MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St. Ph. 772-6141

ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN JR., Mng. Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Tele. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail — In Advance
Daily and Sunday—1 year $18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 10.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. 5.00
Sunday Only—One year $5.00
Single Copy (Mailed) .10
By Carrier—And Motor Route
Daily and Sunday—1 year $20.00
Daily and Sunday—1 mo. 1.75
Sunday Only—1 mo. .50
Carrier and Vendors — Copy .10

Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County

United Press International
Full Leased Wire
U. P. I. Telemats, Newspictures
MEMBER AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

Represented Nationally by NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver.

Oregon 1963 Newspaper Publishers Association

National Editorial Association 1963

Member California Newspaper Publishers Association

Flight o' Time

Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Oct. 2, 1953 (Friday)

Tax levies for school districts of Jackson county have shown a decrease over the assessment of a year ago in nearly every district; however, the total tax money will be more.

A total of 478 students in grades four through 12 are taking band and orchestra training in the Medford schools, according to I. A. Mirick, supervisor of instrumental music.

20 YEARS AGO
Oct. 2, 1943 (Saturday)

Shady Cove man killed when mistaken for deer on hunting trip.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "Jim O'Brien, the Applegate tiller, towned Wed. and whizzed around a prominent corner like a high school boy. The former was late to milking."

30 YEARS AGO
Oct. 2, 1933 (Monday)

Nine winter CCC camps to be established in this area.

Crater Lake highway to be surfaced from Medford to Elk Creek.

40 YEARS AGO
Oct. 2, 1923 (Tuesday)

Heavy rains feature September weather.

Shipping of valley apple crop starts.

50 YEARS AGO
Oct. 2, 1913 (Thursday)

New schedule eliminates two trains daily here; residents protest.

U.S. Hotel at Jacksonville gets new roof.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. A thick glass when filled with hot liquid is more likely to break than a thin glass under the test; true or false?
2. "Private" was formerly the lowest rank in the Army; what is it now?
3. Which of the following do not belong in the same category: Alimentary, Erie, Panama, Suez?
4. Which countries comprise the members of the Arab League?
5. Patagonia is on what continent?
6. Appendicitis occurs more often in males than females; true or false?
7. Which is the taller, the Empire State building or the Eiffel Tower?
8. In history, who were called "prisoners of the Vatican"?
9. Where are the ruins of the Parthenon?
10. Is the capital of Maine Bangor, Lewiston or Augusta?

Answers: 1. True. 2. Recruit. 3. Alimentary. 4. Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Trans-Jordan and Yemen. 5. South America. 6. True. 7. Empire State building. 8. The Popes. 9. Athens, Greece. 10. Augusta.

Neuberger, Morse Vote With Majority

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Sens. Maurine Neuberger and Wayne Morse, (D-Ore.), cast their ballots with the majority Tuesday as the Senate voted 70 to 15 to extend the Civil Rights Commission for one year.

Tax Bite

We see the Oregon Journal has taken a "poll" which showed that 55.3 per cent of the respondents are against the new state tax program to be voted on in two weeks. About 10 per cent were undecided, and about 34 per cent were for it.

That's cheering news.

Our own guess would have been that about 66 per cent were against it, 33 per cent for it, and 1 per cent undecided.

Well, we'll know the evening of Oct. 15.

MEANWHILE, back in the Rogue valley, the editor of the Ashland Tidings comes forth with another of his gems of wisdom, to wit:

"What some people do not seem to be able to comprehend is that virtually no one is questioning the size of the current state budget."

"Virtually no one, Edd? Who have you been talking to?

Far more than half of the anti-tax letters we've received have been lambasting the "big spenders," the "bloated bureaucrats," the "spendthrift educators" and so on and so on. "Cut the fat out of the huge, unnecessary budget!" they cry.

