

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE, Inc. 33 North Fir St. Ph. 772-8141

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—1 year \$10.00; Single Copy (Mailed) 20c

Official Paper of Jackson County, Oregon. United Press International Full Leased Wire

Member California Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Editorial Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

Member National Newspaper Publishers Association

What Medford Needs

What, we should ask ourselves occasionally, does Medford need?

Progress and growth in any city comes relatively slowly, when measured against the fleeting experiences of the day and month. But the accumulated change in a city may simply make it almost unrecognizable over a period of just a few years.

Some of the changes are for the good. But not all of them.

And a periodic self-inventory is a healthy thing for any city, and for its citizens.

What then does Medford, at its present stage, need for improvement?

EVERYONE can make his own list. Here is ours. Medford needs an air pollution control ordinance with enough teeth in it to give us some hope that the depressing smog and dirty air with which we must put up so often will eventually be gone.

Medford needs an effective billboard control ordinance, to prevent the elevated freeway from becoming a disgusting billboard alley.

Medford needs a new city hall, one which would reflect the essential beauty and integrity of this little city, preferably located in the civic center-park area, where the new federal building will soon go. (Medford could also use a county court more attuned to the needs of the city, and one less bent on decentralizing all its functions to the fairgrounds, at great cost and inconvenience.)

Medford needs more rapid completion of the arterial streets program, to keep the ever-increasing traffic flowing.

Medford needs a more attractive, spacious downtown area, with more ample parking, more elbow-room for customers, and with more new, bright attractive store-fronts.

Medford needs a civic auditorium, to better accommodate the wide variety of attractions which now must make do with inadequate school facilities. (How about buying the Holly Theater building, using it as an interim auditorium, and the offices to house the many varied functions of community endeavor which logically could be associated with it?)

MEDFORD needs a stadium of some sort, more extensive in nature than the limited-purpose baseball diamond now proposed by a short-sighted county court.

Medford needs rapid development of the park area along Bear Creek, both to make the south approach along the Freeway one of the most attractive city entrances in the nation, and to offset in part the detraction from Hawthorne park caused by the erection of the Freeway viaduct.

It also needs the development, as rapidly as is feasible, of the projected school-park plan, to create parks in a variety of the city's areas.

THIS is our list, at the moment. It could be added to. But given these things, Medford would be a far more attractive place in which to live and work and raise children than it is now.

It is, of course, at least in part a matter of money, and how much we, collectively, are willing to spend to improve our services and our surroundings.

But even more it is a matter of attitude. If we, as residents of Medford, really want these things, a way will be found, provided we signify our willingness to support them, and, ultimately, to pay for them.—E. A.

Daffy-Down-Freeways

The unpoetic types who write editorials for the Salem Capital Journal were moved to quote Wordsworth the other day, as follows:

I wandered lonely as a cloud That floats on high o'er vales and hills, When all at once I saw a crowd, A host, of golden daffodils.

The editorial was motivated by the fact that some unsung genius in the State Highway Department has come up with the idea of planting daffodil bulbs along the stretches of Interstate 5 Freeway so far completed, that the flowers are now in bloom, and that they do indeed provide "crowds and hosts" of golden daffodils.

IT IS amazing what these little patches of cheerful yellow do to perk up the borders of the freeway. It is a masterful touch, and adds much to the generally excellent and well-planned landscaping which the department is doing along the freeway.

We understand that the department initially purchased 20,000 daffodil bulbs. As the Capital Journal points out, the blooms are somewhat spotty this year, their first, "But they'll be truly spectacular next spring."

It added: "Most shrub and tree plantings are maturing enough to enhance the scenery. It strikes us that in a few years this likely will be one of the finest examples of rural highway landscaping in the West."

IF THOSE there be who might crab at the relatively minor expense connected with this, laugh upon them.

What house is complete without drapes, or pictures on the wall? What city is complete without a park? What building is so intrinsically beautiful that it cannot be improved by decoration?

And, over the rolling beauty of western Oregon, how fine are the crowds, the hosts, of golden daffodils—in comparison, say, with billboards? —E. A.

Audience Reaction Report



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.

