

Medford Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
Subscription Rates:
By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday - Year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$5.00
Daily and Sunday - 1 mo. \$1.50
Sundays Only - Year \$4.50
By Carrier - In Advance - Medford
Ashland, Clatsop, Clatskanie,
Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill
Phonics, Shady Cove, Rogue Riv.
or Talent and on other routes
Daily and Sunday - Year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday - 1 mo. \$1.50
Carrier and Dealer - copy 10c
All Terms Cash in Advance
Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International
Full Leased Wire
U.P.I. Telephone News Pictures
MEMBER OF THE BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS
Advertising Representative:
WESLEY HOLIDAY CO., INC.
1400 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Louisville, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.
NEWSPAPER 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.

Rivers and Partisanship

In 1948, the Rogue River Basin project was killed. It died in the cross-fire of people interested in irrigation, flood control, power, fish, and recreation.

These varying interests could not compromise their differences. Later, after a long series of delicate negotiations, the Talent project was "chopped off" from the overall basin development project, and received the support of the people of the basin, at best, or a lack of noisy opposition, at worst.

It was authorized, and is now nearing completion.

BUT the Rogue project itself lay dead.

And it stayed dead until two things happened:

1. Disastrous floods hit the main stem of the Rogue, from above Shady Cove to below Grants Pass, in the winter of 1955-56.

2. A vigorous, impetuous, ambitious, candid and intelligent young Eugene lawyer, Charles O. Porter by name, was elected Congressman from this district in November of 1956.

These two factors breathed new life into the long-dormant plans. It is now a "live" issue. Studies are well along. It is believed they can be completed in time to present the proposals in 1962, during the second session of the 87th Congress.

Its chances of passage then look good.

ONE of the moving factors in getting things rolling again was an organization which sprang up after the 1955-56 floods, which had the cumbersome name of Rogue Basin Flood Control and Water Resources Association.

This was composed of many local organizations. But in practice, its governance was handled by a 16-man board of directors.

They are all men who are dedicated to eventual development of the Rogue basin. And this time, it had been hoped, the differences of the varied "special interests" could be reconciled in a plan which will harm no one special interest, and benefit all.

This is commendable.

BUT there is such a thing as being so dedicated to a single objective that you can't take into consideration anything else.

There is such a thing as not recognizing other worthy projects which (in these single-minded, dedicated eyes) might conceivably delay the thing you're working for.

There is such a thing as being blind to political realities, engineering realities, and the realities of widespread public opinion.

And there is also such a thing as using a "non-partisan" organization for violently partisan purposes, while at the same time throwing up one's hands in mock horror at "dirty old politics."

IF WE read the signs aright, the small board of directors of the Rogue Basin Flood Control and Water Resources association has trapped itself in that cul de sac which often is the dead-end for single-minded, dedicated organizations which won't listen to the opinions of others—including, be it noted, some of the groups which comprise its own membership.

It has played dog-in-the-manger with the Rogue River Valley Irrigation district, which wants and needs the Agate Dam project, on the grounds that this small project, to be tied in to the Talent project, might delay the over-all basin project—their Holy of Holies.

And this despite the best possible political and engineering advice that such would not be the case.

THEY lashed out at the Medford Chamber of Commerce, when it voiced approval of the Agate project as a small, but important, bit of irrigation and recreation development for the valley.

And this week they vented their spleen at Congressman Charles O. Porter (without whom the Rogue project would still be a dead issue), largely because he, too, supports the Agate project.

They did so by using the device of calling themselves "non-partisan" (which they are, or should be), and expressing a self-righteous horror at a frankly partisan press release he had issued for use AFTER he was to meet with them the other night.

WELL, it's the silly season, so one can expect more of this type of thing.

But one is tempted to wonder how much sub-rosa partisanship entered into the decision to withdraw Porter's invitation to the "non-partisan" board because of his frank and open partisan approach to his campaign for reelection.