THERE IS a slim chance — an outside one, mark you — that a bare majority can be convinced by Oct. 15 that:

1. It is not an outrageous budget, but really a rather modest one, considering the needs of the state and its growing population;

2. The proposed tax bill, distasteful as it is, is far to be preferred to the inevitable results of defeat, and,

3. The state government, and particularly education at all levels, the blind, the needy, the mentally retarded and ill, will suffer drastically if the tax measure is beaten, for a long or short time.

If they can be thus convinced (and it won't be easy), then work can go forward on a thoughtful, rational revision of the tax structure—a revision not done in emergency conditions and amid heated and emotional debate.

HOW BADLY will the tax bite hurt if the new measure is passed?

Here are a couple of examples:

Single man, no dependents, earning $4,000 per year: Tax increased by $32 per year.

Ditto, earning $8,000 per year: Tax increased by $75 per year.

Married couple, no dependents, earning $4,000 per year: Tax increased by $24 per year.

Ditto, earning $8,000 per year: Tax increased by $63 per year.

Married couple, two children, earning $4,000 per year: Tax increased by $22 per year.

Ditto, earning $8,000 per year: Tax increased by $88 per year.

What price Government? One package of cigarettes per day costs $91.25 in one year.—E. A.

Beards and Conformity

In the San Francisco Bay area, a juvenile worker was fired this week because he refused to shave off his beard.

It made him look like a "beatnik," according to his supervisor, and thus impaired his usefulness while working with young people and attempting to get them back on the track.

O Tempora! O Mores!

Time was when a man's choice of facial adornment was his own business, and not that of fussy employers who fear that "the image" created by hirsute fancies — and not the worth of the man behind them — is what is important.

A BEARD is to its owner what that owner wishes. A beard is as much a badge of personality as is the style of dress one affects.

A beatnik type beard is, as often as not, a form of social protest; rebellion against the clean-shaven, conforming majority.

A long, full beard, combed but scraggly, often is the badge of a man who glories in the pioneer tradition, and seeks to identify with it.

A Mitch Miller beard, spade-like and ugly, defies rational analysis, unless it is simply a trade mark and a symbol.

TIMES CHANGE.

The Greeks frequently were bearded; the Romans were mostly clean-shaven — because, in the tradition of Alexander, it offered their enemies less chance of something to grab hold of in the heat of battle.

During much of the history of civilization the wearing or not wearing of a bead was a matter of personal preference, with no stigma attached either way. Our nation's Founding Fathers were mostly clean-shaven, but Civil War figures, including Lincoln, Lee, Grant, General Burnsides (of "side burns" fame) and many others, were bearded.

As a matter of fact, Americans often were baby-faced, until the doughboys of the A.E.F. of World War I were issued G.I. safety razors, and the habit of shaving spread and stuck.

THERE ARE a few faint signs that beards may once again become acceptable and respectable. But the chances are against it. It is now too easy to shave, what with machines and keen and cheap blades, and all sorts of foams and creams and lotions, to go back to the itch, scratch and bother of beards.

Still, it is evident that Caucasians are still close enough to the apes to grow hair on their face, and that shaving is, in a way, "unnatural."

In any event, a man getting fired for wearing a beard is a distressful symbol of the conforming and small-minded times in which we live.

Abe Lincoln, where are you? — E. A.

"What's Our Firm, Unswerving Asia Policy This Week?"

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.

Sarcasm?

To the Editor: The letter by Leonard Firman, "Exposing the Dross," 9-26-63, was the height of foolishness. Why use such mighty big and unnecessary words when you don't have anything worthwhile to say in the first place? After running it through my electronic computing machine, it showed that you were just trying to pounce on the bigotrous communicants with your "superior intelligence."

Some of the words in your letter were written in English, the rest had to be interpreted and translated into English. If you were trying to give an example of your college education, then I'm glad I got cheated out of it. And if you're looking for a big pat on the back, I think it was a masterpiece of "idiotic sarcasm."

John B. Gascom
Route 1, Box 310B
Central Point, Ore.

