

Townsend Club No. 1 Notes

Fifty persons, most of them in comic dress and masks, attended the Halloween party last Tuesday evening, all of the crowd had lots of fun and a good time was enjoyed in the dining room at a late hour.

At nine o'clock the president called a short business meeting, club bulletin was read and reports of officers given, also committee reports.

All are very enthusiastic about the voting, Nov. 7, 1944. Don't forget it.

Door prize was won by Mrs. Schrosser. Twenty new members reported. Sorry we have several sick members, three in the hospital at this time. Next meeting buns and jelly will be served.—Frost Cor.

Typewriter Service
Cleaning — Repairing
WALTER E. YORK
Phone 6215 Coquille



EDGAR SMITH
A Successful Congressman
for U. S. SENATOR

Re-elect
Charles W. Forrest
a Democrat
Coos County Assessor
General Election
Nov. 7



I have no favorites. Home owners, farmers, factories, merchants, corporations, all receive equitable treatment—based upon the actual value of their respective assessable properties.

During my term of office the county tax levy has been reduced 6.7 mills, or over 25%.

Equalized assessments, together with the improved tax system installed in the Assessor's office, has been a contributing factor in this reduction. If re-elected to office I pledge continued courteous and energetic service.

(pd. adv.)
(Charles W. Forrest, Assessor)

"Close-Ups Of The News"

(Continued on page nine)

likely be bolstered by the scheduling of a conference with Stalin. The opposite argument will be that since a little has really been done toward international postwar settlement, in spite of all the talk and the appearances, that new leadership had best go in, with fresh viewpoints and free from false starts. The sort of things that happens when a sales manager sends a new salesman to push over a deal that has hung fire for too long.

There is another thing to be considered. Never before have the heads of two great foreign nations expressed such definite preferences about an American election. Mr. Churchill in his speech of the week put in a definite plug for Candidate Roosevelt; Mr. Stalin lets his official Moscow press attack Americans in the United States who wish a change of administration here.

You are going to hear two arguments about that, too. One will be that the American voter should bow to the desires of the British and the Russian heads of state. The other will be that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin are notably and outspokenly devoted first and foremost to the interests of their own empire and dictatorship, respectively, and that their preferences could be based upon the furtherance of only those interests, rather than the interests of America, and that this should be warning to the American voter that he needs a new leadership to deal with Stalin and Churchill if he thinks that cases might come up in which American interests and consciences and vision will need to be defended against British imperial interests or Russian expansionism.

This point of view goes back to the warnings issued by Alexander Hamilton at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 and by Thomas Jefferson in 1821. Both warned against foreign powers exerting influence in American elections upon the occasion of a chief executive's effort to continue himself in office. I quote Alexander Hamilton: "The executive would be ambitious, with the means of making creatures; as the object of his ambition would be to prolong his power, it is probably that in the case of a war he would avail himself of the emergency to evade or refuse a degradation from his place." "Degradation" was used by Hamilton in the sense of "stepping down." Thomas Jefferson, speaking of perpetuation in the presidential office, said: It becomes "worthy of intrigue, of bribery, of force and even of foreign influence. It will be productive of cruel distress to our country." Apparently Jefferson considered foreign influence the worst of the bad list. Again, Jefferson said: "Pierce contentions that might excite among ourselves . . . dangers of interference, either in money or aim, by foreign nations."

There you have the two opposing arguments about the foreign angle of this coming election. You will listen and watch, and take your choice thoughtfully. Of course, you may act on pure emotional like or dislike, or just follow the particular herd in which you run. The future of your nation and everything in it will be affected by the mass result.

Now, what would the honest historian who judges the future by the past say will be the basic picture in United States politics if Candidate Roosevelt wins, and the alternate picture if Candidate Dewey wins?

I'm going to draw these pictures for you in bold brush strokes exactly as I foresee them, and you may agree or disagree, object or get furious as you wish—remembering that it is your privilege to redraw or recolor the pictures I offer.

