

Medford Mail Tribune

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE, INC., 20 North First St., P.O. Box 2-6143

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERR GIBBY, Advertising Manager; CECIL T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.; EARL W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; HARRY CHIPMAN, Tel. Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STARBUCK, Women's Editor; DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c; Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$12.00; Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$6.00; Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$3.25; Sunday Only - One year \$4.50

Official Paper of City of Medford; Official Paper of Jackson County; United Press International; Full Length News Pictures; U.P.I. Teletype News Pictures

MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS; WEST HOLIDAY CO., INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

1960 PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION; NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION; AFFILIATE 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; Sept. 28, 1950 (Thursday); A federal judge in Portland today ruled that the government had failed to prove its charge of restraint and monopolization of prepaid medical care against Oregon doctors.

20 YEARS AGO; Sept. 28, 1940 (Saturday); Jacksonville and Gold Hill scored victories Friday in opening games of the Jackson county six-man football conference.

30 YEARS AGO; Sept. 28, 1930 (Sunday); Employment in both the county and city has shown an increase during the past month.

40 YEARS AGO; Sept. 28, 1920 (Tuesday); Harry Howard, a newcomer to the city, has announced he is a candidate for mayor and will try to unseat Mayor Gates.

50 YEARS AGO; Sept. 28, 1910 (Wednesday); The Medford Commercial club will meet next week in its new quarters at the recently completed Natatorium.

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

1. Does arid refer to dryness, acidity, or bitterness? 2. Helsinki is the capital of which country? 3. Lard is a product of what animal? 4. What is the singular of axes? 5. Name the smallest planet.

6. At which "Mount" were the Ten Commandments introduced? 7. How many years are denoted by "three score and twenty"? 8. Only three States in the Union have four letters in their names; can you name them? 9. Is Midway Island in the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean? 10. Does r.o.s. thrive in well drained, or in damp soil? Answers: 1. Dryness. 2. Finland. 3. The hog. 4. Axe or axis. 5. Mercury. 6. Mount Sinai. 7. Eighty. 8. Iowa, Ohio, Utah. 9. Pacific. 10. In damp soil.

SEIZES NEWSPAPERS; Tokyo - (AP) - The Indonesian government today seized two more newspaper printing plants, Radio Republik Indonesia reported today. The radio said eight plants now have been taken over by the government.

The "Debate"

We were pleasantly surprised at the presidential candidates' debate Monday night. We'd expected a fairly cream-puff affair, from the advance billing, but it turned out to be a good show — a revealing one, in fact.

No strong supporter of Vice President Nixon was, we suspect, motivated to switch his support to Senator Kennedy.

And vice versa. But we wonder what impression it made on the undecided and uncommitted voter—of whom there a lot this year.

IMMEDIATELY following the two party conventions, we were pretty well depressed, feeling that both candidates were sort of gray-flannel-suit, machine-made, precision-ground, calculating automatons.

We felt it would be difficult to work up any degree of enthusiasm for either.

Our bias, frankly, was against Nixon. But we found it hard to see John F. Kennedy as a man who fitted the crucial needs of the time; a man who would give this nation some intelligent, aggressive, spirited, dynamic leadership after nearly eight years of what Joe Alsop calls "soothing syrup."

AS THE campaign has progressed, however, and as the candidates have made their positions, their personalities, their approaches more clear through speeches and statements, our original reactions have changed.

As a result, it was with an unabashed liking for Kennedy that we sat down Monday night to watch the debate.

What happened strengthened our impressions — of both men.

Nixon, who obviously was suffering from nervousness and tension, and who looked thin, almost haggard, and far from well, was still his old skillful, fast-on-his-feet self, and acquitted himself with poise, dignity and reasonableness.

But he was (in these eyes at least) on the defensive from first to last.

Kennedy, on the other hand, was master of himself and the situation, had done his homework well, looked fit and self-confident, and was frank in his appeal to the American people to move forward into the adventurous 1960s.

ONE OF our favorite Washington political commentators the other day described the difference between Nixon and Kennedy more or less as follows:

"Kennedy is saying to America 'Wake up!'; Nixon is saying 'Relax!'"

This is an oversimplification, and a lot of people will disagree with some heat.

