6 mos. \$8.00, 3 mos. \$4.25. Single Copies - 10c.

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Inc., 1000 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Official Paper of City of Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

Official Paper of Jackson County, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

United Press International, Full Leased Wire.

U.P.I. Telephoto Newspapers, MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS.

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Inc., 1000 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Official Paper of City of Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

Official Paper of Jackson County, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

United Press International, Full Leased Wire.

U.P.I. Telephoto Newspapers, MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS.

Satellite Arguments

We received a note in the mail the other day which said this:

"Since you published Maurine Neuberger's viewpoint, how about publishing this, too, in your editorial column?"

The enclosure was from the "Washington Report" of the Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. It said:

Do not be misled by Senate charges of "monopoly" and "give-away" in reference to President Kennedy's Communications Satellite Bill. The Senate legislation, as well as the House-approved version, contains fully adequate provisions for protecting the public interest.

Under both versions, the contemplated privately owned satellite company will also be subject to the rate-fixing authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

The Chamber agrees with the President that the creation of a private company is the best way to insure our nation's supremacy in space communications. As the Chamber put it in a letter earlier this year to the Senate Commerce Committee:

"It should be kept in mind that a space communications system is only an extension of the existing systems of national and international communications, and that the satellite program will supplement, rather than replace, cable and radio services now in existence. The present United States systems have been developed by private industry. This supplemental system should be developed and operated in much the same manner."

To turn over the development of a space communications system to a government agency, as a small group of "liberals" propose, would only inject the government again into an area where private industry can do the job more efficiently and effectively. It would also delay a program in which speed is urgently needed.

FAIR enough.

But are the public interest provisions in the bill adequate, as the U. S. Chamber declares? No, Senator Neuberger says. She calls them "transparent," and says they "fail to account for the reality of A. T. & T." And she adds:

"The massive economic concentration represented by the Bell System - owned and controlled by A. T. & T. - is staggering. This \$27 billion corporation owns and controls 98 per cent of long distance telephone service in the U. S. and all domestic facilities for overseas commercial telephone service.

"A. T. & T.'s monopoly grasp of communications is now threatened by the advent of communications satellites. The Syncom system, rapidly being perfected by Hughes Aircraft as an alternative to the Telstar system, would enable American companies such as Western Union, Hughes, RCA and International Telephone and Telegraph to compete with A. T. & T. for the business of long distance communications users. If the commercial development of the Syncom system is permitted, A. T. & T.'s enormous investment in its long lines and cables will be threatened. To thwart competition, every sniew of the A. T. & T. organization is at this moment straining to insure that A. T. & T. will control the destiny of communications satellites.

"No films formula for the allocation of directorships such as that contained in the proposed satellite bill could possibly blunt the naked economic power wielded by A. T. & T. The bill would permit A. T. & T. to purchase as much as 50 per cent of the capital stock of the proposed satellite corporation. A. T. & T.'s stockholders and officers would be free to purchase additional blocs of corporation stock..."

THE U. S. Chamber declares that the rate-fixing authority of the FCC would be an adequate safeguard. Senator Neuberger comments:

"Nor can I take comfort in the bill's provision for FCC regulation... Since the founding of the FCC in 1934, it has never completed a full formal hearing on telephone rates. Current independent reports by the Budget Bureau, the Hoover Commission, and the Rand Corporation are unanimous in concluding that the FCC has been totally ineffective in regulating A. T. & T.

"As Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee has said, 'A. T. & T. has successfully avoided regulation on earth. Divine guidance will be necessary to regulate A. T. & T. if it is permitted to expand its domain into space.'"

WOULD "private industry" indeed do a better job than government? Perhaps. But would a government-chartered monopoly do a better job than competing private industry? What about the many other firms interested in space?

Senator Neuberger points out:

"The proposed satellite bill would establish a revolutionary new pattern for commercial exploitation of our natural and scientific resources. For the first time in history, the U. S. government would be the creator and sponsor of a private, international cartel..."

Talk about private enterprise; talk about rugged individualism; talk about the capitalistic system; talk about competition; talk about freedom of opportunity; then answer Senator Neuberger's final question:

"Why should the Federal government license the unchecked expansion of monopoly and economic concentration?"

The senator's arguments are, to us, far more logical and compelling than those of the Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. — E. A.

Abby Green

Abby Green was a kindly man who liked people and loved music. Each Christmas for several years he put a tiny, perky Christmas tree in his front yard for passers-by to enjoy. Through his music, his friendliness, his eagerness to please, he increased the happiness of others.

He did not, himself, have a very happy life, and his death yesterday was a release from a long, painful, crippling and debilitating illness.

