

MEDFORD, OREGON TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North St. St. P.O. 712-6141
ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHAPMAN, Tel. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.
An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail—In Advance
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$9.50
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$5.00
Sunday Only—1 year \$10.00
Single Copy (M-F) 30c
By Carrier—And Motor Route
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$21.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$11.00
Sunday Only—1 year \$13.00
Carrier and Vendors—Copy 10c
Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International
Full Leased Wire
U. P. Telephone News-pictures
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS
Advertising Representative:
NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER

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
Sept. 18, 1952 (Friday)

Ashland begins observance of 100 years of memories and achievements.
George Baker Dunkin, 67, denies intention of murder in case of state justice officer; states he was "just trying to scare him away."

20 YEARS AGO
Sept. 18, 1942 (Saturday)

Jackson county grand jury recommends invoking and enforcing curfew ordinances in all cities and towns of the county for minors under 16 years old.
From Arthur Perry's "Ye Snudge Pot" column: "The juvenile element skins out for school Monday morning, to welcome their teachers with bright and shining faces."

30 YEARS AGO
Sept. 18, 1932 (Monday)

Petitions being circulated for C. E. (Pop) Gates, former mayor of Medford, as independent candidate for county judge.
Frank DeSousa, Medford, named to committee which will greet Franklin D. Roosevelt, Democratic candidate for president, during stop in Portland.

40 YEARS AGO
Sept. 18, 1922 (Tuesday)

Enforcement of prohibition laws in Jackson county costs \$600 a month during June, July and August, 1922.
Oregon Sen. Charles McNary denies report he will leave United States Senate to accept position as federal judge.

50 YEARS AGO
Sept. 18, 1912 (Thursday)

Medford fire department extinguishes blaze in woodshed before discovering large quantity of dynamite stored in building.
Conservator of imperial Russian botanical gardens calls Crater lake one of world's most beautiful sights.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. Correct the sentence: "We have been to church."
 2. Antiochus Epiphanes, who wrought suffering and cruelty upon the Hebrews, was king of what country?
 3. Does the U.S. Constitution provide for the resignation of the President?
 4. Is elderdown gathered from the female or from both sexes of elder ducks?
 5. Aliens may, or may not, acquire patents in the United States?
 6. The first U.S. President to use the "pocket veto" was Lincoln, Monroe, or Madison?
 7. A place where coins are manufactured is called a what?
 8. Is the goldfinch a bird, fish or signet ring?
 9. Which State is electing both U.S. Senators in this November election?
 10. What is the world's most popular vegetable?
- Answers: 1. "We have been at church." 2. Syria. 3. Yes (Article II, Sec. 1, 4. Only from the female. 5. May. 6. Madison. 7. Mint. 8. Bird. 9. Idaho. 10. Potato.

The Outlawry of Red China

John Foster Dulles used to say, in regard to the admission of Red China, "The United Nations is not a reformatory for bad governments."

So long as Fidel Castro's Cuba retains its credentials, along with a good many other nations that don't have to be identified, this argument evades the issue.

A more logical case was made by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon when the annual debate began last year. Nixon said that public opinion in the United States by "an overwhelming majority" was opposed to the admission of Red China to the U.N. And he cited "a growing minority opinion . . . that the United States is bearing too much of the burden, financial and otherwise, in supporting the U.N."

With these considerations in mind, Nixon said: "The result (of Red China's admission) could be withdrawal of the United States from the world organization, or a reduction to mere token participation. Either would doom the organization to the impotence of the League of Nations."

At the past 11 sessions of the U. N. General Assembly the United States has succeeded in blocking Peking's hopes. For the seven years from 1954 through 1960 we kept the question of Red China's membership off the General Assembly agenda.

Last year, with the influx of new Asian and African members, our strategy changed. We agreed to a vote, but insisted that it be treated as "an important question." This would require a two-thirds majority for approval. This stipulation carried by a 61 to 34 vote, with seven nations abstaining.

Actually the question of seating the Reds and unseating the Nationalists failed of even a simple majority. The Assembly voted 48 to 37 against, with 19 nations abstaining.

THE question is bound to arise again at the General Assembly's 17th plenary session.

India had long been the faithful sponsor of the Mao Tse-tung regime, but retired from that role in 1960, undoubtedly as the result of the rape of Tibet and India's own border troubles with the Reds. Despite the growing cleavage between Soviet Russia and Red China over ideological and other matters, Russia's foreign minister brought the question of membership formally before the 1960 session. Russia again acted as sponsor in 1961 and is expected to repeat this year.