But that was the net impression which we received from the television "debate," and if Kennedy can reinforce this "image" of his, keep Nixon on the defensive, continue to call out to the best instincts and ambitions and hopes of the American people, he will wind up in the White House next January.

ONE THING which was notable by its absence was the fact that not once during the hour-long TV program was the word "religion" used.

The "religious issue," as a matter of fact, has dropped out of public view in the last few days, and we hope it stays buried, for it is a minor issue, if it is an issue at all.

Perhaps, having been raised so early in the campaign, and having been bruited about so viciously, people are just plain tired of it, and will ignore any further attempts to inject it into what should be a campaign based on far more important issues — those of survival, of prosperity, of equal justice, of health, of education.

AS TO THE "debate" itself, it didn't really strike the sparks nor define the positions and issues as sharply as it might have with a freer-swinging format.

But it most certainly did more to illuminate these things than just about anything in political history.

If the next three sessions are as good, such face-to-face confrontations should be permanently adopted as an American political tradition. One thing — one great thing — that stood out:

Because the opponents were both physically present, there was little of the slam-bang, eye-gouging sort of campaigning (nor the smear by innuendo) that one has seen in the past.

It was a gentlemanly encounter, and did both participants credit. We can hardly wait for the next one.—E.A.

Who Is "Shocked"?

Elmo Smith, Republican candidate for the United States Senate, was quoted yesterday by United Press International as saying, "I was shocked to hear my opponent say she would not risk a nuclear war to protect free West Berlin."

Politicians, of course, are easily "shocked" by their opponents' statements.

But Smith's statement actually did shock us. WE WONDER if Smith has carefully considered the implications of what he said.

We suggest he think about the words "nuclear war," which he bandies about so easily, and remember that implicit in them is the certain end of civilization as we know it, hundreds of millions dead — combatants and innocent bystanders alike — and very possibly the end of the human race.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"WHO WANTS TO GIVE MY MOM A SEAT 'FORE I STAND ON HIS SHOE?'"

... 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.

Later Than We Think

To the Editor: After Monday evening's talks by our Presidential candidates, I feel a deep sense of pity and revulsion for a group of people who are so obviously desperate to hold their grip on the voters of America, they have the unmitigated gall to offer us a pathetic, sick, weary little man as prospective leader of our country.

Naturally, being the compassionate people we are, we feel sympathetic with Mr. Nixon's sincere efforts, his willingness to be "used," much as they used that dear old well-liked General.

However, sympathy and compassion will never, never lead us out of the miserable mess the Republican party has gotten us into already.

This statement of "guarding Federal money to force us to use our own initiative" reveals their objective exactly. Those of us who labor for a living pretty well know how to do that already.

There is nothing that convincing Russian leaders would like better than to see the American working class in a further state of depression and confusion, than we already are.

It doesn't take a very smart person to know that. I would most sincerely urge those who have the voting privilege to consider the above facts, and to remember that only we, the voting public, can prevent further damage to our great country, by "voting out" the present power of greedy weaslings.

We now have a young and vital statesman as a leader that has our full confidence. We know his intelligence is both desired and necessary. He has the integrity, the courage, to do the job, and we had best grab him while he is available.

It is much later than we think. Mary A. Williams, 357 Orr dr., Central Point, Ore.

Lost Freedoms

To the Editor: Good morning. What freedoms have you lost lately? As for me not many but a few.

However this has been our best season for losing freedoms. First we lost our freedom to talk to the county court of Josephine county. Next we lost our freedom to bargain. Then we lost our freedom to bargain. Then we lost our freedom to protest the taking of our land. Next we lost the freedom to collect remuneration on private property for public use. Next we were restrained by the county sheriff while our property was being destroyed.

But that was only a beginning because the hard wallop came when we lost our freedom to earn a livelihood. Due to economic conditions the mill where we worked shut down because they could not buy logs from the government that had a monopoly on the timber. The mill lost its freedom to operate. We lost the freedom to work. The freedom to sign checks. The freedom to pay bills. The freedom to buy groceries and shoes.

reau of Land Management.

Well, folks we still have the freedom to take a pauper's oath. Be joyful. That is the "Freedom" for which my honorable ancestor fought for at the Battle of Brandywine.

