

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune
Published Daily Except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER
Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association

Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1946
A serious shortage of fruit pickers now exists in valley orchards and City School Superintendent E. H. Hedrick urges today that students employed in the fruit remain on the job for a few days.

20 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1936
Jackson county yesterday receives from the department of the interior a check for \$22,369.59, in payment of the county 1933 share under the O and C land grant tax refund bill.

30 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1926
A new record for visitors at Crater Lake National park is set today when the season total reached 170,469.

40 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1916
The Southern Oregon Pioneer society is planning a meeting in this city Oct. 7, for their 50th annual reunion.

50 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1906
Moving pictures of the first air mail flight to Medford, taken yesterday by H. L. Bromley of the Copco publicity department, have been dispatched to San Francisco to be developed and returned by air mail.

60 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1896
A large crowd witnessed the final day's program at the fair grounds this afternoon.

70 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1886
It is estimated that 2,000 persons visited Roseng Camp at the army last night.

80 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1876
Amos Walker announces his French Coach stallion "Vanguard" has taken first prize in his class at the state fair in Salem.

90 YEARS AGO
Sept. 16, 1866
Jackson county secures third premium in the county exhibit competition receiving a percentage of 86 out of a possible 100 points and is awarded a prize of \$200.

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

- 1. Who are the two living defeated Republican nominees for Vice President?
2. Adlai E. Stevenson inherited much stock in a successful Illinois newspaper through his mother, father, grandfather, uncle or former wife?
3. The Jewish Day of Atonement is Rosh Hashonah, Yom Kippur, Purim, Pesach or Chanukah?
4. No President has been elected in this century without carrying New York; right or wrong?
5. The Istagial is a nationalist movement in Cyprus, Morocco, Malta, Puerto Rico, Egypt or South Africa?
6. The Duke of Windsor did or didn't have a coronation as king of Great Britain?
7. President Johnson had the same initials as another president, namely — ?
The answers: 1. Chief Justice Warren and Senator Bricker. 2. Mother. 3. Yom Kippur. 4. Wrong. 5. Morocco. 6. Didn't. 7. Andrew Jackson.

Who Won Last Tuesday?

The esteemed Oregonian is having rather a hard time to interpret the recent primary and election results as outstanding victories for President Eisenhower.

The governorship race in Utah for example is cited as exhibit No. 1. In that state the amazing troglodyte J. Bracken Lee was beaten by 60-year-old George D. Clyde, the former favoring repeal of the federal income tax and refusing to pay his own and the latter eschewing all issues but one: the personal popularity of "Ike" and his coattails, which proved sufficient.

Well, that was a Republican victory of sorts, but hardly one we should think to crow about.

NO. 2 victory, according to the Oregonian, was that of Senator Wiley, former chairman of the foreign relations committee over Representative Glenn R. Davis, isolationist and McCarthyite.

If President Eisenhower had yielded to the pleas of Senator Wiley and his friends to give at least a nod of approval to the man who had so staunchly supported him and his foreign policies, there would be more cause for White House jubilation. But to do that would have enraged the McCarthyites of that state, and President Eisenhower sought refuge in the plea that he did not regard it as proper for the President of the United States to take sides in the primaries of his own party.

At the time it was freely predicted in Wisconsin this refusal of any White House endorsement would defeat Wisconsin's senior senator. But it did not.

This result we should surmise was more a personal triumph for Senator Wiley and a personal slap-in-the-face for McCarthy and McCarthyism than a notable triumph for General Eisenhower.

ACCORDING to press reports President Eisenhower did enter the state election in Maine to the extent of writing a letter to a Maine newspaper editor endorsing the congressional candidates of his party and the GOP candidate for Governor. Whether or not this was done, there is no doubt that the Republican candidates made "We like Ike" their main issue and not only was a Republican candidate for Governor beaten, but at this writing it appears one or two of the congressional GOP aspirants suffered the same fate—if so, an upset unprecedented in Maine's entire political history.

THE OREGONIAN did not find cause for Republican rejoicing in this upset but played it down by chiding Adlai Stevenson for repeating the time-honored slogan "As Maine goes so goes the nation." If Adlai said that we are sure he said it with a smile, but according to the report to this paper he only said "it indicated a Democratic trend" and naturally showed pleasure that the trend was in favor of him and his party and against the opposition.

