

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Everybody in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune... Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance, Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

Member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association

Flight of Time

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

10 YEARS AGO

Aug. 28, 1946 (It was Wednesday) Many residents of this area today report having seen a flaming object streak across the heavens last night about 9 p.m.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: An eminent Eastern educator reports, "The upturn of youth is now under way." It's about time, so say we all.

20 YEARS AGO

Aug. 28, 1936 (It was Friday) Miss Ella Gardner, national recreation specialist of Washington, D.C., and Mrs. Gertrude Skow Sanford, state specialist in recreation, arrive in Medford Saturday, according to Mabel Mack, county home demonstration agent.

Model Home tickets will be redeemed at the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce from 7 to 9 p.m. next Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings.

30 YEARS AGO

Aug. 28, 1926 (It was Saturday) Bill Lydiard, partner of W. A. Gates in the grocery business, is still on an auto trip with his brother, Mrs. J. H. Lydiard.

40 YEARS AGO

Aug. 28, 1916 (It was Monday) Odd Fellows picnic and meeting of Southern Oregon Odd Fellows association at Ashland, Sept. 5, 1916.

From Local and Personal column: Miss Ina Cochran spent the week end at Eagle Point as the guest of Miss Frances Heath.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955 Editorial Research Report

- 1. Has any defeated presidential candidate, renominated, beaten the man who beat him four years before?
2. After seven years the value of a new car will be about 25, 17 1/2, 10, or 2 1/2 per cent of its original price?
3. Adlai E. Stevenson did or didn't get many votes from Deep South at the 1956 Democratic convention?

Tydings' Wife Loses Bid for Senate Seat

Baltimore, Md.—(UPI)—Contractor George P. Mahoney—political foe of ailing ex-Sen. Millard E. Tydings—today replaced him on the Maryland Democratic ticket to oppose GOP Sen. John Marshall Butler. Mahoney defeated Mrs. Eleanor Tydings, the former senator's wife, for the nomination by a vote of 87 to 35 Monday night in the Democratic Maryland Central Committee.

"Watch Out!"

It is rather hard to believe. But the Oregonian is not a champion and defender of the private utilities in their effort to secure a monopoly of electric power from atomic sources.

In its lead editorial of Sunday, at least, the highly influential Portland daily takes a stand against the private utilities as far as this source of power is concerned, that is nothing short of sensational.

Listen to this, for example, quote:

The recent defeat in Congress of the Democratic-sponsored Gore bill, which would have accelerated federal research in the field of civilian atomic power reactors, is considered a great victory by the nation's private utilities, whose theories on power development the administration has swallowed whole.

The attitude of the electric light and power companies in this matter is quite simply explained. They want full control over the production and sale of electricity produced through the harnessing of nuclear energy. They want no repetition in the atomic field of the TVAs and Bonneville resulting from federal experiments with hydroelectric development.

What could be clearer or stronger, regarding control of atomic power?

But that is precisely the attitude the private power companies have always had toward federal competition in the field of water power. And their highly efficient and highly-priced lobby in Washington, D.C. ever since the inauguration of President Eisenhower has been working toward two main objectives, one: To prevent any extension of federal power—(Hells Canyon, for example)—in this country, and two: Work steadily toward the transfer of TVA and Bonneville types of public power to private power control as far as that is possible.

As the Oregonian continues:

This policy of course is not very attractive to the average American, who likes to see his country in the forefront of everything. So it has been necessary for American utilities to put on a public relations campaign to persuade us that things really are coming along fine.

Recently the St. Louis Post-Dispatch drew anguished outcries from the power industry when it asserted editorially: "Not a single commercial-scale atomic plant is being built in the United States by private enterprise. . . . There is not even any such plant directly in sight. The only large reactor going up in this country is government-financed."

The evident reference was to the 100,000-kilowatt pressurized water reactor being built at Shippingport, Pa. Since this is under construction by the Western Electric company and will be operated by the Duquesne Light company, it has been pointed to with pride as an example of private enterprise at work in the atomic field. THE FACT THAT THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IS PUTTING UP \$80,000,000 OF ITS \$85,000,000 COST IS SELDOM MENTIONED. NEITHER IS THE FACT THAT THE AEC HAS AGREED TO ABSORB ALL COSTS OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT THE PLANT IN EXCESS OF EIGHT MILLS PER KILOWATT HOUR IN ITS FIRST FIVE YEARS OF OPERATION.

Could the selfishness and hypocrisy of the electric power combine, be brought into sharper relief than that which uncompromising indictment?