Equitable Method

To the Editor: At a recent joint luncheon meeting of the Republican Women and the Chamber of Commerce Round Table, I made the statement that of the 36 states that have the income tax, 17 do not permit deduction of federal income taxes. When I included California among these states I was challenged by several members of the audience and at the time could not document by assertion.

After checking my references again I find that California is indeed among the states not permitting deduction of federal income taxes. I emphasize the point because many Oregonians look to California for solutions to our tax problems. And in this instance California, with 16 other states, shows us that we are by no means proposing an innovation in the present tax proposals.

The experience of our big neighbor to the south suggests that this is an acceptable and equitable method of determining taxable income at the state level.

C. R. Hoyt,
State Representative,
Benton County,
Corvallis, Ore.

Only Solution

To the Editor: The Socialist Labor Party claims that the Seaside riots furnish additional evidence to prove that capitalism is a criminally obsolete system now more than ready to be "hewn down and cast into the fire." Being so, it exerts an increasingly baleful influence on every aspect of our social and personal lives.

Particularly alarming is the damage that dying capitalism is doing to the mental and moral fiber of America's youth. Juvenile delinquency, the name given to this alarming evil, is not a new manifestation. It has long been an inevitable product of capitalist social conditions.

Recent evidence, as indicated by the Seaside and other disorders, indicates a further impairment of young America's character that demands the most serious attention. For there can be no ignoring the dangerous implications of rising delinquency. This trend not only means present grief; it also throws a dark shadow across the future. The nation's young are our most precious asset, infinitely more than even the vast natural wealth and industry of all these United States. If in their formative years the men and women of tomorrow are warped and degraded, what kind of world are they likely to shape?

It would be pleasing to record that this problem is receiving the attention that is needed for a solution. The case is otherwise. Although the subject has been virtually "conferred to death" no solution is forthcoming [illegible] cept inane suggestions for reforms that must prove futile because they leave the causes of the problem untouched.

We claim that it is only the Socialist Labor Party that has completely and adequately analyzed this problem and presented the one rational and constructive solution.

Henry R. Korman
Box 541
Longview, Wash.

At What Price?

To the Editor: At what price do we Oregonians want our sons and daughters or grandchildren deprived of the opportunity of attending an Oregon university or college?

At what price do we cut our aid to the needy, the infirm, the unfortunate?

At what price do we say cut and cut drastically the services that an enlightened state society must maintain in providing for the police, the penitentiary, the mentally deficient, the delinquent young people, etc.?

How bright are we when we literally drive out of Oregon the brainy, able faculty members of our fine institutions of higher learning as we will be doing if we cut some 25 per cent or more from the present already inadequate budget of our state universities and colleges?

It has taken years to recruit and build into the Oregon System of Higher Education the excellent instructional staff we now possess in our state. Nationwide there is a mad scramble for such outstanding talent going on. Are we to lose our great educational leaders?

It is a fact that since the filing of the tax referral petitions some of our top people in higher education have been offered similar positions in other states where adequate financing is readily available. Can we blame them if they get fed up with Oregon's parsimonious treatment of our most valuable asset and responsibility, the education of our young people, and decide to pull out? Outcome of the Oct. 15 election will be decision making time for many of them.

No one enjoys paying taxes. Not you. Not I. But pay them we must.

Most of us agree that the tax bill passed at the last legislative session could be improved. But wisdom dictates that the way to improve it is to revise it at the next session of the legislature, after electing legislators who recognize the fiscal needs of the state and who have the courage to set up adequate taxes to pay for such.

Wise thinking Oregonians will vote "Yes" at the coming Oct. 15 election, to sustain the present tax law.

Ursel C. Narver,
4190 N.E. Alameda,
Portland, Ore.

Teaching Hard Work

To the Editor: To me it is very unwise for a person to condemn our freedom of acquiring an education. God created us all equal, so both of you men had a chance to spend your money, time and ambition to become teachers. Our colleges are open to all who want to learn, regardless of age and sex.