UP to this writing the Oregonian has made no comment on the primary results in Washington state. We agree with the Oregonian, however, that in this case "it would not be wise to draw broad conclusions from such fragmentary data." But the pro-Eisenhower Oregon Journal a few blocks away did draw the conclusion from the victory of Senator Magnuson in the "popularity contest" with Governor Langlie, that the GOP better look to its political fences in that progressive and prosperous commonwealth and do it before election day comes around. We think this is sound advice.

IN SHORT the primaries—and elections—on Tuesday last did show a definite trend in favor of the Democratic party, and away from President Eisenhower, and the magic potency of his coat tails. It would however, as we view it, be as foolish to deny this, as to contend SERIOUSLY that as Maine went in September the nation is bound to go on November 6th. That would, to quote the Oregonian, also be "silly."—R.W.R.

Is Nixon a GOP Asset?

The Oregonian complains that to date the presidential campaign has been lacking in the "zippety-zoom of the party conventions."

Sayeth our favorite breakfast-table daily, quote:

"Perhaps what this political campaign needs is a little more of the zippety-zoom of the recent conventions. Certainly it is zippety dull now, with the president wearing the dignity of his office, Adlai Stevenson having been advised to eschew his quips of '52 and strike a statesmanlike pose, and humorless Wayne Morse and sobersides Douglas McKay confronting each other locally.

"The experts are saying the national campaign is a 'horse race.' Who knows, maybe race horses run faster when they're sporting lively racing colors."

Well we admit we miss the improperly termed "wise-cracks" of Adlai, so poignant, refreshing and original in the 1952 campaign, and we have often been depressed by the complete lack of humor in Mr. Douglas McKay. But we have—and still do find—the latter somewhat amusing, and in spite of the presumptive warnings of his professional advisers, Mr. Stevenson still gets in a few "asides" which show that his native wit, and sense of proportion are still there, although under wraps for the time being no doubt.

BUT we wonder if humor isn't where you find it and the Oregonian is too restricted in its search?

Take the two Salem papers for example, the Statesman and the Capital-Journal. Isn't their present juxtaposition somewhat amusing?

Did the Oregonian observe that while occupying the same building and being printed on the same press, the two papers are poles apart in editorial quality and beliefs, particularly as far as that increasingly

controversial figure, Vice President and heir-apparent Richard Nixon, is concerned?

Editor Sprague thinks the Republicans made a mistake to invite "Slick Dick" to campaign for the Republican ticket in Oregon, observing that his efforts did the party no good in 1954 and implying they will do no good this year.

THE EDITOR of the Capital-Journal takes issue with its journalistic room-mate, and lauds "Poor Richard" to the skies.

Everything that said against him, is "bogus" and the speech Mr. Nixon made in Corvallis was, quote "one of the best this writer ever heard in his life."

We don't know whether in that speech the tremolo stop was pulled out on dear little "Checkers" and the Nixons' simple but idyllic family life to alibi that \$18,000 expense fund or not, but there is no doubt that as far as speech making is concerned, the former California Senator is a second Wm. Jennings Bryan and a slicker politician. But after all, does ability to deliver a speech eloquently and persuasively, necessarily qualify one for the White House?

"The greatest speech he ever heard in his life"—that is a splendid tribute to "the gentleman from California" by the Capital-Journal editor, but it is hardly an answer to the Statesman's argument. The same remark was made about the late W. J. Bryan of Nebraska, hundreds of times, but somehow the American people regardless of party, never seemed to want him to be PRESIDENT. They didn't doubt his integrity however, as in the case of Nixon. They only doubted his judgment.

Nixon is a good talker, an excellent hand shaker, but just isn't of presidential calibre.

And this goes for many Republicans. They like to hear him talk, he is smooth as silk, plausible and eloquent. Moreover, judging by recent efforts he has abandoned his "call 'em communist" line, which for so many years was his favorite method of getting votes.

But to like to hear a man talk and approve his verbal reform is one thing—to want him as President—or next in line to the presidency—is quite another.

And in our judgment, the Salem Statesman is 100% correct, as is frequently the case, in seriously doubting the wisdom of calling on "Slick Dick" to tour Oregon to make votes for the Republican ticket.—R.W.R.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

SUEZ: THE AMERICAN VIEW

It would be a mistake for anyone in London or Paris to suppose that the American attitude on Suez is softer and more pacific than it would be if there were no national elections.



Walter Lippmann ponderant support of those who think about Suez at all is that no case exists which would justify a resort to force, and that the use of force by France and Britain alone would almost certainly involve them and the Western world in incalculable risks.