Red China's chances look little better than in previous years. The United Nations has 104 members, counting Nationalist China. Of these, 38 recognize Red China, and 55 "White" China. Ten have relations with neither.

The whole debate of course is to some extent academic. There is real doubt that Soviet Russia honestly wants Red China admitted, and no credible evidence at all that Red China wants in. If it did, it unquestionably could gain the two-thirds vote necessary just by offering convincing proof of willingness to abide by the rules and by-laws of the U. N. club.—E.R.R.

U. N. and Southern Rhodesia

The 17th regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, which opens today is likely to put new pressure on Britain to end white supremacy rule in Southern Rhodesia.

Southern Rhodesia, a land largely of cattle ranches and tobacco plantations, is a white settler's stronghold and last fortress of legal racial discrimination in the Central African Federation. Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland are the other segments of the three-part federation.

By a vote of 73 in favor, one against (South Africa) and 27 abstentions (including the United States), the General Assembly last June 28 called on Britain, as "administering authority," to convene a constitutional conference to replace the 1961 Southern Rhodesian constitution with one that would "insure the rights of the majority of the people." The self-governing British colony has three million black Africans and 210,000 whites. The U. N. resolution set no deadline and was considerably milder than a Soviet demand that the colony receive independence this year under black rule.

THE British government claims that it lacks power to intervene in Southern Rhodesia's affairs. Indeed, the colony has enjoyed full internal self-government since 1923 and is firmly in the hands of the white Rhodesians. Africans and Asians in the United Nations (and the political left wing in Britain itself) reply that, on paper, Britain has the power to put Africans in control. "The Economist" of London commented with some asperity that it was time for the British government to make up its mind whether or not it was responsible for Southern Rhodesia. The weekly advocated putting pressure on Sir Edgar Whitehead's Southern Rhodesian government "to open up a short road to political power for his country's Africans."

"The Economist" admitted it may be true that, once in power, Africans will prove to be irresponsible or dictatorial but added: "The British government will be expected to carry the can if black frustrations and white stubbornness meet head-on and bloodily in Southern Rhodesia; it ought to do its best to avoid such an eventuality."—E.R.R.



Washington Report

By William S. White
(c) United Feature Syndicate

SETS RIGHT THEME

Washington—The head Republican campaigner, Former President Eisenhower, has set the right theme for the oncoming campaign for Congress, and a highly responsible theme it is. If he has his way, the whole range of menacing foreign crises, from Cuba to Berlin to Southeast Asia, will be absent from our national argument over who is to go to Congress.

He means to beat President Kennedy's party in these races if he possibly can. Already, he is blasting away at that "parade for theorists" and that "playpen for the exercise of their notions and abstract fallacies" which to his mind is the Kennedy administration. But he is talking about domestic things which are Congress's real business and over which Congress has some control.

And he is also grasping President Kennedy's hand in an oddly moving way in a joint effort by them to keep the fight involved to issues on this side of the water—even this side of the thin strip of water lying between Florida and Cuba.

IN THIS, General Eisenhower will not altogether succeed, and President Kennedy will not altogether succeed. But that they are at least trying is not the least important fact of this campaign. For Congress, no matter which party controls it, does not, cannot and should not make foreign policy. To think that it does, to make the impossible attempt to put it into position to do so, is a futility and a great danger to this country. No Congress, no collective body of any kind, can run our affairs abroad. Only one man—a President—can do that.

Moreover, even if the current administration is as wrong-headed about foreign policy as some of its critics will say, the argument is not relevant to this election in this year any more than a comparable Democratic argument against President Eisenhower was relevant in 1958.

There is in any event no way to repudiate President Kennedy as a foreign policy leader by some vote in a Congressional race in 1962 any more than there was to President Eisenhower by such a vote in 1958. What we are

about to do—and all we are about to do—is this: 1. To elect 435 members of the House of Representatives, the basic job of each being to look after his district and then to make such contributions to national interest as he can. 2. To elect that one-third of the Senate where terms expire this year—a Senate which has an advisory role in foreign policy, but still a Senate quite incapable, by the Constitution and in fact, or running that show.

ALL this is precisely what is in General Eisenhower's mind, as it is in Mr. Kennedy's mind. It is also in the minds of the party leaders in Congress like Senators Mike Mansfield of Montana and the Democrats and Everett Dirksen of Illinois for the Republicans and their associates. They know that foreign policy in a time of many perils can not safely be made the topic for reckless disputation from 500 stumps this fall.

