

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

Subscription Rates
By Mail - In Advance: Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. 8.00
Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 4.25
Sunday Only - One year \$4.20

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

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 31, 1950 (Monday)
Police are investigating a \$1,500 burglary at the Rogue Valley Country club last night.

20 YEARS AGO
July 31, 1940 (Wednesday)
Offers for cannery Bartlett's have ranged only as high as \$30 a ton, the same as last year, but far below the \$45 price anticipated by a grower's committee.

30 YEARS AGO
July 31, 1930 (Thursday)
A Medford boy has now been sitting in the tree in front of his home for 51 hours.

40 YEARS AGO
July 31, 1920 (Thursday)
The Trigon oil well in Fern valley is now down 831 feet and has encountered lime shale, rock and water, in fact, just about everything but oil.

50 YEARS AGO
July 31, 1910 (Sunday)
Condemnation proceedings brought by Pacific and Eastern railroad against the Phipps property west of Bear creek ended yesterday with J. J. Phipps being awarded \$1,500; he had asked for nearly \$40,000.

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

1. Was the first cotton-sewing thread in the U.S. manufactured in Pawtucket, R. I., or Charlotte, N. C.?
2. The capital city of which state is named for the fourth U. S. President.

3. The correct word for writing paper is stationery or stationery?
4. By what treaty was the War of 1812 ended?
5. Did the U. S. government ever mint half-cent pieces?

6. Who wrote the words and music of the comic opera, "H.M.S. Pinafore"?
7. How many feet are in two rods?
8. What constitutional amendment abolished slavery?

Answers: 1. Pawtucket, R. I.; 2. Madison, Wis.; 3. Stationery; 4. Treaty of Ghent; 5. John Howard Payne; 6. Yes (1793 to 1857); 7. Koran; 8. Gilbert and Sullivan; 9. 33; 10. Thirteenth.

High Stakes

The 1960 Republican National Convention came to a close with no major surprises, not much drama, and only a limited amount of excitement. High point of the proceedings, as far as most delegates and TV viewers were concerned, was Richard M. Nixon's able acceptance speech.

Using every calculated histrionic trick in the book, from the raised finger to the humble, down-cast eye, Mr. Nixon somehow managed to convey both humility and confidence, aggressiveness and moderation, sage wisdom and youthful vigor.

IT WAS skillful. It was convincing to many people. It was acting of a high order. Even to us, who have never been one of the Vice President's admirers, it had moments of considerable impact.

Not so to our companion in front of the TV set, who said "I don't think it's a very good speech. He hasn't said anything new."

Well—maybe he didn't say much that was new. But he said a lot of things that were worth saying over again, and he said them well.

BUT, while granting (a bit grudgingly, in view of our bias against the man) that it was a slick, expert job, we must also record our impression that it was almost too slick, too expert, and too reminiscent of the Vice President's ability—proven convincingly in the way he sewed up the convention—to be all things to all men.

"Just how honest, how sincere, how convinced is he in what he is saying?" we asked ourselves afterward.

It also was a question which came to us a couple of weeks before, after hearing Senator Kennedy's equally-skilled acceptance speech. On the basis of their performances so far, we must confess reservations about each, when thinking of either as President of the United States.

YET the choice must be made. It will be made by the American voters, and it will be made in the course of the next three months. It will, as the TV commentators remarked, with a certain anticipatory relish, be a slam-bang campaign, of great interest and excitement.

But deeper than that, it will be a vitally important decision to make, for as both candidates have emphasized, the dangers facing the world are great and many, and we will need the greatest possible skill and ability in our leadership.

Two tough, able, young men, battling for the most potent office in the world: This will be a race to remember, and the stakes are awesomely high.—E.A.

Possible--and Desirable

Our protest in this space last Sunday, against the unsightly destruction caused by logging along well-traveled roads and highways, drew a moderate response, printed on this page Friday, from one of the valley's better logging operators.

First, Mr. Manley agreed that unsightly logging along roads and highways is to be deplored. He then said, "to be realistic, I know this (eliminating such conditions) cannot be, due to economic conditions and the necessity of harvesting the mature trees, especially for private timber owners."

He is 100 per cent right about the problems facing owners of private timber, for they must use their resources to the maximum to stay in business. (And not all of them are as careful operators as Mr. Manley.)

