

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North First St. Phone 2-6341

Subscription Rates: Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00; Daily and Sunday—Six months \$7.00; Daily and Sunday—Three months \$3.50; Sunday Only—One year \$3.50.

Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY, INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION APPLICABLE MEMBERS; NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION 1956

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. 20, 1946. (It was Tuesday) Members of the Oregon State Highway commission will be in Jackson county tomorrow as part of state-wide inspection tour of highway projects.

20 YEARS AGO: Aug. 20, 1936. (It was Thursday) County court announces that beginning next week, county patients while convalescing will be housed at the county poor farm in new and remodeled wards completed this year with WPA and county funds.

30 YEARS AGO: Aug. 20, 1926. (It was Friday) Trustees of the Medford museum met last night to transact business. Medford delegates that attended the Rail-to-Trail celebration of Eugene yesterday arrive home on train No. 13 this afternoon.

40 YEARS AGO: Aug. 20, 1916. (It was Sunday) "The Beggar of Cawnepore," a play, will be presented here at the Page theater, for a two day run.

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

1. The Republican party has always renominated an incumbent Republican president; right or wrong? 2. First big reactor in U. S. for commercial nuclear fuel is to be started near Denver, Colo.; Monroe, Mich.; Alamogordo, N. M.; Memphis, Tenn.; or Houston, Tex.?

Theater Thoughts

We have been listening to second-hand reports of a continuing argument among aficionados of the theater as to what is, or should be, the prime purpose of the "live" stage.

One school has it that the most important function is to "educate," to inform, to bring a message. The other believes the theater must, first of all, entertain. We take the stand that both are right.

FOR it is a rare vehicle of pure entertainment that can be any good at all without some sort of meaning or message—however trivial.

And it is a certainty that the most message-laden play is foredoomed unless it also entertains.

The best plays—whether they be musicals, tragedies, comedies, farces—are a skilled blending of content and manner. In this case, it is both WHAT is said and HOW it is said that are important.

SOUTHERN Oregon is not the most theater-conscious community in the world—but neither is it deficient in that quality. The community theater group, the Footlighters, while never affluent and seldom strong, does exert a considerable influence.

And the annual Oregon Shakespearean Festival at Ashland, while it owes much to the climate of nearby Southern Oregon college, could not have survived and flourished without the patronage, the assistance, the hard work of residents of the area who have done what they have done purely because they want to; because they feel that the theater is a living and vital and important part of their environment.

RICHARD Graham, an Ashland resident, a professional actor and director and a veteran of a number of festivals, some time ago gave a talk to the Footlighters in which he voiced some thought-provoking views about the amateur stage. We quote excerpts:

A community theater can be either negative or positive in relation to its community. It can be a recipient, with all the effort and interest flowing toward it, or it can be a source, channeling that effort and interest into a positive power, serving and benefitting the community of which it is a part.

And here is why. First of all, the theater is the most moral of all the arts. True, actors may be bohemian—the art of the theater cannot be. For it is an absolutely inflexible rule of the dramatic art that two things must be present in the course of any play. First, the force of evil must be overcome by the forces of good, and second, the hero or protagonist must undergo an experience of moral growth or ethical improvement.

Now I don't mean to imply that the theater exists for the purpose of moral or ethical elevation. The theater's primary reason for existence is entertainment of its audience. And it is the audience which imposes these moral principles upon the theater, for the audience refused to be entertained by the triumph of evil or by the debasement of a soul.

In the same way, the theater is the most austere of the arts. For it requires that everything that is displayed upon the stage be of immediate and pertinent significance to the audience, and that all meaningless embellishment be stripped away. And for that to be true, it must be the most disciplined of the arts. This is not the autocratic discipline that is imposed from above. That may achieve order, but it won't achieve art. The discipline which the theater requires is of the self-imposed variety, the subordination of one's individual efforts and desires to the realization of the whole, so the audience may see an integrated picture, unmarred by vagrant inconsequentialities.

On either side of the curtain, the potentialities are inherent in a community theater to make a positive contribution to the citizenship of the community, giving thoughtful entertainment to its audience, and providing the satisfactions of group effort for its practitioners. And that certain is no iron curtain, for one may pass from one side to the other of it at will.