All this having been said, the present prospect is that the top fellows in both parties will try to keep down idle partisanship in this field—idle because Congress can do little about it anyhow—but that lesser partisans will play this mischievous game all the same. Of course, free speech is free speech, even if sometimes irresponsible speech.

But a great distinction should be borne in mind. Criticism of national foreign policy in crisis by private people—columnists included—is one thing. But criticism of that policy in such times by elected members of a nation's government, or those hoping to be members, is another thing altogether. Private men speak only for themselves and bear no public responsibility. Public men do bear public responsibility and to some degree they speak, or hope to speak, for the United States of America.

Swedish Scientists Report Russian Test

Stockholm, Sweden—UPE—Swedish scientists reported the Soviet Union set off a 9-megaton nuclear explosion today at its Arctic testing site of Novaya Zemlya.
The blast was detected by monitoring devices at Stockholm University.
It was the 10th of a series the Russians began Aug. 5. Explosions estimated at 15 megatons each were detected Saturday and Sunday.

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

DAVID NIVEN tells about a movie star who was invited to the wedding of his former wife—an event he anticipated with unholly glee, since it spelled the end of his heavy alimony payments. However, he decided not to risk appearing at the ceremony in person. He was afraid that, in his moment of supreme joy, he might embarrass everybody by kissing the groom instead of the bride.

Back from his first tour of Europe, a disillusioned college student reports that he couldn't get hamburgers in Hamburg, English muffins in England, London broil in London, French toast in France, or even eggs Florentine in Florence. The wines—and the girls—he admitted, however, were wonderful.

Out on his feet after eight rounds against an infinitely superior prize fighter, a glass-eyed gladiator was implored by his manager, "Don't give up now, Eddie boy! You got a no-bitter going!"

"In Africa," notes Danny Kaye, "native tribes beat the ground and utter blood-curdling yells. The anthropologists call this primitive expression. In Palm Springs we call it golf."
© 1962, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate

Indian-Red Chinese Border Dispute Occasionally Bobs Back Into News

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst

The Indian-Red Chinese border dispute has been bubbling along now for about three years. Most of the action has been confined to occasional hot words exchanged between the two antagonists, and here and there a patrol clash. Involved is an area of some 51,000 square miles along the Himalaya spine separating India and China. It is an inhospitable area of towering mountains, deep gorges, murderous winters and of communications such that months may go by before either side may know of a border violation.

It is not on tourist maps and most Westerners would be hard put to locate Ladakh (which is in the border area of northeast Kashmir on the western end of the Indo-Chinese border) or to describe the habits of the Monba, Aka, Dafia or Apa Tarange tribes (who live along the border in the northeast).

Occasionally it bobs back into the news, as it did a few days ago when it was announced that Indian Defense Minister Krishna Menon's departure for the United Nations General Assembly had been delayed by new Red Chinese incursions.

The forces involved were 45 men of an Indian outpost and an undetermined number of Red troops at that point "several hundred yards away."

On the basis of the foregoing, the dispute would seem to be isolated and not one at the moment to intrude itself upon other world problems. Such is not the case. For example: President Mohammad Ayub

Khan of Pakistan and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India seldom see eye-to-eye.

In London during the last week, at the meeting of commonwealth prime ministers, they have been in rare agreement in opposition to Britain's entering the European Common Market.

Their area of disagreement is wide, but especially they disagree on Kashmir which presently is held jointly along a cease-fire line. Ayub has elected to reach tentative agreements with Red China on a border delineation over that part of Kashmir he holds and which India claims.

Chums With China
This has brought from Nehru an expression of surprise that a member of the SEATO and CENTO treaties suddenly should elect to "chum up with China."

In London, Nehru has been protesting the effect on India's five-year plan if Britain should join the common market and cut off commonwealth economic preferences. On their side the British have asked why Nehru is negotiating to buy MIG jets from Russia rather than take his business to the hard-pressed British aircraft industry.

As for Peiping, there is no doubt concerning as to why a supposed Red ally is selling airplanes to a country which someday might use them against Red China. It's a small world.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE MAKING OF EUROPE

Paris—Unless Prime Minister Macmillan encounters an unexpected revolt in the House of Commons, it now seems highly likely that the new Europe, with Britain as a full member, will shortly come into being.

There could be a revolt, of course. Or the Prime Minister could simply be intimidated by the loud agitation against British entry into the Common Market, and could therefore be induced to accept the alternative now being discreetly offered by Gen. de Gaulle—"an economic arrangement between Britain and Europe" which would not involve British membership.

