

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by
MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., Ph. 772-6141
ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor
HERB R. RUIHL, Advertising Manager
GEO. L. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIDMAN, Tel. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STANCHER, Women's Editor
DALE BRICKSON, Circulation Mgr.
An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at
Medford, Oregon, under Act of
March 3, 1897.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail - In Advance
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 \$3.00
Single Copy (Mailed) 20c
By Carrier - And Motor Route
Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$21.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. 12.00
Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 6.00
Sunday Only - 1 year \$3.00
Carriers and Vendors - Copy 15c
Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International
Full Lead Wire
U. P. I. Telephoto Newsletters
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU
OF CIRCULATIONS
Advertising Representatives
NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCI-
ATES, Offices in New York, Chi-
cago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los
Angeles, Seattle, Portland and
Denver.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

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. 25, 1952 (Monday)

Another delay in the con-
struction of a stand-by Army
training camp at Camp White
north of Medford was made
known today.

A district court decision
rendered this morning de-
clared that the sheriff's search
and seizure of slot machines
at two local night clubs was
legal.

20 YEARS AGO

Nov. 25, 1932 (Tuesday)

Medford ration board points
out that all persons purchas-
ing coffee must have a ration
book.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye
Smudge Pot" column: "The
nation observes Thanksgiving
today, and in the midst of
war gives thanks for the
privilege of eating turkey
with the day not far distant
when the U.S. will talk tur-
key with the leaders of the
axis."

30 YEARS AGO

Nov. 25, 1932 (Thursday)

California fugitive arrested
near Trail by state police;
man said involved in plot to
kidnap wealthy Illinois
banker.

Clyde Fichtner, Medford
High school fullback, "man-
imous selection on Southern
Oregon Conference all-star
team."

40 YEARS AGO

Nov. 25, 1922 (Friday)

E. A. Welch speaks for
Medford Chamber of Com-
merce at Interstate Com-
merce commission freight
rate hearing in Washington,
D.C.

Ned Wolf, Medford, and
John Bohner, Central Point,
among members of Jackson
county Boys and Girls club
winning trips to Oregon state
fair.

50 YEARS AGO

Nov. 25, 1912 (Sunday)

Campaign opens in Grants
Pass to raise funds for Grants
Pass to Crescent City, Calif.,
railroad.

Businessmen of Gold Beach
and Wedderburn propose con-
struction of wagon road up
Rogue river to Grants Pass.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. In the Army, what is a "hash mark"?
2. Which word is expressive of bullet caliber or caliber?
3. Of these three states, which is largest in area: Pennsylvania, Georgia, New York?
4. Is the Dominion of Canada larger or smaller in area than continental U.S.?
5. Is the word tariff derived from the name of a city, a sultan, or an Arabic word meaning "information"?
6. What is an AA battery?
7. What range of mountains does the U. S. continental divide follow generally?
8. What well-known university is located at Palo Alto, California?
9. Name the American statesmen who made a great electrical discovery in 1752.
10. Portugal occupies the western part of what peninsula?

Answers: 1. Service stripe. 2. Caliber. 3. Georgia. 4. Larger. 5. Arabic word. 6. Anti-Aircraft battery. 7. The Rocky Mountains. 8. Leland Stanford University. 9. Benjamin Franklin. 10. Iberian Peninsula.

Campaign Expenses

Two writers — Frank Jenkins in his column and the writer of a Communication—today discuss some of the problems related to high campaign costs.

Mr. Jenkins points out that the source of the contributions are not, in most cases, known before the election—only afterward—and if voters knew them in advance, their vote might be influenced.

Mr. McGarvie points out, quite accurately, that the major portion of campaign expenses are paid for through contributions, and not from the pocket of the office-seeker himself. If this were not the case, only wealthy men could seek major political office.

INCREASING concern is being expressed these days over the matter of high campaign costs. Increasing sentiment appears to be building up in support of proposals made over a span of many years, notably by the late Sen. Richard L. Neuberger, that campaign expenses be paid by the government.