We do not believe that Nasser has as yet committed an aggression which calls for a military reprisal. We do not believe that by the reoccupation of the canal zone and the overthrow of Nasser, the vital interests of the West could be made secure. We believe that reoccupation would be the beginning of an endless and indecisive guerrilla war, a war of sabotage, sniping, ambushes, and assassinations. We think this guerrilla war would be much harder to cope with than the rebellions in Algeria and in Cyprus.

So we very much hope that we shall not be confronted with an accomplished fact, and compelled to say we cannot approve and that we must stand aside.

IN our view Nasser's rejection of the 18 nation proposal for operation by an international board was to be expected and does not justify a rupture of negotiations. It has always been evident that Nasser would refuse, and that the 18 nations would not use force to compel him to accept, the proposal for international operation of the canal. The task of diplomacy has been, and still is, to inject into Egyptian operation a reasonable and reliable measure of international influence.

There are two ways of going at this. One is to begin at the Dulles end, to propose an international board to operate the canal, and then to compromise at some point where there is Egyptian operation but important international advice, assistance, and supervision. The other way is to begin at the Nehru end, which starts with international advice and supervision, and then to negotiate for ways of making them practically effective.

It is a question whether there is a real difference, a real attainable difference, between the American and the Indian plan. If, as seems probable, international operation is impossible while international supervision would have united the London conference, it might have been

wiser to unite on the Indian plan.

THE American desire to settle the Suez dispute by negotiation is not based on the old illusion about Nasser and his ambitions, but on the conviction that the Western position in this dispute is weak and vulnerable. Great Britain and France have never before raised the question of international operation after 1948 when the company's concession is to run out. They have now raised the question before Nasser has violated their rights to the use of the canal. Our view, or at least the view of many among us, is that it is a mistake not to seize upon Nasser's offer to negotiate a modernized version of the Treaty of 1888, which guaranteed to all nations free and equal use of the canal. For this would put us in the position to hold him to account if he plays politics or profiteers.

Such a treaty, signed not only by the Western powers as in 1888 but by the new powers of Asia as well, would be something not to be regarded lightly. It would establish international rights in the Middle East on a clear political and legal foundation. Then, if there was a serious and willful violation of those rights, there would be a case—which does not now exist—for collective action.

NASSER has big and dangerous ambitions, and his seizure of the Suez Company is undoubtedly intended to be the first major overt act in his cold war against the Western power and influence in Africa and the Middle East. He was a shrewdly calculated move. He acted in an unfriendly manner. But he acted entirely within the boundaries of Egypt, and therefore, there was no military aggression. He did what he did, what under international law he had a sovereign right to do. He has, of course, gained great prestige in the Arab world. But if he will agree to an international treaty which makes explicit the international right of the users of the canal, he will not have won an unconditional victory. So far as the canal is concerned, he will have shot his bolt.

What is to happen in the oil fields and the pipe lines will happen no sooner if we negotiate such a treaty than if Britain and France, with the rest of the world standing aside, resort to force. We are on notice, however, that in the Middle East the older order is changing and that we must get ready for it, that we cannot afford to be as unprepared for other changes as we were unprepared for Suez. (Copyright New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

Breaks in the trans-ocean cables can usually be traced down by shore stations to within one-half a mile.

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

WAR OF NERVES

Washington—British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden's proposal of a "users' association" to control traffic through the Suez Canal simply serves to underline the real issue in the Suez crisis. Can the Egyptian dictator, Col. Nasser, get away with kicking the Western powers in the teeth?

Eden's proposal was not a serious proposal, in the sense that neither he nor anybody else seriously expected Nasser placidly to accept it. The proposal was, instead, another salvo in the war of nerves being fought out between the Western powers on the one hand and Egypt, with the backing of the Communist powers and the Arab states, on the other.

In this war of nerves, the objective of the British and the French, at least, is to demonstrate as publicly as possible that Nasser cannot get away with kicking the Western powers in the teeth. The British and French purpose is, at the very least, to force Nasser to perform a public backdown, and at best to get rid of him once and for all.

To this end, the British and French want to demonstrate, as a prelude to further action, that Egypt cannot run the canal. This is why the Suez Canal Company has "authorized" the non-Egyptian pilots to quit their jobs, which will have the effect of crippling canal traffic. The Eden proposal is likewise designed to put on Nasser the onus of preventing ships from passing through the international waterway.

BUT, if Nasser flatly rejects the British proposal and defies the Western powers, as everyone expects, what happens next? Eden talked of using "other means" of bringing Nasser to heel. These other means boil down to two, both exceedingly distasteful and dangerous.

