

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Fir St. Ph. 772-6141

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor. HEHR GREY Advertising Manager. GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr. ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor. EARL H. ADAMS, Teleg. Editor. RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER Women's Editor. DALE BRICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00. Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$10.00. Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$5.00. Sunday Only—One year \$10.00. Single Copy (Mailed) 20c.

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, 1000 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10018. Offices: Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time: Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO Nov. 18, 1952 (Monday): A Gold Hill woman was killed by a hit-and-run driver last night as a thick layer of fog shrouded city streets.

20 YEARS AGO Nov. 18, 1942 (Tuesday): Forty-seven Oregon state hospital inmates die from food poisoning; frozen eggs blamed.

30 YEARS AGO Nov. 18, 1932 (Thursday): Cargo of 60 gallons of high grade Scotch whiskey seized from car by federal prohibition officer between Rogue River and Grants Pass.

40 YEARS AGO Nov. 18, 1922 (Friday): Confessed automobile thief breaks out of county jail in Jacksonville after stealing \$25 in cash and the sheriff's pants.

50 YEARS AGO Nov. 18, 1912 (Sunday): Newly elected county court, headed by County Judge Frank TouVelle, decided to request construction of state highway through Jackson county.

What's Your I.Q.? Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. Three dots and a dash in the Morse Code indicate what letter of the alphabet?

2. Jerry Cruncher is a character in which of Dickens' novels?

3. When does the 24th hour of the day begin?

4. When two members of a legislative body "pair" their votes, do they have their votes recorded on the same or opposite sides of an issue?

5. Who wrote the "Blue Danube" waltz?

6. Baldwin, Jonathon, and McIntosh are commercial varieties of which fruit?

7. Mothers Day is celebrated the first, second, or third Sunday in May?

8. Is baseball a popular game in Japan?

9. What word means the opposite of windward?

10. Belmont Park race track is in N—U County?

Answers: 1. V. 2. A Tale of Two Cities. 3. 11 p.m. 4. Opposing sides. 5. Johann Strauss. 6. Apple. 7. Second. 8. Yes. 9. Leeward. 10. Nassau.

Politics and the Post Office

It has been an open secret in Democratic party circles in Jackson county that Marvin Madden, county clerk who was reelected Nov. 6, is an active candidate for the Medford postmastership, although he has made no formal application.

He was listed as one at the meeting of the Democratic Central Committee Thursday night, and being present, did not deny it. He did not deny it when we asked him, point blank, on Friday. Another prominent Democrat has been actively promoting him for the job.

We consider it a breach of political ethics for anyone to seek an elective office, and then, if successful, refuse to accept it.

WHEN a candidate files his declaration of candidacy, he is required by state law to declare that he is willing to accept the nomination or election, and that he will qualify if elected.

Madden filed such a declaration when he sought the Democratic nomination for county clerk last spring. The recent death of Moore Hamilton, the widely respected and liked postmaster, left a vacancy in that office. It is filled by appointment, which is usually based on political considerations.

If Madden were to receive the appointment as postmaster, and thus renege on his obligation to the voters of the county who put him in office, he would be guilty of violating his self-declared responsibilities, and also his moral obligation to the voters.

He should, at a minimum, clear the air with a forthright statement that he is not seeking the job, and would not accept it if it were offered.

WE AGREE with Bob Duncan in his belief that postmasterships should be taken out of the patronage pot.

The postal service is a technical one, in which training and ability are necessary, and political preferment is not. All too many postmasters (unlike Moore Hamilton, who worked at the job) do little but keep their chairs warm, letting the career men actually run the post offices.

Most of the postal service is now under civil service. We see no reason why the ancient spoils system should be permitted to remain the principal factor in naming postmasters. — E. A.

Oregon Dunes Prospects

We are hopeful that, with the election of Bob Duncan to Congress from this district, the chances for the creation of an Oregon Dunes National Seashore will be improved.

Bob has never been terribly enthusiastic about the Dunes proposal, but his view of it as a possibly worthwhile thing is in stark contrast to the opposition voiced by Congressman Edwin Durno, who Duncan will succeed in January.

