

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune" Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Fir St., Ph. SP 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERRI GRAY, Advertising Manager; GERALD P. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.; ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; HARRY CHURMAN, Tel. Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor; DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c; Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$13.00; Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$8.00; Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$4.25; Sunday Only - 1 year \$4.20

Official Paper of City of Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1897. Official Paper of Jackson County, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1897.

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

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION MEMBER

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: July 17, 1950 (Monday). Wes Echols and Levi Mitchell will tangle at the fairgrounds tonight in a national middleweight championship boxing match.

20 YEARS AGO: July 17, 1940 (Wednesday). Oregon's 249th coast artillery regiment, including a unit in Ashland, has been mobilized and will be sent to Camp Clatsop as soon as Congressional authority is given.

30 YEARS AGO: July 17, 1930 (Thursday). The Jackson county agent is urging cover spray for codling moths.

40 YEARS AGO: July 17, 1920 (Saturday). Roasting ears are selling at Medford's public market for 45 cents per dozen.

50 YEARS AGO: July 17, 1910 (Sunday). The Fish Lake company is under new ownership and plans to spend \$2 1/2 million to irrigate 55,000 acres of Rogue valley land.

What's Your I.Q.? Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. Should an apostrophe be used in the form "Yours sincerely"?

2. The moon is sometimes visible from the earth's poles; true or false?

3. Name the author of the novel "Main Street"?

4. Seoul is the capital of which country?

5. If a London housewife refers to a "pram" what does she mean?

6. Which ex-boxer is nicknamed "Slapsie Maxie"?

7. Is the process of combustion fundamentally the same for coal, wood, oil and gasoline?

8. In 1899 which of the colonies moved its seat of government from St. Mary's to Annapolis?

9. Is the highest peak on the North American continent located in California, Alaska, Colorado, Montana, or Canada?

10. For what offenses may a civil officer of the U. S. Government be impeached?

Answers: 1. No, 2. True, 3. Sinclair Lewis, 4. Korea, 5. Baby carriage, 6. Max Rosenbloom, 7. Yes, 8. Maryland, 9. Alaska (Mt. McKinley), 10. Treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

OIL MUDDY STREETS: Muddy, Ill. (AP) - Mayor John Molinaro announced today that all Muddy streets have been oiled.

Pitiless Eye

The pitiless eye of television has done more to reveal the essential phoniness—occasionally enlivened by genuine excitement—of national political conventions than anything that has happened since conventions began.

The probing cameras, and particularly the ones with telephoto lenses, were no respecters of persons in Los Angeles last week.

A woman dozes off, a man yawns, a delegation sits stonily during a noisy demonstration, a man attempts to stir up enthusiasm among the tired and apathetic members of his own delegation—all these human foibles and failings are flashed electronically throughout the land.

THE WANDERING, questioning, eavesdropping reporters, with earphones and microphones, are everywhere, flashing back the latest rumor, pushing into an excited caucus, putting governors and senators on the spot.

And over all are the calm, cool, temperate and intelligent assessments of men like Walter Cronkite, Edward Murrow and Howard Smith, who help put things in perspective and, with their background and experience, somehow get at the meat and truth of what is happening behind, under and around the meaningless noise, fury and oratory.

They did a splendid job. As a result, the viewer in his own home often knew far more of what really was going on than the beleaguered delegate on the floor of the convention.

TELEVISION has its drawbacks. But reporting this kind of affair, in perspective and in depth, is not one of them. It has earned our respect and gratitude for the job it has done.

This is not to say that newspaper coverage of a convention is outmoded or unnecessary or ineffective. There are many aspects of such a convalescence which cannot be chronicled as well by the electronic media as they can be by reporters who record in black and white the nuances and implications of events.

In particular, the speed and immediacy of electronic reporting mitigates against the sort of reflective assessment, after-thought, and interpretation of a Walter Lippmann, a Lyle Wilson or a Joe Alsop.

Both media have a vital role, and supplement each other nicely.

IT REMAINS to be seen how long the American voter, now that he is, in effect, made a passive participant in these goings-on, will stand still for the sort of nonsense which comprises about 98 per cent of the proceedings.

The convention system, with all its faults, has served moderately well as a vehicle for the selection of our leaders—with some notable exceptions.

But this does not mean the system cannot be improved, or the methods brought more into conformity with our republican ideals.

Increasingly in recent years there has been more and more talk about nationwide primary elections, and perhaps in that direction will lie a promising change.

BUT, IN THE absence of public demand, the convention system will continue.

