

THE ELECTION ... And You

(The following space is made available on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Sundays during the election campaign to the two major political parties so that they may publish, without charge, material concerning the presidential election. Offerings are limited to 400 words, must have the approval of the county chairman of the party, and must be submitted not later than 2 p.m. the day before publication on week days, at 11 a.m. Saturdays for Sunday publication.)

DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT

Richard M. Nixon, not President Eisenhower, is the basic issue in the present presidential campaign, and the people of the United States, yes, the voters of Jackson County, might just as well face up to that fact.

Vice President Richard Nixon has already taken charge of the Republican party. Without denial it has been reported that it was Nixon who told President Eisenhower that he must campaign harder, that he must go before the voters of the United States, that he must put on a "show of strength," despite the fact that he has suffered two major illnesses in a single year. It is Nixon, with his ambition, his drive, his strength, who is calling the dance of the Republican party.

And how many Republicans are there in Oregon, in Jackson County, and in insignificant ones, who held their noses prior to the primaries in fear that Nixon would be the vice-presidential nominee of the Republican Party? There were many of them. They cannot forget what they said.

Richard Nixon's ambitions know no bounds. He was forced to take charge of the presidential campaign for two reasons. The campaign was without a leader, and Nixon stepped into the void to further his own ambitions, which are to take charge of the country. Nixon has taken charge of the campaign in a definite and forceful manner, as evidenced by President Eisenhower's dancing to Nixon's music.

You must remember, that all of Nixon's ambitions depend entirely upon the reelection of Dwight Eisenhower. Within Nixon's grasp is the presidency.

ONLY 42
Shopping Days
Till Christmas!

What
A Problem!



More friends than funds?
Don't worry, you can
get ready

CASH FOR
CHRISTMAS

at

PACIFIC
INDUSTRIAL

Dick Hans, Manager

16 S. Central • Ph. 3-5308

Why Do You Ignore
The Issues, Mr. Nunley?

What about your hidden tape recorders?
Your disregard of the Bill of Rights?
The J. P. Cating payments and report?
The fabulous increases in your budget?
Aren't the voters entitled to explanations of these matters?

VOTE 120-X
Thomas J. Reeder
DEMOCRAT
for DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Democratic Party of Jackson County, Larry Sheehan, Chairman

Editor Gives Fanciful View of Fluoridation Defeat in California

(Editor's note: How do other cities and other newspapers view the "fluoridation fight"? The matter came up in Watsonville, Calif., in 1954, and Frank F. Orr, editor of the Register-Pajaronian, commented on it in a fanciful but dead-serious editorial. It took the form of an "article" from the Readers Digest of "September, 1950." Excerpts from that editorial are reprinted here with the permission of the Register-Pajaronian.)

WILL IT HAPPEN HERE? From the Readers Digest Issue of Sept. 1950

This is the case history of one city that rejected fluoridation. Almost every city in the United States today is reaping the benefits of fluoridation. We tend to forget, so universally accepted is the program now, that a decade ago, tooth decay was one of the most prevalent diseases in the United States with a staggering annual cost of treatment. Its ravages ate at the very foundation of our national defense; more inductees were rejected for bad teeth than for any other single cause. Truly, bad teeth was a national disease of great magnitude.

Now, thanks to fluoridation, the end is in sight: Tooth decay is being cut in half, and so are our dental bills. We are producing a nation of healthier children who will grow into healthier adults.

A Few Rejoice

Strangely enough, there are still a half dozen cities in the United States which continue to reject fluoridation. One of these is Watsonville, Calif., a small city tucked away on the fertile coastal plain 90 miles south of San Francisco.

What happened in Watsonville? Why do its citizens, while chanting, "We Must Keep Our Water Pure," continue to deny the proven benefits of fluoridation to their children?

To find out, let's crank the time machine back to May, 1954.

That was the month that fluoridation, as a program for prevention of tooth decay, was first introduced by the over-worked dentists of the community. At first, there was no significant opposition. One community service group after another, after hearing how it had helped other communities, supported it. Everybody seemed to think it was a good thing.