It would be a different proposition altogether if you two had to pay all the bills for our children's education.

It is probably true that you, Mr. Lee, walked six miles round trip to school. But stop and think of all the advances and improvements we have made. And was the economy up to the high standards that we of the United States now rate? No.

Mr. Murray, have you tried to teach a class divided into six periods averaging about [illegible] had you wouldn't have written what you did.

If you ever have a vacation, why don't you teach a class and relax, and earn a big salary not doing anything? Well, if you do, you're not teaching a grammar, Junior High, High school, or College class room. You must be learning, not teaching, how to relax while drawing a pension.

I have two different teachers, and believe me, they earn their pay. I know I'd hate to work under the conditions they do.

I am also a member of the McLoughlin Junior High varsity band and am proud of it.

I am 15 years old, go to school, work hard, and try my best.

Well, I hope to hear from more than one person who agrees with me out of the possible 50,000 people who read this paper.

Patrick Pursel,
1301 Beekman,
Medford.

Champagne Campaign

To the Editor: Commenting on the unsigned letter with the caption "Ticket," suggesting to conservative Republicans a list of names for various offices beginning with Goldwater for President, in your issue of Sept. 27, may I remark that the nameless writer may have had not a little champagne mixed in with his campaign notions.

As was intended, it was a whimsical melange of names ranging from five great Americans down to four cheap left-wing extremists.

The perpetrator of the atrocity is surely the most confused fustianist that ever got loose. No wonder he refused to let his name appear in print. His verdant verbiage could tarnish with shame any name or fame. After such an exhibition he probably feared to walk home alone at night with himself.

Charles R. Weave,
General Delivery,
Medford.

Alliance for Progress Bogs Down in Colombia as Castro Forces Unleashed

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst

In Bogota's ancient adobe and stone San Carlos Palace one day last spring President Guillermo Leon Valencia told this correspondent:

Newsom

"Colombia is an open window ready to exhibit the fruits of the Alliance for Progress. Unfortunately, the window still is mostly empty."

Last week in that same San Carlos Palace, damaged now by a terrorist bomb, President Valencia told his assembled ministers:

"We are faced with a true emergency . . . the start of an era of struggle between constitutional government and extremists."

San Carlos Palace stands near the center of Bogota, just off Bolivar Square and close to the great cathedral. For nearly 500 years it has been a witness to the changing currents of Colombian history.

The archbishop of Bogota ordered its construction in the mid 1500's. Simon Bolivar, the Latin American liberator, barely escaped assassination there in 1828. The palace itself barely escaped destruction in 1948 when rioters set the city afire during a Pan-American conference. A reported visitor to the city at the time was a young Cuban terrorist named Fidel Castro.

And last week the forces unleashed by Castro against Latin America were at work in Colombia, challenging with bombs the peaceful evolution sought by the Colombian government through the U. S.-sponsored Alliance for Progress.

The tactics were identical to those of the pro-Castro terrorists in Venezuela. First the telephone call to the newspapers and then the bomb explosion on schedule.

Either Venezuela or Colombia would be a rich prize for the Communists. Both governments are anti-Communist and anti-Castro and both have rich natural resources to aid them. If the Alliance is to fail there, then the chances of less richly endowed Latin American nations are slim indeed.

Colombia had other advantages to justify the hopes of Alliance planners that it would become an Alliance showcase.

Agreement between the warring Conservative and Liberal parties had ended a 10-year civil war and given to the nation a stable government.

It had an agrarian reform law and was working on tax reform. With the help of International Monetary Fund planners, it entered 1963 with a balanced budget.

From the Alliance it has received or has ear-marked more than $500 million for vast school and housing projects, for food, public health centers and roads.

But, as in many another Latin American nation, action has not kept pace with good intentions.

A vast housing project outside Bogota, for which President Kennedy laid the first brick in December, 1961, still is far from complete. Legislation has lagged. Inflation is contributing to national unrest, and the budget will wind up the year in the red.