But Abby Green was a gentleman, and he will be missed. — E. A.

Blood Needs

The Red Cross Bloodmobile will be in town Monday and Tuesday.

It is our hope that everyone who is physically able will give serious thought to donating a pint of blood. Stocks of life-giving blood are exceedingly low, and it is a sad fact that Jackson county has performed its share of the blood-giving chore only once or twice in recent years.

This is a situation where the phrase about being one's brother's keeper takes on real meaning. — E. A.

"Ho Hum—It's Sure Dull Around Here"



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 200 words. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

On Life and Death

To the Editor: When the state, fulfilling its responsibility of protecting society and attempting to balance the scales of outraged justice (in as far as it is possible), by inflicting the severe punishment of death on a convicted murderer, it is written off by you as merely "cold-blooded killing." And the unjust, premature expulsion of a nonviable fetus because of the possibility of malformation, if carried full term, is a good and merciful act (the end justifying the means). In short Mr. Allen, you find yourself insisting a guilty murderer must be spared and the innocent child must be punished.

Apparently the dignity of life (MT 8-6-62) for you must be measured by the perfection of the body. Presumably, if a society can eventually determine if the unborn child will be perfect, it may be born naturally; but if there is the possibility of deformity, the child must be destroyed. Thereby we can develop a perfect race of people - full of dignity, of course. Shades of a depraved Austrian corporal.

But when we wipe away all this sentimental slush, we find Mr. Allen in the case of the unborn child (Finkbine) you are advocating the direct killing of the baby. According to law this is murder, even if you spell it euthanasia.

The distortion rising from the discussion about the possible malformation of the child (Finkbine) and the problems and heartache and effects on the other members of the family was cleared up a bit when other couples, parents, offered to adopt and love the unborn child. This is dignified. This is making manifest the true Christian spirit. This is demonstrating perfect trust in the Divine Plan.

Let the child be born, for deformed or not, there are always sufferings and problems in raising children; but there is also the compensating joy of doing God's will. There is no such compensating joy in willful murder.

Our Brother's Keeper

To the Editor: M.M.T., Aug. 8, '62, in one of its captions: "Mrs. Duncan, Cohorts Executed at San Quentin."

I had no feeling of elation as I read those words, only a horror, to think a society that calls itself modern can apparently so blithely put to death three humans.

As a friend remarked the other day, "Man in all his so-called intelligence, has never found the true answer of how to reprimand the human delinquent."

Although many people would close their eyes to the facts, we all have the blood of those who are executed on our hands, for allowing such laws to exist.

We need to search for another answer to this problem, and until that answer is found, life imprisonment is our best solution.

We are our brother's keeper, and whatever society inflicts on one person, inadvertently affects the other.

Mrs. Delbert Casey, Route 1, Box 358, Central Point, Ore.

Breath of Life

To the Editor: It is a fallacy to confuse the "life force" with personality or soul. "Life force" is a term given to the power underlying the mechanics of nature. This power—the thrust of life—though vital and persistent, is totally impersonal.

Among many other definitions, Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines "soul" as "The immortal part of man having permanent existence." "Sometimes distinguished from spirit." But even if it did include, "a life force," the definition signifies that more than one force is involved in the life process. A letter in the communications column Aug. 7 stated a dictionary employed this definition, and so the writer concluded soul was part of the body "in the beginning."

Nature's vast assembly line turns out products by the billions a minute in an unending stream - fruits, flowers, birds, bodies. When, due to the law of change, a product has completed its natural cycle, it terminates. Where a human mechanism is concerned, the personality or soul departs but the life force remains to carry on the process of disintegration, and eventual transition.

If soul actually exists, and this is a moot question, it would probably be added with the intake of air at birth. Permit me to quote the Christian Bible: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed

For All Citizens

To the Editor: A little over 3,000 years ago that extraordinary man, Moses, gave his people a code of ethics that has been honored ever since and respected by millions of people all over the world. This included the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Then he prescribed that the penalty of death be imposed by the state for the violation of this commandment. He was strengthening the commandment, not repeating it.

Later the great prophets and finally Christ, built on that foundation and added even loftier ethical requirements. Christ strongly emphasized that we must consider all others, that we must love our neighbors as ourselves, that it was the good intent of our hearts, not just the letter of the law that he valued most.

Consequently the question is not merely, "Shall the State of Oregon impose the death penalty for first degree murder?" But rather, "How best can Oregon foster the welfare of all our citizens?"