One is to use economic and political methods to bring Nasser down, over a period of time, as old Mohammed Mossadegh was brought down in the end in Iran. But an attempt to bring Nasser down by starving out Egypt would alienate the whole Moslem world. Moreover, rather than quietly withering on the vine, Nasser would certainly turn to the Soviets for aid, which might well be the first step in the Sovietization of the Middle East.

The other alternative, of course, is to use troops and aircraft carriers to teach Nasser his lesson. At the very least, this would mean an ugly little war.

Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

in the Middle East, with British and French troops probably forced in the end to occupy all Egypt.

At the most, it might mean world war.

THIS ultimate danger cannot be ruled out, especially since Nikita Khrushchev has promised Egypt the help of "volunteers," if Egypt is involved in a "just war against the imperialists." Yet the British and the French governments are genuinely convinced that their vital interests will be destroyed if Nasser is allowed to get away with the canal take-over. And thus the use of British and French troops in the canal zone cannot be ruled out either.

With one eye on the election, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has been trying frantically to dissuade the British and French from resorting to force. But his position is complicated by the fact that his own kick in the teeth for Nasser inspired Nasser's counterkick. For the manner of Dulles' abrupt withdrawal of the American offer of aid to Egypt in building the Aswan High Dam—without any of the usual diplomatic niceties or delays—was nothing short of a calculated kick in the teeth.

The kick was largely the result of Congressional opposition to the dam. But it was based on a grave miscalculation—that there was nothing much that Nasser could do about it. The plain fact is that American policy in Egypt, which has contributed heavily to the present crisis, has been based on a whole series of miscalculations.

FOR example, when American Ambassador Henry Byroade reported from Cairo in the Spring of 1955 the Soviet offer of arms to Egypt, the offer was blandly written off as a bluff—which it was not. Again, when Nasser caught the American government completely off base by nationalizing the canal, it was hopefully assumed that the Soviets would be nice about it, and restrain Nasser, because "then don't want to run any really dangerous risks in the Middle East."

Instead, in Cairo Soviet Ambassador Kisselev has encouraged Nasser to go the limit. At the London conference Soviet Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov backed Nasser to the hilt. And in Moscow Khrushchev talked about Soviet "volunteers" for Nasser's "just war."

Altogether, the record of American policy in the Middle East has been less than brilliant. It may be that the British and French, in their desperation, feeling Nasser's knife across their jugulars, will resort to force despite every American effort to dissuade them. If so, the American government will bear a heavy share of responsibility for the consequences, which are incalculable.

Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

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.

From a Pioneer
To the Editor: My next-door neighbors, who are visiting in Medford, have sent me a clipping from the Mail Tribune, an editorial of Sept. 11, "The Real 1956 Issue."

I am deeply gratified, and at the same time amazed that there is any newspaper editor left in the U.S.A. who will write this sort of editorial. I do not need to tell you of the attitude of both large Portland papers.

My own father, about 1870, "took up" a small tract of land, 80 acres, in Umatilla county, 25 miles east of Pendleton. Shortly after that he married and we children arrived. My earliest recollection (I'm the youngest) is of a little home and very hard-working parents, and hard-working neighbors everywhere. Our little farm was the best of wheat land; my parents had planted an orchard of fruit trees; a spring of cold water gushed up from the garden and flowed through meadow pasture land. I believe all of the neighbors that I first knew were like my parents, the little money, but we always had the best of food. My father hauled pine wood from the foot hills of the Blue mountains for our fuel. All these pioneer people made the soil blossom, and "civilized" it for future generations. But nobody at first had any great wealth. Later, of course, some few have bought up many of the small farms. I believe my brother and I got our first "learning" in the original school house in our district.

Now I tell you all this to let you know why I so greatly approve of your editorial. There is in my mind simply NO ANALOGY between these that I knew and Douglas McKay's "Give Away." All four of my grandparents came to Oregon in 1847 and helped clear land in the Willamette Valley. There is most surely no analogy between what they got and the present "Give Away." I only speak of my ancestors because I know directly about them. The same is true of all those early pioneers.

When my neighbors get home we are going to enjoy so much discussing your editorial. And thank you again for writing anything so reasonable and fair. I can only guess that some sincere Republicans actually believe there are "favored people" who should have the cream of everything.

(Mrs.) Della P. Blaisdell
5112 N.E. 13th ave.
Portland 11, Ore.