Valencia's critics accuse him of being a do-nothing president. And the moment of truth may be approaching.

It's Not the Facts It's the Figures

By Arthur Hoppe

What we ace political strategists worry most about these days is a candidate's Recognition Factor. "You can't beat somebody with nobody," we say. And all of us ace strategists agree the Republicans need a nationally known candidate to whip Mr. Kennedy next year. But they don't have any.

The best known they've got is Mr. Rockefeller. And the latest Gallup Poll shows he's known to only 85 per cent of the people. While Miss Elizabeth Taylor, for example, is known to 91 per cent. Although perhaps not personally.

In this hour of crisis the Republicans obviously face two choices. The first is to persuade Mr. Rockefeller to divorce his wife. And marry another one. After all, Miss Taylor is well known because she's had a dozen husbands, some of whom she was married to.

But isn't this seemingly practical solution a bit risky? True, it would correct Mr. Rockefeller's overly staid image. But would he have time between now and November to marry enough ladies? Would he perhaps not tend to mix up his speeches in the grueling days ahead? Pledging unemployed miners 100-karat rings and castles in Venezuela? And offering his next intended improved workmen's compensation? It could be disastrous.

So the safest and wisest path for the GOP appears clear: they must nominate Miss Taylor.

There is no need to cite Miss Taylor's broad experience in both international and domestic affairs. Besides, we ace strategists never give a fig about qualifications. What we care about is Miss Taylor's figure.

The figure is frightfully important with us strategists. But it keeps changing. Mr. Eisenhower, as you know, was a Father Figure. This was unbeatable. Indeed, the best the Democrats could muster was Mr. Adlai Stevenson, as an Uncle Figure. He got clobbered.

In 1960, however, Mr. Kennedy, handsome and dashing, presented the Romantic Figure, while Mr. Nixon, friendly and folksy, offered the voters The Boy Next Door Figure. The voters rejected the Boy Next Door. At least if he were going to be Mr. Nixon. And since then the Romantic Figure has reigned supreme.

So Miss Taylor's figure is unquestionably in vogue. And the questions we ace strategists must next ask ourselves are: (1) Does she project a more Romantic Figure than Mr. Kennedy? And (2) is her Romantic Figure better known than Mr. Kennedy's? Yes and yes.

Thus if the Republicans heed the advice of us ace strategists they'll nominate Miss Taylor. And there's no question her prettier smile, wavier hair and more stimulating voice, among other assets, will sweep her to victory over Mr. Kennedy. He'll be lucky to carry Boston.

So now that Miss Taylor's triumphal entry into the White House is assured, let us turn to other matters. Like who'll be the First Gentleman?

Of course, I suppose a few idealists will oppose Miss Taylor's nomination. "The heck with choosing the most publicized candidate. Let's just pick the best man we've got."

Nonsense. These are perilous days. And it's certainly no time for either party to embark on a radical political experiment.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(c) 1963, The Washington Post

CROSSING A FRONTIER

Both east and west, the pace of change is growing faster, and the future of both alliances is now in question. If all the trouble were on one side, it would be a triumph for the other. But, as a matter of fact, the Chinese-Russian rift is running parallel with increasing divisions between Europe and America.

Lippmann

For that reason, in neither Moscow nor Washington is there as yet a view of the future sufficiently clearly defined to form the basis of a long-range foreign policy. Both are waiting and wondering and trying to feel their way.

It is more agreeable to begin by talking about the troubles of the other side. It is now apparent that the conflict between Red China and the Soviet Union has widened and has come to include the historic rivalry of the Russians and the Chinese in Central and Eastern Asia. The origin of the quarrel, so I am told by men who have reason to know, was the refusal, indeed the inability, of Russia and the European satellites to subsidize the Chinese Communist revolution.

MAO seems to have assumed that as Communists these Europeans would make all the necessary sacrifices to bring the backward Chinese abreast of the European standard of life. Khrushchev refused to make these sacrifices. This, said a very knowledgeable Communist whom I know, was politically impossible for Khrushchev to do. The Russian people have suffered too long and too much to be made to suffer more for merely ideological reasons.