And it may well be that, with the advent of expert and comprehensive and probing television reporting, such as that seen last week, the parties' powers that be will decide that speeches (to which no one listens), and "demonstrations" (which are planned, calculated, and sometimes use paid "demonstrators") should be limited or eliminated, and that the process of selection should be brought more into the open.

It could happen—thanks to television.

BUT IF IT doesn't, we believe we can still count on the television people to help reveal the truth of what goes on, to uncover the compromises, deals, soul-searching, embarrassments, which go in to these quadrennial shows.

And, despite the boredom and phoniness, we still found the convention show a fascinating one—and not entirely disillusioning, either.

For it seemed apparent to us that a majority of the delegates were decent, honest American citizens, intent on doing their best to select the best man for the job.

Whether they succeeded may never be known. But the processes by which they tried are better revealed now than ever before in our history. —E.A.

Here's Why

"Natural beauty" has been a recurring theme in this space.

Parks, trees, rivers, lakes, picnic spots, lawns—these have been encouraged and approved. Billboards, unsightly messes, litterbugs, vandals—these have been deplored.

British Historian G. M. Trevelyan tells why:

"Two things are characteristic of our age... The conscious appreciation of natural beauty, and the rapidity with which natural beauty is destroyed. No doubt it is partly because the destruction is so rapid that the appreciation is so loud."

"Yet now when natural beauty is most consciously valued, it is being rapidly destroyed upon this planet... This matter has become a public question of the first magnitude. The value of natural beauty is admitted in words by our public men, but when it comes to deeds the doctrine is too new to bear much fruit."

"Destruction walks by noonday. Unless the state reverses the engines and instead of speeding up destruction, plans the development of the country so that the minimum of harm can be done to beauty, the future of our race, whatever its social, economic and political structure may be, will be brutish and shorn of spiritual value."

That's why.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I THOUGHT WE OUGHTA MAKE UP 'FORE I GO TO SLEEP GO WE COULD WAKE UP FRIENDS!"

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Well, it's over. Youthful Jack Kennedy won.

It would be hard to deny that he won on merit.

HOW DID HE WIN? One of the newspaper commentators (Bill Theis of UPD) puts it this way:

"Senator John F. Kennedy didn't capture the Democratic Presidential nomination with just mirrors and money. He did it with daring, personality, a lot of money and the ability to survive the political organization since the heyday of James A. Farley."

"That added up to a powerhouse effort. And if there is anything that commands political respect, however reluctant, it's power."

I SUPPOSE that tells the tale. But it leaves out something. What it leaves out is the good judgment Kennedy displayed when he went into the primaries back at the beginning and fought it out before the people who will do the voting come November.

It was the hard core of grass roots voters he obtained in the free-for-all primaries this spring that enabled him to win against the STOP-KENNEDY drive that developed in the final hours of Wednesday. But for that hard core, he might not have been able to survive the spectacular and at times emotion-packed demonstrations put on by the Johnson-Symington-Stevenson followers.

THE FACT is interesting. It is interesting because in many minds in this modern space-age year 1960 is this thought: Are political conventions the best way to choose Presidential candidates in this day and age?

Presidential primaries aren't perfect. But in many ways they compare favorably with the three-ring circus that we call nominating conventions.

WHAT ARE Kennedy's chances? I think it must be conceded that as of now they are good. People are nervous, a little scared, jumpy, uncertain. For the first time in our lives, we are faced by a powerful, ruthless enemy whose grim purpose is to destroy our way of life and substitute for it a way of life that is utterly alien to ours. There are conflicting assertions as to our strength in relation to the strength of our enemy. People don't know what to believe. When people don't know what to believe, they are confused.

There is economic confusion. We know we have more money than we used to have, but money buys less and less. Our national debt is staggering in its size. And so on.

THIS IS the point: When people are edgy, uncertain, a little frightened, they tend to throw the ins and out and put the outs in.

The Republicans are IN-administratively, that is, The Democrats are OUT. To that extent, the Democrats have the inside track in the political race that is shaping up.

HOW WILL it all turn out? Much will depend on what the Republicans do at Chicago.

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. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

Our Own Responsibility: To the Editor: Copco wants its present consumers to pay for expansion and enlargements of its present services, as well as to meet the inflationary costs of operation.

There is no argument on the question of costs of operation. Such costs have increased 500 per cent over the 1930's. However, on the point of expansion and improvement under our private enterprise system, such cost is the obligation of Copco. If they are short of funds for such purposes, they then should offer stock and bonds to finance the matter—not have a closed corporation but instead let the public share in the enterprise by purchase of stock and bonds.