ACTIVE participation, or even inactive participation, in the living theater, is not for everyone.

But we think Graham effectively points the way for those who are searching for a means of entertainment or self expression, and who are willing to undergo the rigors and trials of stagecraft, behind the scenes, or in the glare of the footlights, or even in the seats "out front."—E.A.

Columbia Bridge

The good people of the Oregon coast, particularly those in the counties near the Columbia river, are all steamed up about the possibility of bridging the river at Astoria.

They make out a pretty good case, too.

The Astorian Budget reports that the present ferry service (there are three boats) is totally inadequate during the summer rush months, with cars of tourists lined up waiting to cross the river bottleneck, and goodness knows how many avoiding the coast altogether because they know of the situation.

As a result, the coast, both in Oregon and Washington, is not getting its fair share of tourist traffic, despite the fact that the Oregon coast is one of the most spectacular scenic attractions in America.

ENGINEERING firms have estimated the cost of a bridge at some \$25 million. Present estimated toll revenues would pay for principal and interest in the amount of \$13 million. The other \$12 million "deficit," it is hoped, will be put up by the states of Oregon and Washington on a yearly basis for 23 years, after which revenues would have been built up to make the bridge fully self-supporting, carrying principal and interest costs, and also paying the two states back.

The Budget says: If the states . . . would agree to underwrite the annual deficit for the first quarter century, it would cost them each \$226,000 a year for 23 years—but they would get the money back at the end of another 23 years. It is already costing Oregon approximately \$100,000 a year to operate the ferries in losses above operating revenues.

NEW ferries—badly needed if the bridge is not built—also would be costly, and the Budget adds:

It begins to look like good economy for the state of Oregon to assume its share of the bridge project if Washington will do the same.

Gov. Elmo Smith is interested and encouraging, and the highway commission has the proposal under study and will see if Washington will go along.—E.A.

Ike Pondering Slams by Demos; He Too Will Have Plenty To Say

By LYLE C. WILSON, United Press Correspondent

San Francisco (UPI)—The word today from the Republican high command was that President Eisenhower is coming out here to do some talking—plenty of talking.



It seems that Mr. Eisenhower was stung by some of the goings on last week at Chicago. Gov. Frank C. Clement of Tennessee opened the Democratic National Convention with some hard words about Mr. Eisenhower and his political associates.

Former President Harry S. Truman wound it up with some harder words, such as racketeer. Mr. Eisenhower is not drawn to Mr. Truman much even when he is silent. It is a notable fact that the present president of the United States has never sought the advice and counsel of the former president nor sought his by-your-leave for such tinkering as was undertaken with Truman administration policies. Mr. Truman resents that Mr. Eisenhower resents Mr. Truman.

President Arrives Tuesday: All of this should lead to some interesting talk when the President arrives Tuesday, one day ahead of the schedule worked out many weeks ago. It will not be necessary for Mr. Eisenhower to do any talking here to obtain the renomination of Richard M. Nixon for vice president. Nixon is in unless he withdraws.

If he talks about the vice presidential situation—in public, that is—he could say only one of two things: 1. Repeat that he would be happy to run with Nixon again without specifically requesting his nomination; or, 2. Suggest a list of several persons, any one of whom would be acceptable to him as a vice presidential nominee.

President on Record: The President is too firmly on record against singling out any individual for the nomination to do so at once. For that he will wait until his own nomination has been accomplished, if he makes a single choice at all.

So, the field of Mr. Eisenhower's interest and activity is somewhat limited because not many issues here are up for grabs. Having little to worry about with respect to what happens at this convention, the President has had a lot of time to ponder what the Democrats in Chicago did in theirs.

Harsh criticism still is new to the man who was America's sweetheart when he was a general. He'll be answering up to the Democrats, no doubt about that.

But these things are trifles. What matters, first of all, is that with the help of James A. Finnegan, he can now be counted on to run a hard-headed, strictly professional campaign, in sharp contrast with the egghead-dressed shambles of 1952.