Either they're babes in the political woods, or else they're out gunning for the Congressman and upholding the lily-white banner of "non-partisanship" to do it. We see no third alternative.

ON SECOND thought, maybe there is a third alternative.

Maybe they're afraid to listen to Porter, and his factual recounting of what has been done on their pet project, plus his "political" pitch for support.

Maybe they're afraid he just might convince them that he's right. And wouldn't that be awful!

It reminds us of the little girl who said: "I'm awfully glad I don't like spinach, because if I did, I'd eat it, and I hate the darn stuff."—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I DON'T CALL LETTUCE AN TOMATOES SALAD! I CALL POTATO SALAD SALAD!"

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

THE SPEECH

En Route with Nixon - In pelting rain in Memphis, in a thin drizzle in Arkansas, before a poor crowd in Queens and a good crowd in Mineola, and in other places too numerous to mention, Vice President Nixon on has been doggedly making "the speech" in the somewhat nervous days since the television debate with Sen. Kennedy.

Veteran members of the Nixon campaign encourage call it "the speech," because it always is, always has been, and presumably always will be just about the same speech. It has the uniformity, and some would say, the approximate intellectual consistency of toothpaste. It may be squeezed out long or short, but this is the only significant variation.

Technically, "the speech" is not an absolute innovation in American politics. Judging by reports, Senator Kennedy's shorter orations are also highly standardized. In the pre-convention campaign of 1952, Sen. Robert A. Taft, one of the least artful and most forthright leaders in our history, also made the same points in the same words on every street corner and platform in America. Indeed one suspects that Nixon's use of "the speech" is imitated from Taft.

BUT there is an important difference between "the speech" that Nixon delivers, and the flat, pedestrian, opinionated, fact-rammed, transparently honest, wonderfully self-revealing discourse that all reporters following Bob Taft eventually came to learn by heart. In "the speech," as delivered by Nixon, there is much emotion but there are almost no facts at all. A reference to the link between the cotton bolls in Mrs. Nixon's ceremonial bouquet and the cotton output of Arkansas is about par for the factual course. There is no self-revelation in "the speech," either. Nixon's public personality is on view. As to the opinions expressed, they are all contained in the following shortened version of "the speech":

"Religion, ideals, the family, America, the voters, President Eisenhower, Henry Cabot Lodge, and peace are all good things! Communism, poverty, Khrushchev, appeasement, farm surpluses, and war are all bad things! Senator Kennedy is also a bad thing, because he keeps saying that America's world position has been deteriorating."

"But that does not mean we have no problems. Take these insert your favorite rights, or farm surpluses, or the balance of military power in the world. This is a national problem. We need to make progress in this field. All Americans must move forward. We must leave no one behind!"

THE sentences emphasized are those the Vice President actually used, when outlining his proposed specific solution of the civil rights problem in Memphis. But almost the same sentences serve him almost equally well to outline solutions for all the other problems. "Progress," "moving forward," "keeping America first," are also good things.

As can be seen, "the speech" does not offer its hearers an indigestible intellectual diet. That does not mean, however, that it is uninteresting. As a salesmanship, it is very good indeed. There are moments when it comes so close to a television commercial that you expect to hear

a boast about "the BIGGER, more GENEROUS quart container." The use of these well-tested devices of emphasis is effective, although not always attractive. It is all the more effective, too, because of the happily simple Nixonian division between good things and bad things. A throbbing lit in the speaker's voice invites the listening thousands to cheer for peace, America, and family life. A sudden hardening of tone calls for hisses for Khrushchev, war, and weakness. And the invited responses almost automatically occur, as though buttons had been pushed in the crowd.

YET one cannot avoid wondering why this highly intelligent, remarkably well-informed man, capable of such an effort as the acceptance speech at Chicago, should be stumping the country with a standard campaign speech of just this kind. Is it because he thinks the voters are like queasy infants who reject any nourishment more solid than pablum? This has not been his view in the past.

