

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North 3rd St., Ph. 774-0141. ROBERT W. BULL, Editor. HERB GREY Advertising Manager. GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr. ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Asst. Editor. EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor. HARRY CHIPMAN, Tel. Editor. RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

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 \$10.00. Single Copy (Mailed) - 20c. By Carrier - And Motor Route. Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$21.00. Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$13.00. Sunday Only - 1 mo. 1.75. Carriers and Vendors - Copy 10c. Official Paper of City of Medford. Official Paper of Jackson County. United Press International. Full Leased Wire. U. P. Telephone News Features. MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS.

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

Birchers and Believability

Robert Welch, the founder and still the nominal leader of the John Birch Society, is up to his old tricks again. The United Press International reports that he was interviewed on a television show Thursday, and it added:

"Welch reiterated charges that former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is a traitor and that the late John Foster Dulles was a Communist." This sort of thing, which tended to attract the lunatic fringe in the early semi-secret days of the society, is now rather an embarrassment to some of the later members, who apparently are striving for respectability.

THE NEW YORK Times Western Edition recently carried a story under a headline which said, "Birch Leaders Curb Welch; Name Him Elder Statesman."

In part, the story said: "SAN MARINO, Calif., Oct. 12. — The lesser leaders of the John Birch Society have at last discovered a way to curb the contentious utterances of their founder.

"Robert H. W. Welch Jr. has been promoted, at the age of 63, to a position as the society's elder statesman, with all of the veneration and uncertain authority that term implies. "At a recent testimonial dinner in Los Angeles, Mr. Welch was lavishly honored by 1,600 members and guests. The principal speaker, however, was a nonmember, Ezra Taft Benson, whose message was strongly conservative with few traces of Mr. Welch's preoccupation with conspiracy in high places.

"Although most critics of the Birch Society have aimed their fire at Mr. Welch, his continuation in some capacity was never seriously in doubt. "Only one council member, it is reported, still believes that Mr. Welch can serve his organization best by detaching himself from it.

"The council, however, has been expanding its role steadily at the expense of his one-man rule. The council members now issue their own statements of policy on current issues. "Birch leaders are also trying to lower the emotion of their members, who are being exhorted to behave with good will, patience and tact toward disbelievers.

"Overly belligerent tactics such as were recently employed at a civil rights meeting in Los Angeles County, are to be avoided. Three Birch members (were charged with) disrupting that forum with shouting and insults." (They later were convicted. — Ed.)

IF, INDEED, Birch Society members do behave with "good will, patience and tact" it will be a net gain, for a rational discussion of the great issues of the day cannot be conducted in an environment of heckling and cat-calling. As a matter of fact, the very violence of the Birchers' charges, and the tiresome repetition of statements which are palpably false, has destroyed the Society's claim to credibility among run-of-the-mill citizens.

Welch can continue to rant about General Eisenhower being a traitor, and who will believe him? Respectability and believability can't survive that sort of rot.

Can they, Senator Goldwater (who recently made overtures of peace to President Eisenhower)? — E. A.

Veterans Day Critics

Some veterans—and we can't for the life of us figure out why—are outraged that the special session of the Legislature next month will open on Nov. 11, Veterans Day. Nov. 11 originally was Armistice Day, the day on which fighting ended in World War I. As such it was a very special day to the doughboys who were "over there."

It was a time of reunions and celebrations and parades. But then World War II and Korea came along, and Armistice Day—the day celebrated to mark the end of the "war to end wars"—lost some of its charm. Later, in a sort of uneasy compromise between sentiment and practicality, the day was renamed Veterans Day, and it is observed to honor all who have served in the nation's armed forces, in all wars.

AS A HOLIDAY, it never has fully "caught on," in the sense that Labor Day or Independence Day has. Many veterans, of course, still have a sentimental feeling about it, and as is entirely appropriate, celebrate it. But, while a legal holiday, most businesses continue and the world goes on much as usual. Why shouldn't the Legislature convene on that day? The members, if one wishes to look at it that way, are "veterans" of many a battle. And, this year of troubled finances, it would be a good idea for them to declare an "armistice" and get on with the job.