About 'Give Aways'
To the Editor: I feel it fitting to answer local Republicans about the "give aways." They are also artists in using figures to fool the people. First, I am not against private ownership as long as they can and will do as well for the people as has government ownership. But they have not, and in building the three low level dams on the Snake river, have not given what I think is the proper consideration to our present generation, to say nothing of a short 50 years in the future.

Their sole thought is monopoly and quick profits, with a quick refund from the government to let the same taxpayers indirectly assume their investments.

And while we are on taxes, DID any private corporation ever pay any taxes? Of course not—we, the consumers, pay every cent, and we also pay a terrible fee to them only to be our tax collectors.

As to TVA, the people in that area, as the vast majority will testify, are more than satisfied; so satisfied that a local group stopped President Ike from forcing the Dixon-Yates contract down their throats. And in the same figure juggling that the boys thought we would swallow, what has been the savings to the taxpayers on cheaper power? We Democrats cannot afford TV time, but thank God we can still think clear. L. J. D. (Name on File) Ashland, Ore.

POTLUCK
(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

If you want to mail out a whole bunch of circulars or letters or something, the thing to do is to go to the post office and get a permit. Then you can print on your mailing piece basic information about the permit, dump 'em into the mail, and pay the post office in a lump sum, rather than licking all those stamps. (Ugh!)

Well, one piece of mail we got recently was sent out that way. Up in the corner where the stamp usually is, appeared the correct permit information, and the inscription: "U.S. Postage Paid."

Special tax on glue, now, maybe?

Newman Bill Jenkins, in the high desert county at Klamath Falls, advocates everyone learning how to use a bow and arrow.

"With the vast strides already made in the perfection of atomic and hydrogen bombs," he says, "we may be needing this skill one of these days."

Our Jacksonville correspondent and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Hoskins (we are informed by an anonymous source) recently completed a new, pink and white house. After it was done, they realized there was no special place provided for their two black Labrador retrievers, "Panther" and "Jet."

So the Hoskins plunged into a "dog house" project, building a miniature replica of their own house—identical in structure, roofing and color scheme.

Still another crucial decision, also involving animals, has to be made at the Hoskins residence, our informant declares. This is whether to change the name of their cat, "Miss Muffet," to "Mrs. Muffet" now that she has attained the dignity of motherhood of three fuzzy kittens.

The district attorney and his staff of two deputies and two secretaries learned, rather to their amazement, last week, in the columns of a weekly newspaper, that there are now three deputies. The DA and his staff are in a flurry of curiosity about the "third deputy," wondering what his name is, what he looks like, and why no one ever sees him.

Parking meters, at best, are only an uneasy solution to the problem of keeping things moving down town. Witness the distress of a woman we watched from our office window last week.

She parked across the street, got out, and started toward the parking meter with a penny in hand. But a car and trailer had parked in front of her, and the trailer took up about half of her parking space. Not realizing this, she saw only that there was no meter by her right front fender. She walked to the rear of the car, and found a meter half-way between her car's rear door and rear bumper. She then walked back to the front to make sure there was still no meter there. There wasn't.

She passed a moment in what looked like puzzled meditation, then walked stiffly to the rear of her car, deposited the penny in the meter for the space left behind her car, and walked determinedly away.

A man was walking down the street the other day with a toddling girl, obviously his small daughter, trailing behind him. She trailed further and further behind, which he knew without looking, in the way of fathers, and he held out his hand saying, "Come here, honey."

He then looked around and found he was reaching for the hand of a third pedestrian, female, aged about 20.

Each day a reporter calls the weather bureau to get data on the climate and the forecast. The efficient weathermen are usually ready for his call, and start right out with the forecast for Western Oregon.

Last week the reporter called, and the weatherman started out: "A bit windy today..." The reporter copied it down dutifully, and read it back.

"Whoops—" the weatherman "I meant the wording, not the weather, was windy."

A young man we know spent an evening last week going from door to door on Winchester ave. to remind people that Oct. 5 is the deadline for registering to vote. As he reminded them, he earned the title "The Pied Piper of Winchester" by collecting a following of three dogs, two cats and about eight children.

LADIES! HEAR THIS
Seneca, S.C.—(U.P.)—A gentleman in nearby Honea Path believes in the power of advertising as witness the following ad in the current issue of the weekly Seneca Journal: "Would like a nice reliable wife between the ages of 24 and 35. I have a nice home, nice income, don't drink, smoke, am good church member. Contact Box 142, Honea Path, S.C."