Or is it because Nixon thinks the best campaign strategy is to begin with television commercials, and to go on to something more serious later on? This may be the case. He has already begun to publish special position papers, like the interesting one on education. On special occasions, too, he has addressed himself in some detail to special topics, as in his farm speeches.

Yet, "the speech" remains a mystery, all the same, unless you simply assume that Nixon is mainly trying to avoid the Charybdis of Bob Taft's kind of Republicanism and the Scylla of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's more novel and controversial brand. If this is the answer to the riddle, the double effort of avoidance is successful. But it must be added that this effort has also landed the Vice President in a kind of middle-of-the-road void. (c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE TV DEBATE

The TV debate was a bold innovation which is bound to be carried forward into future campaigns, and could not now be abandoned. From now on it will be impossible for any candidate for any important elective office to avoid this kind of confrontation with his opponent.

This will have considerable consequences. One of the most interesting is that it will break down the synthetic candidates, the men who communicate with the public only by reading speeches that other men have written. The TV confrontation forces a man to speak for himself. For which he will still be able to recite passages written by others—as both Kennedy and Nixon did—the whole effect is the product of the candidate himself, and not of his ghost writers and public relations men.

In this first try, which can be improved in the future, the main impact was not that of a real debate. It was the showing, as no other medium could, of the two personalities. TV, it is often said, is a truth machine. What the machine revealed is hard to put into words. But we may be sure that the chief effect of what it revealed will not be felt immediately in the opinions of the voters but on their unconscious attitude towards the two men. That is probably the reason why immediately after the debate it proved impossible to measure the effect on the election.

OF THE experiment itself, I would make two criticisms. The first is that the cameras, which can be very searching but can also be cruel and sometimes unfair, were very hard on Mr. Nixon. I do not for a moment suggest that they were intended to be unfair. Almost certainly, however, they were not corrected for his photogenic defects. They made him look sick, which he is not, and they made him look older and more worn than he is. I do not understand the technical reasons for this. But they should be studied. For it was a misrepresentation and we must make sure for the future that the cameras are in fact impartial.

My second criticism is that the procedure, as agreed to by the candidates themselves, prevented the exchanges from becoming a genuine debate. The candidates should be able to question one another, subject to the right of the moderator to rule a question as out of order. There is no reason, except of course the prudence of the candidates themselves, why there should be interposed between them a panel of interrogators.

Furthermore, in my view if there is to be a genuine debate which is to have a decisive influence on the national election, an hour is too short a time to devote to domestic affairs. There is something unsuitable in having the two men, one of them is to be the

next President of the United States, told that they have "three minutes and 20 seconds" to sum up. If these debates are worth having at all, they should be allowed to run on without rigid time limits until the two principals themselves have had their full say. If that proves to be boring to some of the audience, it will be enlightening to the rest of it.

AS FOR the show itself, each person's reactions are personal and subjective. My general feeling was that both men treated each other with dignity and respect, and behaved as the citizens of a free county are supposed to behave. My main surprise came from the fact that I expected Mr. Nixon to be the more aggressive of the two. It turned out that he was on the defensive, responding to the challenges which Mr. Kennedy put to him.

I have since read the text of the debate, and it supports this impression of Kennedy's holding the initiative. But the impression is less vivid in the text than it was, for me at least, in the viewing. And that difference was due, I believe, to what at the cameras did to Mr. Nixon and to the general effect of his physical vitality being lower than Mr. Kennedy's.

IN FACT, so much did he seem to be on the defensive that I became convinced that he was far from happy and comfortable in the position he occupies on the welfare measures, and on the question of economic growth. It would be only a little exaggerated to say that he sounded as if he wished he had Kennedy's side of the argument. Certainly he had no burning convictions against the Kennedy position, and to my ear he was diffident and apologetic in dealing with it.

This effect of being in a minor key may well be the result of his reasonably sure it is the result of his trying to deal with three conflicting pressures, one coming from Goldwater reactionaries, one from the Rockefeller progressives, and one from the Eisenhower record itself. As a result of these pressures he looked and sounded like a man who knew that he was in a difficult position and was determined to preserve his dignity and to make the best of it.

