

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
27-29 North 5th St. Phone 2-6131

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER
Oregon NEWS PAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

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

10 YEARS AGO
Aug. 5, 1946
Water will be cut off at midnight for several hours tonight on the East side between Keeneway drive and Windsor ave.

20 YEARS AGO
Aug. 5, 1936
Optimism prevails among Rogue valley orchardists as greater resistance was shown to California cannery overtures than in any recent year.

30 YEARS AGO
Aug. 5, 1926
The president's coordination committee will hold a hearing at Diamond lake this evening, after spending the day there.

40 YEARS AGO
Aug. 5, 1916
A party of 100 timber cruisers and compass men leave for the hills east of Ashland to begin the task of surveying and classifying O and C land grant.

What's the Answer?
Can You Get 4 of the 7?
Copyright 1955 Editorial Research Report

1. The U.S. has or hasn't ratified the anti-genocide treaty that has been ratified by most states in U.N.
2. In the Bible Noah's three sons were Shem, Ham, and (a) Enos, (b) Methuselah, (c) Japheth, (d) Moses, or (e) Absalom?
3. Family name of Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain is Windsor, Hanover, Tudor, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Edinburgh, or Bowes-Lyon?

4. First President to live in the White House was Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison or Monroe?
5. The state with the northernmost point is Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Michigan, Minnesota or Washington?
6. The Roman Catholic college of cardinals contains more cardinal bishops, cardinal priests, or cardinal deacons?
7. St. Cecilia is the patron saint of history, dancing, poetry, music, painting, sculpture or travel?

The answers: 1. U.S. hasn't ratified. 2. Japheth. 3. Windsor. 4. John Adams. 5. Minnesota. 6. Cardinal priests. 7. Music.
MILLION-MILE ADVICE
Hartford, Conn.—(AP)—Cited for driving one million miles without scratching a fender, taxi driver Irving Weiner advised: "Just take your time—but not too much time. Be cautious and you'll be all right."

It Isn't Over Yet

In our national sport there is a time-honored saying that goes like this: "It's never over until the last man is out."

We think some such slogan might well be adopted in another national sport, namely "politics." Most of the wise boys are saying "it's a 'shoo-in' for Adlai Stevenson at Chicago, as well as Eisenhower and Nixon at San Francisco."

HAVING attended many party conventions both Democratic and Republican, we would not quarrel with the GOP prediction, for there is no doubt about the presidential nominee nor any doubt that he can—and will—name his running mate. Thirdly, as of today there is no REASONABLE doubt as to the man he will name (although why he wants him is beyond this department's understanding). So that's that.

IT IS DIFFERENT with the Democrats. They don't like "smoke-filled rooms" and star chamber decisions on a strictly business basis—they like a fight.

And while as of today, it is hard to see how the party candidate of four years ago can be beaten, it is just as hard to see him winning without a real fight.

And there cannot be much of a fight if Adlai is to be put over on the first or second ballot, as the dopest chorus is saying he will.

At any rate we wouldn't advise anyone speculatively inclined, to mortgage the old homestead and put it all, on the Democratic candidate who lost the election in 1952. He is by far the best qualified man for the job, and as the situation now stands, he will only need about 100 votes to get the brass ring on the first ballot.

But four years ago Estes Kefauver had almost as sweet a lead when the convention opened, while Governor Stevenson was not even an "inactive" candidate, but see how that turned out?

So as far as this department is concerned, we stick to our original contention that the GOP gathering near the Golden Gate will be about as exciting as a meeting of the Board of Directors of US Steel, as far as elements of political surprise, suspense and real conflict are concerned, but the Democratic gathering at Chicago will, as usual, be something very different. — R. W. R.

The People Should Rule

It is true that the railroads for many years have been plagued by the problem of losses on passenger service that must be made up out of freight profits. But they have had much friendly help in trying to reach a solution through efforts of such organizations as the Federation for Railway Progress and the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissions. The deficits, though still large, have been reduced through such measures as the use of more modern, lightweight equipment and a greater emphasis on short haul patronage. There is every reason to believe much more could be done in this direction.

If the railroad officials themselves are pessimistic about the probable results of such methods, however, there is not much reason for the rest of us to keep looking on the bright side. One can hardly expect a competitive business to flourish when even the boss lacks faith in its future.

The above is help from an unexpected source, namely the Portland Oregonian.

The comment was also called forth by the statement of President Donald J. Russell of the Southern Pacific predicting that in 20 years there will be no passenger service, only freight.