What's Happening?

To the Editor: What has happened to our local products on our groceryman's shelves? Has the groceryman forgotten who has helped him since the beginning?

The farmer, who has long been the friend of local dairymen, is now suffering great loss, because of this out-of-town movement. Dairy products coming from distances cannot possibly be as fresh as from our local area. These are not even purchased from our local farmers.

Are we going to be rocked to sleep and see our local dairy men, farmers, drivers and plant workers suffer because of out-of-town shipping?

The local dairies do not mind the competition, as long as it's fair. Local dairymen have done all within their power to give quality products to stores and consumers at fair prices.

Out-of-town shipping tends to lower our economy and employment situation. We need more, not less. Are we so gullible that we are going to sit idly by and be "swallowed up" by out-of-town firms?

Think, Mrs. Consumer, are you willing to forfeit quality for price?

D.S. (Name on file) Medford

Make Sense? To the Editor: Can we look forward to a promising future under the present economic and social order? The answer is obvious. There can be no future with capitalism in view of the fact that it is now suffering from many incurable maladies, because, like previous social systems that have come and gone, it has now outlived its usefulness.

For one thing, capitalism has been a predisposing cause of war, even though those who profit by it have desired peace. Today the danger of war is all the greater because arms spending on a massive scale is now a vital prop to the economy. There is no doubt whatever that without the huge and wasteful arms program capitalism would collapse like a house of cards. Not so long ago an American diplomat stated that if there were disarmament and the United States stopped its military expenditures abroad, and if our trade with other countries could not be increased to take up the slack of these military dollars, there would be the biggest bust in the world.

There is also the following to consider: Under the present system things are not produced to satisfy human needs, they are produced to be sold at a profit. When the capitalists cannot sell what the workers have produced, surpluses pile up, production is curtailed, factories close, and unemployment spreads. Does this make sense to any thinking person?

Lydia Burnham 814 W. 3rd St. Prescott, Ariz.

Regulars To the Editor: Evelyn V. Reith's letter, "You give too much space to Arnold Eugene Jenny," is to be commended for its brevity, but why single out Mr. Jenny? Since she gives no reasons for her statement, one can only assume that her contention is based on the frequency with which Mr. Jenny's letters appear in Communications.

Using that criterion, one could fairly say that you also give too much space to Ella Powell, Everett Acklin, Helen Prevo, Henry Johnson Jr., James K. Shafer, Floyd R. McCabe, Pearl Spackman and many other "regulars" who

appear to enjoy seeing their literary efforts in print. The names of these many others escape me for the moment, but the list includes, Yours truly, W. L. Stevenes, Jr. 52 West Vilas rd. Central Point, Ore.

To the Editor: Re Communications, month of March: Youth Vs. Age Youth versus Age Has always been The controversial rage. How now, how then— Whence experience came? To learn, to live, to play the game Is youth's inherent right To continue and uphold This country's freedom-might, How now, how then— Whence experience came? To do, to see, to serve That is their rightful aim. (Name on file) Phoenix, Ore.

Weatherwise To the Editor: These days of variable weather remind me of days on the farm a number of years ago, and experiences we had due to sudden changes in the weather. It was during an occasion of this kind that I was prompted to scribble the following poem, while in due sympathy with my neighbor farmer, who awoke to find his garden of blossoming peas blanketed in snow.

A FARMER'S PHILOSOPHY Yesterday the sun was shinin' And it felt so warm and nice, Hard to make a fellow believe There could still be snow and ice.

The hens were all a cacklin', Then again they'd sing, Anything to fool a feller, To make him think it sure is Spring.

Saw old Tige out there a lynn' Where the shop leans to the South, Just a pantin' like a lizard With his tongue way out his mouth.

When I split the wood for Emmy, My old duckin' coat I shed, And the sweat just kept a pourin' In big drops off my forehead.

Last night when I was comin' From the pasture with the cows, I saw some silver pussies shinin' On the weeping willow boughs.

Then I caught myself a lookin' Just perchance there might be up A little meadow crocus or A golden buttercup.

But today an East wind's blowin' With frozen rain drops in the air, Makin' me so mighty thankful I've got on wool underwear.