At the very base of both pictures, somewhat underground, but coming out boldly, let's put in the figures who plan to use whatever happens to change America, to do away with Congressional government and local autonomy, to do away with private business and agriculture, to do away with uncensored speech and press and to make the United States over on some foreign model or on the lines of some "ism" not yet translated into practice, even abroad.

Remembering that those sinister figures are there, waiting their opportunity, let's first fill in the picture that shows Mr. Roosevelt re-elected. If Mr. Roosevelt wins, what, specifically, does Mr. Roosevelt win? This is going to sound a bit brutal, but if I am wrong, you correct me.

Mr. Roosevelt wins a great triumph of personal career. He wins a fourth tenure in what Calvin Coolidge called a "killing job."

But Mr. Roosevelt wins a Congress

that he cannot control. No political prognosticating and finagling gives him a Congress he can control. With a Congress in opposition to his general leadership he must tackle the job of making a world order with the heads of two powers who have given evidence of being stronger in their own national interests than he. Secondly, Mr. Roosevelt wins with a party whose many factions agreed upon electing him and nothing else, and which by all historical precedent, will engage in factional disputes as soon as that triumph has been gained. Thirdly, Mr. Roosevelt wins as the benefactor of a politically activated labor faction which he cannot restrain. He will owe that faction a debt greater than the debt he owed John L. Lewis after the last election, and if he does not pay, that faction will similarly turn against him. That labor faction and others are going to demand the unfreezing of jobs and wages, and Mr. Roosevelt will be pressed against his own inflation line. These are the predetermined conditions of Mr. Roosevelt's winning.

It is like the Chinese proverb of riding the tiger—a great spectacle, but your mount may eat you. The picture holds a prospect of chaos in which the sinister figures at the bottom of our picture, alone, would be happy. If Mr. Roosevelt should leave the presidential office to Mr. Truman, we have to believe that each of these individual problems would increase in intensity.

Now, let's draw the picture of a Dewey win. Should Mr. Dewey win he would face the same terrific problems of reconversion, debt carrying, and world order. But he would stand a fair chance of commanding a majority in Congress. History shows that first-term presidents control their own parties, at least. Mr. Dewey will have to deal with labor, but he will not be in the position of one faction's creature. He will not be embarrassed by radicals demanding pay-off for their services, nor by a split between north and south in his own party. The picture shows Mr. Dewey matching Churchill and Stalin with youthful vigor and a gift of obstinacy—sometimes a needed thing—in place of Mr. Roosevelt's personal acquaintanceship and pliability.

There is plenty of rough going indicated in either picture, don't forget. The difference that strikes the eye is that around Dewey, if the voters elect him, there gathers a party long out of office, subject to moulding, subject to leadership, ready for new ideas, co-hesive, not beholden to strong-willed labor chiefs or other factions. In other words, the present opposition party does have the prospect of becoming a nucleus for unity in this nation—and I am speaking as a historian, not as a politician. In the days ahead a large degree of unity is the only thing that can enable us to hold our own with other self-seeking nations—the only thing that can enable us to keep our representative government and personal rights to engage in business and professions from being taken away from us by those sinister figures at the bottom of the picture. In the picture of a Roosevelt win, on the contrary, a real nucleus of unity just is not in sight. That Mr. Roosevelt is so much stronger than his party is his personal triumph—but in that very thing lies the great risk of disunity within this nation.

The historian notes that a great many American voters who were not happy about the third term in 1940 nevertheless voted for Roosevelt then because they were thinking of the great need for unity in a nation entering a war era and they saw no other way to get such unity in 1940 save under Roosevelt. By the same logic applied in 1944 the historian

sees no way to get unity for the nation tapering off on war and entering a turbulent post-war era save under Dewey. It will be hard enough to get a working American unity under Dewey. It does look entirely impossible under Roosevelt. This is the basic and deep reasoning which has caused weighty, careful newspapers such as the New York Times, the Chicago Daily News and the Baltimore Sun to declare for Dewey.