In my estimation the power rates are now fair and equitable. I do object to the "schedule" used in dividing cost of power as used. Not so long ago when a consumer used some \$8.35 per month of power his rates dropped to "cheap" power-hot water heaters were on special low rates. Today that schedule is such that one must use about three times the power in order to get any reduction in rates; and water heaters are now off special rates. Overall, to the small consumer the cost of power has about doubled due to the "schedule" now in effect. If the schedule was corrected there would be no complaint on "rates."

But who is to blame? If you were the power company would you not seek the highest returns for your investors? It is all controlled by the Public Utilities Commission. Hearings are had on request of either side—the power company or the consumer. The commission must act according to evidence and testimony.

If we, the consumers, were to ask for a reduction and show good and sufficient cause, and without opposition from the power company, the consumers' request would be granted.

The same applies to a power company's request for increase of rates. In the past the consumers have sat on their hands and made no presentations against the power company requests. The commission has acted accordingly. Result—a higher cost for power service. We all have rights but those rights must be asserted; they are not "rights" as a matter of course.

It follows—if one is not satisfied with our power situation then tell the commission about it. Don't look to some one else to protect your interests and then complain about it later.

We are all responsible to ourselves.

Ray DeMars, 708 West Second St., Medford.

Back Scratching: To the Editor: I am very much intrigued with Lella A. Morrow's line of reasoning and her application of egocentricity. It might be said that any one that labors without reward is either childish or eccentric. However, labor, like virtue, is its own reward. Labor of love that is.

That accounts for the letters "To the Editor." Even as you and I.

What puzzles this writer is: Why Lella A. Morrow did not embroider and blow up her story about the patriotic German and sell it to a magazine that might be in the market

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

THE DEMOCRATIC SMELL: Los Angeles—The smell of hope sets this Democratic convention apart from all the others held since the war. A large majority of the party leaders, petty politicians, and factots here assembled seriously expect to win the next November.

At the Democratic convention in 1948, no such expectations were entertained by any one at all except perhaps Harry S. Truman, and one can be pretty sure that at the convention-time, Truman himself secretly regarded Thomas E. Dewey as a better money bet. In 1952, before Adlai E. Stevenson's campaigning flaws had been revealed, there was some hope of victory, but no solid expectation. In 1956, there was damp prophetic discouragement.

But this time, the deals that have been made are counted on to pay off. The expectant convention-time, Truman himself secretly regarded Thomas E. Dewey as a better money bet. In 1952, before Adlai E. Stevenson's campaigning flaws had been revealed, there was some hope of victory, but no solid expectation. In 1956, there was damp prophetic discouragement.

What, then, is the reason for this new surge of Democratic confidence? The main reason, of course, is the twofold amendment that forbids the Republicans to draft Dwight D. Eisenhower at the last minute.

One leading Democrat has bitterly remarked that "if those damned Republicans hadn't passed that amendment to trample on Franklin Roosevelt's memory, they'd have the President of the United States in the hands of the taxidermists this minute, being stuffed for permanency, and we couldn't win any other election in this century."

The remark, though coarse, might accurately reflect the Democratic estimate of the President's unvarying personal appeal, which is so strangely unaffected by the public's varying opinions of the Eisenhower administration. It also suggests the Democratic opinion that Vice President Richard M. Nixon is not as formidable as he looks.

IN this respect, the Democrats seem over-optimistic to this reporter. If one can judge the results of rather widespread doberling ringing, Nixon has a far stronger popular

for just such a story and acquire a little folding money? If she was up and around during World War One she is mature enough now to turn out a yarn that would meet with a ready market. She is a conformist. She could do it. I cannot.

However, she has a streak of Christian charity. She can't ignore the egocentric and neither can I. She scratched my back and now I scratch hers.

Walter Reede, Galice rd., Merlin, Ore.

Getting Vorse Faster: To the Editor: A week ago, I wrote a letter to the Tribune and I said, "Everything's gettin' worse" and it was, but, by golly, it's gettin' worse faster than Aye tink it was. Der day before der letter was printed in der Tribune, Aye was going East on Sixth st., and Aye hit a door going North on Riverside in Medford, and Aye got der first citation.

For 50 years, Aye miss 100 million cars, and miss 100 der cars have four doors. You wouldn't tink vun person could miss 200 million doors in 50 years, but Aye dunnit.