So if tomorrow's nice and balmy With atmosphere Spring-like and warm, I'm gonna know it's not Spring yet.

With another breeder for a storm. Mrs. O. T. Wilson Central Point, Ore.

De Gaulle Still 'Odd-Man-Out' in Berlin Talks; He Still Simply Ignores Them

By JOSEPH W. GRIGG United Press International Paris—(UPI)—Resumption of United States-Soviet talks on Berlin in Washington finds French President Charles de Gaulle once again in his now familiar odd-man-out role. France is taking no part in the talks. De Gaulle is not even an interested spectator. He simply is ignoring them.

That has been de Gaulle's posture for at least 18 months where East-West talks with the Soviets are concerned. There is no sign of his changing in the near future.

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

THE FRENCH QUESTION MARK Paris—During Gen. de Gaulle's triumphant visit to Germany last summer, there was a solitary moment of plain talk. All the other Germans were understandably too pleased with the Franco-Germ reconciliation to get down to hard cases.

But this was not true of President Luebbe.

The small, genial President of West Germany thought it his duty to warn the towering, glacial President of France against being misled by the warmth of his German welcome.

Germany, said Luebbe, was first of all loyal to its alliance with the U.S. And in addition, he continued, German policy was squarely based on NATO and was aimed towards an outward-looking Europe including Great Britain.

The German official named to act as Gen. de Gaulle's escort on his tour received the full impact of Luebbe's warning to de Gaulle. In the motor leaving the German President's house, de Gaulle did not trouble to mince his words.

WHAT he had heard from President Luebbe was very "shocking," de Gaulle said. If this should prove to be true, he went on, he would be "forced to re-examine the whole basis of his policy."

Everything, in fact, would be called into question.

But a little later, de Gaulle recalled the comforting fact that the German constitution gives the President almost no power. And a little later still, he was receiving the plaudits of a gigantic crowd; and Luebbe's warning was all but forgotten.

This episode from the past is relevant at present, because the time when Gen. de Gaulle may be "forced to re-examine the whole basis of his policy" is coming nearer and nearer.

The odds are very heavy indeed, in fact, that the General's European policy is based on a misconception about Germany.

FRENCHMEN who ought to know are quite forthright about this. Gen. de Gaulle apparently believes that in the final crunch he can always persuade the Germans to follow him—or at least prevent the Germans from opposing him too forcefully, as was the case when he vetoed British entry into the European Common Market. This belief is based on his special relationship to Chancellor Adenauer, plus the warmth of the welcome he received in Germany.

But although contrary hopes are still cherished in Paris, Chancellor Adenauer is all but certain to be replaced by the end of the summer. Furthermore, those loud German cheers for de Gaulle were not cheers for Gaullism. They were cheers for Franco-German reconciliation, which is quite a different thing.

The great mass of Germans, of all three leading parties, want precisely the kind of German policy that President Luebbe outlined, with such sharp though temporary effects on de Gaulle. In fact, both of Chancellor Adenauer's most likely successors, Foreign Minister Schroeder and Economics Minister Erhardt, have let it be known that almost immediately on taking office, they will say to de Gaulle all the same things that President Luebbe said last summer.

THESE facts are crucially significant in turn, for two obvious reasons. As Gen. de Gaulle himself admitted, he will then have to take another look at the bases of his policy. This will be unavoidable in turn, because Gen. de Gaulle's power to bend the Europe of the Common Market to his will entirely depends on his power to bend the Germans to his will. Without them, he will be too isolated.

Even now, with Chancellor Adenauer still in office, the French are experiencing rather sharp disappointments in Bonn. They have an overriding interest in the completion of the Common Market's common agricultural policy, which will favor French agriculture at the expense of non-European agricultural exporters to the Common Market, such as the United States.

Since the end of 1961 de Gaulle has refused any part in negotiations with the Russians.

His hostility even to diplomatic "probing" on Berlin blew up into a crisis in the North Atlantic Council in December, 1961.

It was settled only by a compromise arrangement that the United States and Great Britain would go on talking with the Russians and that France, though disapproving, would not veto the talks, but simply would take no part.