Mr. Hoover, the head of the FBI, claims that the death penalty does deter men from committing murder. So it seems reasonable that it is the uncertainty of the punishment that partially nullifies the deterring effects. England, where the execution of the penalty is much more certain, has a much lower rate of murder than the U. S. A. Life

Red China's Attitude Toward America Indissolubly Linked to Formosa Question

By ARTHUR J. DOMMEN
United Press International

Hong Kong - (UPI) - Marshal Chen Yi, Communist China's foreign minister, recently surprised Western correspondents in Geneva by engaging them in an informal give-and-take that is rare with any Chinese Communist diplomat anywhere.

Among other things, he spoke of Sino-American relations and of Formosa, Peiping's thinking on these two subjects is indissolubly linked together.

Peiping's statements on Formosa have been consistent from the beginning in 1949, when the Communists came to power on the Chinese mainland and the island became Chiang Kai-shek's last bastion.

Peiping's announced objective of extending its rule to Formosa, as distinct from the military or political tactics necessary to accomplish this, has never been in doubt.

The Communists are serious about this. When they talk of "the Americans occupying China's territory of Formosa," their viewpoint is one of chasing foreigners from their country, not of attacking a foreign government.

"We can wait 10 or 20 years," Chen Yi told his listeners. He meant it, Hong Kong diplomatic observers believe.

In the past, the Chinese Communists have made it clear they would be willing to settle the Formosa "question" by political means instead of by armed force. This might mean offering some form of local autonomy to the Nationalists under the Communist flag.

For instance, Chou En-lai said in a speech July 30, 1953,

"If possible, the Chinese government is willing to enter into negotiations with responsible local authorities of Formosa to map out concrete steps for its peaceful liberation."

So far as it is known here, this offer still stands.

"The people in Peiping are waiting for the day when they will be dealing with a leader on Formosa who will ask the Americans to withdraw from his country," one observer in Hong Kong said.

"No self-respecting Chinese Communist or Nationalist - will admit that the present situation can be perpetuated. No Chinese wants an independent Formosa. Nor does he want two Chinese governments. He thinks of 'Mother China' as being one, and only one."

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris
(c) Field Enterprises, Inc.

ROCKING THE BOAT

If you happen to be looking for some summertime reading that is diverting without being asinine, and thoughtful without being pretentious, may I recommend the new book, "Rocking the Boat," by Gore Vidal, which I have been enjoying for the last week.

As Philip Rahv, editor of the "Partisan Review," enthusiastically remarks in the jacket-blurb: "This collection of essays contains some of the most courageous, liveliest and wittiest comment on literature, the theater, and social life that has lately been written in America."

Vidal's honesty, directness and ease of style come through in everything he writes - whether he is interviewing Barry Goldwater, anatomizing the art of social climbing in America, or discussing the form and fate of his own plays.

An idea of his candor may be gained from Vidal's discussion of his "visit to a Small Planet," and why it did not turn out to be the play he originally had in mind. The play became a hit, he confessed, because its teeth were drawn during the out-of-town tryout - and then he explains, succinctly and with devastating frankness, what is wrong with the modern commercial American theater:

"I was obliged to protect an eighty-thousand dollar investment, and I confess freely I obscure, and humbly turned with a successful play which represented me very little. It was not that what was fashioned was bad or corrupt... but the play that might have been."

Modern world news note: Actor Hugh O'Bryan (already in the chips) plays chemist de fer at Monte Carlo and wins \$22,400 at one sitting. "Normally," he tells the reporters, "I don't gamble. This time I started off with a few pennies, and after somebody showed me how to play I just couldn't go wrong."

MMMMMMMMMM
This gambling is funny business. Them as has gits.

CHEMIN DE FER is the French term for railroad. Its literal meaning is "road of iron." It is also a Monte Carlo gambling game.

Question:
Does anybody in our State of Jefferson know how chemin de fer is played?

MORE modern world news: At the Optimist night club in East Orange, New Jersey, a stripper named Libby Jones tells her audience that she is a graduate of the University of Washington and produces her diploma to prove it.

Why her present profession? She explains it thus: "A mediocre stripper will make more money than a graduate physicist and more than some state governors. I make from \$1,000 to \$1,200 a week - and I can see no threat to society in a little girl taking off her clothes to music."

With Labor Day just over the horizon, a piece on the teletype starts off like this: "It's time now to make some resolutions for the coming school year. Home assignments are an integral part of the education process. If you are a good parent, you should be able to help guide your child with homework."

"Don't do it for him."

"In total, parents can help most effectively by GUIDING rather than DOING."