As indicated by the Oregonian the solution of the passenger traffic problem by rail does not lie in the railroad heads quitting but in improving and reducing the costs of the service.

HOWEVER, it is doubtful if the comments of the powerful and conservative Oregonian has any more effect upon the even more powerful and more conservative SP, than the comments of the smaller newspapers of the state, have had.

The basic trouble is that while the people of the country have in theory some control over the railroads via such controlling bodies as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various state public utility commissions, in reality they have none—or very little.

And we fear they won't have until these controlling bodies are made up of individuals not under obligation to the politicians for their jobs but to the people. — R. W. R.

Democrats and Civil Rights

Democratic leaders, striving to avoid a convention fight that could split the party, are reported agreeing on a civil rights platform plank that will use the language of the 1952 "moderate" platform. But one of the oddest pre-convention problems in political history remains to be solved: Will the Democratic platform language specifically refer to the school integration decree handed down by a Supreme Court of which the chief justice is a Republican?

It was a strong civil rights stand that caused the Dixiecrat revolt in 1948. And even though a relatively weak plank was adopted in 1952, the three Southern state governors most active in the convention fight on civil rights eventually came out for Gen. Eisenhower. And the GOP carried Florida, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

REP. WILLIAM L. Dawson (D-Ill.), one of the three Negro members of the House, all Democrats, on July 29 predicted that the convention would adopt a "reasonable" civil rights plank. "Reasonable men ought to be able to work out their differences," said Dawson, "and I think the platform committee will be composed of reasonable men." A northern Democrat, Rep. John W. McCormack, will serve again as chairman of the committee.

But even as Dawson was speaking, Gov. George Bell Timmerman of South Carolina was calling for a meeting of representatives from 10 southern states in Atlanta August 2 "to organize our southern unity."

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

REPUBLICAN PROSPECTS

Rather suddenly, so far as the public is concerned, Republican prospects have taken a turn, and have become less clear and less bright.

The cause of this turn is a spreading uneasiness about the rate of the President's recovery. It is plain enough now that this is the cause of what would otherwise have been an absurd thing for a practical politician like Mr. Stassen to do. It alone explains his having waited until it was so late in the day. For it was about the middle of July that doubt arose about the official prognosis, on which Chairman Hall and Mr. Hagerty have been acting.

Quite evidently, the less satisfactory the rate and character of the President's recovery, the more serious a liability is Mr. Nixon. For virtually every press and public opinion has shown that there are a majority who would not vote to elect Nixon to be President of the United States. If, during the campaign, Mr. Eisenhower is ailing, if he does not look and feel and act more fit than he does now, the outcome in November will be very much in doubt.

THIS, we may be sure, is why Mr. Stassen has not been obliterated for challenging the plan, of which Mr. Hall was the manager, to renominate the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket by acclamation.

There are powerful elements in the Republican party, veteran sponsors of Eisenhower, who have never liked Nixon. There can be little doubt that they realize, the President's health being what it is, that they are running a double risk—the risk of losing the election and the risk of ending up with a President who belongs to the Old Guard.

It is not clear whether they have backed Mr. Stassen, or whether he has raised a flag to which they are rallying. But in any event, Mr. Stassen is no longer playing a lone hand, and on his main point, that Nixon should not be taken for granted, he has now carried the President and Mr. Hall with him.

MR. HAGERTY won the confidence and admiration of the press and the public for his handling of the publicity after the President's heart attack. He has not been equally successful since the President's second illness in June. For he has led the country to expect that by this time the President would be fully recovered, as good if not better than before. The excessively optimistic prognosis of June was an unwise gamble with fate and with the nature of things.

It would have been far better, as things have turned out, if the country had been told that illness is a serious disease, that the operation was a serious one, and that the President would need time for his convalescence. Then it would not have been necessary to subject the President to a press

agent's stunt, like taking him to Panama and compelling him to show how much weariness and boredom he can endure.

The uneasiness about the President which Mr. Stassen has articulated and dramatized, would be no greater and might in the long run be less if Mr. Hagerty had dealt with the illness as he did with the coronary thrombosis—that is to say, by giving the press access to the President's doctors instead of imposing an embargo. For the secrecy has served only to aggravate the disappointment because it is taking the President longer than was promised to regain his health.

I should add that I do not think Mr. Hagerty imposed the embargo in order to mislead the country. I have no doubt that he was entirely convinced by the President's doctors that the first prognosis could be relied upon, and that he felt a public debate among doctors would be an unseemly thing, would be dispiriting to the patient and very unsettling to the American people.