De Gaulle has taken the same stand on disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations. He has boycotted, even ignored them. But he has not sought actively to block them.

The stubborn old French leader never has gone for the "talk rather than war" argument.

To begin with, he is firmly convinced the Russians will not attack the West in Europe and thus provoke a nuclear showdown with the United States.

He believes the periodic Berlin crises touched off by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev are largely bluff. He believes Khrushchev is seeking to threaten and scare the West out of Berlin but would not risk use of force.

De Gaulle does not rule out East-West talks for good.

He believes a time will come when the Russians will be ready for genuine negotiations—without threats, bluff or duress—about their relations on a world-wide basis with the West.

But that time may be a decade or more away, de Gaulle thinks.

Meantime, he is unlikely to put in an appearance at the East-West conference table.

In the Day's News By FRANK JENKINS

In Washington the other day, a government press official was being fried out in the pan by a congressional investigating committee because of a statement he is alleged to have made recently to the effect that the government HAS A RIGHT TO LIE in order to defend itself.

The incident had to do with the situation that arose back in the grim days when we were telling the Russians to get their missiles out of Cuba OR ELSE. The "or else" is believed to have been an ultimatum to get the missiles out or face nuclear war.

The press officer (his name is Sylvester) is supposed to have been asked by the reporters if the nuclear threat had been made. He is supposed to have denied it. Accused later of having LIED, he is supposed to have stated that the government has an inherent right to save itself "when it is going into a nuclear war."

HE told the investigating committee yesterday that the remark (to the effect that the government has a right to lie under certain grave circumstances) was taken out of context and was a "kind of shorthand." He said that on the one hand "there is no right of the government or any of its members to lie."

But on the other hand, he said, "I believe in times of extreme peril it is incumbent on the United States government to save itself through the means necessary."

IS he right? Or is he wrong? LET'S put it this way: Suppose our government, for reasons that it considers good and sufficient, is planning an assault (of whatever kind) on an enemy. Suppose it is asked by the reporters what it has in mind to do. If it tells the truth, the whole truth, it will tip off the enemy.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Then—Duke William tried a stratagem. He called for the ancient trick of a feigned retreat. His men turned and rode down the hill in seeming disorder. That did it. Harold's Saxons, believing the enemy beaten, BROKE RANKS and followed in wild pursuit.

The disciplined Normans then turned around and DESTROYED THEM.

That was the end of Saxon England.

SUPPOSE King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Suppose King Harold had been tipped off that the retreat would be a feint. His ranks would then have been PREPARED. They would have stood fast.

In that event, Duke William's attack would have been a failure, and England would have remained Saxon. Great events can hang on STRATEGEMS.

This is the point: If a lie is necessary to CONFUSE AN ENEMY, and thus save a nation from possible defeat, a government is justified even in lying to the reporters.

Strictly Personal

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

PERSONAL PREJUDICES

It is always easy to tell when a man is too small for his job—he gives his subordinates a great deal of responsibility, but no authority, so that he can take credit for the right decisions, and blame them for the wrong ones.

The money one gets for selling one's soul is always spent in deadening the conscience, so that the net gain at the end of a lifetime is no greater than if the diabolic bargain had not been made.

Most of what we call "history" is gossip in top-hat and tails.

America, more than any other country today, is a land where boys refuse to grow up, and where girls grow up too soon; whatever the stated cause, I am convinced that the majority of divorces occur because the woman has attained a level of emotional maturity that the man does not even aspire to.

And should anyone ask what this vague and tantalizing phrase "emotional maturity" means precisely, I refer him to an analect of Confucius: "What the superior person seeks is in himself; what the inferior person seeks is in another."

Most parents of any affluence give their children too many lessons too early—skating lessons, swimming lessons, dancing lessons, riding lessons, piano lessons—which merely rob the children of initiative and turn out "well-rounded" mediocrities who can do many things fairly well but lack the passion and drive to do any one thing supremely well.

A puritan is too often a person who thinks he has to make a hell out of this world in order to enjoy heaven in the next.

Those many among us who over