This would result in two things:
1. Everyone would know precisely how much a campaign would cost, in advance.
2. It would free successful politicians from the necessity of seeking contributions, often hat in hand, often with a quid pro quo either implied or expected.

OUR Washington correspondent, A. Robert Smith, has given considerable thought to this problem, and has come to the conclusion that it is not only important to regularize, in some fashion and preferably by government subsidy, the problem of campaign costs, but that it is one of the most important political problems of the day.

We must avoid politicians who are, in effect, "bought" by campaign contributors; we must avoid the undue influence a big contributor can wield over a politician by threatening to withhold future donations; we must end the continuing worry and strain caused by having to raise campaign funds, which in no conceivable way assist a man to do his best in an important job.

There is little evidence, however, that proposals for government-financed campaigns are receiving any serious consideration at the present.

RELATED proposals, however, are under study. They would provide tax benefits for donors of small amounts to campaign expenses; remove the top limits on spending (now observed principally by their violation); tighten requirements of listing campaign costs and contributions, and establish an election finance registry.

These provisions are among those contained in a package of five bills submitted to Congress by President Kennedy last May. No action has yet been taken on these rather modest suggestions, although they may be revived when the new Congress convenes next year.

Moreover, they apply only to Presidential and Vice Presidential election campaigns, although President Kennedy suggested that Congress might wish to extend them to other campaigns.

WHATEVER the ultimate solution may be, we believe that the time is past when candidates for major office should be wholly dependent on their own personal funds, or on those given them, often by special interests with axes to grind.

It is in the public interest that elected officials should be freed from their dependence on labor unions or moneyed interests for campaign financing, and freed from the never-ending struggle to raise enough money for an adequate campaign.

The sooner we all recognize this, and set out to seek logical and workable solutions, the better off will be the public welfare and the body politic. — E. A.

Legislative Pay

Speaking of money and politicians, members of the Oregon legislature next year, for the first time, will be free to set the amount of their own compensation.

We do not expect them to go hog wild on this, for a majority of them are honest, fair-minded men and women. But some adjustments are imperative, for with the present \$600 per year legislative salary, too many able people are prevented from seeking election to the legislature.

Senate President Harry Boivin recently appointed a non-legislative committee to make recommendations. It based its report on two conclusions:

- "That these salaries and expenses be sufficient so that any public spirited Oregonian ought to be able to enter public service."
- "That the amounts to be low enough so no one is encouraged to run for the legislature as a full-time job, therefore becoming a 'professional' politician."

WE agree with these basic points.

The committee then suggested that a salary of \$150 per month (or \$1,800 per year; \$3,600 for the biennium) be paid, plus an allowance of \$15 per day up to 110 days while the legislature is in session.

They also proposed that certain minimum expenses be allowed.

This sounds like a well-thought-out and fair basis. But the Capital Journal of Salem points out one inequity — the fact that legislators in and near Salem live in their own homes, while those from a distance must maintain two residences during a legislative session.

A housing allowance for legislators from a distance may be a good idea. — E. A.

"It's A Pleasure To Work At Your Side—Can You Move Over A Bit More?"



Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE WATERSHED

Washington — The removal of the Soviet jet bombers is highly likely to be the last serious act of the Cuban drama. To be sure, Fidel Castro is still refusing to permit the verification by inspection called for under the Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement.



But there is a great deal to be said for continuing to use our own means of inspecting Cuba, without being bound by the "no invasion" pledge which we should have to give if the Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement were carried out in full. There is small likelihood, therefore, that the U.S. will resort to sanctions, in order to force Castro to accept inspection, thus, in turn, bringing the "no invasion" pledge automatically into force.

To be sure, the Kennedy administration's world opinion-watchers will not be content to let well enough alone. But there is little danger that the President will buy any of the dubious contraptions, supposedly guaranteeing to pacify the Caribbean, de-nuclearize the hemisphere, tame Castro, and work other miracles, which are now being promoted.