What matters second is that he is willing and even eager to spare no effort in the campaign. The whole theme of the Stevenson campaign, in fact, is to be the people's choice seeking out the people wherever they are. While the President makes his six or eight television speeches, Stevenson is to be in almost perpetual motion, beating the bushes for votes in every bushy dell and back alley where votes may be concealed. The idea, in fact, is to present a contrast between the perspiring, energetic and vital Stevenson and President Eisenhower, White House bound by his illnesses, with a lingering doubt about his health always hanging over him.

FINALLY, Stevenson has also realized the great truth that a politician does not become a teacher until he is in office. He no longer wants to lecture the people on what he thinks they ought to hear. He is desperately anxious to talk to the people about the problems that matter to them. And he has already shown he can do it, in California for instance.

Altogether, this very able, very shrewd, exceedingly courageous and honorable man has learned an enormous amount about the politician's trade. He does not have much time to put himself across. But the Democratic leaders, who think Stevenson cannot put himself across, like those described in the last report in this space, may still be due for a big surprise.

Copyright, 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

ADLAI WANTS TO WIN: Chicago—The cronies and advisers of Adlai Stevenson are talking a lot of rather transparent nonsense about "the new Stevenson."



This new Stevenson is supposed to be an earthy fellow, who has put aside the essayist's quill pen for the demagogue's galleus. Allegedly, he adores slapping backs, revels in baby-kissing, and enjoys nothing more than endlessly wringing the horny hands of the great unwashed. His favorite parties are clam-bakes and fish fries. His favorite beverage is bourbon and branch.



His favorite author is Dale Carnegie. All this, of course, is just not so. But the nonsense about the new Stevenson obscures the hard fact that in a quiet different way, there really is a new Stevenson. Stevenson today is a man who wants to win. He wanted to win the Democratic nomination, and staged a drive for it that would have done credit to Thomas E. Dewey in the high days of his gimlet-eyed ambition, when he won the Republican nomination from Robert A. Taft in 1948.

AND Stevenson not only wanted to win the nomination. He wants above all to win the election from Dwight D. Eisenhower. He longs to trounce the Republicans. He longs to show his critics that he too can be a popular candidate. Above all, although he still has a tendency to say that the presidency should seek the man, he eagerly longs to be President and is busily seeking the presidency.

In all these ways, the Stevenson of 1956 is radically different from the Stevenson of 1952. Then he very much did not want the nomination. None of the politicians really believed in his sincerity, but his reluctance to accept was deeply sincere. Furthermore, he really did not much want to be elected. He thought, along with a lot of other Americans, that his own party was suffering from having been in office too long, and his advisers had a desperate time preventing him from saying so, in his reflective, blurted way, on the public platform.

THIS time, on the contrary, he thought himself the best of the Democratic party's available candidates. Furthermore, he is also firmly convinced that Dwight Eisenhower has made a dangerously inadequate present job, and he is sure he would do a better job. And finally, the harsh experiences of politics on a national scale, and particularly his defeat in the Minnesota primary, have persuaded him that his old way of doing things had its defects as well as its virtues.

These changes in Stevenson do not mean, naturally, that the essential character of the man has changed. Men do not change their essential characters in their mid-fifties. Nor does the change in Stevenson mean that he will abandon all those small quirks and mannerisms that tend to drive the professional politicians almost crazy. Men do not change easily their mannerisms, either, when they are well along in middle age.

NO DOUBT he will go on as before, fascinated by words as no American politician has been since Woodrow Wilson. No doubt he will continue to use phrases like "the democratic dialogue" and "the diminishment of the Presidency," which mean a lot to him but very little to the electorate. Perhaps, too, he will continue to make his small, funny, but non-vote-getting self-deprecatory jokes, which his advisers have fruitlessly pleaded with him to suppress. Perhaps he will even continue to reject the use of the teleprompter, reading his speeches in the old-fashioned way, and so presenting the na-

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 initials 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.

Constitution Party: To the Editor: Wanted—names of all ex-marines, soldiers, sailors, aviators, for a constitutional party to stamp out communists in the U. S. Drop a card to: Reilly, 338 North Laurel st., Ashland, Ore.