THE Republican prospects, which have become darker than they appeared to be at the beginning of July, would surely be greatly improved if Nixon were replaced by Herter. In fact, if they go on with Nixon, the Republican leaders will be placing a bet that by September or early October, the President will be so well recovered that his health will not be an issue. With Herter, they would be reinsuring themselves against what might become a big secession of Eisenhower Republicans.

But even with Herter, there is no longer any certainty, as most of us have assumed there was, about the outcome in November. More than a year will have passed since the President was first stricken, and if he is still convalescent, the paramount question will almost certainly be how and by whom the powers of the Presidency are going to be exercised for the next four years.

Mr. Eisenhower's enormous personal popularity, which is reflected in the Gallup polls, cannot be separated from a belief that personally he will and can carry on. A very considerable number of voters will be looking for signs not so much about his life expectancy, which they will take for granted, but about his strength and his energy to carry on.

A REALISTIC appraisal of the political prospects must take into account also the probability that the Democrats seem likely to prove formidable. If, as is now so probable, they unite behind Stevenson, they will have a record in Congress and a candidate which fits the situation. They will not have much of an issue against Eisenhower. But there is no issue against Eisenhower that could be raised effectively in the campaign. The issue is about Eisenhower's ability to carry on.

The Democrats will be offering an alternative for the Eisenhower Republicans and the Eisenhower Democrats to go to if they become too uneasy. Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Timmerman said that he seriously doubted that the party could write a plank that both the South and the nation would accept.

Timmerman was the prime mover behind a similar Atlanta conference in mid-July. But the statement that came out of that meeting, July 14, made by state Democratic chairman, urged northern and southern Democrats to work in "party unity" to remove "the inept Republican administration . . . from the White House." The chairmen asserted: "We do not favor any bolts, walkouts, or third parties."

Defeat of the relatively mild administration civil rights bill at this session can be laid at the doors of senators from southern states. But timing was involved, too, and also an agreement cutting across party lines to get on with adjournment. Republican leader William F. Knowland (Calif.) was quite candid at that point. Addressing Sen. Herbert H. Lehman (D-N.Y.) on July 25, he said:

This is no time, in the last few days of the session, to proceed with something which, from a practical point of view, the Senator knows as well as anyone knows cannot be accomplished. It is only "kidding" minority groups and the American people to go through a lot of idle gestures.

In any event, the Democrats will have at least a small fight on their hands in Chicago. A group of 55 Negro Democratic leaders from 17 states on July 21 accepted in principle recommendations to be put to the platform drafter. The most important of these called for denial of federal aid to states enforcing school segregation. Also, George Meany, AFL-CIO head, will appear before both party platform groups with labor recommendations, sure to have some bearing on civil rights.

Gov. Frank G. Clement of Tennessee, Democratic convention keynoter, was chosen for the job in part because he can cover the racial segregation issue "in a way that will not be offensive to any segment of the population," in the words of National Chairman Paul M. Butler. But it was the same Clement who told a press conference recently: "Not a single school has been desegregated in Tennessee, with the exception of those in Oak Ridge, located on federal property." — E. R. R.

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 an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

From Senator Neuberger

To the Editor: In a letter to your newspaper of July 29 Mr. Henry Kane, "research director" of the Republican Party, makes the claim that "Senator Neuberger's silence on the part dealing with his opinion of Senator Morse is a good example of the book's accuracy."

If I were to reply to every falsehood circulated by the Republican Party concerning Senator Morse and myself, I would have to forego all other activities and to invent a week of at least 14 days.

In the expensive "book" prepared by the Republican Party to victimize Senator Morse, a whole series of quotations from earlier articles of mine have been lifted in an effort to emphasize differences between Senator Morse and myself. My favorable comments on Senator Morse's record, in those articles, are of course completely overlooked.

It is true there were some differences politically between Senator Morse and me when he was trying his best to be both a liberal and a loyal Republican, and when I was pursuing my activities as a Democrat. What is so dreadful about that?

As the editor of the Mail Tribune has emphasized so cogently in his editorial of July 29, the best and most reliable test is my present high estimate of Senator Morse—and it is high, indeed—after a year and a half of close association with him in the United States Senate.

But suppose we let the record stand of my earlier disagreements with Senator Morse on certain policies. History, after all, cannot be cut in two, even with a pair of Republican scissors.

