

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North First St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. Ruhl, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
Gerald Latham, Business Manager
ERIC ALLEN, JR., Managing Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHAPMAN, Telegraph Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
DALE STARCHER, Society Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Manager

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 \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00
Daily and Sunday—Three months \$4.50
Sunday Only—One year \$4.50

By Carrier—In Advance: Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent, and on motor route
Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00
Daily and Sunday—Three months \$4.50
Carrier and Dealers—10c per copy. All Terms Cash in Advance

Official Paper of the City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press—Full Leased Wire
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

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

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
AFFILIATE MEMBER

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
1955

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

Nov. 4, 1946 (Monday)
Southern Pacific passenger service from San Francisco to southern Oregon will be speeded up 50 minutes.
From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: The bakers are now making larger loaves of bread, and holes in the doughnuts.

20 YEARS AGO

Nov. 4, 1936 (Wednesday)
Jackson County votes overwhelmingly against all measures on the ballot Tuesday.
For the 10th straight month in 1936, building permits in Oregon rose substantially over the figures for the same month a year ago.

30 YEARS AGO

Nov. 4, 1926 (Thursday)
City administration's budget for 1927 year's operating expenses adopted by city council.
City council passes resolution to sell \$425,000 in bonds Dec. 14, to complete building and equipping new waterworks system.

40 YEARS AGO

Nov. 4, 1916 (Saturday)
Mail Tribune is taking a straw vote in Medford, Ashland, Talent, Phoenix, Central Point and Gold Hill to ascertain sentiment in the county.
President Wilson in campaign address charges opponents with "coercing working people" by spreading alarms.

50 YEARS AGO

Nov. 4, 1866 (Sunday)
White and Trowbridge company, Medford, will receive three carloads of cement tomorrow.
More than 1,500,000 tons of steel rails have been ordered by the railroads for delivery during 1907, and within a short time orders for as many more tons will be placed with the various mills.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 77? Cop. 1955 Editorial Research Report

1. New York voted for Eisenhower over Stevenson four years ago by a relatively wide or thin margin?
 2. The average American gets (a) 2, (b) 6, (c) 10 or (d) 15 colds a year?
 3. In the last 10 years U.S. membership in the Masonic order has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?
 4. State with "Land of Opportunity" on its car tags is Arkansas, California, Michigan, New York or Pennsylvania?
 5. President Eisenhower is or isn't the first Republican President to appoint a Democrat to the Supreme Court?
 6. The Cotton Bowl is in Atlanta, Dallas, Miami, New Orleans, Los Angeles or Houston?
 7. Music of "Show Boat" was composed by Oscar Hammerstein, Oscar Straus, George Gershwin, Ira Gershwin, Jerome Kern, or Franz Lehár?
- The answers: 1. Wide Margin.
2. Six is average. 3. Increased.
4. Arkansas. 5. Isn't. 6. Dallas.
7. Kern.

Edwards, N.Y. — (UPI) — Miss Margaret Rude and James A. Rider were married in the Methodist church and immediately after the ceremony, Miss Rude's grandmother, Mrs. Eva Miller, was married to Leslie W. Hartle.

Candidate Recommendations

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT. Vote 102, Stevenson and Kefauver.

U. S. SENATOR. Vote 104, Wayne Morse (incumbent).

U. S. CONGRESS. Vote 106, Charles Porter.

GOVERNOR. Vote 107, Robert D. Holmes.

SECRETARY OF STATE. Vote 110, Monroe Sweetland.

STATE TREASURER. Vote 112, Sig Unander.

ATTORNEY GENERAL. Vote 114, Robert Thornton.

FOR CITY MAYOR. Vote 119, John W. Snider.

FOR COUNCILMAN, Ward I, Vote 137, James Dunlevy.

STATE REPRESENTATIVES. Vote 117 for Littrell and 116 for Duncan.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Vote 119, Walter Nunley (incumbent).

COUNTY ASSESSOR. Vote 121, Allen D. Curry.

COUNTY COMMISSIONER. Vote 123, Ralph A. James.

COUNTY TREASURER. Vote 125, Karl Janouch (incumbent).