And it is the judgment not of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch but the conservative and strongly Republican Portland Oregonian, which we had always supposed — perhaps incorrectly — was the great friend of the private power utilities and the sworn enemy of such public power projects as TVA and Bonneville, which their party and its leader so vehemently condemned as "creeping socialism."

HOW come?

The Oregonian concludes by claiming its editors are still worshippers of that GOP idol known as "free enterprise," but it takes rather a contrived and complicated route to prove it. For example, quote:

"The federal government will not intrude further into the power business unless the congress so wills it. And the chances of this it seems to us will be greater if the American public gets fed up with the private utility tactic of trying to delay progress until it is convenient for its stockholders to let it go forward."

WE lack the Oregonian's knowledge of what the government will do either before or after November 6th.—we don't even know which party will then be in control of the congress, but we DO know this:—as far as anything in life can be known in advance—and that is:—

The private utilities will try to delay progress from the standpoint of the general welfare as opposed to the profits of its stockholders in the future, just as it has done in the past; it will also try for the same reason and the same purpose, to secure, as the Oregonian maintains, a monopoly in the atomic field as it has for decades tried to secure a monopoly in the field of electric light and power. And the effort will continue as the Oregonian indicates until the American people get fed up with it and with them. And when they DO,—then brethren and sisters,—"Watch Out!" —R.W.R.

Parties' Civil Rights Planks Seek to 'Bridge' North, South

Washington — (CQ) — Democratic and Republican platform drafting committees—Builders of the programs the parties will take before the voters this year—have managed to construct a pair of bridges over the chasm between northern and southern emotions on the school segregation issue.

But will these few hundred words of plank stand the strain of 10 weeks' campaigning for both southern segregation and northern desegregation votes?

Already party workers are sawing the beams of the opposition's handiwork. A successful demolition job by either side will enhance its chances to win in November.

Both Adlai E. Stevenson and President Eisenhower are covetous of the votes of northern liberals and Negroes—and southern friends of segregation. Thus, the giant straddle on civil rights:

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In the upper echelons of the Republican party in the pre-convention days of 1956 there were two controversial figures—Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen.

At the convention that adjourned last week, the fortunes of Nixon soared spectacularly. Stassen's fortunes nose-dived.

LET'S deal first with Nixon. Why is he a controversial figure?

THAT question isn't easily answered.

He is a personable young man. He is courteous. He is pleasant. He handles himself with discretion. He has carried out with striking success every mission that has been entrusted to him. Almost without exception his former colleagues in the house and the senate speak well of him. They do so without reservation. In their voices, when they praise him, there is none of that peculiar inflection that indicates that the speaker's words and his OPINIONS do not necessarily coincide.

Above all, he has won the unqualified approval of his great chief, President Eisenhower. And in this convention that has just adjourned the support that won him UNANIMOUS renomination was not synthetic. It was GENUINE. It wasn't just a deal among the delegates. The crowds were with him. Their applause told that rather clearly.

YET it can't be denied that he is a controversial figure. Why?

THE ANSWER is all the more difficult to find because those who say they are opposed to him so seldom have a definite reason for their opposition. They are vague about it. For example:

Chatting at breakfast this morning with the waitress—a pleasant middle-aged woman with graying hair—I started off with the usual bromide: "How did you like the convention?"

"Oh," she said with unmistakable enthusiasm. "Isn't Eisenhower wonderful? I just love him. But that Nixon—I can't stand him!"

"Why not?" I queried. "As so many anti-Nixonites do, she hesitated. "Well," she finally said, "he's so cocksure of himself."

"That," I said, "doesn't sound to me like a very good reason. The vice-president of the United States can't be wishy-washy. When he acts, he MUST be sure of himself."

SHE PONDERED a moment, as if searching her own mind. "Well," she finally said, "I suppose my real reason is that the Democrats tell us working people we must vote for Democrats because they are our friends and the Republicans are our enemies. But I'm going to vote for President Eisenhower anyway. I love him. I have faith in him. He's a good man. But I don't know about Nixon. They say he's against us working people."

WHAT of Stassen? What was he up to? I wouldn't know. And I wouldn't go so far as to say he was wrong in what he did. This is a free country. Any man has a right to do as he pleases within the limits of the rights of others. He had a perfect right to oppose Nixon. But at this convention his popularity nose-dived because of the way he handled himself.