Aye should have hit der door in Los Angeles. Aye knew vun Los Angeles driver w r e c k e d three cars, knocked down two telephone poles, busted vun fire hydrant, vent through der porch and landed in der parlor, all in vun operation, and he didn't even have der driver's license. He didn't get der citation. Dot yasn't reckless driving in Los Angeles.

Ven Aye lived in Compton, Calif., somevun took der door off my car. Aye vent to der Police Station to make out der report. "Votnell do you vant to make out der report for?" asked der Police. "You still got three doors left, ain'tcha?"

Vas you efer chased out of a watermelon patch by der airplane? Aye vas. Aye vas driving der old Brush car through der field on Oakdale ave., in Medford, ven Aye seen Eugene Ely coming down der blackberry patch in his plane. He didn't catch der Brush car. He stopped ven he wrapped der blackberries around der propeller.

YEP! Aye miss' everything but vun door. Everitt Acklin, Ashland, Ore.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

If the district attorney will just glance the other way for a moment or two, we'd like to report that we won a small wager (25 cents) Friday morning.

The bet was made with one of our less mechanically-oriented young men (the one who used to spell carburetor wrong), and concerned a mechanical contrivance in the office - to wit, a pencil sharpener.

We have three of the gadgets, and none of them seem to work at peak efficiency at any one time. (As a matter

platform of peace and prosperity, with full knowledge that the peace part of the platform, at least, was straight Madison Avenue stuff.

The failure of the summit meeting, the contempt for the United States displayed by the Soviet leadership, the humiliations that have been suffered in these last weeks, have knocked the intended peace plank in the Republican platform into a cocked hat. With steel production at 50 per cent of capacity, the prosperity plank is also a bit worm-eaten in places. The Republicans will therefore have to pay the price that always must be paid by those who try to do it with mirrors, and then find that the mirrors are cracked.

Such are the reasons for the surge of Democratic confidence. Most of them are solid reasons, solidly rooted in the facts of the existing political situation. This Democratic confidence is also a significant fact in itself, since a confident party usually makes a better fight. But it very much remains to be seen whether the confidence will be justified by events.

(Copyright 1960 New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)

THE INQUIRING Dr. Gallup has just reported the popularity rating of the Republican party is very near the 1936 low. The last man-to-man polling test between Nixon and John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts showed Kennedy a couple of points ahead. Yet the record shows that Democratic contenders have always run more poorly in July than in November.

Again, the Democratic analysts are cheered by the total collapse of the strategy which the Republicans were so hopefully preparing last winter. In this respect, the Republicans have got what they deserve. They planned to go before the electorate on a

base than is generally supposed, even in Republican ranks. But it is certainly true that Nixon lacks Eisenhower's universal appeal. The Vice President's curious power to make voters like him and give him their votes because he is "a nice man," without particular consideration of his qualities as a national leader.

The shrewdest of the assembled Democrats - those who do not share the widespread underestimate of Nixon - make another point which is certainly valid. They say that Nixon is untested in the kind of campaigning he will have to do to win the presidency. He cannot run for President, after all, in the way he ran for the House and Senate in California. He certainly cannot run for the presidency in his sharply partisan manner of 1954, 1956, and 1958, when President Eisenhower assigned him the "shock-troop" role. He will therefore have to develop a quite new manner.

The manner Nixon develops will have to be pretty miraculous, too, in the opinion of most of the Democratic bigwigs, because the Republican party is thought to be in bad trouble at the moment. For this view, there is considerable evidence.

THE INQUIRING Dr. Gallup has just reported the popularity rating of the Republican party is very near the 1936 low. The last man-to-man polling test between Nixon and John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts showed Kennedy a couple of points ahead. Yet the record shows that Democratic contenders have always run more poorly in July than in November.

Again, the Democratic analysts are cheered by the total collapse of the strategy which the Republicans were so hopefully preparing last winter. In this respect, the Republicans have got what they deserve. They planned to go before the electorate on a

WHAT IS meant by an average rate of growth of 5 per cent? It does not mean that the output of the economy must increase at the rate of 5 per cent every day, every week, every month, or every year. Our economy is cyclical, it has its upswings and its downswings. And however much we succeed in regulating the business cycle, there will always be these ups and downs.

What the Democrats and Governor Rockefeller mean is that in the course of a three or five year cycle of booms and diminishing business, the average rate of growth will be about 5 per cent. In the booms the rate will be more, in the recessions the rate will be less. But the average of the booms and the recessions will be about 5 per cent. What the country needs in order to plan well its public and private investments is confidence that the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Bureau of the Budget will see to it that this average rate is maintained.