Duncan has stated that he thinks he and Senator Neuberger can reach agreement on a Seashore bill. Senator Morse does not oppose the Dunes proposal on principle, and if adequate protection for property owners in the area can be incorporated in a bill, he presumably would add his support to it.

THE STATE also has a responsibility. Governor Hatfield is not against the Dunes, but he and his natural resources chief, Dan Allen, have dragged their feet, and have insisted on some qualifications that might endanger the passage of any really effective Seashore measure.

This sort of thing has been going on for a long time.

We recently finished reading a book entitled, "Our National Park Policy — A Critical History," by Prof. John Ise, an internationally known authority on park, forest and land management matters.

Ever since Yellowstone became the first National Park in 1872, there have been both strong supporters and strong opponents to National Park creation. Generally they have been opposed variously by lumber, mining, grazing, power and irrigation interests, and supported by recreation enthusiasts, lovers of natural beauty, and those who believe that we should retain some of our outdoor heritage for future generations.

IN ADDITION, however, the states themselves have often been foes of the establishment of a park in their own boundaries.

But parks have been established. It appears we are now in a period of park formations. Cape Cod National Seashore and Pt. Reyes National Park have been authorized within recent months, and there is reason to hope that Padre Island in Texas, and perhaps the Lake Michigan Dunes in Indiana, as well as the Oregon Dunes, may achieve National status before too long. There are a number of other less prominent candidates for National Park status, too, which have considerable support.

IN EVERY case, surveys have revealed, where a National Park has been established, property values in nearby areas has gone up, as have tourist revenues.

Crater Lake National Park is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to Medford and Klamath Falls. An Oregon Dunes National Seashore, with a status and fame which only National designation can bring, would be a major attraction, and the entire state would benefit.

Let us hope that the favorable prospects for an early agreement can be fulfilled, and that with a positive and cooperative approach among the Oregon delegation and the state government, the Oregon Dunes will become a reality, and not too long from now. — E. A.

And Now A Few More Late Returns In Those Disputed Races



Drummond Reports

(Walter Lippmann is in Europe. Roscoe Drummond reports from Washington in his absence.) (c) 1962 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

CUBA: CRISIS FAR FROM OVER

Washington — The outlook for any clean, satisfactory settlement becomes more elusive, more uncertain, more disturbing every day.

President Kennedy and his top advisers are understandably hesitant to use blunt words in the middle of delicate negotiations which might have a faint chance of success.

But only a faint chance. At this point it seems to me urgent to cut through the polite words of officialdom and to look at what is happening and what isn't happening in Cuba since Premier Khrushchev agreed to remove all offensive Soviet weapons under UN inspection.

THE blunt facts are these: Soviet missiles were not dismantled under UN inspection. (They were hurriedly dismantled before inspection of any kind.)

Soviet missiles were not removed from Cuba under UN inspection or under any other kind of inspection. (We have been allowed to see that packed crates allegedly containing the missiles were on the decks of Soviet ships.)

Some Soviet missiles have been removed. All may have been removed. But we don't know because no trustworthy verification has been allowed.

All offensive Soviet weapons have not, as promised, been removed. Soviet bombers capable of carrying nuclear warheads remain in Cuba. The Russians claim they are not "offensive." Castro claims they don't belong to Russia, that he bought them and is going to keep them.

Three weeks after Mr. Khrushchev's clear and concrete commitment, there is still no international inspection of incoming ships to guarantee that other offensive Soviet weapons will not be returned.

That's where things stand today and they don't stand very well. Negotiations are being dragged out until verification will be impossible without an inch-by-inch underground inspection of the whole of Cuba — which has caves as big as New York's Grand Central station. It's evident that the Russians are beginning to act like Russians. This is why the Cuban crisis is far from over.

WHEN THEY HAD THEIR WARNING, THE AMERICAN POLICYMAKERS ACHIEVED WITH CONSPICUOUS GOOD JUDGMENT, NOT TO MENTION SPEED AND COURAGE.