We live at Galice, The Bureau of Land Management is planning on taking all freedom over below Heligate for its private empire. It plans on being the trail boss. But we have plenty of company. We are all in the same boat. The rich and poor alike.

Don't feel slighted folks, your time will come. The ghost of Hitler is moving in. While Mr. K moves into Cuba, Hitler's ghost enters the land of the free. Make way for State Socialism. Ours appears to develop into Big Business and Big Government.

There is an issue for the boys that want to be president. Walter Reece, Galice rd., Merlin, Ore.

Can Love Be Bought?

To the Editor: In regard to a communication about unjust taxation, the poor paying less and the rich paying more, would our writer have us believe that capitalism is true equality?

Let us suppose that the government is taxing the farmer of his substance. One has a thousand bushels, another has fifty, and a third person has thirty-five. The taxer sets the quota at fifty bushels per person. The first has 950, the second has none, the third is left in debt or put in prison for failure to pay. And this is just?

Our government has had to lean toward socialism to keep a few from monopolizing the entire country. For every rich man there are tens of thousands of poor and there always will be. If a rich man was to be taxed according to how much a poor man could pay, his wealth would greatly increase. Eventually the rich would be fighting each other to see whose slave you would be. You can look at it in many ways, but they all have a slight curve and when pursued they go in endless circles. To a true capitalist this is heaven, but to the socialist and the poor it is hell.

The Lord only asks that we live in peace with one another. If we seek to out-do one another, shall we be at peace with one another? Can love be bought? T. M. S., Rogue River, Ore.

Two Bar Associations?

To the Editor: I want to congratulate you on the unusual daily paper you put out. I doubt whether there is a town the size of Medford in the United States that can compare with the over-all news and special articles your paper has.

Another tribute is to your wonderful Southern Oregon with its beautiful mountains and streams. I am surprised at the number of modern motels from Ashland to Grants Pass, and this goes to prove that your tourists have to stay over to get a better look at what is here.

I had my attention called to a front page item in your paper last week and also Sunday's paper of Sept. 25 in regard to the State Bar association attempting to get an injunction against a lady in Central Point by the name of Naples for making legal papers for her clients.

I was also told that a certain attorney was recently indicted but still practicing law, without any action from the State Bar association. If some jealous attorneys

Congo Is Second Time U.N. Has Foiled Communist Aims; K Wants Takeover

By PHIL NEWSOM, UPI Foreign Editor

Twice in the last 10 years prompt United Nations action has thwarted imperialistic communism's ambitions to expand.

The first time was in Korea. More recently it has been in Africa, a far richer prize.

Back of this, then, lies Nikita Khrushchev's violent attack upon Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold and his determination to destroy United Nations usefulness even if it must be at the cost of some popularity among the uncommitted or neutral nations he seeks ultimately to win.

So far as Korea was concerned, the Communist attack there was a line-straightening operation designed to remove

a free-world thorn sticking in the side of the Asia mainland between Red China and Soviet Siberia.

The U.N. scarcely was five years old then and never before had it supplied troops against aggression.

Inspired by America it is doubtful if it would have acted at all except by United States initiative and it did not have the unanimous support of all nations outside the Communist bloc.

In contrast has been the strong world support for the U.N. action in the Congo which has triggered Soviet determination to destroy it.

The three-man presidium with which Khrushchev pro-

posed to replace the office of secretary-general had its counterparts in Korea and later in Indo-China where Communist representatives armed with veto power successfully hamstringed both the armistice and efforts to reunite divided nations.

The United Nations secretary-general is the world's chief troubleshooter, instructed both to carry out United Nations mandates and to warn the U.N. Security Council of potential trouble spots.

He has no veto. The Soviet Union, with one veto already in the Security Council, now proposes to add another.

Would Increase Power

By setting up a presidium in which the membership would consist of one Communist, one neutral and one representative of the West, Khrushchev would take over one-third control of the entire world organization in contrast to the approximate 10 per cent he now has.

His veto power effectively would prevent any such action as the U.N. has been able to carry out in the Congo.

Thus, Khrushchev would gain his free hand to swallow up young and confused nations one by one as they emerged and would turn the U.N. into a futile debating society.

