

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Ft. St. Ph. 779-4141

1963 NEWS PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION MEMBER OF 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

April 3, 1953 (Friday) The First National Bank of Portland will build a new and modern bank building...

20 YEARS AGO

April 3, 1943 (Saturday) First degree murder charges filed against Camp White Soldier and his common law wife in the slaying of their nine-week-old son.

30 YEARS AGO

April 3, 1933 (Monday) Rogue valley orchardists urged to save orchard smudging to offset possible shortages later.

40 YEARS AGO

April 3, 1923 (Thursday) First steps taken to procure Sixth St. subway under the Southern Pacific railroad tracks.

50 YEARS AGO

Jury brings in verdict of innocent in criminal libel suit against Bert R. Greer, editor of Ashland Tidings.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

- 1. If you traveled from the country of Peeping Tom to that loved by Omar Khayyam, you would go from where to where? 2. Is Flickertail State the nickname of Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota or Idaho? ... 10. Which fossil is without a definite volume, but no definite shape (solid, gas or liquid)?

The Most Important Thing

Today is election day in School District 549C, when the voters will pass on the 1963-64 budget.

This is not to discuss the merits of the proposal. But it is an appropriate time to wonder what it is that motivates citizens to serve on school boards and budget committees...

The editor of the Pendleton East Oregonian was using along these lines recently. He knows (as a former "Oregon Education Citizen of the Year" himself...

AND in his column he quoted the current Oregon Education Citizen of the Year about his own philosophy.

The 1962 award winner is S. E. Brogoitti. He is a farmer and lives in one of the smallest communities of the state.

Why? As paraphrased by the Pendleton editor, Mr. Brogoitti put it this way:

"It began with me. I realized how much more I could have done if I had been well educated. It spread from there and I soon saw that there is nothing that we do in our society that is as important as educating our young people...

HERE, today, in the second half of the 20th century, with what appear to be insuperable problems on every hand — here is a man who, because he lacked all its benefits himself, sees the solution not in whining and whimpering...

If anyone should ask you what is the most important thing in the world today, you would be well advised to answer in Mr. Brogoitti's words:

"... There is nothing that we do in our society that is as important as educating our young people."

Congratulations, Mr. Brogoitti. And thank you. — E. A.

A Plan for Alcatraz

The last of the prisoners have left Alcatraz prison, and the grim, fortress-like buildings and the island on which they stand—long a landmark of San Francisco Bay—will soon be declared "surplus" by the federal government.

The problem arises—what to do with the island?

Should it be taken over by the city and county of San Francisco? Or by the state? Considerable discussion has been generated in the Bay Area by this problem, and several of the ideas have merit.

FIRST of all, the island does not readily lend itself to commercial development—unless it be of a resort or scenic type of attraction.

Secondly, while the island is in San Francisco Bay, and in the State of California, it has been the property of the U.S. Government for many years.

Some people envision the becoming a national monument of some type—perhaps along the lines of Liberty Island in New York harbor, where the magnificent symbol of the Statue of Liberty stands.

Since the island is already federal property, what better use could it be put to than as a national monument, marking a spot which is both historic and beautiful: a spot which is the West Coast's center of trade and commerce, of culture and international understanding, and a spot of singular beauty as a whole.

Why not appoint a commission (at no cost to the taxpayers) to come up with a contest for the best, most striking, and most appropriate plan for the creation of a monument symbolizing the nation's stake in the Pacific?

San Francisco is the most beautiful city in the world (in our eyes, at least, although others might argue for Rio, Sydney, or Cape Town).

A great monument facing the Golden Gate, the Pacific on one side and the peaks of the city on the other, the bay all around and the Oakland-Berkeley hills as a backdrop—this would be a breathtaking thing, and rival the great bridges for magnificence.

Alcatraz (Penguin Island) belongs to all of us now. Why get rid of it whereas a possibility exists? — E. A.



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.