But before the warning was provided by that U-2 flight on Oct. 14, the policy-makers had judged the problem quite wrongly. While maintaining surveillance as a needed check, the U. S. government was in fact operating on the assumption that the Soviets would employ no offensive missiles in Cuba.

This misjudgment, it must be added, was identical in all but one respect with the Eisenhower administration's judgment of the problem of the missile gap.

The same parts of the government machine worked in the same manner. In large measure, the same individuals contributed to the underlying papers. In both cases, the judgment was reached that the Soviets would NOT do something that might be very damaging to the U. S.

THIS reporter pointed out during the missile gap debate that it was simply playing Russian roulette with the national future, to base national policy on a mere judgment that the Soviets would not do something well within their capabilities, which could be hideously damaging.

In that case, for reasons which are still mysterious, the Soviets did not order early mass production of their long range missiles, and they therefore failed to achieve the overwhelming nuclear-strategic advantage that was clearly within their grasp. In the Cuban case, the Kremlin tried to remedy this past error by a desperate trick.

In the first case, the American policy-makers were quite correct, thank God, about what the Soviets would not do. In the second case, the American policy-makers were quite incorrect, but were warned, thank God, in good time. In both cases, however, it is now recognized that an error of principle was committed.

HEREAFTER, national policy will not be based on the happy assumption the Soviets will NOT do something damaging, if doing it is clearly within Soviet capabilities.

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

NO MORE RUSSIAN ROULETTE

Washington — The effects of the Cuban affair on Khrushchev, on Fidel Castro, on this country's world posture, have all been lavishly analyzed. But no attention has yet been given to another effect of high importance.



The American government has received a jolt from this affair, which has already quite perceptibly altered the viewpoint of the higher policy-makers, and may also alter certain quite significant policy-making procedures.

The jolt was administered by those first U-2 pictures proving that Soviet missile bases were being clandestinely constructed in Cuba. It was a severe jolt, for the quite simple reason that nothing of this sort was expected to happen.

UNTIL very recently, for example, it was a favorite tenet of almost all professional demagogues that the Soviet armed forces played no role in Kremlin infighting and policy debate.

Contrary evidence has been accumulating for a long time. But even today the important internal influence of the Soviet marshals and colonel-generals is only admitted with some reluctance by a minority of the experts.

Again, it used to be held that Soviet communism was a "political and not a military movement." Political rather than military-strategic considerations were therefore supposed to predominate in the Kremlin. This demagogical theory, of course, tended to rule out what the Soviets did in Cuba — which was to take a gigantic political risk in the hope of making a major military-strategic gain.

The American policy-makers' viewpoint has altered, because the military bias of the Kremlin and its susceptibility to military influence are now clearly understood.

Russian roulette, in fact, will no longer be played. If this good resolution is adhered to, it will amount to a considerable change in the established procedures of American policy-making. Behind the procedural change, there lies the change of viewpoint above-referred to.

Perhaps the best way to define the change in the policy-makers' viewpoint is to have a look at the sources of their original incorrect judgment. There were two main sources. First of all, the Soviets were not expected to employ offensive missiles in Cuba, because they had never before sent weapons of this type beyond their own borders.

Second, this negative precedent was given undue weight for a more subtle reason. In brief, the craft, or science, of Soviet demagoguery originated in the period before the Second World War, when the Soviet armed forces were rather weak militarily and quite impotent politically because of Stalin's terror. The ideas formed in that period still color much demagogical thinking today.

When they had their warning, the American policy-makers achieved with conspicuous good judgment, not to mention speed and courage.

But before the warning was provided by that U-2 flight on Oct. 14, the policy-makers had judged the problem quite wrongly. While maintaining surveillance as a needed check, the U. S. government was in fact operating on the assumption that the Soviets would employ no offensive missiles in Cuba.

This misjudgment, it must be added, was identical in all but one respect with the Eisenhower administration's judgment of the problem of the missile gap.