When he saw the error of his way and withdrew his opposition and asked to be allowed to second Nixon's nomination, his request was granted. If he had got up and laughed and said he knew when he was licked and was happy to make it unanimous, he would have been received back into the fold with enthusiasm. Instead, he took one minute to make his seconding statement and 19 minutes to defend himself unconvincingly for what he had done.

That cooked his goose.

The Republicans "accent" the Supreme Court's desegregation decision and the Democrats "recognize" the Supreme Court and its work. The Republicans call for "deliberate speed" in the face of the "complex and acutely emotional problems" created by the 1954 decision. The Democrats "reject all proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters."

What is the reality behind these carefully chosen phrases? Where do the parties really stand on civil rights questions? The conscientious voter who peers behind the platform and examines the record of the last Democratic and Republican Administrations and the views of the 1956 candidates will find:

1. In the past eight years, generally Republicans in Congress have given more support to civil rights measures than Democrats. But neither party, when it controlled Congress, could pass a single major civil rights bill.

In 1949, a majority of both House Democrats and Republicans voted for an anti-poll tax bill. It died in the Senate.

PEP Bill Dies In 1950, the Republicans, against Democratic opposition, pushed a voluntary Fair Employment Practices bill through the House but could not muster the votes to end a Senate filibuster against the measure.

In 1956, a majority of Republicans managed to tack an anti-segregation amendment to the school construction bill, only to see the amended bill lose—with a majority of Republicans voting against the final measure.

Also this year, a majority of House Democrats and Republicans voted for an omnibus civil rights bill. It went to the Senate in the last week of the session, never came to a vote.

The last two Presidents—Democrat Harry S. Truman and Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower—used different tactics but were equally and completely thwarted in their legislative civil rights programs.

Truman launched his 10-point program in 1948 and each year thereafter sought unsuccessfully to have it enacted. Mr. Eisenhower waited until 1956 to present a more modest two-point program, but it, too, foundered in the Senate.

Both Presidents made use of their executive authority to lessen discrimination in areas of federal control. Truman can claim credit for initiating some moves; Mr. Eisenhower for pushing them to completion.

Both sought with some success to reduce discriminatory practices by private firms with government contracts. Both set up agencies to protect federal civilian workers from prejudicial action. Mr. Truman began, and Mr. Eisenhower completed, the desegregation of the armed services.

Under both Presidents, the Department of Justice went into the courts on the side of persons claiming infringement of their civil rights. Truman's Justice Department argued in 1950 for an end to segregation in interstate railway diners and Mr. Eisenhower's Justice Department sought in 1954 to end all segregation on trains and in stations.

The last Democratic Attorney General, James P. McGranery, and the present Republican Attorney General, Herbert Brownell Jr., filed briefs with the Supreme Court urging it to do what it ultimately did—order an end to segregation in the public schools.

Ike, Adlai Similar 5. The stated views of President Eisenhower and Democratic Presidential Candidate Adlai E. Stevenson on civil rights are so close they could read each other's speeches without embarrassment.

Stevenson pledged in his acceptance speech to "press on . . . toward the fuller freedom for all our citizens which is at once our party's pledge and the old American promise."

Mr. Eisenhower, in his 1956 State of the Union message, called for "an expanded effort on every front . . . to assure our citizens equality in justice, in opportunity and in civil rights."

Both reject the use of force to impose desegregation and both opposed the addition of the anti-segregation amendment to the school bill.

(Copyright 1956, Congressional Quarterly)

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

CONTRASTING THE PARTIES San Francisco—There was one virtue, at any rate, in having the Republican convention begin

just as the Democratic convention ended. It made the contrast between the two parties singularly vivid and immediate. You could see the strengths and weaknesses of each with stereoscopic clarity.

For example, one of the great strengths of the Democrats is their rich riot of personalities. Chicago crawled with Democrats of note and stature. There were two front rank candidates, Adlai Stevenson and Averell Harrington. There was another, Lyndon Johnson of Texas, who is highly likely to be a front rank candidate four years from now. The strength of the second level was displayed in the exciting Vice Presidential race. And among the group of political organizers there were plenty of big men, including the important new face of Adlai Stevenson's able manager, James A. Finnegan.

IN CONTRAST, the most obvious weakness of the Republicans is the fact that they have now become a one-man party. Dwight D. Eisenhower by no means typifies the Republican viewpoint as Robert A. Taft used to do. A great many of the delegates who screamed themselves hoarse for him in the Cow Palace very sharply disagree with many of his policies. If he ever makes a really bold attempt to implement the foreign affairs sections of his acceptance speech, for instance, the President will surely be opposed by most of the Republican Senators and Congressmen who are now so desperately anxious to ride back into office on his coat-tails.