Only One Consideration: To the Editor: First it was Collis Huntington with his \$4 million bribe money before Congressmen to get millions of acres as railroad grant lands, then the Lieou Land act to exchange unwanted lands for choicest elsewhere, persuading Senator Stanford that he was more valuable to the RR Co. as U. S. Senator than he could be as Governor of California; selling 500 to 1000 acre parcels to timber speculators at \$50 an acre, instead of "to settlers in not to exceed 160 acre tracts at \$2.50 per acre;" providing Southern Oregon with trains and operators that tortured passengers; station agents across the U. S., telling people for years before train service was discontinued in August, 1955, that there was no train service into southern Oregon, to discourage and diminish passenger service; or a battery of "friendly S.P." lawyers, et al, before the Oregon Public Utilities Commission to convince the Commission and the people that southern Oregon needs and is entitled to NO passenger train service; that the poor "friendly S.P." can no longer afford, therefore will not run, passenger trains into southern Oregon.

For all these violations of the contract with the U. S. government there has been but one consideration; that one by, and only by, the "friendly S. P." And for but one purpose—namely, that the "friendly S. P." increase its dollar profits. All these acts have been arbitrarily performed apparently without consent, and against the letter of the government contract and

the will of the people. Thus the Collis Huntington "friendly S. P." regime sets itself up as superior to and independent of the U. S. Government, and the people of southern Oregon, Collis Huntington said: "Whoever I bribe I make forever my slave." The last nine lines of the Mail Tribune Aug. 5 editorial, "The People Should Rule," covers this situation. Boiled down it is that controlling bodies must be of individuals not under obligation to politicians but to the people. And this should apply to America's forests and all other natural resources. John E. Gribble, 139 Kenwood, ave., Medford, Ore.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

DEMOCRATIC PROSPECTS

As of Friday morning, the story of the convention has turned, I think, on the rise of Stevenson and his acceptance as the leader of the party.



Since his victory in the California primary he has been, to be sure, almost certain of the nomination. But this did not mean that he had actually been accepted by all the main factions of which the party is composed—that is to say, for example, by the far South as well as by the moderate South, and by what remained of Truman's professional political following.

It was not until this week in Chicago that his party leadership was put to the final test. The proof that he passed the test successfully is that he was nominated by an overwhelming majority without having to make any deals, without having to buy off any of his rivals and opponents.

HE did not, however, clinch his victory until Wednesday, which was the day when the agreement on civil rights was reached and when all serious opposition to his nomination melted away. This sequence of events has considerable significance. While Stevenson emerged from the convention as the accepted leader of the party, he did not enter the convention in that role. A week ago the most powerful Democrat was believed to be ex-President Truman, and while the odds were on Stevenson to be nominated, the Convention until then was not a Stevenson show, and it did not have the imprint of his personal leadership.

THE campaign will show whether he can do this. But it is clear today that he is far and away the Democrat who has the best chance of doing it. That is because a voter who has been for Eisenhower can turn to Stevenson without feeling he has turned his back upon himself, and made his own past look foolish. It would be impossible, for example, for an Eisenhower Democrat to come back to being a Truman Democrat, or for that matter, a Harriman Democrat. But with Stevenson he would feel at home.

All of this is not because a Stevenson administration would be a carbon copy of the Eisenhower administration. Far from it. What it means is that Eisenhower and Stevenson have this in common, that they are healers and not dividers, and that they bring peace.

This is the magic, in my view, which has attracted so many Democrats and so many independents to Eisenhower. Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Washington (UPI)—President Eisenhower plans to fly to San Francisco Tuesday, a day earlier than originally announced, to "visit and meet" with delegates to the Republican National convention.

There was some speculation that Mr. Eisenhower wanted to sound out the delegates on the controversial GOP vice presidential nomination.

But an authoritative source said the President merely felt his arrival on Wednesday "after it was all over" would make him "almost isolated" from the convention.

"He just wanted to be there, to get the feel of it and meet the people," the source said. White House News Secretary James C. Hagerty made public the President's decision to leave a day early at a specially-called news conference Sunday. He said Mr. Eisenhower will leave here at noon Tuesday aboard his plane, the Columbine III, and arrive in San Francisco at 6:30 p.m. (PST).

We made this mistake because hotheads couldn't wait for tolerance and basic human decency to solve this problem of civil rights. They insisted on forcing a solution immediately. We mustn't make that mistake again.