The same parts of the government machine worked in the same manner. In large measure, the same individuals contributed to the underlying papers. In both cases, the judgment was reached that the Soviets would NOT do something that might be very damaging to the U. S.

THIS reporter pointed out during the missile gap debate that it was simply playing Russian roulette with the national future, to base national policy on a mere judgment that the Soviets would not do something well within their capabilities, which could be hideously damaging.

In that case, for reasons which are still mysterious, the Soviets did not order early mass production of their long range missiles, and they therefore failed to achieve the overwhelming nuclear-strategic advantage that was clearly within their grasp. In the Cuban case, the Kremlin tried to remedy this past error by a desperate trick.

In the first case, the American policy-makers were quite correct, thank God, about what the Soviets would not do. In the second case, the American policy-makers were quite incorrect, but were warned, thank God, in good time. In both cases, however, it is now recognized that an error of principle was committed.

HEREAFTER, national policy will not be based on the happy assumption the Soviets will NOT do something damaging, if doing it is clearly within Soviet capabilities.

Washington Report

By William S. White (c) United Feature Syndicate

NEW FACES

Washington—From the hitherto all but deserted Capitol there now issue the faint, rustling sounds of newly elected members arriving and old members returning for the 88th Congress opening in January.



It will be a new Congress with some new faces. But the overwhelming probability in this columnist's opinion, after some searching around into the matter, is that in no important particular will it be much different in attitude from the old Congress. If anything, it is likely to be a touch more moderate-to-conservative.

It is a safe prediction, notwithstanding much excited comment about the great things that would be produced by the recent election, that the position will be expressed in an old saying: the more things change, the more they are the same.

THE House, with 258 Democrats, 176 Republicans and one present vacancy, will be a shade more nearly Republican than before. The Senate, with 68 Democrats and 32 Republicans, will be a shade more Democratic. There is, however, a good deal less in these labels than meets the eye. For the sole issue in the new Congress, as in the old, is not so much how many members are Democrats and Republicans as what kind of Democrats and Republicans they are.

Will there be many more Democrats ready to approve such of President Kennedy's domestic welfare program as compulsory medical care to the aged and urban renewal? The answer, almost certainly, is no. Will there be fewer Republicans prepared to follow the President's essential leadership in world affairs? The answer, again, is almost certainly no.

All through the last Congress the real story was this: practically all the Democrats, and a very considerable number of the Republicans, were always willing to back the President abroad. They were willing to back him at home, too, on about everything he asked which did not involve reformist innovations in a dangerous world.

ALL through the new Congress, assuming the President makes no major errors in world affairs and retains his present rationally firm line in the Cold War, it will be, as to foreign policy, the same story. And by every present sign all through the new Congress he will have great, and probably insurmountable, difficulty in persuading Capitol Hill to give him those items — urban renewal, medical care, and so on — which may or may not be academically desirable but are patently not very pressing in a world of foreign peril.

The very first of the newly elected Democratic Senators to arrive here, Birch Bayh of Indiana and Thomas McIntyre of New Hampshire, struck heavy blows to reformist hopes. Both said in substance that they had not come here to cast automatic votes for any and all of the President's bills. What they mean to do is what practically all the old Democratic Senators have done — support the President when they believe him right and oppose him when they believe him wrong.

THE expression of these natural and entirely sensible sentiments was, of course, wholly predictable except to those who had convinced themselves, against history and reason, that because the election had returned more Democrats to the Senate it necessarily had returned more who would necessarily favor any and all of the President's ideas.

What really happened in the election merely confirmed the long obvious fact that this country is far more concerned with its safety in the long world crisis than in tinkering with welfare schemes which are not very relevant to the era in which we live.

There is no evidence whatever that such issues as "urban renewal" and "medicare" had much to do with it, one way or another. The people want national safety more than slum clearance; they want sustained care for this nation's survival more than guaranteed medical care for the old folks.

and a very considerable number of the Republicans, were always willing to back the President abroad. They were willing to back him at home, too, on about everything he asked which did not involve reformist innovations in a dangerous world.