But the Republicans are a one-man party just the same, because Dwight D. Eisenhower is the only Republican candidate with a tinker's chance of winning a national election.

After four years in control of the White House, in fact, the Republican party has become poorer, not richer, in notable personalities of national stature. If Eisenhower wins again, the greatest Republican problem will be to develop men who can carry on where he leaves off. And it will not be an easy problem.

BUT it is the Democrats who are poor, and the Republicans

who are rich, in the other significant area of politics, the area of issues. This happy situation the Republicans owe to the singular political astuteness of Dwight D. Eisenhower. If the party as represented in Congress had been left to itself, it would quite certainly have spent its time generously manufacturing issues for the enemy, in the manner of the 80th Congress. But by wise and moderate action in many different fields, from social welfare to the administration of the labor laws, Dwight Eisenhower quietly captured the Democrats' issues.

Except for the health issue above all, plus the regionally important farm and public power issues, the Democrats now have no straw left to make electoral bricks with. And while one must always recognize politician Eisenhower's primary responsibility for this Democratic misfortune, it is also necessary to note that the Democrats have themselves to blame as well.

Many people have pointed out that their long experience of opposition left the Republicans, particularly the Congressional Republicans, sadly unprepared to act as a party in power, but it is also true that this long experience of power and responsibility left the Democrats sadly unprepared to act as an opposition.

Specifically, they forgot that political issues do not lead an independent, God-given existence of their own. They did not realize, any longer, that issues have to be made, and made in particular by the opposition. And they neglected to make several of the most important issues, for which there was ample raw material lying about, because the task of making issues is almost always unpleasant and controversial at the outset.

THE classic example in our time was Winston Churchill's handling of the issue presented by the rising menace of Nazi power. Churchill had to undergo years of ostracism and abuse because he insisted on the vital importance of that issue. But in the end, because he stood the racket when the going was rough, he was the sole, inevitable Prime Minister in England's darkest hour.

The Democrats did not have to be Churchill to make very great and stirring issues in the areas of defense and foreign policy. For instance, they only had to have some knowledge of the problem, to show some guts in discussing them and to hammer away until the country turned its attention to the problems. But they did not do any of this because it would have been initially uncomfortable.

And so today, while Adlai Stevenson frankly regards the defense and foreign issues as far and away the most important of all, he has said with rueful frankness that he does not think

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initial for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Lily D. Blackwood

To the Editor: Last week one of the Rogue valley's oldest churches laid to rest a life-member, Lillian D. Caldwell was born at Buckhorn Mineral Springs, southeast of Ashland, and spent most of her almost 93 years at Phoenix. Her husband, Richard T. Blackwood, helped construct the old church building, erected in the pines near the cemetery, and dedicated in 1875. In 1926, Mrs. Blackwood turned the first shovel of ground dedicating the building site of the present edifice.

Flowers were a gift hallowed in her heart. For 30 years—and more—she cultivated and lovingly carried them to the house of the Lord. Gladiolas being her favorite flower, and her passing occurring at "glad" harvest, Mrs. Bert Stancliffe decorated Sunday morning's sanctuary with pink and white blooms. Vivian Stancliffe Jackson and her husband, George, were here from southern California for this service. On Monday, the memorial day, a band of "glads" was arranged back of and flanking the casket. A cross of white "glads" was placed at the right of the bier.

Offerings of asters, delphiniums and other seasonal flowers, brought by friends, were a lovely contrast as they graced the altar rail.

The daily "walk" and behavior of this person was in my memory a benediction, even if there had been no eulogizing by pastors. The Reverend Mr. Clark and Mr. Volkman spoke with heartfelt comfort. Mrs. Gene Thanos, acquainted with "Auntie" Blackwood since her tiny-girl days, gave the vocal selections. Mrs. Hale Looftorrow was at the organ.

Some friends who had cared for her with loving hands followed an injury about 20 years ago surely felt mixed emotions at this sacred service.

This, to us remaining, is more than the passing of a pioneer. We've committed her soul to God gladly—yet with sorrow. She was most precious to a wide circle of friends.

Mrs. Nellie M. Poling, Route 3, Box 201, Medford, Ore.