All the same, the outlook today is very different from the outlook some months ago, when Britain's admission to the Common Market first began to seem doubtful, because Gen. de Gaulle's opposition to Britain's admission first began to be manifest.

THE French President's attitude has not changed since then in any material way. If he had the sole say in the matter, it is clear he would much prefer the "arrangement" as the best way out. What has changed, rather, is the Gaullist calculation on which the possible exclusion of Britain was based.

As first reported in this space, while desiring Britain's exclusion, de Gaulle never intended to keep Britain out by his solitary veto; that, he always knew, would be going too far. He always intended, instead, to use his power to prevent any material reduction of the admission fee Britain would have to pay.

And he calculated that if the fee were not materially reduced, the British would refuse to pay, and would therefore remain outside of Europe.

As Gen. de Gaulle expected the admission fee for Britain has not been sharply cut by the negotiations which have taken place in the interval. But something else has happened which de Gaulle did not expect. The British have shown strongest indications that they mean to enter the European club, even if they have to pay the fee they formerly described as impossibly high.

THE French have watched, somewhat anxiously, for any sign of a change in this British intention, caused by the anti-Common Market storm at the Commonwealthe Prime Ministers' meeting in London. There has been no such sign to date. Hence British entry into Europe may perhaps be agreed upon in the first round of the renewed British-European talks, which are scheduled to begin soon.

It must be added, however, that there is one other uncertain, indeed unpredictable, factor in the situation. It has been introduced by de Gaulle's triumphant tour of Germany, where the French President dropped hints about the need for some sort of closer "union" or more intimate "collaboration" between Germany and France.

What de Gaulle was talking about, it can be stated on high authority, was a special Franco-German political arrangement that would give organic expression to his own informal partnership with Chancellor Adenauer. This may come one day. But the primary aim of de Gaulle's hints, at this time, was to force a renewal of the stalled negotiations for the creation of a larger European political community.

These negotiations were broken off at the insistence of the Dutch and Belgians. The Dutch and Belgians have always opposed their renewal, on the grounds that decisions at this stage about the future political organization of Europe would make it more difficult for the British to join the club. The British themselves have strongly endorsed this argument. The blocking of the negotiations has caused great annoyance in Paris where Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak is especially unpopular.

"We cannot let our policy be obstructed by a Spaak!" Such was the formula employed to explain the hints dropped by de Gaulle in Germany. Besides a certain pique, it clearly reveals the intention to use the threat of Franco-German political talks as the lever, in order to force the renewal of the larger European political talks.

EVERY the most European-minded Frenchman now favors such a renewal, without regard to the status of the bargaining with the British. Presumably this is because they fear Chancellor Adenauer may not survive much longer, and they want the European political community to be established while Adenauer remains in office. If the lever works, and talks about the political organization of Europe are resumed at an early date, it is hard to foresee the exact effect in London. Most probably, however, the effect will be to hasten the British decision to enter the Common Market in order to be able to join the unavoidably protracted and complex political discussion before major decisions have been reached.

In sum, although another abrupt reversal of the trend is always possible, the new enlarged Europe seems to be in the making. It may become a reality, politically as well as economically, before too many months have passed.

Witnesses Voted Allowance Increase

Washington—UPE—The Senate Judiciary Committee Monday approved a bill that would increase the per diem allowance for federal court witnesses from \$4 to \$6, their travel allowance from 8 to 10 cents a mile and subsistence allowance from \$8 to \$10 a day.

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name on initial publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Has More Wisdom

To the Editor: One of the chief gripes of Republicans against Senator Morse is that he had the good sense to leave his party and join one of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland and F.D.R. He is an intellectual who, while having both feet firmly on the ground, looks beyond the immediate present.

In that very important field of international politics—Latin American affairs—he is far better versed than his Republican opponent. It would be the part of wisdom to return him to the Senate.

David Frisch,
P.O. Box 292,
White City, Ore.
Hope He's Right
To the Editor: Mr. Kennedy says: "We will beat the Russians to the moon."
I hope he is right, but if we can't beat the Russians to Cuba, how in 'ell are we going to beat them to the moon?
Everett Acklin,
Ashland, Ore.

Strictly Personal

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

MOTTO OF MANKIND

Perhaps the most curious and perplexing paradox of the human race consists in the fact that we make progress only in the things we do not know. Most of mankind is ignorant of physics, higher mathematics, engineering, genetics, ecology, astronomy, medicine—indeed, of every sphere in which tremendous and profound developments have taken place over the ages.

