

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
 "Everybody in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
 Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
 27-29 North First St. Phone 2-2424
 ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor
 HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
 GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager
 ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor
 EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
 HARRY CHIPMAN, Telegraph Editor
 RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
 OLIVE STARCHER, Society 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 Per Copy 10c
 Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00
 Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50
 Daily and Sunday—Three mos. 3.50
 Sunday Only—One year \$3.50
 By Carrier—In Advance—Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent, and all motor routes.
 Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00
 Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00
 Carrier and Dealers—See copy.
 All terms cash in advance.
 Official Paper of the City of Medford
 Official Paper of Jackson County
 Official Paper of Josephine County
 MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
 Advertising Representative
 WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY INC.
 Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
 APPLICANT MEMBER
NEWSPAPER 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. 16, 1946
 (It was Friday)
 Wild blackberries are now ripe in the county, particularly in Upper Applegate and Old Stage rd. district.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: The dog days have arrived here. They bring out the painful fact shade is more unevenly distributed than wealth.

20 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 16, 1926
 (It was Sunday)
 Maj. H. D. Bagnall, district recruiting officer at Portland, confers with Sgt. Charley R. Hill, local recruiter.

Steps taken to procure an enlarged federal building so that all permanent agencies here might be centralized in one structure.

30 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 16, 1926
 (It was Monday)
 Dick Isaacs, son of William F. Isaacs, catches large salmon bare handed in a shallow hole while fishing.

Faster trains to the east, plating in service millions of dollars worth of new railroad equipment, are all part of the Southern Pacific's program this year, according to A. S. Rosenbaum, Southern Pacific official.

40 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 16, 1916
 (It was Wednesday)
 The city council last night adjourns without taking action because several members were absent.

From Local and Personal column: Fred Lewis left Wednesday morning for San Francisco.

What's the Answer?
 Can You Get a 7?
 Copyright, 1955 Editorial Research Report

- Adlai E. Stevenson is or isn't the only grandson of a former Vice President to get a major-party presidential nomination?
 - Average amount of life insurance per family is around \$700, \$1,700, \$7,000, \$11,700 or \$17,000?
 - Prince Rainier of Monaco is the same age as his wife, the former Grace Kelly, or two years younger, or three, six or nine years older?
 - The U.S. farm population over the last six years fell by 500,000, three million or 7,500,000, or rose by 75,000?
 - The Democratic party has never yet nominated a Catholic for Vice President, true or false?
 - Sun Valley is in California, Colorado, Idaho, North Carolina, Texas, Wyoming or the Canadian Rockies?
 - Which Southern state has the most votes at the Democratic national convention?
- The answers: 1. Is. 2. \$7,000 per family. 3. Six years older. 4. Fell by three million. 5. True. 6. Idaho. 7. Texas.

McCANN ON VACATION
 Charles M. McCann is on vacation. His weekly news outlook and daily foreign news commentary columns will be resumed upon his return.

How About Key-Noters?

The key-note speech of Governor Clement of Tennessee must have been better than we thought, or Chairman Leonard Hall of the Republican National Committee would not have called a special press conference to condemn it.

Key-note speeches are always extreme, extravagantly partisan and over-declamatory. For years this fact has been taken in stride by the opposition, as a part of the time-honored pattern of "pointing with pride" and "viewing with alarm."

In the tradition of the "Boy orator of the Platte" William Jennings Bryan, and the late and lamented Billy Sunday, we thought the youthful Governor of Tennessee did a good enough job, but we couldn't take it very seriously.

The Republican chairman, however, did. He apparently viewed the table-thumping revival of the "cross of gold" technique, as mendacious, inflammatory and demagogic, unworthy of the governor of a great state, and of the party of Jefferson, Jackson and Roosevelt, etc., etc.

ALL of which is rather silly. Of course the Chairman of the Republican national committee would not like the "key-note" speech of the Democratic party, whoever delivered it, any more than the chairman of the Democratic National Committee will like the "key-note" speech of the Republican party,—such allergies are,—or should be,—taken for granted.

But to take the time and trouble to answer them publicly on the part of either party chairman, seems to this department, to be what Woodrow Wilson liked to call "supererogation"—that is going beyond the call of duty, in a decidedly childish and petulant fashion, giving an importance to a purely routine partisan performance, which it in no way merited.