Doesn't Last

This was not to last. Almost overnight, an unprecedented campaign of hate and fear was launched, and it spread its tentacles throughout the community. Its purpose was to scare; its techniques were many and varied.

The noise and heat of this campaign got people to doubting. Were they being sold a bill of goods by the fluoridationists? Who would profit from all this? This fluoride is poisonous, isn't it?

The seeds of doubt were planted. It was easier not to approve than it was to approve a question which had brought so much controversy. And when the citizens went to the polls, they voted fluoridation down.

No Ill Effects

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.

Editor's note: No Communications on political subjects will be printed on Tuesday, election day. Because of the quantity of pre-election letters, it will be impossible to print them all, but an attempt is being made to select those which are representative, and which furnish a fresh viewpoint on the matters being discussed.

For Clean Law Enforcement

To the Editor: The readers of Jackson County newspapers will note that the advertisements for the Democratic DA candidate look quite familiar—it seems we are to be deluged with the same literature, "facts," and personalities that composed the unsuccessful campaign of the defeated Republican primary candidates for this office. It is unfortunate

political consideration, and when he is re-elected next Tuesday, Nov. 6, it is only fair that we send him men with the same moral convictions and integrity.

They voted "no" although millions of citizens throughout the United States had been drinking fluoridated water, some of them for generations, without ill effects.

They voted "no," even though most of their children's teeth showed evidence of the ravages of decay.

They voted "no" to the advice of every recognized medical, dental and public health group in the country and, instead, heeded the voices of the fear peddlers.

They voted "no" because they feared it was mass medication, although fluoridation in helping to build strong teeth prevents decay, not cures it.

They voted "no" because they didn't want to force it on their unwilling neighbors, although the courts had held under the first amendment that a small group had no constitutional right to deny to the community as a whole the benefits of such a program.

They voted "no" because if the city's drinking water had been good enough for their fathers, it was good enough for their children (and doesn't father still have his original teeth?). They didn't stop to realize that their fathers did not eat the same food, nor did they gulp down sweets every day of the week.

Fearful Cost

They voted "no" because they feared the cost would be too high, even though it had been shown that it would take many years before the cost to the individual would come anywhere near the cost of filling just one tooth.

They voted "no" because they felt there were other ways for children to receive fluorides, although no practical or inexpensive way had been suggested, up to then.

They voted "no" because they felt fluoridation violated individual rights, although the courts had held this not to be true.

They voted "no" because they feared the slow poisoning of the community's adult population, although scientific studies had shown no difference in the death rates from disease of people living in fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

They voted "no" because they feared their teeth would become mottled, although there was no competent medical evidence that this would occur.

And in some cases, they voted "no" against their own convictions, because they were afraid. Who were the losers? They were their own children and the children for generations to come.

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.

Editor's note: No Communications on political subjects will be printed on Tuesday, election day. Because of the quantity of pre-election letters, it will be impossible to print them all, but an attempt is being made to select those which are representative, and which furnish a fresh viewpoint on the matters being discussed.

Editor's note: No Communications on political subjects will be printed on Tuesday, election day. Because of the quantity of pre-election letters, it will be impossible to print them all, but an attempt is being made to select those which are representative, and which furnish a fresh viewpoint on the matters being discussed.

For Clean Law Enforcement

To the Editor: The readers of Jackson County newspapers will note that the advertisements for the Democratic DA candidate look quite familiar—it seems we are to be deluged with the same literature, "facts," and personalities that composed the unsuccessful campaign of the defeated Republican primary candidates for this office. It is unfortunate

political consideration, and when he is re-elected next Tuesday, Nov. 6, it is only fair that we send him men with the same moral convictions and integrity.

able one. Why advertise a partial report unless to accomplish the aim of a devious result? Half-truths have no place in a law enforcement office.

If any voter will investigate other charges made against District Attorney Nunley, he will find the truth is with Nunley. A public office-holder, doing a good job, should not have to contend with this type of character assassination, which is a blot on the ideals that founded our great nation. Nunley's public record plainly shows the most efficient, effective law enforcement in the last 25 years in Jackson County.

