

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO
33 North First St., Ph. 77-41

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL 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
March 6, 1953 (Wednesday)
Seventy-five cases of influenza led the list of 123 cases of communicable diseases in Jackson county last week.

20 YEARS AGO
March 6, 1943 (Monday)
Rep. Frank Van Dyke, Ashland, urges establishment of another institution to care for minors of higher intelligence.

30 YEARS AGO
March 6, 1933 (Wednesday)
Medford High school basketball team defeats Phoenix, 24 to 21, to win trip to state high school tournament.

40 YEARS AGO
March 6, 1923 (Thursday)
Ku Klux Klan "nightriding" case goes to jury at Jacksonville.

50 YEARS AGO
March 6, 1913 (Friday)
Local trappers start annual shipment of skunk hides; post office and express clerks threaten to quit.

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

- 1. Sugar loaf dominates which South American city?
2. Give a Verdi opera whose name begins with A.
3. With what recent scientific development do you associate a route with a perigee and an apogee?
4. Which Illinois city is named for a revelation reported by a Mormon?
5. McAuliffe said "Nuts" at Bastogne; what did General Putnam say at Bunker Hill?
6. Madison, Monroe, J. Q. Adams and Hughes all held which federal office?
7. Though a mediocre play, a performance of "Our American Cousin" was made famous by what infamous off-stage event?
8. Which Amendment provides against double jeopardy and for just compensation for private property taken for public use?
9. In what game would you find the "hot corner"?
10. When at rest, does a normal heart beat 18, 40, 72 or 98 times per minute?
Answers: 1. Rio de Janeiro. 2. Aida. 3. Satellites. 4. Deni. 5. Until you see the whites of their eyes. 6. Secretary of State. 7. Assassination of Lincoln. 8. Fifth. 9. Baseball (third base). 10. 72.

World's Greatest Men

Who were the round dozen human beings who, by any criterion or standard, could be accurately termed "the greatest"?

This was the subject of an interesting late-evening conversation the other day, and the results were, to us, a bit surprising. There actually was difficulty in finding 12 men (no women, alas, made it) who could be unqualifiedly placed on a "greatest" list.

There was agreement on seven names, not necessarily in this order: Jesus of Nazareth, Mohammed, Plato, Leonardo da Vinci, Beethoven, Copernicus and Einstein.

OTHERS mentioned as deserving the "greatest" appellation, but not approved without qualification, included Sir Isaac Newton, Thomas Jefferson, Karl Marx, William Shakespeare, and Charles Darwin. (An additional suggestion was Sigmund Freud.)

Beyond that, there were some tentative suggestions, but most were rejected. Note that there are no military men on the list (unless, by stretching definitions, one could call Da Vinci or Mohammed military men.) Only one was a major political figure.

There are two religious figures, four scientists, one musician, one author, one philosopher, one political philosopher, and two men who were so broad gauge they are difficult if not impossible to confine to any one category.

WHAT is it that made these 12 or 13 men great, in almost any meaning of the term? Is there any common denominator?

Perhaps, if there is one, it is that all had a tremendous influence over the lives of all men who followed them.

In each case but one (or perhaps two), the result has been good, making for greater understanding, greater humanity, greater skill, for the greater satisfaction of human curiosity.

The outstanding exception, of course, is Karl Marx, whose influence, even though twisted and misapplied, has resulted in greater crimes and miseries than any other single individual, even such malevolent forces as Genghis Khan or Napoleon Bonaparte or even Adolf Hitler.

It is still too early to assess the true worth and value of the thinking of Sigmund Freud. But no one can deny that his work has had a startling and revolutionary impact on the last three generations of human beings.

THE POSITIONS of the others, probably because all but Einstein were remoter in history, or because their work and teachings have been so thoroughly explored and understood, is firmer.

Still, the impact of the life and work of all of these men is not too widely understood. That Copernicus, for instance, gave us our first real understanding of the kind of universe in which we live is not universally known.

Too, it must be understood that, giants as they are, none or very few of them could have stood entirely alone. Even Jesus had his Paul. Each was influenced by the thinking of others, and some were given greater scope by the additional work of others.

BUT it occurs to us that these seven or ten or twelve or thirteen men, by any standard, deserve to be on the list of the men who are the greatest the human race has produced.

Other names could be added, or some of these deleted, and the effect would be much the same.

Perhaps some of the great explorers—Columbus, Magellan and Prince Henry come to mind—should be added. Perhaps some of the great geniuses of medicine rate a place on such a list. Perhaps this list skimps on some of the towering figures in letters—Homer, Virgil, and a few others. Perhaps political genius should be more prominently represented on a list of mankind's greatest sons.

It is a fascinating exercise, open to all. Would others care to submit their lists of the 12 greatest figures of the human race?—E.A.

Whalewatching

Birdwatching, we are told by its practitioners, is a fine avocation. We presume this to be true, but given the proper circumstances we prefer whalewatching.

The circumstances were ideal on Monday of this week, as we sat at breakfast, and later beside the window in our room at the Adobe Motel just north of Yachats, binoculars in hand, waiting for the tell-tale spout of spray.

It would come, and the great mottled body beneath would heave into partial sight for a moment or two, then plunge again beneath the waves, only a stone's throw offshore.

IN THE COURSE of an hour, the whale (there may possibly have been two) spouted and showed its back perhaps 50 or 60 times, each time being greeted with excited cries of "There he is!" or "Oh, look!" or simply "Ooooo!"

The little dark ducks, meanwhile, bobbed on the glistening water, the great combers came roaring up onto the rocks, the gulls wheeled in detached circles, and the stubby little fishing boats chugged along a mile or so offshore.

A few miles down the coast the whales' distant cousins, the sea lions, were out in force, sunning themselves on the rocks high above the sea. As we finally and reluctantly turned the car inland again, we felt it difficult to await another chance to watch the whales, and the other beauties of the great ocean which make Oregon's coast the magnificent playground it is.—E.A.

"Dear Friend and Comrade: We long to welcome you again. Let us hear from you soon, admitting that your a no-good two-faced lousy bum. P. S. — You Rat!"



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

Pretty Disgusting
To the Editor: I agree with our Editor on Sunday closing laws. I do not believe this law, if passed, would be constitutional, and anyone wishing to do so could go to court and win the right to sell anything he wanted to on Sundays, and if such a law is passed I would like very much to see them do just this.

We have already lost many of our personal freedoms in this land of the free as it is, many freedoms that have cost the lives of many good men to preserve. This is too much to tell a guy, on which day he can or can't buy or sell, and I hope our legislature throws this bill in the waste basket where it belongs without further ado.

If these merchants who want this law don't like the competition from those stores remaining open on Sundays, then let them stay open on Sundays themselves. If it is against their religious beliefs then let them find another business to get into that they do not have to deal with the public. No one is telling them what they can or can't do.

Many of us that work long hours all week and perhaps live far out of town find it impossible to do our shopping except on week ends. Many of us wishing to improve our homes in our spare time on week ends find it difficult as it is to find a place of business open on Saturday afternoon and Sundays to purchase our building needs. Unless we rush in by noon Saturdays we are just out of luck, and with the boom in building in this valley, it would seem it would pay a few more places to keep their doors open on these days. Perhaps they could take turns staying open.

It is pretty disgusting to start a project and discover there is something you forgot to get and can't finish the job. I do hope some of them reading this article will give us a break on this score. (Name on File), Eagle Point, Ore.

You Name It
To the Editor: Many things that take place in this greedy commercialized age are more than amazing, they are tragic! Instance, the persistent, voracious, and greedy cruelty of modern advertisers to put over upon—as they suppose—a gullible and ill-informed public absolute lies to sell not only worthless but murderous products!

Four glaring examples of such are: the liquor traffic; pornographic literature; tobacco sales—producing lung cancer, etc.; and that skull and marrow bones aluminum sludge—formerly selling at a pittance for rat poison, but now being foisted on the public at a high price as a "health additive"—called by an influential writer of the past year the greatest crime extant against civilization, namely, fluoridation of public drinking water.

Little did the voters of Medford and Ashland who turned it down so completely at the recent polls, think that it would raise its slimy nefarious head so soon again to prejudice an unsuspecting public in its favor.

Remember the recent partial report about Detroit and area to be fluoridated? We pity them to require to "learn the hard way" and require to do as over 100 American cities before them have done, namely, oust it with anger when the truth becomes known, when the skull and marrow bones stood out in bold relief. Proverbs 29:8 says, "Scornful men bring a city into a snare," and the margin says, "set a city on fire." Unwise and sinister contention to poison Medford's and Ashland's pure spring waters does both!

Let all wise advocates of purity cry out in timely remonstrance against these four monsters of iniquity: the liquor traffic; the pornographic literature; the opiating tobacco killer; and the aluminum purveyors who want to poison our water.

All the ads claim on signboards, television screens, the printed page, and by radio, that they too have made (to quote the recent communication) "exhaustive studies of all available data" to convince you that their wares are to be "accepted as safe and effective!" They don't try to advertise fluoridation! They leave that to the in favor of D.D.S.'ers; and to the eight member city councils, such as Detroit has, to decide for the 1,670,144 populace, and, with its area, a total of three million. Amazing and tragic? You name it!

R. R. Hulman
Route 4, Box 316A, Medford.

Woe Be To Us
To the Editor: and to our state legislators, an open letter: Gentlemen: What is this major decision you are about to make, or are contemplating, that would so effect the efforts and status of Oregon's citizens? Have you considered or pondered their rights to expression in so great a proposition? Is there so vital a haste that this matter cannot be put to a vote to ascertain their desires concerning it? Who are the instigators of this monstrous invasion of private rights? Who is, or constitutes the lobby? Where are they from? What do they do?

Two Faces of Adenauer, Man of History And Politician, On Display in Capital

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst
On display in Bonn in recent days have been what might be called the "two faces of Adenauer."

One is the face by which Chancellor Konrad Adenauer seems most likely to be remembered by history. The other is that of a tough politician, an in-fighter who rides roughshod over his opposition, often to the irritation of the German people.

The occasions were the approval by the upper house of the West German parliament of the new West German-French accord which will go into Adenauer's historical record; and, on the political side, the renewal of his vendetta against his economic minister and vice chancellor, Ludwig Erhard.

Back on Jan. 22 when Adenauer signed the accord, the aging chancellor called it "the crowning point of my career... the most beautiful day of my life."

But when Adenauer returned to Bonn from this emotional moment, he found a rebellious cabinet. Europe still was in an uproar over President Charles de Gaulle's veto of British membership in the Common Market. It appeared this might be the issue which would turn Adenauer's "most beautiful day" to ashes.

The opposition accused Adenauer of being so anxious for the treaty that he had not even attempted to plead Britain's cause.

In a shaft directed straight at Adenauer, Erhard declared: "Europe without Britain is unthinkable." While parliamentary veto of the accord now seems unlikely, the issue did reopen the ancient feud.

Adenauer now is scheduled to step down from his job this fall in order to give his successor time to prepare for the 1965 elections.

That successor is expected to be Erhard, whom Adenauer never has thought the man for the job.

In 1959 Adenauer risked splitting the dominant Christian Democratic party when his opposition to Erhard led him to renege on an earlier promise to step down and seek the largely honorary post of president of the republic.

That the split was avoided was due to the fact that Erhard voluntarily stepped aside.

Now the two have publicly shaken hands, and a party spokesman has announced an end to the feud. Time will tell if the new friendship lasts.

WAR HAWKS AND WAR WHOOPS
After a week in Arizona, I not only have a fine sunburn, but I also think I have learned something. By reading Mr. Pulliam's newspapers in the morning and the evening, I have learned that we must distinguish between a war party — of which I have seen no traces out here — and a war whoop party, which likes to be warlike but does not want war.

A war party consists of people conspiring and agitating to start a war from which the country will win, they think, profit and glory. It would be hard to find an American who thinks that in any great war today there would be much profit or glory.

The war whoop party consists of people who suppose that, no matter what we do, the Russians will not go to war. Having this kind of confidence, they suppose that, in order to get rid of Castro, we are quite free to flirt with smallish acts of war, such as blockade or even an invasion of Cuba would require several divisions of troops and would cost very heavy casualties and would, after a successful invasion and conquest, leave us with the odious task of policing Cuba and with the obligation to feed and restore Cuba for a period of perhaps 10 years at the least.

NOT EVEN the war whoopers in their most careless and irresponsible moments want an invasion and occupation. What then is left? What is left is what we now have: the policy of containment. Once we adopt the policy of containment, we are faced with the controlling reality, which is that the United States alone cannot contain Castro tightly.

How tightly he is contained depends not on us alone, but most of all on what the other American states are able and willing to do. We can help them with advice and technical devices, but the United States cannot guard all the harbors and airports and control the channels of communication, including embassies from all parts of the world, through which subversion operates. Each American country will have to deal with the small aggressions. The United States, if it has Latin American cooperation, can control the seas and intercept any large scale operation which might be launched from Cuba.

The policy of containment cannot be emotionally satisfying. Only an invasion, and an invasion only in the first days before the casualty lists come in, would satisfy the emotions of the war whoopers. But while the country will not feel happy about containment, it will surely feel unhappy about the alternative. For a war would not be clean and surgical and quick. It would be long, dreary and inconclusive.

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris
Field Enterprises, Inc.

MALE AND FEMALE
Speaking of the inconsistencies and irregularities of the English language — as I was in some recent columns of "nouns of multitude" and different verb forms in the past tense — I ran across the word "usherette" in a new book the other day.

Why should the feminine of "usher" be "usherette" instead of "usheress"? I suppose it follows the lead of "drum majorette," which also makes no sense.

The feminine of "poet" is "poetess," and the feminine of "actor" is "actress" — but the feminine of "painter" is not "paintress," and the feminine of "doctor" is not "doctress."

And why should the feminine of "aviator" be "aviatrix," and the feminine of "executor" (as in a will) be "executrix"? Like wise a female Jew is referred to as a "Jewess," but a female Greek is not a "Greekes," and a female Turk is not a "Turkess."

How is a foreigner to know that the feminine of "hero" is not "heross" but "heroine"? Or that the feminine of "wizard" is "witch"? And while a baron's wife is a "baroness," an earl's wife is not an "earless" but a "countess."

And, in the animal world, while a few females are designated by the traditional "ess" ending — "lioness," "tigress," and so forth — most of them have separate forms of no regularity or consistency.

We have a bull and a cow, a dog fox and a vixen, a billy goat and a nanny goat, a buck hare and a doe hare, a peacock and a peahen, a boar pig and a sow pig, a cob swan and a pen swan, a tup lamb and a ewe lamb, a tom cat and a she cat, a male dog and a bitch, a stallion and a mare, a steer and a heifer, a stag and a hind, a ruff and a reeve (sandpipers), a milker and a spawner (fish in breeding time), a gander and a goose, a drake and a duck, and so on.

For that matter, why should the feminine counterpart of "male" be "female" instead of "males"? The merman takes a mermaid and the milkman takes a milkmaid, but the postmaster's equivalent is the postmistress and the testator's opposite number (in law) is a testatrix.

The confusions in such gender words is pointed up by the story of the French visitor being taken on a tour of a select English college for women. "Notice that lady in front of us," said the guide. "She is the mistress of Ridsley Hall." The Frenchman looked quizzically at the guide. "And who," he asked, "is Ridsley Hall?"

We at First Baptist church would like to extend a personal invitation to you to attend our services some Sunday soon and learn a little more about us. We have been in Medford as a church for some 78 years and are now making an investment in the community of over \$200,000 in a building that will be a credit to our city. Nor are we asking anyone else in the community to help us foot the bill.

Perhaps you will see fit to correct the false impression created by our editorial.

Rev. Bernard E. Andrews, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Conservative, Crater Lake ave. at Stevens St., Medford, Ore.

Editor's Note: The Yearbook of American Churches lists 28 separate church groups using the name Baptist. Of these, two are Seventh-day Baptist churches. It was these to which the editorial referred. No derogation of other churches was intended, nor do we think a fair reading of the editorial would cause such inference.