The speech has also been termed intemperate and irresponsible,—well from the standpoint of the political opposition all key-note speeches are, and there will be plenty of Democratic leaders who will curse with vehemence and write in their seats with pain when they listen to the GOP "key-noter" a few days hence.

OUR objection to the key-note type of declamation is not on the moral grounds of intemperance or inaccuracy, such attributes are to be expected for their object is not to inform the people but to arouse the fighting spirit and enthusiasms of the party members. Our objection as has often been stated in this department, is their political ineffectiveness.

They do pep-up, arouse and delight the 100 per cent partisans, but they are "safe for Democracy"—or Republicanism as the case may be,—anyway.

The aim of campaign speeches should be not to stir up the animals who are in the cage, but to go out, and get new recruits not by overwrought partisan appeals, but by presenting the facts in their favor in a clear and convincing way. In other words as Adlai Stevenson has so often remarked, to "talk sense."

AND here we come to the parting of the ways with former President Truman, and his school of "give 'em hell."

We grant that in 1948 the "give 'em hell" technique won. But we have never been convinced, however, that HST was victorious so much because he "gave 'em hell" as that his opponent Governor Dewey didn't give the voters anything. Mr. Dewey was so sure of himself and of victory that he thought all he had to do was to pass out pleasing platitudes and a few inoffensive generalities, and ride silently and majestically with the tide to an overwhelming victory. In other words the American voters did not vote so much FOR Harry Truman and his "give 'em hell" oratory, as they voted against the complacent, confident Tom Dewey, who gave them nothing.

That we grant is merely a matter of personal opinion. So what? That is all editorials are anyway! —R.W.R.

More Al Sarena

We are rather fed up with the Al Sarena case. We believe most of the people are too.

But the enthusiastic supporters of ex-Secretary of the Interior McKay apparently want to keep the issue alive. Their favorite method of resuscitation is to convert the controversy into a straw man and then tear it down,—and down—again.

The straw man adds up to something like this: The critics of the Al Sarena deal claim it was against the law, that the owners of the mine were cheats and crooks, and that Secretary McKay was little better than a second Albert Fall of Tea Pot dome infamy, in granting the mining patents.

They then with great care demonstrate no laws in force at the TIME of the "give-away" were violated, that the owners of the mine are and were at the time respected and law abiding citizens, of Alabama, and instead of being criticized for this action Mr. McKay could not have done otherwise and should be praised for it.

We can only speak for the Mail Tribune of course but this paper has repeatedly stated the deal was undoubtedly "within the law." We have never directly or indirectly reflected upon the private characters of any individuals involved,—for all we know they may all be paragons of virtue, and pure as the driven snow.

BUT we did criticize—and will continue to criticize—the policy adopted by the Secretary of the Interior and upheld by the present administration that the practice of "mining timber" on the U.S. Forest reserves at a cost of \$5 an acre when timber dealers have to pay twenty or thirty times as much

IT IS true that Congressman Ellsworth secured the passage of a law that would make some of what the Al Sarena owners did, illegal today. But the law is so worded that it works a hardship on the small miner, and gives a great advantage to the large one. Also assuming the Al Sarena practice of disregarding the rulings of the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management and going to the Bureau of Mines as well as to the owners' special assaying office, for the judgments desired are followed, there would seem to be little difficulty in evading it.

FINALLY the Al Sarena case is not so important in itself, but is important as a symbol of basic GOP doctrine, whenever the issue is drawn between private profit and the public welfare.

After all, the timber on these mining claims was not private property but a part of the U.S. Forest reserve, it belonged to the people and should have been under the control of the U.S. Forest Service not the Bureau of mines or the A. W. Williams Inspection company of far off Alabama.

As has so often been stated in this department it is not a question of stealing anything from the government, but giving it away, it is not a question of moral turpitude but improper and destructive and undemocratic public policy.—R.W.R.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

TRUMAN AND STEVENSON

Mr. Truman, for all his legendary reputation as a practical politician, has got himself into a strange predicament.