This letter will make it evident that all the voters have not taken the bait, and we are confident that the election will show a clear victory with Democrats and Republicans voting for clean law enforcement and Walter Nunley, as they did in 1952.

Mr. and Mrs. John Benson
Box 1175
Medford, Ore.

Vote for Nunley

To the Editor: A recent news release (Mail Tribune, Oct. 19, 1956) stated that a poll conducted by the Jackson County Bar Association indicated that 36 of 54 ballots returned preferred Reader and 15 preferred Nunley for District Attorney.

It is not deemed proper to condemn the learned attorneys of our area for their action. Whenever we are able to select our competition we always prefer an opponent we can subdue easily or one whose actions we can influence to gain our own ends.

The preferential ballot forces the undersigned to believe Walter F. Nunley to be the man most capable and best suited to conduct the duties of District Attorney for the next four years.

It is not known whether gambling interests or other small pressure groups are boosting for the election of Tom Reeder, but it is known by all who read our local paper that Walter Nunley has conducted the duties of his office in a highly satisfactory manner for the best interests of all the people in Jackson County. Nunley doesn't play favorites, and that is a quality to be much admired in a person in public office.

Dan F. Krotz II,
Route 1, Box 315
Eagle Point, Ore.

The Man Who Walked Alone

To the Editor: Here is a young man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another village. He worked in a car-wash until he was 30, and then for three years he was an itinerant preacher. He never wrote a book. He never held an office. He never owned a home. He never had a family. He never went to college. He never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He never did one of the things that usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but himself!

While he was still a young man, the tide of public opinion turned against him. His friends ran away. He was turned over to his enemies, and put through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. While he was dying, his executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had on earth, and that was his coat. When he was dead, he was laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend.

Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone, and today he is the central figure of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that were ever built, and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this earth as has that One Solitary Life.

I think, with election day drawing so near, that we all ought to ask this One Solitary Life for guidance, vision, and wisdom of choice. If we do this in all sincerity, faith will tell us that this divine power will always bless our nation.

Ken Corliss
1564 Myers Lane
Medford, Ore.

Can't Use Parks

To the Editor: Concerning the off-street parking measure to be presented to voters of Medford on November 6 there is a question in many minds concerning its location. It is understandable

Sunday, November 4, 1956

MEDFORD (OREGON) MAIL TRIBUNE—FIVE

that certain speculation in real estate might result from a premature announcement of the exact site of such parking. However, if voters could be assured that there is no intention of sacrificing present city park lands for the project, many who are now in doubt concerning the desirability of the project would vote for it with greater confidence.

It was only a few years ago that the shady strip on Front Street was converted to parking to the regret of many of the city's residents and visitors.

While speaking of parks, I should like to say that I have heard many persons speak in enthusiastic concurrence with the suggestion made in a Mail Tribune editorial that the banks of Bear Creek be someday developed as an extension of the city's park system. Provided, of course, that this strip is not used

for Highway 99, it would certainly provide a picnic area and playground which would be within easy reach of any part of the city. It would also make an excellent route for a bridle path that would be safer for our many young riders than the paved busy roads to which most of them

(Continued on Page Six)

SAWDUST
Phone 2-8277
McGinty Fuel Co.

Use Tribune Want Ads

VOTE

FOR MAYOR — 2 YEAR TERM

128 X PAUL J. SELBY

Pd. Pol. Adv.

Selby for Mayor Committee

The TRUTH About the "UNQUALIFIED?" Endorsement by the A.M.A. on Fluoridation!

Proponents for Fluoridation have often stated that the American Medical Assn. wholeheartedly endorsed Fluoridation. The following letter by the chairman of that committee refutes that claim!

MEDICAL ASSOCIATES OF PAWTUCKET

166 Pawtucket Avenue
Pawtucket, Rhode Island
Pawtucket 3-4141

Staff
Charles L. Farrell, M.D.
Robert G. Hayes, M.D.