I suppose some of my critics will say this is a political broadcast and I should be put off the air, etc. But since ninety per cent of our air time given to news and comment just automatically comes loaded in favor of the "ins"—that being the way radio operates under present controls and immaturities—and since Sidney Hillman has a radio for Roosevelt committee at work trying to capture the remaining ten per cent for his candidate, I think it no more than fair and sporting for me to take my infinitesimal portion of air time on this Sunday five weeks before election to give you a historians' look ahead. And there is no reason why you can't be your own historian and take a preview for yourself. It does not have to agree with mine. Do, however, put it on the basis of logic, not just prejudice and emotion.

This campaign is remarkable—and ominous—for the intrusion into it of foreign influences and aims. In 1936 and 1940 Candidate Roosevelt as well as his opposing candidates repudiated the support offered by such aims and their promulgators. This time—with five weeks to go—Mr. Roosevelt is still silent. So I am going to quote his statement of 1940. Said he: "I am fighting to keep this nation prosperous and at peace, and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States." All of you whose opinion I care about will agree that that fight to preserve American institutions must go on, and it must go on more successfully than in the past recent years, and the leader must be chosen who will best carry it on, whoever he is. Very often in the human record, a leader's fight is best carried forward by his rival. That is the way English common people got the right to vote and better wages under Disraeli and Gladstone. The cause was bigger than any man.

Any Old Coats And Suits?

Have you questioned the possibilities in those discarded coats and suits hanging in closets or attics? By putting such clothing to work not only are attractive garments possible but the demands for new goods are reduced and you aid in keeping prices down.

"Make-Overs from Coats and Suits," a new bulletin from the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, gives simple directions and illustrations which will be of help to the home dressmaker. Diagrams are included which show how the pattern pieces may be placed to the best advantage on the material from the old garment and there are pictures of actual make-over in their "before" and "after" versions. You may secure this material from the office of the County Home Demonstration Agent, Mrs. Dorothy Dunn, Court House, Coquille. Just ask for U. S. Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication No. 545.

Phone 222R, to Art Hooton for your electrical wiring and repair needs. He is located north of the ball park on the Fairview road. 521fs

Insurance Specialist, F. R. Hull.

Out Board Motor
4 H. runs good. Starts easy.
\$69.50
Garden Tractor
3 1/2 Horse Power. Starts Easy.
Gear and Belt Drive

Stationary Engine
1 1/2 Good Mag.
RANGES CIRCULATORS HEATERS

Brooks Used Furniture, Phone 119L

VOTE for

BEN C. FLAXEL

Present District Attorney
Democratic Candidate for Re-election

The Record 1940-1944

Criminal Cases handled in Circuit Court.....	224	224
Plead Guilty	194	
Cases Tried (16 acquitted; 6 convicted)	22	
Dismissed by Court Action	8	

With a similar high percentage of guilty pleas in Justice Court Cases. All of which has resulted in a substantial savings to the taxpayers of Coos County.

As incumbent I have personal knowledge of facts concerning the various matters and cases now pending involving this county and therefore am especially qualified for their proper handling.

My experience in this office will enable me to more efficiently and economically handle the affairs of the office of District Attorney.

If re-elected I Pledge

myself to perform my duties as District Attorney in a prompt and impartial manner, striving always to eliminate all unnecessary expenses.

BEN C. FLAXEL
(Paid Advertisement)

Vote For

GEORGE H. CHANEY

FOR
SENATOR
FROM THE EIGHTH DISTRICT

Democratic voters who are in the majority in COOS COUNTY need representation in the Oregon Legislature. My policy is based on support of President Roosevelt and a liberal administration. I believe in the development of Western industry and the sustained yield system to maintain the lumber industry.

GEORGE H. CHANEY

Paid Advertisement sponsored by the Coos County Democratic Central Com.