In 1950 Phil Hitchcock, the junior version of Douglas McKay, had this to say of Wayne Morse:

"It is my opinion that Wayne Morse has given the best explanation of a sound program that has been given by any public figure in American life. Maybe this stamps me as a 'maverick,' but I believe sincerely that the Republican Party must look in this direction or disintegrate."

Today, Hitchcock is traveling all over Oregon, denouncing and abusing Senator Morse. Evidently the Republican State Committee believes it is perfectly fine for Hitchcock to reverse his earlier high opinion of Senator Morse, but that it is reprehensible for Neuberger to make any change in his stand! This affords some insight into the curious reasoning processes of those who are spending so much time and money to try to defeat Oregon's distinguished senior member of the United States Senate.

Richard L. Neuberger, United States Senator.

"Great Respect for the Dollar" To the Editor: Do you remember what remark the great McKay made when he was running for Governor of Oregon, and again when he was expecting to receive the appointment to the place of Sec. of Int. in the Cabinet of the President of the United States?

Well, I do, and here it is: "I have great respect for a dollar", and, again he said: "I have a high regard for the dollar."

Remember, now? Well, a lot of us remember.

Personally, I should like to know exactly what was behind such remarks. To whom were such remarks directed? What was the idea, anyway? Was there any call for such utterances?

He was already known for his parsimonious treatment of his employees. He could not have been directing such statements to them.

If not, then to whom? Do you suppose it possible that he knew the Big Money men would gather, a certain conclusion from them? Or was he just "shooting in the dark?" I don't know. Who does?

It seems to be rather a queer thing to make such a remark under such circumstances. It arouses suspicions in my mind that it was for possible future use. Such seemingly little things have happened before, with good financial returns to the man who made such "hints", if we may call them that.

In view of later happenings it just could have been intended to produce such an event, or events.

Was there any personal inducements for issuing exploitation permits on game and fish preserves?

Or for the "freeing of the Indians" with the present removal to their natural resources, to the great profit of the ones who obtained them? Or for the issuance of licenses to put in certain dams on our rivers to the exclusion of our Federal Government and loss in power and money, and benefit

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Last week, when a staff member answered one of the office telephones, the voice of a young girl gave him a news story about a recent trip made by two local people, using the first names (both female) and the last name, which was the same for both.

The staff member thought how nice that two youngsters would take a trip, assuming that the person calling was one of the two, so he inquired as to their ages.

The party calling, after a long conversation in the background, said one of the two on the trip was more than 40 years old.

Mrs. Phil Brainerd and Mrs. Guy Phetteplace are neighbors and both are active in various doings around town.

Recently, Mrs. Brainerd was hostess at her home for a hospital benefit coffee, and Mrs. Phetteplace, being a gardener, helped the former with her

to our dollars? Especially when highly competent engineers testified to the much greater value of the higher dams.

Is there anyone of average intelligence who can deny that Federally built dams soon pay for themselves and are then owned by the people? Well, let me tell you they are so owned and the Federal Treasury does not lose one single dime.

Let us mull that over in our thick heads and maybe we can see why Morse and Neuberger are so determined to get us the dams and all other things for us and not for a lot of moneybags who never turn a single shovel of dirt.

Me for Morse and Neuberger. A. L. Unger 634 Pennsylvania ave.

Thanks Blood Donors

To the Editor: August 8, the Red Cross Bloodmobile will again be in Medford.

I wish I might go and repay the Red Cross some of the 39 pints I have received since May 16. However, you who are in good health can help balance my account by donating.

To the 22 persons, most of whom I do not even know, who gave blood in my behalf on June 13 I am deeply grateful. Frank C. Thompson, Talent, Oregon.

Hells Canyon Dam

To the Editor: Again the forces of evil, greed, prevailed—in the Hells Canyon dam deal. WHY? In every age unselfish, public spirited, farsighted people have worked to perpetuate natural resources for best use and future generations. Socrates did.

In every age a few grab more than they need or can use, and exploit it for personal selfish use. The rockbound shores and desert sands of time and this earth are strewn with wreckage and dust of God-given bounteous natural resources, and human bones.

January 15, 1779, George Washington wrote to Patrick Henry, urging him to "come forth and help save the Colonies from the persistent, pertinacious selfish special interests." The Colonists fought off another tyrant that insisted on "taxation without representation." But slaveholders, robber barons, looters of the public domain, politics thwarted every effort to stop wholesale thievery of America's natural resources. Promoters of four Western Railroads, grabbed areas of America's rich lands equal to Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Michigan. Fifteen railroads appropriated 112 million acres—nearly twice the area of Oregon. Greed brought on the Civil War.