BUT we must point out again, as we did before, that mature timber CAN be harvested without destruction of the forest corridors which add so much to the attractiveness of our state.

It is, in fact, being done, as we pointed out, under the auspices of the Forest Service. (The Bureau of Land Management has not yet reached this point in multiple-use of forest management.)

The private operator and forest owner, under today's economic conditions, cannot afford to protect these values, as can government. But modifications of the tax structure could make it feasible, even attractive, for him to.

MR. MANLEY points out, rightly, that more than half of the state's economy is based on lumber. We should like to add that a considerable, and growing, portion of the economy is based on the tourist industry.

Also, we see nothing "remarkable" about the suggestion that informational signs in logging areas would be helpful. The biggest timber owners are doing this very thing, and the Forest Service also, to a much more limited extent.

We hardly think it need be so extensive as to "hide the area logged," but brief explanatory signs certainly would educate our visitors (and ourselves, for that matter) as to the importance of the forest industries to Oregon, and on the fact that timber is a harvestable crop.

WE'RE no logging expert. But we do know that, for the industry's own sake, it is going to have to take the general public's reaction into consideration, to an increasing extent, if it is to continue to flourish.

Dennis the Menace



"JUST CLOSE YOUR EYES AND GO TO SLEEP, MR. WILSON. I'LL SWAT THE FLIES WHEN THEY LAND ON YA!"

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE SEVEN GOOD YEARS
The most important question at Chicago is also a very hard one to answer. It has to do with whether and how and when Nixon will take over the leadership of the party.

Walter Lippmann
The signs indicate that he knows he must do it—almost certainly to have a chance to win the election, very certainly to make any kind of success if he is elected.

For the general position taken by the keynote speakers, Judd, Halleck, Durksen, and finally by the President himself, rests on a failure to understand and a refusal to look squarely at the challenge of the Soviet Union throughout the world and the challenge of our own internal development with its growing population and the advancing technology.

The theme of the keynoters boils down to the assertion that all the mistakes were made before 1953, that all has been better and better ever since 1953, and that all will be well in the future if the country takes as its model and its ideal what has been done since 1953.

The keynoters including the President claim that the challenges abroad have been met and that in its foreign and domestic actions the Eisenhower administration has been a triumphant success. It follows that not only the Democrats but Governor Rockefeller and his many Republican followers are selling America short, they are belittling our unmatched power and greatness, and thus they are giving aid and comfort to Khrushchev.

The keynoters seem to think that if only the Democrats and Rockefeller would shut up, Khrushchev would think we are all powerful.

ALL the keynoters were angry at the American critics who are saying that we are not meeting the Soviet challenge and that the balance of power is turning against this country.

Some of the keynoters talked as if it were not the hard facts, but what Kennedy and Rockefeller say about them, which explain our trouble. All the keynoters, and foremost among them the President himself, talked as if the whole criticism rested on nothing more than the misinformation of disaffected military men who have been overruled by the President.

The criticism rests on a lot more besides that. It rests not only on the evidence that comes from inside the Pentagon. It rests also on the manifest facts that in recent years the power and influence of the Soviet Union and of Red China have expanded dramatically.

THE President assures us, and we may take his word for it, that our security system is second to none. But that is not the point. While in a direct and isolated and theoretical conflict with the Soviet Union, we are now the stronger, and may be able to continue to be the stronger in the missile age, our relative power over all is declining.

How? Is there any question, considering what is happening in Japan, in Korea, in Okinawa, in Vietnam, that our position in the Far East has deteriorated? Is there any doubt that our position is weakened in Turkey, is fragile in Iran, is ambiguous in Pakistan? Is it not true that

during these 7 1/2 marvelous years the Soviet influence has penetrated deeply and widely into Africa, or that it is penetrating Cuba and elsewhere in this hemisphere?

That's what the critics mean when they argue that the balance of power is turning against us. This is only a short way of saying that the Soviet and Chinese influence is expanding in Asia, in Africa, and in the Americas, and that our influence is declining.

What the President does not like to see is that what counts is total national power, not only armaments, but also economic power which may be directed to national, not merely to private and personal, ends. In the confrontation of natural power between the Communist bloc and ourselves, we are moving backward. The proof of this is visible from Japan to Cuba.