There will be much debate during the campaign about how a higher rate of growth can be had. There is here no real difference of opinion between the Democrats and Governor Rockefeller. Both maintain that the rate of growth can be raised by increasing both private and public investment. Both want to give incentive and facilities for private investment, and both believe that more must be "spent" - that is, invested - by the federal, the state, and the local governments. Such increase of investment is the way economic growth is increased.

IT SHOULD be said that the 5 per cent rate, which the Democrats and Rockefeller advocate, is a high rate.

There are well qualified students of the problem, notably Prof. F. M. Bator, who believe that an annual rate of 4 per cent increase would take care of our public needs, as estimated by the Rockefeller brothers report, over a ten-year period. They believe that 4 per cent, because it requires less investment which fluctuates so easily, will be less vulnerable in the slumps and less inflationary in the booms.

Be that as it may, the commitment made by the Democrats is to move towards 5 per cent. If they get to an annual increase of 4 per cent or somewhat more, they will know then whether they need to go on to 5 per cent. This is a sound public policy, and it makes real the party promise to augment the nation's power and to go forward towards meeting its public needs.

(c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

of fact, we've known our women's editor to break down altogether when three pencils in a row have suffered broken points while she cranked away.)

But there is a minority of us who stoutly maintain it's a matter of technique, not mechanical inadequacy.

Pencil sharpeners, we are almost convinced, have tender feelings. So, when they are approached in an aggressive and unfriendly manner, they react not dissimilarly to a sensitive human being. Anger, begins to get aggressive, and the natural result is a broken point.

But back to that wager - if the DA is still averting his eyes.

Our young man had, on Wednesday, suffered an unhappy experience with one of the sharpeners. In revenge, he had taken it entirely apart, and since (as we said) he is not mechanically-oriented, couldn't put it back together again.

There lay the pathetic pieces all during Thursday - his day off - until compassion overtook us and we reassembled it and, muttering soothing rhymes, successfully sharpened a pencil.

Came Friday, and the young man returned to work. Picking up a pencil he approached the disassembled-reassembled contrivance, shuddered slightly, backed away, and turned to another one.

His face became grim and determined. He thrust the pencil into the sharpener's maw with all the finesse of a small boy stabbing a toad, and savagely turned the crank. The pencil point, as he fully and fatalistically expected, broke.

At this point we sauntered up and asked timidly if he cared to have us sharpen his pencil for him.

His face reddened. His eyes narrowed. His hands balled into fists. His breathing came in gasps.

Through clenched teeth he said, menacingly, "I'll bet you a quarter you can't sharpen five pencils in a row, without breaking one, and without chewing up more than a quarter-inch."

This, of course, was a real challenge. We blanched slightly, but accepted.

We quietly approached the machine. We gave it a tentative and kindly pat. We gently inserted the first pencil, and tenderly - oh so tenderly - began turning the crank, humming a lullaby the while.

The sharpener, upset by its recent experience, bucked at a groaned and whined for a moment, then settled down to a smooth, whirring hum. One after the other, five pencils came out with bright, sharp points.

Have you ever seen a strong, vigorous, young man cry?

Moving from that small triumph to more mundane matters, we were badly shaken last week to read a headline in the Salem Capital Journal which said "State JDs Due for 3-Day Meet - 1400 Will Attend."

Horrid pictures of 1400 juvenile delinquents descending on the quiet streets of Salem filled our mind's eye.

We were considerably relieved to read, and find that the headline didn't refer to juvenile delinquents after all, but to Job's Daughters.

Maxims, or old sayings, usually have at least an element of truth, or they never would have become maxims. The one about "There's nothing new under the sun" was born in on us the other day.

The young man who digs into the files to compile our Flight 'o' Time column noted that, week before last, Page 1 of the Mail Tribune in 1960 and Page 1 of the Mail Tribune in 1937 bore a striking resemblance.

He was aware of the flurry over the possible finding of Amelia Earhart's plane, and of the Domestic Laundry and Dry Cleaners fire. So he somewhat bemused to find that, 23 years ago, Amelia Earhart was missing somewhere in the Pacific and a massive search for her was under way, and also that "worst fire in five years" awoke Medford as it did out the Medford Domestic Laundry and several other firms.

A bigot, we learn, is a person who has such a deep understanding of a subject that he refuses to be confused by the facts.