Following its long established custom the Mail Tribune announces herewith its preferences for public office, national, state and local.

As remarked so often before our preferences are merely preferences and should not be taken, particularly in the state and local field, as casting any reflection upon the character or abilities of their opponents.

This paper simply prefers the candidates mentioned and for one outstanding reason, to-wit:

We believe that under EXISTING conditions, they are best qualified to perform their duties as we think they should be performed in the interest of the people, local, state and national as the case may be.

And that opinion, we admit, has been modified in this election somewhat by a general weariness of the old ingrained habit of this state, to send the same crowd—or more accurately, perhaps, the same political type—to Washington and Salem year after year.

We are fed up with that blind type of "follow the party leaders." We would like to see the voters of Oregon turn over a new leaf and retain genuine "independents and high ability" like Senator Morse, and some new and younger blood. We would like, in short, to see a change in political values pretty much all around.

Whether we will or not—remains to be seen. If our policy were merely to pick the probable winners the selections above would be very different. But that is not our policy this year and never has been in the past.

Our policy is to select the candidates who under existing conditions seem best qualified for the positions to which they aspire, regardless of the party label and let the chips—and the pop bottles—fall where they may.

AS TO the presidency and vice presidency it is hardly necessary to elaborate upon what we have said during the campaign.

"We like Ike" but we don't like him with his party and his exceedingly vulnerable vice president for four more years. We prefer Stevenson and Kefauver and firmly believe that if the former is elected he will prove to be one of the most intelligent, perceptive and courageous presidents the country has ever had. There are many factors involved in this decision but we have mentioned them so many times in the past we see no need to repeat them now.

So on to the race for U.S. Senator.

If we haven't given sufficient reasons why we are 100 per cent for Wayne Morse to stay where he is, and his opponent to stay where he is—in his automobile office in Salem—we fear nothing we might offer now would make up the deficiency.

Wayne Morse is our idea of what a Senator from Oregon SHOULD be—a man with a brilliant mind, a strong fighting heart, and absolute dedication at all times to what he believes best for his state and nation regardless of the party label. We have no personal feeling against his opponent but as we see it, he is—to be guilty again of some understatement—simply not in the same statesman-like class, is in fact one of the weakest candidates for high office the Republican party has ever offered. He would no more think of fighting for a principle in which he believed contrary to the orders from Republican "GHQ" than he would think of jumping off the Washington monument into the Potomac river if he could get there. His theory is "My party, may it always be right, but my party right or wrong."

There are some who want that sort of blind partisan fealty in the Senate—in the House for that matter, also—well they can have it—if they can get it. We don't!

In fact we regard that placing of party above principle, what may be best for some political organization above what IS best for the country, one of the greatest perils to the success and perpetuation of our democracy and its free institutions. So our support goes as it has for over a decade to Wayne Morse.

FOR not identical but similar reasons we oppose the reelection of Harris Ellsworth to the House of Representatives as we have—and without success—for many years. Just as we like Ike but don't want him and his party in control for four more years

so we like Harris—have nothing against him personally in any way—but we DON'T like him as a perpetual uninsurable representative of the Fourth District year after year, for the very simple reason we don't believe in the principles in which he believes from "creeping socialism" through "McCarthyism" to whitewashing "Al Sarena." Not believing in his principles, naturally we oppose him, and believing in the political principles in which Charles Porter, his opponent, believes, just as naturally we favor him.

SO WE come to the governorship. Well here again, using the same criteria State Senator Robert Holmes of Astoria, as we see it, wins over temporary—and accidental—Governor Elmo Smith by several laps. The former is simply the better man and if elected will make, we feel certain, one of the most enlightened, capable and progressive state executives in recent history. It is difficult to tell from his speeches how Acting Governor Smith stands on any issues, state or national, he has changed so often, whereas Senator Holmes has been clear-cut and definite from the outset. We don't happen to agree with him on Measure No. 1 but there are definitely two sides to that question and only future events can determine exactly which, from the standpoint of the best system of state taxation, is preferable.