GOV. HATFIELD, who called the session, is a Navy veteran. Many members are too. Yet they have been attacked in shrill tones by one veterans group in Portland for "desecrating" the holiday. They were answered sharply by State Sen. Ted Hallock, who in turn was sharply criticized by the attackers.

Ted was the wrong one to criticize. He is one of the most decorated fliers to come out of the Army Air Force during World War II—a genuine war hero, the kind Veterans Day honors. And if he says it's ok to convene the Legislature on Veterans Day, it's ok with us. — E. A.

It's An Hour Earlier

Good Morning. What time is it? It is Pacific Standard Time, and that means it is an hour earlier as you read this than it was at the same time, yesterday. If you forgot to adjust your clocks and watches last night, do it now. Set them back an hour. That is, if they say 10, turn them back to 9. Did you get that extra hour of sleep? — E. A.



GREAT IDEAS...

From the Great Books By Mortimer J. Adler

(c) 1963, Publishers Newspaper Syndicate

Dear Dr. Adler: The family has been considered throughout the ages as one of the most important organizations of mankind. However, there has been much disagreement with regard to the role that it should play in society. Plato, for example, suggested a system of marriage for the guardian class which was indeed unique. What did other great thinkers have to say about the role and function of the family.

Aristotle opposed Plato's plan as leading to the destruction, rather than the promotion, of the common good. The political community, said Aristotle, is by nature pluralistic, consisting of families and individuals which differ from one another. Too much unity would destroy the state. As for family affection being spread over the whole community, in which wives and children were had in common, love would be watered down rather than multiplied.

Social and political thinkers of various shades of opinion have tended to side with Aristotle in this argument. The Soviet Union, after some experiments in the early revolutionary days, has recognized the role of the stable conjugal family as a building block of the greater society. Plato's views have been applied in part, however, to family life in the Israeli communal settlements, where children are brought up in common nurseries and dormitories, apart from the conjugal couple.

You can win a 54-volume set of the Great Books of the Western World by writing a letter, not to exceed 150 words, incorporating a question of general interest for Dr. Adler to consider for inclusion in this column. Each week he will select as first prize winners the writers of the three best letters. He will use ONE of these letters as a basis for a future column and will answer it in terms of the intellectual heritage of the Great Books—412 works by 71 authors, spanning 30 centuries of thought. Address the letters to Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, in care of this newspaper.

Editorial Comment

TRAVEL LIGHT If voters could select the places for state economizing there is little doubt they would start with the Legislature. They would cut back salaries and expense accounts, though not as drastically as some might think. They would reduce the spending for secretarial and clerical help and might bar

wives of members from serving as secretaries to their husbands. In the upcoming special session the Senate is going to "travel light" as far as hired help is concerned. The experience will be helpful and may serve as a precedent. —Oregon Statesman, Salem

A Cry for Justice in Taxation Laws

Still, maybe this just isn't the Kennedy nature. What is very much in his nature is to water down his own programs in order to get something on the books. He doesn't exactly march up the hill of a new frontier and then march down again, like the valiant Duke of York. He marches up, then slows and begins zig-zagging, an accepted procedure for crossing mountain passes but of unproved validity in passing legislation. The zig and the zag procedure has now begun with the tax cut legislation, the administration dropping its insistence on a large cut in the favored treatment given oil, gas and mineral producers via the 27 1/2 percent allowance for "depletion." So the royal sojourners in the kingdom of oil are, apparently, to go on being paid, not just for the product they sell, like economic commoners, but also for the product they haven't yet sold. This has always been a "heads I win—tails you lose" proposition in the law. It has always roused the wrath of other than southwestern Congressmen, and it always escapes the annual assault upon it. Proponents of the privilege argue that reducing it or even abolishing it would bring no vast sum back to the treasury. But surely this is a lower rate point.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop (c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

A LAST UGLY FOOTNOTE WASHINGTON — One last, rather ugly footnote is required by this reporter's just-completed Asian journey. In brief, if the signs in the Far East mean anything at all, President Kennedy's troubles with President Charles de Gaulle have only just begun. At the moment, former French Prime Minister Edgar Faure is paying a kind of goodwill visit to Communist China, reportedly with official encouragement from the de Gaulle government. More important still, the head of one of the big French oil and general trading companies, Guillaume Georges Picot, left Peking only a couple of weeks ago, after a long stay as the leader of a trade mission representing the French Manufacturers' Association.