October 16, 1954

Martin J. Kaufman
Business Consultant

Dr. George L. Waldbott,
2930 W. Grand Boulevard
Detroit 2, Michigan

Dear Dr. Waldbott:

I received your article on Fluoridation. I was very much interested in reading it.

Inasmuch as I was Chairman of the Public Health Committee of the American Medical Association which, in Los Angeles brought in a resolution approving fluoridation of water supply "in principle," I think you might like to know some background of that action.

I studied dentistry before I did medicine and I am a graduate registered dentist and, although I have not practiced dentistry, I am aware of the activities of dentists in general. I am not enthusiastic about fluoridation. I was instructed by the Council of Rhode Island Medical Society to survey the field and that I did a few years ago and sent in a Report to the Council which recommended at that time that, while the fluoridation seemed to have merit, they could well wait the results of the controlled studies then in progress before committing themselves on the subject. The Council accepted that decision but the House of Delegates, under pressure from the local District Dental Society, went along "in principle."

When I was made Chairman of the Committee in Los Angeles at the A.M.A. there were two resolutions, before us which would have made the A.M.A. strongly support, completely endorse and go on record as extolling the virtues and benefits of fluoridation. These were submitted by Wisconsin and Connecticut. The Commissioner of Health in Connecticut appeared for this resolution and a member of the Committee was a member of the United States Public Health Service. The Committee was also given a great deal of literature which it had no time to properly evaluate—all in support of fluoridation.

We were faced with two State Associations thoroughly conversant with fluoridation, quite happy in its application, and determined to have the A.M.A. support it. I fully recognized that in the House of Delegates there would be no opposition—at least no organized opposition—and no one, in the "House" well informed, or thoroughly enough informed, to stand up on the floor and lead the fight against the adoption of fluoridation proposals.

Therefore, we were faced with alternatives—accepting the proposals or rejecting them—and thus having a fight on our hands on the floor of the House which unquestionably we would lose because the subject at that time was not of such prime importance as to excite the Delegates for further information, and with vociferous supports and feeble or negligible opposition, the A.M.A. might have been committed to a program of certification which it might later regret.

I proposed, therefore, a substitute for the two resolutions. I boldly worded one which endorsed the fluoridation, in principle, inasmuch as the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry had, at that time, decided such treatment was not toxic. This I felt was the lesser of the two evils. The resolution passed the House. I was able to convince the Public Health men on the Committee and the Commissioner of Public Health in Connecticut that this would not commit the A.M.A. to complete endorsement but would say in essence that so far as we know, there was no harm at the moment and it seemed to have merit. That is as far as the A.M.A. was willing to go.

I have no doubt that there are many things to be said against fluoridation but so far the opponents of fluoridation has been in the minority. They have allowed the Dental Societies to pressurize the local medical groups into support of their stand.

In the City of Providence I, as a representative of the Rhode Island Medical Society attended a hearing in the Mayor's office and the dentists were quite vociferous in demanding fluoridation. The Mayor asked me what our attitude was and I said that we were not prepared to endorse it at the present time. However we were not in a position to actively oppose it in the light of our limited knowledge of the subject. We thought that it could well wait until the studies were completed. The City of Providence, however, went ahead with plans for fluoridation.

I am writing you just to set the record straight. I am still open minded but I am inclined to feel that fluoridation is not without its dangers. I suggest that you and your group continue the work until statistical evidence and support of your position is more general.

Another objection I have to fluoridation of water is that it is not the province of the State to do something for us that is "good for us." The State has a right only to introduce foreign bodies into water supply or to take such other measures as is for the prevention of spread of disease and the protection of the community as a whole.

Very sincerely yours,
Charles L. Farrell, M.D.

CLF:m

Keep Our Water PURE

VOTE "NO" on NUMBER 56

Anti Fluoridation Committee

212 Leverette Bldg.

Pd. Pol. Adv.

RE-ELECT
Nelle W. Burns

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

★ Over 13 years experience as Judge
★ Many years business experience!
★ Will continue to devote FULL TIME to duties of the office!

VOTE 306 X
NELLE W. BURNS

Paid Pol. Adv.