If he loses his fight to stop Stevenson, he will have made a very sizeable contribution to Stevenson's chances in running against

Eisenhower. For Stevenson is now free of the charge that his election would mean a restoration and continuation of the Truman administration. It is against the Truman administration's record that Eisenhower won a landslide victory in 1952.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Truman wins his fight in Chicago and is able to stop Stevenson, he will have made it as certain as such things can be that no Democrat can win the election. It is hard to imagine the convention nominating Harriman. But if it did so after a violent and divisive struggle, it is still harder to imagine how Harriman could win the election. Not only is he unacceptable to a very large number of Democratic politicians and voters—he would be identified with sectional and class conflicts, and he would be the perfect foil for the image of Eisenhower as a unifier and healer and a man of peace.

MR. TRUMAN'S legendary reputation as the smartest of them all is based on his victory in 1948—a victory won despite all the politicians and prophets and the pollsters. This was such a spectacular performance that it has become impossible for many professional observers, to remember that after 1948 came 1952, and that in 1952 the issue was the Truman record. Because of what the country had come to think of that record, no Democrat could in 1952 hope to be elected. For there was a great majority, including a large number of Democrats, who had made up their minds that no Democrat, not even Stevenson, could make a clean break with the Truman administration.

Mr. Truman seems to believe that 1948 provides a formula of victory which he, or someone he prompts and manages, can apply again and again. Thus he complains in his memories that in 1952 Stevenson avoided as best he could letting him run the campaign and be the main speaker. He seems to think that he could have won in 1952. Now he would like to apply the same formula in 1956.

What reason is there for thinking that the formula which worked in 1948—just worked by a freak of circumstances—would have worked in 1952, and would now work in 1956? It was one thing for the heir of Roosevelt—after the victory of World War II and before the Korean war—to give hell to the Republican governor of New York. It is quite a different thing for the Democratic governor of New York to give hell to the President of the United States who is Gen. Eisenhower.

THE main difference, it seems to me, between Stevenson and Truman is that the one is living in the present while the other is living in the past. This applies not only to election strategy but also to the issues. Mr. Truman is forever wanting to fight again the old battles of the New Deal and of the Fair Deal and of the Stalinist era of the cold war. When he talks about a "fighting" candidate, he is thinking of his own fighting days.

But those were the days before Eisenhower took over the welfare state, before the Supreme Court had made desegregation in the public schools the law of the land, before the

death and degradation of Stalin, before Geneva and the atomic stalemate, before the epochal challenge and competition which the western world must now meet. The dominant issues cannot now be solved by the old formulae of the New Deal and the foreign issues cannot be dealt with by the old formulae and slogans of the cold war. The one thing that can be said with certainty about the next four years is that it will be a period when old policies will have to be reappraised, revised, and reformulated.

THE great virtue of Stevenson, as compared with the other candidates, is that he is a man used to think deliberately, carefully, and thoroughly, not one to flip a coin, not one to leap to a conclusion, not one to be satisfied with a rubber stamp opinion. To one of Mr. Truman's temperament this capacity for deliberating seems like indecision. But Stevenson is not an indecisive man. In 1952 he was bolder and more decisive on more hot issues than almost anyone it would be possible to name who ever got within sight of the White House.

This capacity for taking thought has never yet been considered a fault in a statesman, and it is no fault in 1956. The times we live in are very difficult, and we cannot hope to come through them successfully unless we think our way through them. The fact that Stevenson has brains, and that he knows how to use them, will—since he is so thoroughly available on all other counts that matter—count heavily in his favor.

(C) 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Editorial Comment

LODGEPOLE PINE

To date, no one knows very much about lodgepole pine. We don't know much about the way it reproduces. We don't know the growth cycle. We don't know the best methods of logging to assure regeneration. Nor have we developed any new and efficient methods of logging this small timber.

Plus the fact that almost all legislation aimed at timber utilization in the west is based on either Douglas fir or Ponderosa pine. We'll not only have to overhaul our logging methods, but it is becoming increasingly evident that we'll have to overhaul our legislation concerning timber practices, not only in Oregon but in all the western states.

Of one thing we can be sure. There is a vast practically virgin stand of lodgepole pine lying within a 200 mile radius of Klamath Falls. Someone is going to come in and harvest that timber.

And with transportation costs being what they are today, it's probably going to be cheaper to manufacture pulp products in the area rather than shipping the pulp chips or logs, whichever they do, out.

The pulp industry in the west today is so infinitesimally small that it's hard to visualize the booming progress which is sure to come in the next decade. It won't be as glamorous as it was in the tall timber days, but economically it will dwarf anything we've seen in the past. — Bill Jenkins in Klamath Falls Herald and News.