HENCE, it is now in order to add up the score. The addition suggests that the Cuban crisis was one of those great watershed events that change everything, like the launching of the Marshall Plan, or the American response to the challenge in Korea. Only consider the following list.

First and foremost, the Kremlin estimate of the United States has been radically changed. Before the attempted trick in Cuba, it was very clear that the Kremlin was operating on the assumption that the U. S. would not stand up and be counted in a real crunch. The Cuban trick was intended, quite plainly, to copper-riple this assumption.

Instead, the assumption itself was abruptly, alarmingly disproved. The necessary revisions in the Kremlin's calculation of risks by no means insure the safety of Berlin, for instance. But they most certainly reduce the danger at Berlin, and in secondary threatened areas as well, by a very wide and comforting margin.

THIS revision in the Kremlin's calculations of risks is far more important, in fact, than the supposed spur to the Kremlin to look for a victory somewhere else, in order to compensate for Cuba. The most alarming feature of the whole world picture, pre-Cuba, was the mass of indications that the Soviet leaders thought they could kick the United States around with impunity. This primary cause for alarm has now been removed.

Second, Cuba has also changed its situation quite radically within the Communist bloc. While a cheap but decisive triumph over the West was still confidently hoped for, the hope itself acted as a tension-reducing safety valve in Moscow and elsewhere. The hoped-for victory was undoubtedly counted upon to create great Soviet opportunities of many sorts, and these new opportunities, in turn, were expected to make all sorts of current problems easier to solve.

The effect of the removal of the tension — reducing safety valve is easy to see. Most conspicuously, the Chinese

Communist attacks on Nikita S. Khrushchev have taken on a shrillness and venom without past precedent. Unless there are political changes in Moscow or Peking, it begins to be difficult to see how the two leaders of the Communist bloc can avoid an open, final break. Too much that is unforgivable has now been said too loudly.

YET the increasing possibility of a Sino-Soviet break is only one effect of the safety valve's removal. When they look at their domestic economy, for instance, the Soviet leaders must now ask themselves whether they can carry the massive but always augmenting armaments burden for the very long pull—which is a very fundamental question indeed.

Third, it must be added, Cuba has also changed the Western Alliance. President Kennedy and his policy-makers, with exceptional adroitness, most carefully observed every possible form of politeness in their dealings with the other Western allies.

Yet the fact could not be concealed that in this crisis, clearly involving a risk of H-bomb war, the President made his decision alone, without prior consultation with anyone beyond his own policy-making circle. There was no other way to do the job. But the simple fact that the President acted alone, as he had to do, will inevitably and perhaps profoundly alter the Western nations' relations with one another.

THE final result is not easy to predict, but it is certain that much wisdom will be needed for the unavoidable re-thinking of the Western strategic design. Fourth and finally, however, there is better reason for hoping that the American government will deal wisely with this matter—Cuba has also changed the Kennedy administration itself.

The change is not easy to define. Maybe the best way to put it is to say that the Administration has developed much more self-confidence, a

The Sanitizing Effect of Cuban Affair

By ERIC SEVAREID

I cannot get Major Rudolph Anderson Jr. out of my mind. The thought will not go away that a time may come when it will be a tradition for Americans — and foreigners as well — to place wreaths at the grave of the U-2 pilot shot down over Cuba, our one casualty in the showdown, our "known soldier" representing hosts of others who did NOT die, in one of history's most decisive victories.



It is too soon to be sure. The balance of power has been preserved, but the Cuban threat is not entirely liquidated. Russia's long-overdue setback and her alarm over the Chinese attack on India have not yet yielded evidence of a reorientation of Soviet policy and the herald of a new world equilibrium with Russia essentially on the side of the West, fulfilling the prophecy of De Gaulle. Should this miracle come, we would then think of Cuba as its point of origin; John F. Kennedy would surely be immortalized as one of our great Presidents and Major Anderson as the martyr who died for us all. Let his present grave be well marked.