Airmen Thanked

To the Editor: I am sending you a copy of a letter I sent to Colonel Witzemberger, commander at Kingsley Field. I intended the letter for the men at the base.

Dear Sirs: A recent article in the Medford Mail Tribune stated that you get many complaints about "sonic booms."

I wonder how often you receive a commendation? I would like to commend you.

Every time I see a jet trail or hear a sonic boom, I say a mental prayer for the pilot and for his safe return.

As I was listening to enemy guns booming in the hills around Medford or watching the "rockets" red glare, I could not be more grateful than I am now for your protection.

I know my feelings are not unique, although the number of complaints you get might make it seem so.

Today's cake-carton wraps disclose carboxymethylcellulose, artificial color and flavor, mono and diglycerides!

Thelma Carson Prospect, Ore.

Biblical Creation

To the Editor: A recent statement by someone in these columns mentioned that "scientists estimate that the earth is between four and five billion years old."

I recall reading by a college science teacher named R. E. Hoan. It was refreshing to note that this professor believes the chronology as stated in the Bible and recently attested by many records uncovered lately by the spade of the archeologist, especially the Dead Sea scrolls.

Evolutionists deny all supernatural existence or influence. They scoffingly claim that "all things continue" the processes of the development was foretold they would in 2 Peter 3:4. To them, matter is eternal, and is possessed of ability to transform and organize itself.

Evolutionists deny all supernatural existence or influence. They scoffingly claim that "all things continue" the processes of the development was foretold they would in 2 Peter 3:4. To them, matter is eternal, and is possessed of ability to transform and organize itself.

In sharp contrast to the Bible, the concept of more than one god is a doctrine based on a personal, omniscient, omnipotent and long-suffering God.

Two boxers have died and many have been injured because of their sport in one year. In the same time period, thousands of swimmers, boaters, water and snow skiers,

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

This is written on APRIL FOOLS DAY.

If you were in London on this day, and were "tricked," there would be a happy derisive laugh, and somebody would shout "APRIL FOOL!"

Her mother Ceres heard the echo of her screams and went in search of the voice she had heard. But in vain. Her search was a "fool's errand."

APRIL is quite a month in history and literature. Samuel Valentine Cole, in his "In April," says:

"In April, Rome was founded; Shakespeare died; 'The show whose sound rang out from Concord town' and brought an avalanche of echoes down.

"Shaking all thrones of tyranny and pride. 'Was fired in April: Sumner far and wide. 'Lifted a voice the years will never drown; 'Twas when they laid the crown. 'On Lincoln's brow."

Many of the most eventful periods in the history of the United States have begun in the month of April.

Among these are the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, the War between the States, and the entrance of the United States into World War I.

On April 18, 1865, Lincoln was shot by John Wilkes Booth. Paul Revere made his famous ride on April 18, 1775. The San Francisco earthquake and fire was in April of 1906.

Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in April of 1789.

April, you see, is quite a month.

There are some people who believe that the world is a mere collection of atoms and molecules.

They believe that the world is a mere collection of atoms and molecules.

They believe that the world is a mere collection of atoms and molecules.

They believe that the world is a mere collection of atoms and molecules.

They believe that the world is a mere collection of atoms and molecules.

European Leftist Advance Seen Likely; Labor Defense Policy Near That of U.S.

By K. C. THALER United Press International London—Recent shifts to the political left have con-

jured up the specter of a "Socialist front" in Western Europe that might act in solidarity, as did the Catholic Christian Democrats in the years after the war.

In Britain, where the Conservative government of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan is hard pressed, the Laborites have been gaining ground steadily and are at present confident they can win the next general election.

Ernest Bevin, Britain's one-time foreign secretary and a formidable figure in the Labor government of the 1950's, was reluctant to lead Britain into Europe when Socialists on the continent were clamoring for a united Europe.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann (c) 1963, The Washington Post

MONEY AND THE MOON

General Eisenhower has gone on record in favor of a cut of \$10 or \$12 billion in the government's authority to make contracts which will be paid for as the missiles and the ships and the like are manufactured.