In the area of the things we know—or, more accurately, of the things we THINK we know—we have made absolutely no progress since the days of the Hebrew prophets, the Greek philosophers, and the Roman law-givers. It might be argued, in fact, that we have retrogressed in social behavior.

Everybody thinks he understands love and the ways of the human heart. It is impossible to tell someone he is delusory or dense on this subject. And every parent believes he knows how to rear his children. As householders, we think we know how to live in amity with our neighbors—if only they would let us. And, as voters, we are absolutely convinced that our political prescriptions would cure the ailing public body.

Yet it is precisely here—in personal, family, community and international relations—that we behave not one whit better than

the Medes and the Persians, the Gauls and the Goths. What everybody knows, nobody knows; this might almost be the motto of mankind. Those areas in which we think we require no instructions—because our hearts, or our minds, or our characters so easily grasp them—are the very areas of continual conflict, of circular motion, of frustration and futility and defeat.

It may be that what the theologians call "original sin" is this assumption of knowledge on our part; not any particular sin, or any kinds of sin, in the conventional sense of the word—but, rather, a spiritual asompherie in which all of us are born and which we carry with us for a lifetime.

For notice—in those spheres in which genuine progress has been made, the pioneers and innovators and discoverers and inventors did not already think they knew the answers. They knew they were in the dark, and struggled with great difficulty to reach the light.

The rest of us think we are in the light and those who disagree with us, are in the darkness—so our struggle is not with ourselves (as it should be), but with them; to make the loved one more responsive, the child more tractable, the neighbor more suitable to our image. The one thing in the world a fish does not know is water, because he is always contained in it. And the one thing we do not know is our ignorance of ourselves, because it surrounds us entirely. All great teaching is an attack upon this ignorance. So far, all attacks have failed.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In these modern days, most of us have a vague idea that the political entity known as the United States of America sprang forth full-panoplied—like Minerva from the brow of Jupiter—from the Revolutionary War. It wasn't so.

THE Revolutionary War was fought by the 13 original colonies acting together under a loose federation directed by the First Continental Congress. This served to carry on the war. For a brief period after the surrender of Cornwallis, the 13 American states more or less went their separate and sovereign ways—much as the Latin American states do now.

But it was soon realized that this wouldn't work, so late in 1781 a weak central government was established by the Articles of Confederation.

AS a central government, it was a weak sister. The separate states acted like SEPARATE NATIONS. They treated each other much like independent foreign countries.

They quarreled incessantly over boundaries, water rights, currencies and commerce. New York, for example, laid taxes on firewood brought in from Connecticut and on cargoes imported from New Jersey. Pennsylvania WENT TO WAR to drive Connecticut settlers out of a disputed valley. And so on.

FROM his estate at Mount Vernon Washington watched with growing uneasiness this drift toward what seemed to him to be a state of anarchy. He pleaded for a stronger union. Men like Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin and James Madison seconded his plea, and so in the fall of 1786 the Continental Congress was led to issue a call to the states to appoint delegates to a convention to revise the Articles of Confederation. The convention assembled in Philadelphia in May of 1787, with Washington as its

presiding officer. There were 55 delegates, and every state except Rhode Island was represented. These 55 men then proceeded to do a bold deed. Instead of merely revising the Articles of Confederation, THEY WROTE A NEW CONSTITUTION.

THIS bold step so frightened some of the delegates that they left for home. But the rest of them stayed on, working behind closed doors and pledged to secrecy. Finally, nearly four months after the convention began, the last article of the document was agreed upon and Washington called on the delegates to affix their signatures—and all but three of them did. In his call to the delegates to sign, Washington said:

"Let us raise (here) a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

It was signed on Sept. 17, 1787—175 years ago Monday.

IT WAS this Constitution, hammered out by great and devoted patriots, of which William Pitt, England's great liberal minister, who had been the firm friend of the 13 rebellious colonies all through the War of the Revolution, said:

"It will be pattern for ALL FUTURE constitutions and the admiration of all future ages." The Founding Fathers who drafted it are described by historian David Muzzy as "a group of men who have not been surpassed in character and ability by any body of equal size in the history of the world."

SO—On Monday—No matter what we may have been doing—We should have paused for at least a minute or so in silent and heartfelt tribute to these great men and great patriots who hammered out in those dark days 175 years ago the Constitution that is the foundation of our American way of life.