President Lincoln tried to buy the Negro slaves to set them free, but special interest big profits prevented. President Lincoln pleaded for "justice to all, malice toward none." But politicians and carpetbaggers prevailed. Congressman Ignatius Donnelly warned the Congress, "unbridled greed of big business and its corruptive influence on politicians is driving the masses to not even vote, and seek relief in communism."

Noting the greed and destruction, Gifford Pinchot dedicated his life to conservation and perpetuation of America's natural resources for the people. President Teddy Roosevelt, alarmed at the terrible waste by private exploiters, warned of the timber famine already started and set aside a few million acres as National Reserves, for the people. But greed for immediate profits and waste continued destruction of forests, soil, water, wildlife, etc.

Now American Indian lands, National forests, Parks, federal grazing lands, waterpower sites, all are threatened by timbermen, stockmen and waterpower tycoons.

Is it any wonder the all-powerful special interests bulldozed hang onto politicians who favor what private interests want, and use every possible way to defeat candidates who work for the people's interests?

John Gribble 139 Kenwood Ave., Medford, Oregon

flowers outside. Mrs. Phetteplace, of course, was dressed in her gardening clothes.

The day of the party, Mrs. Brainerd saw a woman, dressed up and wearing dark glasses, approaching across the lawn. She turned to a neighbor and inquired as to who the woman was, and the neighbor replied that she didn't know.

Mrs. Brainerd approached the woman in her best hostess manner, greeted the woman, and said: "I'm Mrs. Brainerd. I'm so glad you came . . ." and continued.

That is, until the woman looked astounded, and said something to the effect of "Oh, for gosh sakes."

Mrs. Brainerd then realized she had not recognized her gardening neighbor, Mrs. Phetteplace.

Each summer, the county sheriff issues an order to a "congregation" of hobos to extinguish fires and make use of "free rail tickets" to move from a make-shift camp along the Southern Pacific tracks in the McAndrews rd. vicinity.

The order is issued because previously some camp fires have been potentially dangerous in the dry area.

Asked if they offer any resistance, the sheriff said they don't — "they just look hurt and start on their way."

A candidate for political office, in the valley last week, brought with him a film presentation, which was considerably delayed because of technical difficulties with the projector.

Well-meaning aid from several supporters only got the candidate more entangled in film.

At length, the politician quipped, "I'm beginning to wonder if a trip to Hollywood might be more enlightening to me than a trip to Washington."

A deputy sheriff has to be both strong and agile because there's no telling what emergencies may confront him.

Not too long ago, for example, one of the deputies one night encountered two dogs, which answered his "go 'way . . . go 'way" with throaty growls and began to lick their chops.

Deciding discretion was the better part of valor, the deputy dashed from the scene, cleared a six-foot picket fence, and took refuge with a fellow deputy waiting in the nearby car.

The fellow deputy was impressed with his partner's athletic prowess, especially since the dogs never budged from the spot where he left, and since one of the dogs was a toy terrier.

Patrons at the Shakespearean Festival in Ashland this week brought various sorts of garments to keep warm and dry.

Opening night, a staff member and her daughter attended the play, and although dressed to keep warm, were not dressed for keeping dry. A couple sitting behind them, representing the Ashland paper, however, were prepared, somewhat, for the pre-play rain. They had a plastic table cloth.

Seeing our reviewer without proper protection, they produced a pocket knife, cut the table cloth in half, and loaned half of it to our staff member.

Several people attending the plays have a good idea — the use of sleeping bags, but not for the purpose for which they are intended, though.

At a recent Medford council meeting, action was taken on a request submitted by some local businessmen, who appeared at several previous gatherings. Showing their appreciation for the council action, they asked that if there was anything they could do for the council "feel free to call on us."

The acting chairman of the council said there was something they could do: "Visit us sometime, just for the visit."

Congressional Quiz

(Copyright, 1956 Congressional Quarterly)

Q—Standing for re-election at the age of 78 is a man who has represented his state continuously in Congress since its admission to the union, first in the House and since 1928, in the Senate. He is chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee. Can you name the man and the state?

A—Carl Hayden of Arizona, a Democrat.

Q—The dean of the Senate, who has served continuously since 1922, will not stand for re-election but will take a newly-created government post. Can you name the man, his state and the post he will take?

A—Walter F. George of Georgia, a Democrat, who will serve as President Eisenhower's personal Ambassador to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.