SO—It seems to me—The Democratic national convention made a wise decision when it adopted the milder platform plank on civil rights.

FOR RESULTS USE TRIBUNE WANT ADS

lions of lives. It hurt our country asunder. We made this mistake because hotheads couldn't wait for tolerance and basic human decency to solve this problem of civil rights. They insisted on forcing a solution immediately. We mustn't make that mistake again.

THE real issue is whether to try to FORCE COMPLIANCE IMMEDIATELY or to take time enough to permit tolerance and basic human decency to bring about that which is inevitable anyway.

NEARLY a century ago, we made a tragic and awful mistake. The mistake was the War between the States. It cost mil-

The keynote speech, for example, had no visible connection with what Stevenson is and with the way Stevenson deals with political affairs. And the platform on foreign affairs was certainly not Stevenson's. Both belong to the time when he was a contender for, but not yet the possessor of, the leadership of the party.

WHAT can be said at this time about Stevenson's prospects? I would say that while the odds are against him, there will be a real contest and the result is by no means a sure thing. That is because the Democratic party, since it will be united on the Presidency, is a very strong party. There is every reason to think, in view of the elections that have been held since 1952, that Eisenhower, only when he is himself a candidate, is stronger than the Democrats. That is to say that when Eisenhower is not a candidate—as in the Congressional, State and local elections—there is a substantial Democratic majority.

If this is correct, then, though the odds now favor Eisenhower against Stevenson, the Republican position is fragile. For it depends upon Eisenhower personally—on the fact that there is a big fraction of Democratic and independent voters who expect to vote for Eisenhower but are not Republicans. The question, therefore, is whether Stevenson can win these Eisenhower voters away from the Republican Presidential ticket.

THE campaign will show whether he can do this. But it is clear today that he is far and away the Democrat who has the best chance of doing it. That is because a voter who has been for Eisenhower can turn to Stevenson without feeling he has turned his back upon himself, and made his own past look foolish. It would be impossible, for example, for an Eisenhower Democrat to come back to being a Truman Democrat, or for that matter, a Harriman Democrat. But with Stevenson he would feel at home.

All of this is not because a Stevenson administration would be a carbon copy of the Eisenhower administration. Far from it. What it means is that Eisenhower and Stevenson have this in common, that they are healers and not dividers, and that they bring peace.

This is the magic, in my view, which has attracted so many Democrats and so many independents to Eisenhower. Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Washington (UPI)—President Eisenhower plans to fly to San Francisco Tuesday, a day earlier than originally announced, to "visit and meet" with delegates to the Republican National convention.

There was some speculation that Mr. Eisenhower wanted to sound out the delegates on the controversial GOP vice presidential nomination.

But an authoritative source said the President merely felt his arrival on Wednesday "after it was all over" would make him "almost isolated" from the convention.

"He just wanted to be there, to get the feel of it and meet the people," the source said. White House News Secretary James C. Hagerty made public the President's decision to leave a day early at a specially-called news conference Sunday. He said Mr. Eisenhower will leave here at noon Tuesday aboard his plane, the Columbine III, and arrive in San Francisco at 6:30 p.m. (PST).

We made this mistake because hotheads couldn't wait for tolerance and basic human decency to solve this problem of civil rights. They insisted on forcing a solution immediately. We mustn't make that mistake again.

SO—It seems to me—The Democratic national convention made a wise decision when it adopted the milder platform plank on civil rights.

FOR RESULTS USE TRIBUNE WANT ADS

lions of lives. It hurt our country asunder. We made this mistake because hotheads couldn't wait for tolerance and basic human decency to solve this problem of civil rights. They insisted on forcing a solution immediately. We mustn't make that mistake again.

THE real issue is whether to try to FORCE COMPLIANCE IMMEDIATELY or to take time enough to permit tolerance and basic human decency to bring about that which is inevitable anyway.

NEARLY a century ago, we made a tragic and awful mistake. The mistake was the War between the States. It cost mil-

FUNERAL SERVICES In Every Price Range Since 1908 PERL Funeral Home Phone 2-6675 AT PERL'S every family may make funeral arrangements which are in keeping with its means. A selection of services in every price range is offered to satisfy individual preferences and to meet all financial circumstances. Convenient Terms? Certainly!