This being the origin of the rift, it will not easily be closed. The issue is not what Lenin and Marx said. It is not even how revolutions should be conducted in Africa or Latin America or Southeast Asia. This is a struggle for survival and existence which cannot readily be negotiated.

There is no such issue within the Western world. But there is a rivalry of the affluent and a contest for little advantages (e.g., chickens and carpets) and for status. There is no reason to think that the Western alliance is breaking up as is the Sino-Soviet alliance. But the Western alliance which was constructed in the 1950s, the alliance as the Kennedy administration conceived it when it took office, is in disarray. It would crystallize again, I believe, if it were overtly attacked. But as everyone assumes that it will not be overtly attacked, there is freedom, indeed license, to play hob with the existing arrangements. The alliance is therefore in great confusion.

GENERAL DE GAULLE has been so explicit and so wounding that it is altogether too easy to assume that, but for him, there would be business as usual inside the Western alliance. This is not true. General De Gaulle is not making history, he is recognizing history and declaring it.

It may be that the Germans will still follow our line on NATO, though it will be from expediency and not from conviction. But the British under Macmillan, even more so under Harold Wilson, are not with us on the multilateral nuclear gadget so beloved in this administration. As for the rest of the alliance, it will abstain unless we corral one or two countries by sufficient subsidies.

Moreover, there is little prospect of achieving the "grand design," a great international trading area with low tariffs that includes all of non-Communist Europe and North America.

GENERAL DE GAULLE'S declaration of independence against the two "giants" — the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. — is a way of announcing the end of the postwar era in which Europe depended on America.

The President would be well served if in his talk about foreign policy he began to introduce among the stereotypes of the 1950s a certain awareness that the cold war era is ending and that in fact we are crossing an old frontier.

Strictly Personal

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

SCIENCE FICTION

The arrival of a new book on my desk, "Spectrum II," co-edited by Kingley Amis, the British novelist, reminds me that the once-despised field of "science fiction" has come of age in the last few years. Looked down upon in the past as the lowest form of pulp writing, s-f has gained considerable stature since so many of its "wild" fantasies have been not only duplicated but exceeded by modern science.

Harris

Yet, as a literary genre, science-fiction remains pretty much in its intellectual ghetto, not because of the quality of the writing (which often is quite high) but because it does not deal with central human problems — only with technical and social ones.

What touches and interests and moves people is the relationship between human beings. The highest fiction, drama and poetry deals not with "movements" or historical processes, but with the curious interlacings and fracturings of human hearts. We are concerned with the innermost depths of ourselves, with the roots of our being, whether we know them or not.

When science-fiction takes earthlings to another planet, the inhabitants there are either humans in disguise or subhumans. In either case, the new planetary setting adds nothing to self-knowledge.

Scientists are now convinced that life is a fairly frequent phenomenon in the universe. And with three trillion other galaxies in the universe, it is highly probable that something resembling human life exists elsewhere than on this earth. Even educated religionists now admit this possibility—Father Thurston Davis, editor of "The Catholic Mind," recently said in a speech that "there well may be, on other planets sailing the airy seas around other suns, intelligent beings like ourselves or perhaps superior to our blundering race."

The challenging task for science-fiction today and tomorrow is not to imagine new techniques for space-travel, but to envisage what these other "intelligent beings" might be like, and how they would interact with us. The task is to get out of ourselves psychologically, and not just astrally.

The human brain uses only a fraction of its power. What other powers do we have? Have other races succeeded in conquering their emotional infantilism, as we have not? What do love, rage, greed, envy, mean to humanoids who have developed in a different environment?

There is a vast opportunity to explore the potentialities of "intelligent beings," and only if science-fiction boldly grasps this chance will it escape the narrow confines of its milieu.

"[illegible] teaching [illegible] in Birmingham."