That is for the future. For now, we know that a clearing of the fog, confused intellectual air has started in Europe, in Asia, in Latin America. What has begun to begin is a new sense of reality, an end to innocence, an understanding at long last that neutralism, if not "immoral," as John Foster Dulles claimed, is a worthless stance for many countries, devoid of safety as well as of the "moral power" so long and so spuriously claimed for it. I omit the new African regimes. They will not soon abandon their notion that singly or collectively they can somehow affect the course of world power, because without this notion they would commit political suicide on the international scene.

I am thinking chiefly of India, Brazil and Britain, our most important friends in Asia, Latin America and Europe. Nehru has already shown the courage and candor to admit that he and his people have been living in "an artificial atmosphere of our own creation." No additional comment is necessary or tasteful, save to point out that Nehru was the chief carrier of this intellectual infection to other regimes.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

As has previously been noted in this space, a lot of money was spent in the Oregon political campaign that came to a close on the evening of Nov. 5 — especially in the U. S. senatorial campaign.

Statements filed with the Oregon Elections Division in Salem indicate that \$218,961 was spent in behalf of Senator Morse, and \$132,322 was spent in the campaign for Senator Morse's Republican opponent, Sig Unander — bringing the total spent in the Oregon senatorial campaign to \$351,283, or two and a half times the total salary received by U. S. senator during the ENTIRE SIX YEARS of his term.

ALL of this, of course, was in strict compliance with the law of Oregon on the subject of political contributions. No law-breaking was involved.

But — The election was held on Nov. 6, and it was not until the beginning of this Thanksgiving week — two weeks AFTER the election — that this information as to who gave what for whom was disclosed to the voters of Oregon.

The point is that by that time who gave what to whom had become merely a matter of curiosity. The water had gone under the bridge. The election campaign was a matter of history.

WE ARE all interested, of course, in who gave what to whom. But if this information is to be of any real value to use — other than as a mere matter of news — we should have it BEFORE the election.

It might then aid us in evaluating the backing of the various candidates — which would be useful to us in deciding whom we wanted to vote for and whom we wanted to vote against.

ADMITTEDLY, some difficulties might be encountered in the way of getting the information to the voters before the polls opened. In earlier days, these difficulties would have been considerable. But in this modern world of almost instantaneous communications, it should not be too much of a problem. If made available as late as the day before the opening of the polls, it could be received and digested by the bulk of the voters BEFORE VOTING.

If made available then, it would have some real value as a guide to intelligent voting. When delayed until nearly two weeks AFTER the election, it has no such value.

HOW to put teeth in such a law?

It would be quite simple. About all that would be needed would be to provide as a penalty the invalidation of the election of any candidate who failed to declare accurately the total of his campaign expenditures and the source thereof by a given date.

clearer sense of direction, and above all, a clearer, more united, more easily identifiable political viewpoint.

This will help a lot in the time ahead, when the crowding problems of the Cuba-altered world have to be tackled by the U.S. policymakers.

prior to the opening of the polls.

That should insure compliance with the law. IF, in the future, Oregon election campaigns are to be conducted on the fantastically extravagant scale of this Morse-Unander campaign, it seems to this writer that it's high time to require disclosure of the amounts contributed and spent — along with the identity of the contributors — BEFORE the voters go to the polls.

It's hard to escape the conclusion that the voters are entitled to this information BEFORE they vote.

Comment

A columnist who has participated in many discussion programs passes along these tips for television debaters:

- "1. Recognize that it is impossible to win with logic in a 30-minute program, which comes down to 26½ minutes after commercial spots and station breaks."
- "2. If the points you are making are vague, make them sound precise by numbering them—(1), (2), (3), etc."
- "3. If your argument on any point is particularly weak, state it with great emphasis, pounding the table as you do so."
- "4. If at some point your opponent has you on the ropes with an argument you cannot answer, lean forward, look at him intently, and ask: 'Mr. Smith, aren't you a little confused?'" — Columbia Journalism Review.

There is nothing more difficult to undertake, more uncertain to succeed, and more dangerous to manage, than to prescribe new laws. Because he who innovates in that manner has for his enemies all those who made any advantage by the old laws; and those who expect to benefit by the new will be but cool and lukewarm in his defense.