BOTH Monroe Sweetland and Mark Hatfield are well qualified for the position of Secretary of State, and our preference for the first named is not based on partisan lines, but on the fact we would like a new deal at Salem, and Sweetland would do his part in supplying it. Sig Unander, Republican, and present incumbent on the other hand, is so much better fitted to carry on the duties of treasurer, that we think the voters of Oregon should retain him, and believe they will.

ATTORNEY General Thornton, formerly of Medford, and well known in Jackson county, has been under fire during most of his administration, and has formidable opposition, but most of the things said against him are really to his credit, and on his record of honesty, courage and independence he should also, we believe, be kept right where he is.

SO WE come to the local field and to everyone's relief—including our own—to the final lap.

We admit the human race will still go on and the earth continue to revolve on its axis regardless of the individuals who may be elected to the state legislature or to the local offices. However, we do have preferences, and it is the duty of a newspaper in such circumstances to state them. So we have done so. We have chosen Al Littrell on the ground of legislative experience and business ability, and Robert Duncan because of his promise—he is young, able, aggressive and intelligent, and if elected we predict will prove to be one of the most effective representatives in Salem, that this county has had for many years.

Again as we pointed out above, these selections are not to be interpreted as casting any reflection on their opponents, in fact in one case as far as this department is concerned, it was a photo-finish.

Finally our nod goes to John W. Snider for Mayor and to Jimmy Dunlevy, for the Council. If they are not elected we will send condolences, NOT to them, but to the city.

IN READING over the above we can find no comment on our selection of Walter Nunley for District Attorney—one reason perhaps being that such support in view of the record should be taken for granted. We fought hard for Nunley when the gambling issue was involved, we supported him in the primary, and know that he is far better fitted for this important job now than ever before. But as before he is faced with bitter and curiously vindictive opposition. But we have every confidence he will win, and for one chief reason, because the people of the county don't wish to turn the clock back in that department and go through another costly period of contention, reorganization and confusion. Let well enough alone should be the motto and keep Nunley where he is.—R.W.R.

Measure Recommendations

- No. 1: Vote "yes"
- No. 2: Vote "yes"
- No. 3: Vote "yes"
- No. 4: Vote "yes"
- No. 5: Vote "yes"
- No. 6: Vote "yes"
- No. 7: Vote "yes"

Non-Partisan ballot:

Write in name of Wm. McAllister of Medford for State Supreme Court, No. 301. The other candidates and present incumbents are unopposed for the State Supreme Court or District Court and County School Superintendent. So no recommendations are needed,—just mark the names on the ballot.

Local Measures

- No. 51—"yes."
 - No. 52—"yes."
 - No. 53—"yes."
 - No. 54—"yes."
 - No. 55—"yes."
 - No. 56—"yes."
- Annexation proposals to be voted on by residents of Berrydale and Grandview - Kehwood districts—"yes."—E.A.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

DISASTER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Although this government was not consulted, it knew toward the end of last week that Israel was mobilizing, it believed that this meant a serious military action, and it had at least an informed guess that this would not be happening without Paris and London knowing about it.

When the Egyptian Army struck on Monday, the President and his advisors decided, quite rightly, to take the affair to the U.N. But there were two ways of taking it to the U.N. and they chose the wrong one. One was to seize the whole border problem, to recognize that it is a two-sided problem, and to call for measures to restrain the Egyptian raids as well as the Israeli reprisals. The other way was the one which the President and Secretary Dulles took. This was to ignore the Egyptian raids, to treat Israel as the aggressor and Egypt as the innocent victim.

This was a grave mistake of policy, indefensible in principle and in fact entirely unrealistic and impracticable.

IT WAS indefensible to ignore, and thus condone, the extreme provocation of the Egyptian raids. The resolution which Mr. Lodge submitted to the U.N. would, had it been adopted, have guaranteed the Egyptians behind their frontier but not the Israelis behind theirs. It would have made Egyptian territory a United Nations sanctuary from which the fedayeen raiders could operate without fear of reprisal.

Almost certainly the explanation of this policy decision is that those in authority did not realize what it meant, that there was a little panic in Washington and that there was no cool deliberation.

Had there been how could the makers of this policy have failed to see that Britain and France, which are in a bitter cold war with Nasser, could never conceivably support a policy so one-sidedly favorable to Nasser? I would have supposed that anyone could have foreseen what happened—that if we forced the issue we would

get a veto by our allies and support from the Soviet Union.