WHICH is to say:
If you are an average parent, and you try doing his homework for your youngster, YOU WILL PROBABLY DO IT WRONG.

Which will humiliate both you and your child.

ONE more modern news note:
In Washington, President Kennedy signs a bill to provide the money to run the Treasury, the Post Office and the White House executive office. The appropriation provided by the bill totals \$5,489,781,000.

Nostalgic thought:
Back in 1932, only 30 years ago, it cost only \$5,181,973,000 to RUN THE WHOLE GOVERNMENT.

Washington Report

By William S. White
(c) United Feature Syndicate

DANGEROUS BLOW

Washington - Our government is earnestly accentuating the positive and the British government is patently spreading the balm of calm all over the place.

Nevertheless, an unhappy fact will not dawn. The abrupt suspension for two months of all negotiations to let Britain into the European common market on livable terms has hit a dangerous blow to this whole great enterprise to strengthen the western world.

Nor has it left the United States untouched. We do not intend actually to go into the common market. But we do intend to associate closely with it, if only because we must, considering the vast new community of trade it has raised. We would not necessarily be out of it even if the British were frozen out. But we should find such a situation awkward, to say the least.

MOREOVER, the exclusion of Britain might complicate, or even require some rewriting, of current American legislation to grant President Kennedy wide tariff-reducing powers in order to deal with the common market. One responsible legislator in the field, Rep. Henry Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin, already had suggested that the Kennedy administration should move for stand-by revisions to cover the possibility of an excluded Britain.

The postponement of all real discussions between the French and German-led common market and Britain, on how Britain could enter and still give indispensable protection to the food imports from her oldest commonwealth associates, by no means implies a final collapse of negotiations. Within its own realities it is a setback - but nothing more.

No one seriously supposed that this meeting alone could resolve all the complications of what from the very start has been the ore true British

problem. This is how to go into the common market on such terms as not to break the old trade ties - and the deeper political ties - with Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

THE true harm that has been done here is not so much to the substance of the negotiations as to their appearance. The harm, in a word, is more political than economic. The French have been allowing, if not actually promoting, interpretations of the current negotiations so extreme as to feed the conclusion that something approaching disaster has befallen the British attempt to enter without national humiliation and without breaking up the commonwealth.

Any such view, on the plain facts of the case, is nonsense. This was only one inning in a long ball game, even though admittedly a bad inning for Britain. Wholly reliable British information to this communist in no way supports any notion of any irreparable reverse. All the same, British leaders fear - and soundly fear - that in England itself these scare accounts may enlarge and embolden the already bitter opposition to the common market from among the more tradition-minded members of Prime Minister Macmillan's own party.

THESE leaders are concerned that the British public itself may be led to believe that "the Frogs and the Huns" - the vulgar terms in pub and street for the French and Germans - are determined to do Britain in. Given any such emotional national climate, the British people will say to hell with the common market, economics or no economics.

And it is extremely doubtful that in such a state of public feeling Macmillan could ever put through British entry, even assuming the French should become more generous in their terms for her joining the club. Already Macmillan has been asking his people to accept a new European leadership from the country that started the last war, Germany, and from the country that fought it so briefly and so poorly, France. Already, he has had troubles enough.

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

OCTOGENARIAN playwright and novelist P. G. Wodehouse has jotted down some of his memories in a little book called "Author! Author!" He recalls, for instance, the time he went to Southern California for the winter - and found it. And the time he asked Thurber how his new play was coming along. "It has only one fault," answered Thurber slowly. "It's kind of lousy."

Wodehouse became a writer because, he says, after starting out as a bank clerk, he quickly decided that his true future lay in cashing rather than filing checks.

Bernard Shaw was no favorite of P. G. Wodehouse. He quotes, with relish, a remark made by Sir Arthur Wing Pinero when Shaw resigned in a huff from the Dramatists Club. "Mr. Shaw's resignation," said Sir Arthur, "is as nothing compared with ours."

At a Westchester country club, a member told the owner of a big metropolitan newspaper, "Say, I owe you a vote of thanks. Your paper proved just the thing to stop my two kids from raising the devil this morning." Obviously pleased, the newspaper owner inquired, "What particular article did the trick?" "No article at all," explained the father. "I just rolled up your paper and whacked them with it."



Riddle Department:
1. Q. What's the difference between a school teacher and a railroad train?
A. The teacher says, "Take that gum out of your mouth!" the train says, "Choo! Choo!"

2. Q. What has eight legs, wears feathers, and says, "Ba-a-a, ba-a-a, ba-a-a?"
A. An Inquisitive Indian quartette singing "The Whiffenpoof Song."

© 1962, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate