

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Fir St., Ph. 77-6141

Subscription Rates: Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00, 6 mos. \$10.00, 3 mos. \$5.00

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Inc.

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 21, 1953 (Friday) Richard (Dick) Applegate, whose yacht was reported captured by Red Chinese Saturday, is widely known in Medford.

30 YEARS AGO March 21, 1933 (Tuesday) State supreme court rules city of Medford must pay for damages when city sewer overflowed into stream running through property owned by Axel and Adina Benson.

40 YEARS AGO March 21, 1923 (Wednesday) Elmer Briggs reports first Chinook salmon catch of year from Rogue river.

50 YEARS AGO March 21, 1913 (Friday) "Medium vote" reported in bond issue election on \$20,000 for construction of new Medford armory.

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

- 1. What song heroine "waited underneath the lantern by the barracks gate"?
2. In what country is Tegucigalpa?
3. What was the classical name for the Dardanelles?
4. A romantically minded eccentric, named for Cervantes' hero is called a Don...?

- 5. Is the Pentagon, which houses much of the Defense Department, situated in Maryland, the District of Columbia, or Virginia?
6. Was Calvin Coolidge a Republican, or a Democrat?
7. What was the language of Homer, Plato and Sophocles?
8. W. S. Porter developed his ability as a writer while serving a term in prison; what was his pen name?
9. Is Acidophilus the name of a Greek philosopher, an infectious disease, a kind of buttermilk or a new drug?
10. Which country is the world's most populous monarchy?
Answers: 1. Lili Marlene, 2. Honduras, 3. The Hellespont, 4. Don Quixote, 5. Virginia, 6. Republican, 7. Greek, 8. O'Henry, 9. Buttermilk, 10. Japan.

Whipping In School

"You can't touch me. Lay a hand on me and you'll lose your job." "This is the kind of pupil attitude teachers in the District of Columbia school system seek relief from." The proposal to end a long-standing ban on corporal punishment in Washington's public schools is one of a series made by District School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen as the indirect result of a riot after a high school football game last Thanksgiving Day.

Dr. Hansen has tried to make it quite clear what he is advocating. He does not expect wide use of whipping, but he wants the prohibition lifted — "this sword of Damocles." "THE D.C. Education association, representing nearly 3,800 of 4,500 teachers, on March 7 endorsed the superintendent's recommendation and stated: "Teachers are not desirous of employing corporal punishment but they do desire to be relieved of the effect of the rule against it."

The present ban dates back to March 20, 1918, when the board of education wrote a flat rule prohibiting corporal punishment and rescinded a rule which "enjoined" on teachers and avoidance of corporal punishment "as far as may be with a due regard to obedience on the part of the pupils."

CORPORAL punishment is currently an issue in Maryland. Two teachers at a church school in Hagerstown on March 6 were convicted and fined \$200 each and ordered to pay medical expenses for an assault on a student. (This resulted in 20 days in a hospital.) In another Hagerstown case a day earlier a magistrate had acquitted a high school teacher of assault charges arising from punishment. "The right of the teacher to maintain discipline in the classroom is the same as the right of a parent to maintain discipline in the home," the magistrate ruled. But he then asked the State Attorney General to determine whether the courts should enforce a board of education regulation. "Under no circumstances shall a . . . teacher inflict corporal punishment on a pupil," the rule reads. "Cases which seem to require corporal punishment shall be referred to the principal who may administer (it) as a last resort."

ONLY one state, New Jersey, flatly forbids corporal punishment in public schools. Four states — Virginia, Vermont, Florida, and Montana — specifically allow it. In Florida the teacher or principal in charge must be consulted first. Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, and West Virginia reaffirm the common law principle of placing the teacher in loco parentis — in the position of parents in respect to school discipline — without mentioning corporal punishment.

A STUDY made for the National Education association in 1959 showed that only 60 cases of assault and battery had been brought against American teachers in the preceding 25 years. Many teachers, of course, spare the rod to avoid court action, administrative discipline, or just plain unpleasantness. The problem of discipline in Washington schools is partly the result of racial tensions — 83 per cent of the school population is Negro. These tensions are inevitably going to make discipline trouble in many other cities in the East and Middle West where population migrations are upsetting long accepted school population balances.—E.R.R.

Sociologists and Suburbs

Suburbia holds a special fascination for sociologists. A few years ago the prevailing verdict was that suburbanites were "imprisoned in brotherhood" by a "uniformity of age, income and class outlook" that bred "swarms of neuter drones" — To borrow a few of the less favorable phrases.

Now comes Robert H. Bohlke, associate professor of sociology at American International college, Springfield, Mass., with the statement that when the 1960 census data are fully analyzed "the myth of suburban sameness will have been replaced by a more sophisticated view which will have found some to be quite homogeneous but many to be the opposite." His views are put forth in the January "New Society," a British social science publication, under the title "Middle Class Delinquency in the United States."

MOST sociologists pale at the thought of suburban standardization. Bohlke seems to fear that residents of the land of the kaffeeklatsch may not be enough alike.

His thesis is that many blue-collar families, which are now middle class in income, are "not so in terms of values, beliefs, attitudes and behavior patterns." These are the groups he calls the "novelle bourgeoisie," or the "new middle class." This "marginal group" — neither working class nor middle class — is subject to snubs from "old middle class" peer cliques.

"THERE then arises the possibility that delinquency among their youth is a reaction to the stress generated by the denial of status from 'old middle class' families whose 'middle classness' predates the recent income revolution," Bohlke writes.

A correspondent for the London Economist once commented that most of the alarm about America's suburbs seems to be felt "by people who live somewhere else."—E.R.R.

Invitation To A Top-Level Conference



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.

People Could Profit

To the Editor: In reading the different Editorials and comments on the dangers to our economy that may be brought about by automation replacing workers, this thought has occurred to us. We have the first machine to see suffering from a hangover.

And from the experience we have been having recently, and in talking to others that have to hire help, there are a great many people that might profit by the example of the machines.

Our older and stationary thrasher, and our hay baler that required the work of from 10 to 15 men, have been replaced by the one man combine and field baler.

And we don't know of a single person that has established a reputation of dependability, and willingness to work that was hurt by the transition. Necessity is the mother of invention, and when working people keep demanding more pay for less work, and at the same time demanding cheaper products, the machine is the only way out, for the producer, be he farmer or mill operator.

John Nealon, Route 2, Box 279, Central Point, Ore.

Letter to Legislators

To the Editor: The following is a copy of a letter, one copy each of which I sent to one Senator and three Representatives of the Oregon state legislature.

No Sunday closing law please. Any law forbidding any one his constitutional and God given right to open and operate his business on any given day of the week is unconstitutional and though it may be claimed not to be a religious law, religious fanatics would be first to apply it and honest innocent people would be persecuted, fined and imprisoned unjustly.

Blue laws are not new in this dear land of ours and they have proven to be unfair, unjust, vicious, and trouble making. Please let us not tolerate any law that seeks to make legal criminals of honest, free people.

Ellet Hitt, 3458 Bursell rd., Medford.

Closes Doors

To the Editor: The Park View Nursing home discontinued operations and closed its doors as of March 15. After 20 years of continuous operation in Jackson county, this was a rather difficult decision to make, except for the following reasons.

(a) We did not feel that we could any longer compete with the county itself through the county farm home. The competition is too onerous. We are required to pay taxes, license fees, etc., while the farm home pays none of these costs and at the same time operates under a budget provided by the taxpayers.

(b) The financial requirements by the state in order to operate a nursing home, including sprinkler systems, etc. is so far out of line with what the state and county is willing to pay for the care of patients, the acceptance of such patients is practically impossible.

(c) The standards of nursing care prescribed by the Oregon state board of health, including professional supervision, can not be met at the rates allowed by the state or county. The only alternative is to lower the standards. This we

were unable to accept, hence our closing.

I trust you can see your way clear to publish this letter in order that the public may be advised of our reasons for leaving the nursing field.

A. J. Curry, Rowena D. Curry, R.N., Park View Nursing Home, 908 West Main st., Medford

Through the Window

To the Editor: They say a little knowledge is dangerous. Who has enough to be out of danger? What makes the difference between great and disaster? The gates of freedom rest and gathers rust, as free people hustle about crying what must we do. Nobody can deny that babies are not blossoms of love sent or lent from heaven.

Here at a glance looking through the picture window at youth lies the answer, parents. Our children must remove the obstacles we placed before them, if they are to enjoy freedom. Whereas we were blind, our children must see. You cannot always be with your child, but at that age he or she will only expose those things they were taught.

In the heart of the family lies the answer. The branding iron lies in your home. Most children are conscious of their own limitations because they are constantly comparing their efforts to those of their parents. We, as parents should do all we can to free them from this sense of limitation and help them to develop an awareness of the limitless possibilities within themselves. The answer to children's desires may come through their own efforts. It need not come through us as parents.

The more a youngster believes that he can experience limitless good, the more limitless his demonstration of good will be. The stirrings of ambition in the young children must be directed with wisdom and balance. Children need the prodding of parents and teachers to bring out their best. In our boys and girls lie hidden talents and ambitions. If only we, as parents, excel in whatever skills we so urgently need these days to fire the instinct that exists in most young children to do well.

The commonest fallacy among women is that simply having children makes one a mother. Does a piano make one a musician? Children begin by loving their parents. As they grow older, they judge them, sometimes they even forgive them.

Good parents are dreamers, they see heaven in the soft haze of their baby's eyes, or a spring day, or in the red fire of a long winter's evening. They nurse their children through bad days until they bring them to the sunshine and light which comes always to parents who sincerely hope that their children's dreams will come true.

Grady Conner, 723 West Jackson st., Medford

Hatfield in New York for Speeches

Salem — (UPI) — Gov. Mark Hatfield flew to New York Wednesday to make a series of speeches. He was expected to return Saturday.

The governor will address a group of leading manufacturers Thursday noon, make a "Religion in American Life" address at the Waldorf-Astoria Thursday night, and talk to a meeting of leading bankers Friday.

De Gaulle's Ambitions to Go It Alone In Nuclear Race Land Him in Trouble

By JOSEPH W. GRIGG, United Press International. Paris—(UPI)—President Charles de Gaulle's go-it-alone ambitions to make France a nuclear power have landed him once again in deep trouble. They are the main cause of the long-standing coldness in relations between France and the United States.

Now the resumption of French nuclear testing in the Sahara threatens a major crisis between France and newly-independent Algeria. It also is likely to damage relations between France and other African nations bordering on the Sahara, including Morocco, Tunisia, Senegal and Mali.

Presumably de Gaulle must have taken these risks into consideration. What is at stake is a short cut to the first all-French H-bomb device which the de Gaulle government hopes to explode in the Pacific in 1964.

Trigger for Bomb: The atomic devices being tested in granite caves in the Sahara are said to constitute the trigger for the planned French H-bomb.

The French feel they are on strong legal ground. The Evian peace settlement with Algeria a year ago granted France the use of three Sahara bases for the next five years.

True, the agreement contained no specific mention of nuclear testing. But the French say the Algerians must have been fully aware of the purpose of the bases when they signed the pact.

The Algerians retort that it is incompatible with their national sovereignty for France to use bases on Algerian territory for exploding nuclear devices.

Fact in Danger: The chief risk appears to be the Algerian Premier Ahmed Ben Bella may be forced by his own extremists as well as by pressure from other African nations and the "neutralist" bloc in general to denounce the Evian agreements as a whole.

France gives Algeria nearly \$300 million in financial aid this year. It has promised a minimum of \$200 million a year for the two following years.

Without that aid Algeria has hardly hope to survive. That was de Gaulle's ace-in-the-hole when he ordered resumption of Sahara nuclear tests.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop. (c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate. EUROPE'S NEXT HUGE HURDLE: Bonn — To date, at least, the fruits born of the new Franco-German treaty can hardly be to the taste of its grand initiator, Gen. de Gaulle. The treaty was supposed to inaugurate a new, more intimate Franco-German cooperation. But as yet the Germans have not begun to cooperate.

In the very transaction in which the treaty had its origin, the seeds of frustration were already visible. De Gaulle's first memorandum proposed closer Franco-German links was sent to Bonn very shortly after his intoxicatingly successful German tour. Yet the Germans waited many weeks, until after de Gaulle's triumph with the French voters in fact, to return an answer at all.

When the answer was sent to Paris, it was favorable but infuriating; for the Germans said that they would be delighted to link themselves more closely to France — but only within the framework of their other alliances and especially of NATO, which de Gaulle detests above all things.

HENCE de Gaulle in his turn waited many weeks before making any reply. These delays explain the very long interval between de Gaulle's first suggestion of a new relationship and Chancellor Adenauer's famous voyage to Paris.

Since the de Gaulle-Adenauer meeting, moreover, the pattern has been even less satisfactory from de Gaulle's viewpoint. The French have continuously pressed for all kinds of actions, in the military, cultural, and other spheres, which would give substance to the new partnership. Almost without exception, the Germans have refused to take these actions.

Yet the worst hurdle for the Franco-German partnership, and one must add for the Europe of the Common Market, still lies in the future, albeit in the fairly near future. Last year, with infinite difficulty and only at the last moment, the six European nations of the Common Market managed to agree on the broad outlines of their common agricultural policy. But they have still to agree on the policy itself.

THE common agricultural policy, at this time, may be compared to the foundations and part of the walls of a house. The house has to be completed, by agreement about beef, dairy, and other major products, and above all about the European wheat price.

The way the policy is completed is of vital interest to the United States. The policy being pushed by Gen. de Gaulle will block a larger percentage of U.S. exports of farm products to Europe. And it can also place an eventual additional burden of around \$500 million on the persistently unsatisfactory U.S. balance of payments.

If the Europeans follow the de Gaulle line, half the U.S. Senate will be on its large, angry feet the next morning, bellowing for trade reprisals. A third of the Senate will be intoning, "Bring our boys back home to punish these ungrateful Europeans!" By these self-righteous outbursts, it must be added, the Senators will be playing straight into the hands of Gen. de Gaulle. He will instantly tell the Europeans, "I always said the Americans were selfish and unreliable allies."

THE Germans have not in fact been thinking very much about the poisonous political consequences of the de Gaulle line. Although unable to silence Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, the Kennedy administration's doctrinaire Common Market-ers averted any really clear political explanation with the Germans.

On the other hand, the Germans have been thinking a lot about their own interests, which by no means coincide with those of France, either in the matter of excluding agricultural imports or in the matter of the common wheat price. Hence it can now be authoritatively stated that the Foreign, Agriculture, and Economics Ministries in Bonn are now united on the desirability of leaving Europe's common agricultural policy just about where it is, without further additions or improvements.

The Italian government plans the same blocking tactics. Despite the contrary prodding of the Common Market Economic Commission, therefore, one could confidently predict a long European pause in this vital field if it were not for two doubtful factors in the equation.

THE FIRST factor is the aid that Gen. de Gaulle may get from Chancellor Adenauer. It is clear that other members of the Adenauer cabinet hope to get around this problem by delaying the issue until the Chancellor has been replaced.

The second factor is far more mysterious. Gen. de Gaulle is highly likely to threaten to break up the Common Market if he does not get his way in this matter. But how will the Europeans, and especially the Germans, respond to such a threat? No one can say at this time, any more than anyone can say whether Gen. de Gaulle will make good his threat if still resisted. It can be seen that the hurdle just ahead may be very high indeed.

Washington Report

By William S. White (c) United Feature Syndicate

ADORING 'JUMPERS'

Washington — When John F. Kennedy was campaigning for president in 1960, two sets of adoring "jumpers" were noticed by all but the dimmest of observers.

One set were physical jumpers. These were the people, most of them young and some of them mere adolescents, who went into a quivering public dance at sight of the future president's face, at every whistle stop and airstrip landing. They were wild about Kennedy — or wildly excited by his youth and good looks.

The other set of jumpers did not leap up and down; they only vibrated emotionally, like piano wires in a high wind. These were the Democratic ultraliberals, the knee-jerk liberals as termed by this columnist many years ago. Though most of these had been cultist followers of Adlai Stevenson, they plunged madly into the Kennedy camp after the Democratic convention. And instantly they became the most loudly pro-Kennedy of all.

I DO not know what has happened now to the physical jumpers, those who did the singular snake dances of yesterday. But what is happening to the other jumpers — the ultraliberals who not merely climbed aboard the Kennedy bandwagon but swarmed it in eager assurance that they would be running the show — is clear. They are jumping in happiness no more.

One by one they are turning upon the President. Those who so lately would tolerate no criticism of John F. Kennedy are now so critical of John F. Kennedy as hardly to tolerate a word in defense of him.

They fill Washington drawing rooms — and to some extent this is slipping into the press and television — with solemn accusations that John F. Kennedy is not "leading," is not "educating the people."

HE IS not "leading" because he refuses to press obviously unattainable reformist demands upon a congress and country which are manifestly more conservative than he himself is, and incomparably more conservative than the knee-jerkers who seek so absurd and juvenile a stance of "leadership" from him.

He is not "educating" because he refuses to undertake theatrical lectures to the public based on the nonsensical notion that he could thus force it to accept New Dealish programs which are great stuff to the knee-jerkers but toward which the great mass of the people are either actively hostile or totally unconcerned.

What is happening was entirely predictable. The knee-jerkers went over to Kennedy for characteristically emotional rather than rational reasons — their curiously excessive hatred of Richard Nixon and their equally curious supposition that because they themselves were still unchanged with the Roosevelt New Deal, Kennedy himself must be.

They neglected to read his open record in congress, the record of an only moderately liberal man. They ignored his own clear indications that he was not seeking the Presidency to become some junior-grade FDR for the '60s.

Though they never understood him, he understood them to a point — but for certain signal errors in his estimation of them. He believed he could moderate and make use of them. He thought that by bending a bit here and there toward one or two of their extremist demands, he could bring them to accept the general body of his more moderate ideas. He has failed.

For the plain, inside truth is that John F. Kennedy's truly bitter opposition today is rising neither from Republicans nor conservatives in general. It is coming instead from the knee-jerk Democratic liberals whose total inability to understand political realities has led them to believe that Kennedy is "betraying" purposes he never had in the first place.

Strictly Personal

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

PERSONAL PREJUDICES

Getting fitted for a suit, and being forced to gaze into a three-way mirror, is always a shock for those of us whose beauty is less than absolute perfection — and should give us the sobering realization that the self-image we carry around in our minds corresponds only to a vague degree with the reality other people see in us.

It is impossible to persuade a bigot that he is wrong for the admirably terse reason given by William Butler Yeats, when he said: "When a belief rests on nothing, you cannot knock away its foundations."

Telephoning someone at home and leaving no name or message is as rude as ringing someone's doorbell and running away before it is answered.

Psychological myths die hard; it is still believed by most people that a man who looks you straight in the eye is candid and honest; whereas the first trait that the confidence man develops and masters is the frank look, the firm hand-clasp, and the utterly guileless manner.

Whenever I see a neon sign winking "Continuous Entertainment," it reminds me of Alexander Pope's remark that "Amusement is the happiness of those who cannot think."

For sheer vulgarity — in the original sense of the word — nothing beats those four spialers who point out the "fabulous homes" of the rich, how much they cost, how many bathrooms they contain, and how these financial deities entered the golden circle by providing civilization with beer, bratwurst or plumbing fixtures.

Nothing that "subversive agents could do to undermine the American system could possibly be half as effective as the bulk of television commercials, whose excesses and ridiculous claims make cynics and unbelievers out of children as young as five or six — which is fully as influential



"We protested when they banned a Commie. It's only fair we protest when they ban a Birch Society member. That's Americanism, lady!"