Proposals To Revise Electoral College System Meet Defeat

By LYLE C. WILSON

Washington - (AP) - Some tinkering with the U.S. Constitution would be appropriate any time now to cut pressure and bare-knuckled political minorities down to size.

This could be accomplished by devising another method of electing presidential electors. Any numerous religious, racial or occupational minority in any state is, under the present system, a potential election-day balance of power.

The objective of electoral college reform would be to give back to the voters the presidential election and the party platforms. Such reform was proposed in the Senate in 1956 with the endorsement of 51 senators.

At present, a state's entire electoral vote goes to the candidate who gets a plurality or better of that state's popular vote, no matter how close the vote may be. The reform proposed in 1956 would permit each state to choose between two methods of allotting electoral votes on the basis of popular votes cast.

1. The state's electoral vote would be divided on a percentage basis among the three presidential candidates receiving the most votes.

2. Each congressional district would vote for one elector of its own and for two at-large for the state. That is, electors would be chosen exactly as members of the House and Senate now are chosen.

This was a compromise proposal combining in one package two alternative proposals which long had been pending in deadlock. Supporters of

both proposals joined in support of the compromise. Senate approval seemed assured. Thereafter, a favorable two-thirds House vote would have enabled submission of the proposed amendment to the states for ratification.

A weak spot was alternative No. 1 which seemed to invite third or splinter parties into every state although supporters of No. 1 insisted it would not have that effect.

No. 2 unquestionably would discourage splinter group politics and surely would yank the rug from under pressure group minorities. The objective of the reform proposal was to distribute the electoral vote more equitably between the major parties in relation to popular vote returns. The overall advantage would be to the smaller of the two major parties, the Republican party as of now.

Affect on Truman A shift of less than six-tenths of one per cent of the 1948 vote from Harry S. Truman would have thrown that presidential election into the House and, probably, in deadlock. If the proposed amendment had been in effect in 1948, the electoral vote would have been: Truman 258 (less than a majority); Thomas E. Dewey 221.4; State's Righter Strom Thurmond 38.6; Progressive Henry A. Wallace 9.4; others 1.8. Under the proposed plan, in such circumstances, the Senate and the House together would choose the president, each member casting one vote.

The actual 1948 electoral vote was: Truman 303; Dewey 189; Thurmond 39. Truman polled 49.5 per cent of the 1948 popular vote.

This proposal looked like a sure winner in the Senate until minority group leaders got the word. They put the pressure on and the 51 senators committed to the proposal began to melt away.

At present, a state's entire electoral vote goes to the candidate who gets a plurality or better of that state's popular vote, no matter how close the vote may be. The reform proposed in 1956 would permit each state to choose between two methods of allotting electoral votes on the basis of popular votes cast.

1. The state's electoral vote would be divided on a percentage basis among the three presidential candidates receiving the most votes.

2. Each congressional district would vote for one elector of its own and for two at-large for the state. That is, electors would be chosen exactly as members of the House and Senate now are chosen.

This was a compromise proposal combining in one package two alternative proposals which long had been pending in deadlock. Supporters of

both proposals joined in support of the compromise. Senate approval seemed assured. Thereafter, a favorable two-thirds House vote would have enabled submission of the proposed amendment to the states for ratification.

A weak spot was alternative No. 1 which seemed to invite third or splinter parties into every state although supporters of No. 1 insisted it would not have that effect.

No. 2 unquestionably would discourage splinter group politics and surely would yank the rug from under pressure group minorities. The objective of the reform proposal was to distribute the electoral vote more equitably between the major parties in relation to popular vote returns. The overall advantage would be to the smaller of the two major parties, the Republican party as of now.

Affect on Truman A shift of less than six-tenths of one per cent of the 1948 vote from Harry S. Truman would have thrown that presidential election into the House and, probably, in deadlock. If the proposed amendment had been in effect in 1948, the electoral vote would have been: Truman 258 (less than a majority); Thomas E. Dewey 221.4; State's Righter Strom Thurmond 38.6; Progressive Henry A. Wallace 9.4; others 1.8. Under the proposed plan, in such circumstances, the Senate and the House together would choose the president, each member casting one vote.

The actual 1948 electoral vote was: Truman 303; Dewey 189; Thurmond 39. Truman polled 49.5 per cent of the 1948 popular vote.