—Niccolo Machiavelli

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

REP. OLIN TEAGUE of Texas remembers his first visit to Greece. At an embassy reception he was introduced to a popular Greek drink called ouzo. After four ouzoes, he discovered that the furniture was whirling about.

"Wow!" he exclaimed, "this ouzo has a kick like a mule."

"It isn't the ouzo," the ambassador assured him. "This happens to be an earthquake."

Little Nancy, aged four, was reasonably excited when she ordered her daily vanilla ice cream cone. "There's a new baby in our house," she announced. "The stork brought him this morning." "That's wonderful," enthused the druggist. "Is he going to stay?" "I wouldn't be surprised," admitted Nancy. "He has his things off."

A movie starlet determined to have her nose fixed, but was appalled to discover that the surgeon demanded \$500 for the operation. "Surely," she persisted, "there must be a less expensive way of doing it." "There is," agreed the surgeon (a mean one, as you shall see). "Why don't you try walking into a brick wall?"

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



Drummond Reports

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

ELECTIONS: FRENCH AND U. S.

Paris — There is much in common between the results of the American and French elections, the latter assuring that the strong, if stubborn, hand of President de Gaulle will be at the helm in Paris for at least another four years.

There are three interesting parallels:
1—The French vote was an unexpected and overwhelming vote of confidence for Gen. de Gaulle. The American vote was an unexpected and significant vote of confidence for President Kennedy.

The effect of the French elections is to increase greatly the power and initiative of the French President, even as the power and initiative of the President of the United States have been steadily growing.

2—Even as both the right and left extremists suffered setbacks in the U. S. on Nov.

6—the John Birchers being all mowed down in California—the left and right over here suffered reverses at the hands of the French voters. Ultra-right wing French candidates were crushed and Pierre Poujade himself was routed. For the first time since the end of World War II, the French Communists lost their status as the largest single party in the nation, being far outdistanced by the Gaullist voters.

3—France will now almost certainly be moving toward a realignment, and consolidation, of its multiple-party system—a system which brought about the destruction of German democracy after World War I, and which brought the French Republic to the brink of chaos and revolt in 1958. The two-party system was reinforced in the American elections this month and the multiple-party system was rejected so decisively by the French voters that the very structure of the French parties will have to be reshaped.

EVERYONE was surprised by the outcome — except the French people. They knew how they were going to vote. They made the French political pundits as red-faced as their American colleagues who in 1948 had "elected" Tom Dewey before the votes were counted.

The forecasters, all of whom said a radical decline in de Gaulle supporters was inevitable, thought they had French history on their side. They knew that in the past the French voters had always dismissed the strong leader as soon as a great crisis, which had brought him to the fore, had receded. They were right on history but wrong on its application. The crisis which continued to preoccupy the French people was not the Algerian war—which President de Gaulle had resolved—but the crisis of multi-party parliamentary impotence, a crisis of government which had not been resolved.

That was the crisis-issue which Gen. de Gaulle put to France in asking the nation to choose between his leadership and a return to the perilous weaknesses of the old party system. France voted against the old parties whose leaders were unanimously joined against de Gaulle and, in the first Sunday of voting, gave the pro-Gaullist candidates the largest preliminary number of seats in parliament any party has ever received in French political history.

THE ANXIOUS question which emerges from the French election is this: does the newly approved direct election of the President plus the large powers invested in him by the constitution plus the successful appeal by Gen. de Gaulle for a National Assembly with which he can work—does all this mean that parliamentary government is at the point of destruction in France and personal presidential rule indefinitely enthroned?

This could happen. But it is very doubtful that this is the intended verdict of the latest elections. The French voters have delivered an ominous warning to the old-line political leaders of the multi-party system which in the Algerian crisis was unable either to make war or to make peace. The verdict is not against parliamentary government—but against revolving and impotent parliamentary government.

The verdict shows that the French people will choose powerful Presidential government over indecisive parliamentary government as long as that is the only choice.

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