In addition, during his recent visit to Washington, French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville let drop the remark to Secretary of State Dean G. Rusk that it was now "illogical" not to recognize Communist China. From these portents, certain tentative predictions can be made. FIRST, Gen. de Gaulle will probably recognize the Peking regime if suitable conditions can be negotiated. This means, above all, that the French must not be put in the same humiliating category as the British, who fell over themselves in their haste to recognize Mao Tse-tung's government, but are still not permitted to have a representative in Peking above the rank of chargé d'affaires. De Gaulle will only be satisfied with sending an ambassador of full rank, and receiving one in return.

Second, this mutual recognition, if it is arranged, will probably be accompanied by the extension of substantial French credit to the Chinese Communists. The choice of Georges Picot to head the trade mission implies the hope of petroleum exports to China, to replace the oil the Chinese still precariously import from the Soviet Union. If the credit is extended, the terms are likely to be designed to set a pattern, which may be followed by the Japanese and others who are tempted to do business with the Chinese Communists.

The French are quite astute enough, of course, to see that they are highly unlikely to make large profits from trade with Peking. There is also nothing that makes recognition of Communist China more "logical" today than it was in the past. As always in the past, France and her African allies have just, once again, cast their votes against Communist China's admission to the United Nations. But that, apparently, is likely to change next year.

WHAT, then, are the motives of this significant and potentially damaging new maneuver, to which the French government is known to be giving active consideration? The answer appears to be that "motive" is

the wrong word. This is rather a reaction—an instinctive rather than a motivated reaction—to Nikita S. Khrushchev's snubs of Gen. de Gaulle, to the nuclear test-ban treaty, to the slight warm-up of Soviet-American relations, and to other linked phenomena. In other words, if Moscow insists on treating President Kennedy as the one Western leader with whom it is worth doing business, the grandeur of France demands a comparable relationship with the other Communist giant.

These are shocking things to say. But shocking things have happened already, and the fact that they have happened increases the probability that a French policy-change toward Peking is in the wind. From Saigon, this reporter sent the news of an elaborate, long-continuing French intrigue to defeat American policy in Viet Nam, by promoting conversations between the North and South Vietnamese "behind the backs of the Americans."

THE phrase is quoted from President Ngo Dinh Diem's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, who is both the primary target and the intended mainspring of the French intrigue. South Viet Nam would have been sold out to the Communists to the North if Ngo Dinh Nhu had succumbed to the quite elaborate, French-organized petitions (which included careful softening-up by the French ambassador to Saigon, the well-timed Olympian come-on statement by President de Gaulle, and a private message from the North Vietnamese Premier, Pham Van Dong). The option, it must be added, is always open to Nhu.

On extremely specious grounds, the existence of this intrigue was officially denied to the U. S. Ambassador in Paris, Charles E. Bohlen. The denial merely increases the unpleasantness of the facts, which cannot be doubted. The French government has, of course, previously indicated lack of sympathy with U. S. policy in Viet Nam.

But there is the longest possible step between an honest indication of lack of sympathy and embarking on a secret intrigue to defeat the policy of a presumed ally—with no notice given to the ally, of course. From these facts, future French intentions must be judged.

Our tax structure is based on the assumption that the chief driving force in the economy is the investment of money capital, so it receives special protection. The real driving force is the expenditure of capital—in the form of sweat, brains and talents—but it receives no protection. It is, in fact, discriminated against and discouraged.

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.

Liberty Amendment To the Editor: We the people, and "patriots" of Oregon, would LOVE to support our state in a style even more lavish than it has become accustomed.

This can be done in a way that would warm the saddest legislative legislator's heart in the face of the recent election rebuff . . . and this, by the same action would leave from \$50 to \$100 per week MORE in our respective taxpayer's pockets.

At this writing, buried in the Senate is the Liberty Amendment . . . "tabled during the last legislative assembly. IMAGINE! Our senators and representatives tabled the very Amendment that would provide ways to put their hands on considerably more revenue annually than asked for.