ALL through the new Congress, assuming the President makes no major errors in world affairs and retains his present rationally firm line in the Cold War, it will be, as to foreign policy, the same story. And by every present sign all through the new Congress he will have great, and probably insurmountable, difficulty in persuading Capitol Hill to give him those items — urban renewal, medical care, and so on — which may or may not be academically desirable but are patently not very pressing in a world of foreign peril.

The very first of the newly elected Democratic Senators to arrive here, Birch Bayh of Indiana and Thomas McIntyre of New Hampshire, struck heavy blows to reformist hopes. Both said in substance that they had not come here to cast automatic votes for any and all of the President's bills. What they mean to do is what practically all the old Democratic Senators have done — support the President when they believe him right and oppose him when they believe him wrong.

THE expression of these natural and entirely sensible sentiments was, of course, wholly predictable except to those who had convinced themselves, against history and reason, that because the election had returned more Democrats to the Senate it necessarily had returned more who would necessarily favor any and all of the President's ideas.

What really happened in the election merely confirmed the long obvious fact that this country is far more concerned with its safety in the long world crisis than in tinkering with welfare schemes which are not very relevant to the era in which we live.

There is no evidence whatever that such issues as "urban renewal" and "medicare" had much to do with it, one way or another. The people want national safety more than slum clearance; they want sustained care for this nation's survival more than guaranteed medical care for the old folks.

Two SOC Professors Attend Conference

Ashland — Dr. Lloyd Pennington, professor of chemistry, and Dr. J. Kenneth Bartlett, associate professor of science at Southern Oregon college, attended the Conference on Curricular Problems of Small College Chemistry Departments at Willamette university in Salem recently.

The conference consisted of group discussions of small college chemistry departments and their problems including specific handling of chemistry courses, sequence, course content, placement, laboratory problems, research, and instrumentation.



"I'm against teaching about communism in our schools. There are some college students who haven't even learned about Americanism yet..."

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

The news? It's a mish-mash.

IN Washington a state department spokesman (Press Officer Lincoln White) publicly warns Russia and Cuba against any buildup of OFFENSIVE naval facilities in Cuba that would present a threat to this hemisphere.

He doesn't specify how much of a naval buildup has been detected in Cuba, but says, for publication.

Since the U. S. government is anxious to see that such (naval) facilities do not present a military threat to the United States or to THIS HEMISPHERE, we will continue to follow with great interest any port-building in Cuba.

White's statement came in response to questions about reports that U. S. aerial reconnaissance has spotted NAVAL facilities being built at the "fishing" harbor at Banno, in northeast Cuba.

But you may see, if you are a bit fuzzy-minded, WE have a naval base in Cuba—so why should we stir up a fuss if Russia builds one?

True enough. But Russia didn't and doesn't have a Monroe Doctrine.

WE DID AND DO.

PERTINENT thought: In the 140 years since it was promulgated by President Monroe, we've let the Monroe Doctrine get a bit rusty and stiff in its bearings.

We'd better overhaul it and bring it up to date in such a way as to make it unmistakably plain that if the commies undertake to move by force into the Western Hemisphere they'll have us to fight.

We want no communist military conquests in the Western Hemisphere.

FROM Salem, Oregon's capital: Vacations and business trips out of Oregon by state officials gave Oregon four different governors within the space of about a week.

Governor Hatfield has been on vacation in California. While he was away, Speaker of the House Robert B. Duncan was acting governor. The responsibility fell on Duncan's shoulders because Senate President Harry Boivin — first in line of succession — was also in California.

Governor Hatfield left the state again to attend the Ohio State-Oregon football game. Mr. Boivin is still out of the state and Mr. Duncan was in California on a law case. Secretary of State Howell Appling, next in succession, will also be away.

That means that State Treasurer Howard Belton was acting governor. Boivin was expected back Friday, and relieved Belton of the acting governor's post.

HMMMMMMMM. Just what is this governorship job in Oregon? A game of musical chairs?