(c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

THE ESCAPE OF RICHARD NIXON
Chicago — The great event of the Republican convention was not the nomination of Richard M. Nixon, which was inevitable, or even Nixon's surprise alliance with Nelson A. Rockefeller, which was urgently necessary. The

from the admission of the Vice President to the inner sanctum of policy-making. As a regular attendant at the National Security Council, the Vice President hears all the most secret arguments about the adequacy or inadequacy of the defense effort, for instance. Hence he is a prisoner. He must either refuse to sit on the Security Council, or he must suit his public position to the position taken by the President.

Nixon was quite understandably not ready to make the kind of open break involved in leaving the Security Council—at least until he had the Presidential nomination safely in hand. He would have preferred to plaster over the differences between him and Eisenhower until the empty convention ritual was over. But Governor Rockefeller forced his pace. Nixon's real views were therefore incorporated into the platform. And Eisenhower is as cross as two sticks, above all about the Nixon-Rockefeller defense plan.

AS the nominee, nonetheless, Nixon has escaped at last from his Vice Presidential imprisonment. He can strike a new note. He can say what he really thinks. The degree in which he feels free to do so can be gauged by comparing the Eisenhower farewell speech and the Nixon acceptance speech. Eisenhower sounded like—exactly like—the Eisenhower of the years of deceptive calm, before the luck began to turn. Nixon sounded not very unlike Sen. John F. Kennedy. In fact, a member of the Nixon staff is authority for the report that the Nixon acceptance speech would have been entitled "New Frontiers" if Kennedy had not grabbed the phrase first.

This does not mean, of course, that Nixon will repudiate the Eisenhower record. On the contrary, he will defend the record as best he can, although with little relish in certain policy areas such as defense. Nixon knows that a successor-candidate cannot escape from running on the record of the predecessor-administration. Adlai E. Stevenson tried to do so in 1952, and all Stevenson got for his pains was a bad case of political hernia.

But the really significant national debate will not concern the past. It will concern what must be done next. In this respect, Nixon's freedom is now total.

It is a fortunate thing for the country that this should be so. It is time to talk about hard, even harsh, truths with the hard realism that both Nixon and Kennedy possess. There was a case, perhaps for tranquilizing leadership in 1952. In the era of the McCarthy nastiness, a national Milltown was in order. But in 1960, the approach that Richard Nixon promises is the approach we need.

(c) 1960 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. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

About Coins
To the Editor: Recently you have published several articles from UPI relative to the 1960-D cents. I know it is impossible to check your news sources for accuracy in all cases, but in the past few years nearly all articles you have published on coins have contained many misleading facts and some purely erroneous.

For the record, may I state that the word "flaw" is not used by numismatists in referring to coins. A flaw may occur in the die, but the resulting impression on the coin does not produce a "flaw." The results from the flawed die are usually called "mint errors."

The differences in the 1960 cents (not pennies) are due to the use of several different master dies on which the dates were engraved in a slightly different manner. This also occurred on the 1960 Denver mint coins.

The average persons could not tell the difference in the two varieties without some study. Furthermore, the price referred to by Mr. Douglas is for uncirculated small date variety, 1960 Philadelphia cents.

Asking price on uncirculated rolls of 1960 cents as of July 28 are: large variety, 1960-P, 80 cents to \$1.19; 1960-D, 80 cents; small variety, \$1.25 and \$5.50 to \$7.50.

William F. Thompson, 204 N. Columbus, Medford, Ore. Member, American Numismatic Association

Will Someone Let Him Know?
To the Editor: I'm sure everyone must have enjoyed Mr. Ragland's funny letter in Wednesday's Mail Tribune as much as I did. He and Everett are sure a pair!

The best part was about Senator Scott coming all the way out here to Jackson county from back East to attend the Republican luau (whatever that is) and campaign for Dr. Durno. He must think Doc Durno needs help from the city slickers in order to beat Charlie Porter.

And we are still puzzling what pressures could have been put on him, Sen. Johnson, to be coerced to taking second place with the so youthful, inexperienced Sen. John Kennedy whose only incursion into foreign affairs was to criticize our President for not buckling down to apologize to the blustering Khrushchev by our inspection plane flight 10 miles high over his country.