Reuther Emerges as Michigan's Top Demo in Stevenson Swing

By LYLE C. WILSON
 United Press Correspondent
 Chicago — (UP) — The time comes in any political drama such as this Democratic National Convention when something has to break or give, one way or the other.



Lyle C. Wilson
 then, cr-a-a-a-ack! Something gives and it's all over. Some formalities still to come, perhaps. But the big decision has been made.

That's how it was here in the small hours of Wednesday morning, Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, backed by former President Harry S. Truman, was giving Adlai E. Stevenson a tussle for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Delegates were fleeing by the scores from the coop to the fence for a safety perch from which they could flutter to one side or the other as the identity of the winner might emerge.

A few minutes after 3 a.m. (EDT), Wednesday morning, the weary Michigan delegation to this convention was called into surprise caucus to consider what to do. Michigan had a favorite son, Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams and to him the delegation was pledged. This same Williams back there in February was the first to call a foul on Stevenson, charging him with a program of political moderation that would not do for the Democratic Party in 1956. Williams was way out in front among the stop-Stevenson brigade.

And now a more logically favorite son of Michigan Democrats took over the early morning show. He is Walter P. Reuther, big boss of the Auto Workers and the ambitious vice president of AFL-CIO. Reuther is a Michigan delegate to this convention. The Michigan caucus had no official status so far as the convention was concerned. He had his hands on the delegation controls.

The United Press bulletin on what happened was timed off at 3:39 a.m. (EDT) an early hour, but fatal to the hopes of the governor of New York—and to the hopes of the governor of Michigan, too. He had been thinking he might gamble control of a big favorite son delegation into something like the vice presidential nomination. Perhaps Williams might have brought it off, at that, if he had really been in control. He wasn't, however, because what that UP bulletin said was this: "Gov. G. Mennen Williams said early today he will urge Michigan's delegation to throw its 44 votes to Adlai E. Stevenson."

That was the big, determining break in this convention. Ohio, Michigan and New Jersey, big delegation states, were uncommitted to either leading contender. Each was in a position to break the back of the Harriman campaign for the presidential nomination or to put Harriman on the way to win.

But it was the Michigan delegation, under Reuther's pressure, causing in the lake front Congress hotel that actually brought it off. The decision was against Harriman. From that moment, Harriman was dead politically, and all hands knew it.

In a matter of hours Williams was at Stevenson headquarters tending his delegation's votes. New Jersey was not far behind. The Ohio delegation, pledged to favorite son Gov. Frank J. Lausche, was crumbling away, to Lausche's astonishment and acute discomfort. His delegates were traipsing to the Stevenson corral. The stampede was on and it continues.

What took place before Williams' 3:39 a.m. announcement was a caucus poll of the Michigan delegation which tallied: Stevenson 32½ votes; Harriman 11½ votes; Sen. Stuart Symington, Mo., ½ vote. But what happened a couple of days before that was an announcement by Reuther that he was a Stevenson man.

Williams countered then that Reuther was a nice fellow but that the Michigan delegation would make up its own mind. Reuther may or may not be nice. He is undoubtedly powerful—more powerful in the councils of the Democratic party in the state of Michigan than is Williams who has been elected governor four times running.

Discloses Head Man
 The switch of the Michigan delegation not only ended the presidential contest here with Stevenson the winner, it also disclosed who is Michigan head

man of the Democratic party. Some shine has gone from Williams' prestige.

It was 9 hours and 48 minutes after Williams' small hours announcement that the Harriman camp tossed in the towel. A Harriman manager spoke briefly with a UP reporter. At 1:17 p.m. (EDT) the United Press bulletin said:—

"Gov. Averell Harriman's bid for the Democratic presidential nomination collapsed today.

"The governor's campaign managers privately admitted that Adlai E. Stevenson 'apparently has enough votes' to win the presidential nomination."

Harriman indignantly denied that bulletin. But facts are facts. There may be the formality of a presidential roll call here tonight. The roll call which did the business, however, was that one in the Michigan caucus early Wednesday morning in the Congress hotel.

Matter of Fact By Joe and Stewart Alsop

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON
 Chicago—"What will Lyndon do? What does Lyndon want? What happened between Lyndon and Truman—between Lyndon and Adlai between Lyndon and Averell?"