This proposal looked like a sure winner in the Senate until minority group leaders got the word. They put the pressure on and the 51 senators committed to the proposal began to melt away.

At present, a state's entire electoral vote goes to the candidate who gets a plurality or better of that state's popular vote, no matter how close the vote may be. The reform proposed in 1956 would permit each state to choose between two methods of allotting electoral votes on the basis of popular votes cast.

1. The state's electoral vote would be divided on a percentage basis among the three presidential candidates receiving the most votes.

2. Each congressional district would vote for one elector of its own and for two at-large for the state. That is, electors would be chosen exactly as members of the House and Senate now are chosen.

This was a compromise proposal combining in one package two alternative proposals which long had been pending in deadlock. Supporters of

both proposals joined in support of the compromise. Senate approval seemed assured. Thereafter, a favorable two-thirds House vote would have enabled submission of the proposed amendment to the states for ratification.

A weak spot was alternative No. 1 which seemed to invite third or splinter parties into every state although supporters of No. 1 insisted it would not have that effect.

No. 2 unquestionably would discourage splinter group politics and surely would yank the rug from under pressure group minorities. The objective of the reform proposal was to distribute the electoral vote more equitably between the major parties in relation to popular vote returns. The overall advantage would be to the smaller of the two major parties, the Republican party as of now.

Affect on Truman A shift of less than six-tenths of one per cent of the 1948 vote from Harry S. Truman would have thrown that presidential election into the House and, probably, in deadlock. If the proposed amendment had been in effect in 1948, the electoral vote would have been: Truman 258 (less than a majority); Thomas E. Dewey 221.4; State's Righter Strom Thurmond 38.6; Progressive Henry A. Wallace 9.4; others 1.8. Under the proposed plan, in such circumstances, the Senate and the House together would choose the president, each member casting one vote.

The actual 1948 electoral vote was: Truman 303; Dewey 189; Thurmond 39. Truman polled 49.5 per cent of the 1948 popular vote.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

In Portland the other day, the Agriculture Division of the American Cyanamid company sponsored a recognition and award luncheon to honor the county agents of Oregon for their outstanding service to agriculture and their contributions to the common good of all people.

The luncheon was one of five held in the United States. It was the only one held in the West. The award went to C. A. Henderson of Klamath county as the outstanding representative of Oregon's county agents. The implication is clear. Charley Henderson is regarded as the most distinguished county agent in the Far West.

IT MUST be added here that this honor doesn't belong to Klamath county alone. Charley Henderson is known and respected and consulted all over southern Oregon and far northern California. In this whole area he is Mr. County Agent.

In the nearly four decades he has been on the job, no single individual has influenced more effectively the agriculture of our whole region than C. A. Henderson. This is particularly true of the Klamath Basin. When he took over, the Basin's agriculture was raw and new and untried. He has shaped its development. His leadership is largely responsible for the fact that the Klamath Basin is now not only one of the West's newest agricultural districts but one of the most promising.

OTHER than the conferring of the distinguished service award, the highlight of the luncheon was an address by Dr. Robert H. White-Stevens, manager of the nutrition, physiology and biochemistry agricultural division of the American Cyanamid company.

He gave his hearers some startling new ideas of the importance of the American farmer in the future of a world in which food — because of an explosive increase in population — will be perhaps the most important survival factor.

FOR example: Not TOO long before Charley Henderson took over as county agent in Klamath county, one American farmer fed four people. One American farmer now feeds 24 people. We are presently inclined to think of that as merely an evidence of overproduction. Mr. White-Stevens gave us a picture of it as checkingmate the grim theory of Malthus that population would increase faster than food production and so the people of the world would starve to death.

WHAT to do about it? Well, he said, the world as a whole will have to do what the American farmer has been doing in these years when we have been shivering in our boots because of increased agricultural production PER ACRE and the surpluses that have been piling up as a result.

That is to say: THE WORLD AS A WHOLE will have to learn in the future how to GET MORE FOOD from each productive acre. Either that or STARVE.

IT WAS a challenging speech, and very well worth listening to. It gave all of us who listened to it something new to think about. Maybe, over the long pull that lies ahead, ripples will be nothing to worry about. Maybe, over this long pull, the heavy production that now results in agricultural overproduction will save the world from starvation.