Also there was Sen. Kennedy's inept criticism of

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Wish we could recall the various comments about both the Democratic and Republican conventions we've heard in the last few weeks. The one we liked best, however, came from a teen-ager of our acquaintance, during Mark Hatfield's talk nominating Richard M. Nixon.

"The White House is not for sale!" the governor declared. "Shucks," our teen-ager retorted scornfully, "any real estate man could have told him that!"

The weather cooperated splendidly with the Shakespeare festival. There was a Tempest the opening night of "The Tempest," but it calmed down enough by curtain time so that no one suffered more than a small wet spot in the area which comes into contact with the outdoor seating.

The Ashland fire department also got into the cooperative act, by hooting a siren, long and loud, at a point in "The Taming of the Shrew" where one of the characters was crying loudly for a fire. And there was enough hot air out of Chicago, piped in via radio, TV, news wire, and Telephoto, to make our humid-dred-plus degree temperatures seem balmy by contrast.

One of the hotter bits of hot air was the keynote speech by that spellbinder, Walter Judd, Congressman from Minnesota—a speech, incidentally, which was praised as one of the "greatest keynote addresses of all times," not only by G.O.P. partisans in Chicago, but also by our own Frank Jenkins in his column in this paper.

A dissenting opinion is in, in the form of an editorial from the Washington Post, an independent daily in the capital which tends to lean a little bit to port of Mr. Jenkins.

After pointing out the glaring errors of fact in Mr. Judd's oratory, it went on to say: "Well, all of this grisly catalogue has a pretty familiar if somewhat stale aroma, and few persons are likely to take it any more seriously than the ritualistic Democratic exercises in hyperbole. Nevertheless, so florid and inflammatory a piece of exaggeration set an unfortunate tone for a party that supposedly has met to consider soberly and realistically the great problems of the future that confront the country. Mr. Judd's stem-winder broke the merryspring."

Smoke-filled rooms are all vacated. Fumigated, renovated. And the kids are all alerted: With convention on TV they're stoned.

One of our young men who has been observing the hassle over who's going to get the assessed valuation of the Rogue Valley Manor claims that the dispute reminded him of the story about the coroner in a California city about the turn of the century. He says it goes this way:

There was a fight in Chinatown, and the body of a Chinese was later found in a back alley. It was rushed to the coroner's office, a coroner's jury was called, and by the time he was through, the coroner turned in a bill to the county for \$95.

A few days later there was a fight in a nearby Indian settlement. A body, which looked suspiciously Chinese, but which had feathers stuck into the cropped pigtail, was found nearby. After processing this corpse, the coroner turned in a bill for \$250.

Two or three weeks later, a rather bedraggled body was found along the wharf, in an Italian settlement, with a knife wound in its back. This time it cost the county \$300.

For the next six months, the same corpse turned up after all major brawls and accidents. But the coroner told a friend in confidence, "I'm not through with that old bones yet. Before I get through, they'll send me and my missus to Europe."

He also confessed that the Italian incident wasn't pure profit. He had to stain the corpse's face, buy a floppy-brimmed hat, and a sack coat with spaghetti in the pocket.

There is a rumor going the rounds that on a certain unnamed day a group of unnamed citizens of an unnamed town in this valley are all going to walk down the main street at high noon—all armed with canes.

By the time this appears in print, the Potluck editor will be heading for the desert. It couldn't be much hotter there than it has been here the past week, could it?

IN GENERAL . . . both at Los Angeles and at Chicago (although to a somewhat lesser extent at Chicago) the politicians have been talking to us in rosy terms about making it possible for us to go still deeper into debt for still more gadgets and still more leisure.

This thought in conclusion: Isn't it getting to be about time for the politicians to begin to talk to us about HOW WE CAN REDUCE OUR DEBTS instead of dining incessantly into our ears their rosy promises to provide us with ways to GET STILL DEEPER INTO DEBT?

I think that's something we voters should do some careful thinking . . . some soundly ANALYTICAL thinking . . . about.

LUSK ANNOUNCES BID
Washington—(AP)—General Electric Co., Waco, Wash., was apparent low bidder at \$40,696 for fishway automatic control equipment for the John Day lock and dam on the Columbia river, the office of Sen. Hall S. Lusk (D-Ore.), said Wednesday.

F. J. Clifford, Route 2, Box 200F, Central Point, Ore.