Will Creeping Poison Despoil America?

By ERIC SEVAREID

Chesterstown, Md.—We spend our fretting lives, most of us, feeling east or west of Eden, but never in a thousand erecks and inlets.

It's identity depends upon our particular obsession and concern, and mine, increasing with the years, is for the land and waters of America.

They are wasted and soiled by crowding and greed and heedless habits until one despairs of his children's inheritance. But here, for the moment, along the shores of Chesapeake Bay, I am in Eden's blessed center, worth a notice before the creeping poison penetrates this far.

The Eastern Shore of the Bay has been off the beaten, ravaged path of the automobile hordes and the gaseous factories. In summer these lowlands of field and wood and marsh are stilled, bees drone in the hot sunlight and the odor of honeysuckle hangs in the air. Life and men move as slowly as they must have done before the Civil War.

Right now the maples and the red oak provide the color as the fields turn grey and brown. The air is sharp. The small boats and the nets are busy and refrigerators are filling up with Chinotegau oysters and soft shell crabs.

The great autumn run of the striped bass from Nantuxet and Long Island is finished and they have taken winter quarters here in this bay of a thousand creeks and inlets.

But it was the geese and the ducks that brought me here in the company of tactician Lee Wulff, the master sportsman, and Joe Linduska, scientist and lover of all things wild. To them I am indebted for sparing me a life bereft of one, unmatched vision, a sight of magical beauty and power that will remain forever on the retina of the mind's recollection.

The hunting season was to start precisely at noon. I was vaguely aware that hundreds of men in canvas clothing were crouched in blinds, lying in rows of cornstalks, floating in camouflaged boats for miles about. They knew what was about to happen.

What astonished me was that the geese knew — everything but the day and the hour. I ran out of my quarters as a clamor began to fill the air. It was high noon. Everywhere, north, south, east and west, dark clusters of Canada geese were rising above the tree lines. In minutes the entire sky was streaked and mottled with patches and skeins of geese, wheeling and gathering, signaling to one another in a tremendous din of honking.

Tens of thousands of geese ground and above one is an almost terrifying sight, a natural phenomenon of biblical proportions, stunning beyond my most exaggerated preconceptions. They gathered, in armades, flotillas and squadrons in one general direction where lay the sanctuary maintained by the Remington Arms Company for the preservation of this marvelous species. There they wheeled in, occasional shafts of sunlight reflected from the white bodies of the few snowgeese among them. From there they traded back and forth all day, keeping altitude now, and it was a rarity to see one fall as the guns faintly popped in the distance. At sunset the shooting ceased — and the geese knew they were entirely safe for now each phalanx drummed straight ahead without flaring, almost within touching distance as we stood in the cornfield.

It was a sight to enthral and to humble and to make one consider the future of this American land and its natural inhabitants. The geese may endure, for the shooting is severely restricted and they nest in the wet muskeg regions of northern Canada. For ducks the shooting is also severely limited, but drought in the north has currently depopulated their herds — drought and an insane contradiction in government policies. Hunters' organizations and conservationists struggle and pay great sums, private and public, for

more refuges, while other government agencies pay public money to farmers of the north central states to drain their marshes and sloughs in order to grow more of the crops already in embarrassing surplus.

It is not hunting and fishing — activities far bigger economically, than all the spectator sports, movies and concert halls put together — that are threatening our natural inheritance of wild life in this country. Indeed, in this generation it has been the hunters and their conventional allies who have brought back such marvelous creatures as the antelope and the wild turkey, and saved the ducks and geese. It is the spreading of concrete over the land, the growth of "clean" farming, greedy commercialism of mountain valleys, the poisoning of rivers by city sewage and industrial wastes that are sickening and scarring the American land.

If all this is not checked and regulated as severely as hunting and fishing are limited now, our grandchildren will read about an America where the geese once filled the sky over Chesapeake Bay, as we read about the America of the great buffalo herds. But they will never see it.

(Distributed 1962 by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.)

(All Rights Reserved)