For those in the dark on the subject, the Liberty Amendment is a resolution to take our federal government out of private business, and repeal the federal income tax. Strange enough this does not "rob" the federal government, but rather takes them out of the "red", and hands them back MORE income than ever before . . . but this NOT at the cost of the American taxpayer. He would then have a great deal more than enough to support his own state . . . as said before: Lavishly!

This is a Republic of 50 states, with sovereignty vested in the states by our federal constitution. The United States is NOT a democracy with all power vested in a bureaucratic central government.

The Constitution provides that three-quarters of the states need to pass this resolution to make it become law in three years. Six states have already passed the Liberty Amendment: Wyoming; Texas; Nevada; Louisiana; South Carolina and Georgia.

Therefore, it behooves our elected representatives to put this resolution back on the agenda, and pass it this coming special session. Then, go further, and put pressure on the remaining 31 states required to follow suit.

Oregon taxpayers not familiar with the Liberty Amendment, should write Liberty Amend-

ment Committee of Oregon, 310 SW Stark st., Portland 4, and become fully informed. Then, send tons of this literature along with the information to citizens of other states and their legislators, informing them as to how Oregonians rebuked excessive taxation. (It is doubtful as to whether the other states were even informed in view of "controlled communication medias.")

J. R. McGee, 633 Carrington, Medford

Keep Them Busy

To the Editor: Many wonder why the young adults of Medford get into so much trouble. They really don't intend to get in trouble. The young people just don't have anything to keep them busy. They have lots of "steam" to burn up. It is up to the leaders of our community to see that they burn it up in the right way.

Parents of these young people complain like crazy. But you sure don't see many of the complaining ones doing anything about the problem, outside of telling them they had better not get in trouble or they will be punished. The punishment doesn't do much good if there isn't anything for them to do. They have to find something to do.

They could go to the show, bowling, or skating. But they don't always have the money. Besides the same thing every week end isn't very much fun. Our young people don't have any variety of activity available. I believe there is something our community can do to keep these young adults busy, that won't break anyone's pocketbook.

Carol Dickson, 51 North Oakdale Ave. Medford.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS Hurricanes — and we've read a lot about them lately — are a manifestation of the weather. Two hurricane questions: 1. What causes 'em? 2. How come the U.S. Weather bureau some years ago to name 'em all for women? ACCORDING to the weather sharps, a hurricane is a windstorm of such fury that it can tear ships from their anchors, blow large buildings to pieces and raise Ned generally. A hurricane occurs when a mass of warm air breaks through a mass of colder air above and rushes up through the hole thus formed with frightful force. The winds are caused by more air rushing in to get up through the hole. Hurricanes break up and call it quits when they move over colder water which cools off the warmer air that is rushing in to get up through the hole. THAT'S about the long and the short of it. It explains why hurricanes fizzle out when they leave the warmer waters of the south and get over the colder waters of the north. The weather professionals add that a hurricane is strongest when it moves over water because it doesn't run into objects that could break its force. A hurricane often dies down a short time after it reaches land because mountains and hills slow it down. THAT takes care of Question No. 1. Now for Question No. 2—how did our Weather Bureau people come to name these destructive manifestations of nature for WOMEN? That remains a mystery. I suppose cynics will claim that NOBODY knows why bureaucrats do what they do. HERE'S a thought: Maybe when the weather bureau got together a dozen years or so ago and decided that hurricanes ought to be named they had all been reading Kipling and Sir Walter Scott. Kipling, you know, says in his Female of the Species: "The female of the species is more deadly than the male." That takes care of the deadliness of the hurricane. BUT—The hurricane is also unpredictable. It may do one thing, or it may do another. So, perhaps, the bureaucrats turned to Sir Walter Scott, who says in his Marmion: "Oh woman! In our hours of ease, Uncertain, coy and hard to please, And variable as the shade "By the light quivering aspen made." So, it may have appeared to our weather bureaucrats that naming hurricanes for women would take care of the unpredictable side of their nature. Anyway, they decided to name hurricanes for women.



"Joe, we understand you're afraid to serve Negroes because you think we'll mind. As customers and good Americans, we're here to tell you we don't mind!"