Comments The MT To the Editor: I congratulate you for your excellent editorials. Especially for the one in the Aug. 16 issue, headed "More Al Sarena." It is the most thorough, fair, broad-minded and Democratic appraisal of this controversial act I've ever read. I heartily endorse every word of it. Particularly where you say that the "Al Sarena Deal" was undoubtedly "within the law." It reminds me of an old saying, "It isn't the poor itinerant who steals a loaf of bread because he is hungry who endangers mankind so much as the man who has education, money, power and attorneys and accomplishes his questionable aims 'within the law.'"

I live near Portland where public thought and opinion is largely influenced and formed by our two ultra reactionary Republican papers—the Journal and Oregonian. Indeed, I would be surprised to read an editorial in either casting a shadow of doubt on the worth and legitimacy of anything sponsored by ex-Senator Gordon, McKay, President Eisenhower or the Republican party. So it is truly refreshing and encouraging to read your editorials and know that others share like opinions and ideals, and have the civic interest and moral fortitude to express them.

In regard to our present campaign, it appears that we have two distinct philosophies, and they are not as so many big Republicans claim—Socialism versus freedom and private enterprise, but rather—the welfare of the majority of the people versus the welfare of the few.

(Hap) Guy Lake, 31 North Orange St., Medford, Ore.

Not a "Bum" To the Editor: I just read what is to be done with the "Stranded Transients."

About three years ago, along in winter, late in the evening, a man came up to me on the corner of Front and Main sts. and asked if I knew where he could get a job, that he was broke, and had not eaten all day, and no room for the night. It was storming something terrific. I thought I would not want my dog to be out on a night like this. So I

"there is much mileage in them". And Stevenson is right, no doubt, because issues cannot be made at the last minute either. (C) 1956, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

gave him \$3 to get something to eat and a hotel room. He asked me to give him my name and address, which I did. The next day, I went to the hotel to see if he had found a job, and I learned he had not even stayed the night before.

So I laughed about it. "Just another bum," I thought.

Well, a year later one evening I got a phone call. I asked who it was, and all they would say is "a friend," and wanted my wife and I to meet him up town and go to dinner. We went and to our surprise this previous "bum" was a gentleman. We had a very nice dinner, he gave me my \$3 back, and said he had used the money for a bus ticket to get out of town, and that he had wired his sister for some money. And due to the storm did not get an answer.

You can see how I felt after my saying "just another bum." (Name on File) Medford, Ore.

From CD Chief To the Editor: I have had the pleasure of reading the July 20 and 22 issues of the Mail Tribune and note the detailed reporting of the national exercise, Operation Alert.

Particularly effective was your method of reporting the chronology of events to the public by summarizing the messages as they were received at the county civil defense control center.

Congratulations on your enterprise in developing the news potential in Operation Alert, which would have affected every phase of human activity if it had been an actual attack.

Val Peterson, Administrator, Federal Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.

Why Apologize? To the Editor: Anent your editorial of Sunday, Aug. 26, titled "Let Oregon Decide," please be advised that you have put the right man in the wrong place.

By the right man I mean that Mr. Ralph T. Moore has expressed so rightly the thinking of most of us Oregonians who have to apologize for Wayne Morse. But convinced that there are, in our fair State, enough intelligent voters who are tired of these apologetics, we look forward confidently to rectifying our position come election day this November.

By the wrong place I mean that I know, of my own knowledge, that Mr. Moore is no habitué of Club cars, Country Clubs or cocktail parties, as you insinuate, but rather their diametric opposites. If, on the contrary, you were to search for him in the Presbyterian church or the Masonic Lodge, I am confident that you would find him in one place or the other.

John C. Smith, 127 South Keene Way Dr., Medford, Ore.

Device Tested To Replace Human Brain

Washington —(UPI)—The U.S. Geological Survey is testing an electronic device called "Sur-wac" that may ultimately replace the human brain in computing streamflow data on the nation's principal rivers.

But Geological Survey Director Thomas B. Nolan said today the 250 persons now engaged in this work will not be fired. Instead they will devote more attention to interpreting the data turned out by the electronic computer.

Counsel with

Mr. Insurance FRED BRENNAN

Phone 2-4940

We have a low cost policy which covers fire and theft of your boat and motor. With so much traffic on the lakes and rivers this summer, we need collision coverage. Do you write such a policy?

MEDFORD INSURANCE AGENCY

NOTICE TO BUYERS OF 4-H & F.F.A. PORK-BEEF-LAMB

Have OK Market Meat Experts Cut & Wrap Your Meat for Your Freezer

Phone 3-4462

OK MARKET

1262 North Riverside

OPEN EVERY NIGHT 'TIL MIDNIGHT