WHAT caused the explosion? The sequence of events shows, I think that Col. Nasser, convinced that he had won his fight over Suez, moved on promptly to work out another step in his grandiose plans to become the master of the Arab world. While the Suez crisis was hot Nasser suspended his war against Israel and there were no raids. When the Suez crisis had passed, the raids began again, accompanied by military measures to bring Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon within Nasser's orbit.

His behavior convinced the Israelis that they could not live with him. It convinced the British and the French that not only would they get nowhere with him in a Suez negotiation but that he was their implacable enemy throughout North Africa and the Middle East. Had Nasser been reasonable, moderate, and statesmanlike after his victory in the Suez affair, this explosion would probably not have occurred. But he is the typical aggressor-dictator who will not stop until he is stopped. That is why once again a policy of appeasement has failed to preserve the peace.

FOR the time being this country has no policy in the Middle East. The policy on which we operated is in ruins. It was to restrain Britain, France, and Israel from using force—which was a most desirable objective.

But what this policy has lacked was any constructive plan—such as might have been developed out of the Indian proposals—which looked toward a settlement in the Middle East. The result was that we restrained the British, the French and the Israelis, but not Nasser. This led to the explosion which has blown our Middle Eastern policy to bits.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S formula as a peace-maker has been to stop the shooting and, without working out a settlement, to have both sides accept the status quo.

Why has the formula not worked this time? Because this time there was Nasser who does not and will not accept the status quo, who is so great a disturber of the peace that those who are hurt by him cannot take it forever.

Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

WHO'S TO BLAME? Washington—This city, which has seen a good many extremes in political behavior, has never witnessed such an exhibition of pique and anger as the Anglo-French-Israeli action against Egypt has touched off.

At one moment, the highest American policy-makers actually played with the astonishing idea of ordering the American Sixth Fleet to oppose the Anglo-French landings on the Egyptian coast. Calmer counsels prevailed, however; yet besides joining the Soviet Union against our own allies in the United Nations, the leaders of the Administration have shown their displeasure in other, even more direct ways.

On Tuesday afternoon, for example, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles called in the French Ambassador, Herve Alphand, and gave him the kind of lecture that an old-fashioned schoolmaster might give to a juvenile delinquent.

Dulles told Alphand that the Anglo-French action against Egypt in conjunction with Israel marked the darkest day in the history of the Western alliance. He predicted that it might even mark the end of the alliance itself. He argued that the attack on Egypt risked a general war. With particular emphasis, he complained bitterly of the failure of the British and French governments to tell the American government about their intentions; he declared that this silence had placed him personally in an "impossible" position. And he wound up by intimating that our allies had been acting like Russians.

THIS Dulles' outburst underlines the vital fact that there are two questions to be asked about what has happened in Egypt.

The first question is whether the British, French and Israelis ought to have done it at all. Incredible risks are being run by all three countries. Their leaders have decided that those risks were less serious than the risk to their most vital national interests of allowing Egypt's Col. Nasser to become unchallenged cock of the walk in the Middle East. Only the outcome can tell whether their estimate was correct.

As to the second question, which has to do with the future of the Western alliance rather than the future of the Middle East, it is the question whether the rage in Washington against the French and British is really justified by their behavior.

It is clear that the Anglo-French-Israeli attack on Egypt was carefully concerted in advance. It is probably wrong that the Israelis attacked first because the other two powers encouraged them to do so. In any case, the Israelis need no encouragement. It has always been clear that Israel would end by fighting, before allowing Nasser a final triumph. And it is above all clear that while the British, French and Israelis were concerting their plan, they kept the American government wholly in the dark and did this, furthermore, by design.

WERE they, then, justified in keeping us in the dark? The answer perhaps lies in their reason for doing so, which was their conviction that the American government had already behaved towards them with something really very like perfidy. The Suez crisis itself was made in Washington, by Secretary Dulles' arrogantly brutal withdrawal of the Aswan Dam offer, which he had previously pressed the British so hard to join in. The immediate responsibility for starting the trouble lay right here.