Lyndon Baines Johnson

These variations on the single theme of the intentions of Lyndon Johnson of Texas are the loudest noises in the rising roar of anxious speculation that is the characteristic sound of every national convention. Thus far, in fact, the chief visible effect of Harry S. Truman's bold endorsement of Averell Harriman has been to transform Lyndon Johnson from a mere Texas favorite son into the potentially commanding figure of this Democratic Convention.

From Truman, Harriman and Adlai Stevenson on down, everyone is courting Johnson. Every one is deferring to his wishes, trying to ascertain his intentions, angling to discover his price. It is a wonderful triumph of the waiting game at which Johnson has always been so expert.

THE question is, of course, whether Lyndon Johnson will be the first casualty of his own triumph. There is an intoxication in the very air of a national political convention, particularly when you stand at the head of a large bloc of delegates and are the object of universal courtship.

Only four years ago, one of the wisest men in American politics, Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, reluctantly consented to become the candidate of the South. He only wanted to reinforce the convention-time bargaining power of the Southern delegations. But he breathed the dread convention-ozone. And before you could say Jack Robinson, Russell was stultifying his own record and convictions by a vain attempt to conciliate the labor leaders and so get Northern votes.

In Johnson's case the danger is even greater, for he has more to lose than Russell had in 1952. Russell could not have become a nationally acceptable Democratic candidate. Johnson, on the other hand, can quite possibly become a very serious leading contender—in 1960. If he handles himself well in the next four years, he will have an excellent chance—in 1960.

THE one thing that could ruin this chance (for which Johnson has been consciously preparing for some time) would be a mistake now. If Lyndon Johnson makes an all-out try for the nomination at the present convention, he can only do so as the candidate of the South and of no one else. After that he will be in the category of Russell, universally admired, universally respected, but almost universally acknowledged to be unavailing as a Presidential candidate because of his extreme Southern commitment.

Johnson is playing his cards very close to his chest. Part of the bargaining power of every man in his position is the possibility that he really may succumb to the convention-ozone. So this possibility is being strongly hinted at.

BUT as a politician, Johnson is not only tough and wise and long-headed. He is above all notable for his realism and self-control. So it is a very good bet that he will not succumb to the convention-ozone, although he will keep everyone on tenterhooks of uncertainty for as long as possible. He will seem to want the top spot, but he will not seek it in deadly earnest.

If this is a sound forecast, it tells a good deal, at least in a negative way, about what Johnson wants and will do. What he wants is to get a platform and a ticket that he can approve, and that will not split the party. This means, very obviously, that his great influence will be used for a moderate civil rights plank. This also means, quite probably, that any candidate wanting his support for first place will have to promise not to put any person abhorrent to Johnson, such as Senator Estes Kefauver, in the second place on the ticket.

BUT what candidate can Johnson support? Plainly, because of the feeling in Texas, he cannot support Averell Harriman. He can help Harriman by withholding Southern votes from Adlai Stevenson, but he hardly seems too likely to continue this sort of indirect aid if it begins to look like causing the nomination of Harriman. He can also play for the nomination of a compromise candidate, such as Senator Stuart Symington. But there are very grave risks in that game, too. And finally, after receiving the appropriate assurances, he can remove the obstacles to the nomination of Adlai Stevenson, not perhaps by taking Texas into the Stevenson column, but by encouraging other Southern friends to go that way.

Whatever his final choice—and it can be said authoritatively that he has made no choice as these words are written—Lyndon Johnson is probably the most interesting man to watch.

(Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)

Congressional Quiz
 (Copyright, 1956 Congressional Quarterly)

Q—The Democrats set a record for convention balloting in 1924 when they nominated John W. Davis on the 103rd ballot. The Republican record was 36 ballots in 1880. About how many Presidential candidates have been nominated on the first ballot? (a) one-half; (b) one-fourth; (c) one-fifth.

A—(a) is mostly nearly correct. Since 1856, the Republicans have nominated three-fourths of their Presidential candidates on the first ballot. Democrats about one-half.

For Food That's Right At Any Time
 Shop at...
OK MARKET
 1202 North Riverside
 OPEN EVERY NIGHT TIL MIDNIGHT

CHapel Mortuary
 Funeral Directors
 PHONE 2-8030 1 KING STREET
 MEDFORD