General Eisenhower does not himself specify what the cut should be, being, as he says, out of touch with the details. But he takes figures from his last two budget directors—Messrs. Stans and Brundage.

Although it is not likely to happen, it would be most enlightening if Messrs. Stans and Brundage would present their recommendations in detail and engage in a bout of reciprocal questioning and answering with Mr. Gordon, the present Kennedy budget director. Unless something of the sort can be arranged, the country will be subject to con-

flicting assertions which never meet head on. This will add to the befuddlement which so far has been the outstanding product of this session of Congress.

General Eisenhower's second difference of policy is on the program to put a man on the moon and get him back again before 1970. This is, as he says, a crash program which is spectacular, but too costly. Here, too, is an issue which ought to be debated.

ON THE first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the general must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara.

General Eisenhower's second difference of policy is on the program to put a man on the moon and get him back again before 1970. This is, as he says, a crash program which is spectacular, but too costly.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled secretary of defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control.

Strictly Personal

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

While I was visiting in the East recently, I spent a day with a friend who had just returned from a two-day trip to his state capital. He is a business man, and was involved in some proposed legislation for his group. "This trip did one thing for me," he remarked at lunch. "It made me think twice about the slogan of 'state's rights' that sounds so appealing to those of us who are alarmed about Federal power."

"What do you mean by that?" I asked. "It was the first time I'd had a glimpse of a statehouse in action," he explained. "It was appalling and depressing—and I'm sure that my state isn't any different, or any worse, than most."

"Depressing in what way?" I wanted to know. "In every way," he said. "In the culture of men we have sent to the state legislature. In the atmosphere of intrigue and deals and moral shabbiness. In the cheapness and seediness of the whole political situation there, in both parties."

"Didn't you find any positive aspects?" I inquired. "Of course," he said, "there are a few men there

of character and intelligence. I don't mean to make a blanket indictment. But the general level was so low, the self-serving was so obvious, the ignorance and greed and provincialism so overpowering, that I left before I really should have."

"And that experience soured you on state's rights?" I asked. "Certainly made me ponder the question. After all, government isn't an abstraction. It's run by men—the men in Washington, whichever party is in power, are of a distinctly higher calibre. Some of the bills proposed, and actually got to the point of passage, are incredible. Let me tell you about a few of them."

I listened to his doleful tale, and was able to reciprocate by telling him that my glorious state of Illinois had recently approved a bill that would outlaw flying the United Nations flag on public buildings in the state. A harmless piece of mischief, but highly indicative of the sort of bigoted stupidity that passes for "patriotism" in so many state legislatures.

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

It may be true that the states must guard against Federal encroachments of their rights; but then the equally large question raises itself: who is then to guard us against the inabilities, if no worse, of our statehouse politicians?

Mr. Khrushchev, New Sexpot?

By Arthur Hoppe

Mr. Khrushchev's been awfully busy lately building his image. Telling Soviet folks to eat Post Toasties and popcorn. And advising the rural voters in fatherly fashion to knock off piling manure in little piles. Because, he says, it lasts longer in one big pile. And that's real image building.

But he is taking the proper tack? After all, Communists apologists to the contrary, Russia is at least 20 years behind us in public relations.

So as a good-will gesture, I asked my friend Mr. Henry W. Platte, the noted Moscow correspondent who has covered the Soviet scene since the beginning of the cold war, for his views on Mr. Khrushchev's public relations.

"Platte of all," says Mr. Platte, "Khrushchev is not to be called a 'Sexpot' by any means. He is a political animal, a politician, and a politician is not a Sexpot."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."

"But what about his politics?" I asked. "Not a politician," says Mr. Platte, "is one who stands in opposition to the government, and who is not a politician. He is a politician, and he is not a politician."