On top of this, the subsequent history of the Suez crisis has been a history of repeated British and French decisions not to take immediate steps on their own, because of American promises which were then promptly broken. At the first London Conference on Suez, Secretary of State Dulles promised strong, unqualified American support for the scheme to internationalize the canal. But he withdrew that support as soon as the mission headed by Prime Minister Menzies ran into trouble in Cairo.

BEFORE the second Suez conference, Secretary Dulles himself took the initiative in proposing a canal users association with teeth in it. He pointed proudly to the teeth in his first communications to Paris and London. But within four hours after his arrival in London, the teeth were thrown away, and again by Secretary Dulles himself. Finally, the salvage of the second London meeting was a residual scheme for employing the users association as an instrument of gradual economic

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Stock market notes: Stocks on the New York exchange rebounded Thursday making substantial recovery by noon from the sharp drop that squeezed two billion dollars out of the value of listed securities.

Leading issues throughout the entire list posted gains of fractions to around a point—and in some cases more.

COMMODITY market notes: In very active dealings, grain prices dropped on the Chicago Board of Trade this morning. Selling entered the market after three days of advancing prices.

Today's selling of grains was based on the belief that the fighting in the Middle East may be localized and that we'll keep out of it.

WHY is that significant? It works like this: When war seems imminent, stock prices tend to fall. The modern world has learned that war is bad for business.

But—When war seems imminent, GRAIN PRICES TEND TO RISE because of all-out shooting war means increased demand for food.

WHAT is that saying? Yesterday war seemed imminent, so shrewd traders sold stocks and bought grain. Today war seems LESS imminent, so shrewd traders are BUYING stocks and SELLING grain.

HERE is a thought that is important right now: If you live in Oregon and believe in Ike and think his policies are sound and statesmanlike and will keep us out of war if anything can, you shouldn't vote for Senator Morse next Tuesday.

You should remember that back in March of 1953 Senator Morse said: "I gave absolutely no confidence in him (President Eisenhower) and I am completely lacking in all political morality." In my judgment, he is the most dangerous man who will ever have been in the White House.

PRESIDENT Eisenhower isn't our whole government. He is only our President. If his policies are to prevail, he must have back of him a congress that will SUPPORT his policies.

In view of what he said so flatly back in 1953 when he hadn't yet turned his coat and was still masquerading as a Republican—I think it must be taken for granted that Senator Morse, if he is re-elected, will oppose President Eisenhower's policies at every turn of the road.

And it mustn't be forgotten that the next state may be so narrowly divided that Senator Morse's vote may decide whether President Eisenhower's policies WILL prevail or WON'T prevail.

AT THIS point, I'd like to make a personal statement. I have voted for Senator Morse every time he has been a candidate. I can't vote for him this year. Too much is at stake.

pressure on Egypt, by denying Col. Nasser most of the canal revenue.

Then, when this third scheme had to be implemented, Secretary Dulles explained that he would of course encourage American shippers using the canal to pay their fees to the users' association—but only if the bulk of the money was then paid over to the Egyptian government.

At this point the British and French lost their tempers, finally and for good. By design, the United States was told nothing about what had inspired at the ensuing meeting between Sir Anthony Eden, Guy Mollet and their Foreign Ministers, at which they decided to take military action against Egypt.

THE breakdown in communication was immediately known in Washington. Over ten days ago, for example, a report came from London that the British government had reserved radio time for an important public announcement. The highest American policy-makers became greatly alarmed, because they feared, probably correctly, that the British were thinking about ordering their Ambassador and all other remaining nationals out of Egypt as a preliminary to war. But perhaps there was fear of an angry answer, recapitulating the previous history of the Suez crisis. At any rate, the leaders of the American government apparently did not dare put the straight question to their British opposite numbers: "Just what's up?"

The British and French have been weak, certainly, in their dealings with Washington. It was weak not to choose their own course much earlier, instead of being lured down bypaths by Secretary Dulles' ever-changing proposals. It was weak and foolish, too, not to tell the American government that they were breaking off communications and that they were doing so, in plain and even rude terms.

In judging our allies' behavior to us, it is well to remember our prior behavior to them.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.