THEY have been missing from this page the last two Sundays. It was the victim of a surplus number of things the Potluck editor (who also has other chores) had to do. It may or may not be revised.

Did you miss it? Do you want it back? The Potluck editor wants to know whether it's worth the effort to write the column each week, or whether readers would sooner have more serious things to read about.

feel both men could say about Europe and its problems. They can get no clear conceptions, at least from the campaign speeches as reported abroad, as to how much the candidates believe in the economic integration of Europe and how strongly they would push it whether they would oppose deGaulle's anti-integration influence, encourage or discourage British entry into the Common Market, restrict or expand the arming of Germany. They do not know what value either man places upon free Berlin. They do not know how keenly either man realizes the implications of the tremendous role the President has sketched out for the United Nations, the effect, for example, of general UN custodianship over Africa upon Europe's own pace and system for altering the status of Algeria or Kenya or Nyasaland. As for the Asiatic tinderboxes, while they know both Nixon and Kennedy would refuse to deal with Red China, they have no idea whether either man would withdraw those fragile hostages to our common fortune, the off-shore islands.

The truth is that Europe does not know either Nixon or Kennedy. Kennedy has not recently appeared in Europe, and while Nixon has visited Britain, he left a confused and impermanent impression. As far as Europe is concerned, Mr. Nixon suffers from having been the understudy of a President that Europe, to

put it bluntly - has grown tired of, and Mr. Kennedy suffers from the fact of having supplanted Adlai Stevenson, the American beacon for an astonishing number of responsible Europeans, and the man whose mind they feel they do know.

I suppose no Presidential candidate in mid-campaign would concede to this suggestion, and none would do so purely in the interests of allies, who are not, after all, doing the voting. But there is one simple act that would bring the whole campaign into focus for Europe and other foreign regions; one act that would reveal the minds of the two candidates in world terms. That would be the public designation now, by each man of his prospective Secretary of State. Whatever the names, whether Bowles or Stevenson or Dillon or someone else, they would be the names of men who have accumulated meaningful, disservice records on the specific problems of Europe, Africa and Asia.

If the two names were now would be able to take the first real measure of Nixon and Kennedy and to see if they do significantly differ on the great global issues. Indeed, it is not only the outside world that would feel enlightened, but a fair few millions of perplexed American voters.

(Distributed 1960 by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.) (All Rights Reserved)

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

THERE'S ONE swank hospital in New York where rich folk go to rest up from the merry march of cocktail parties and galas. The town's best brawls have been held in some of those private hospital suites!

One day a group of a male patient's friends invaded the premises with a whole case of liquor and before long everybody, including the patient, was pie-eyed. The next morning the donor of the liquor woke up with a very guilty conscience. He phoned the hospital and asked to talk to his incapacitated pal, Biff Carter.

"Sorry," reported a hospital attendant, "but Mr. Carter is no longer with us."

"Good Lord!" gasped the caller. "What happened?"

"Mr. Carter was so sick this morning," explained the attendant, "that we had to send him home."

© 1960, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

From Whittier, Calif.: Dr. Albert Upton, chairman of Whittier college's English department and a former professor of Vice President Nixon, says he thought the Kennedy-Nixon TV debate was a disappointment.

"I never saw two such eggs laid in my life," he told a reporter. "I suppose we have to regard it as good when two American politicians act as gentlemen."

"But if that is what is known as a history-making debate, I hope they call off the rest of them."

TUT! TUT! Dr. Upton. I'm afraid you're getting old. In these days GLAMOR is the big word.

FROM New York: Emily Post, internationally famous authority on the social graces, dies. She had been in poor health for several years.

WHO was Emily Post? She was a gracious influence in the world. Born in Baltimore in 1873 into a gracious and cultured family, she made a career out of good manners. Her book, "Etiquette," written in her middle years, established her as an authority on proper behavior and made her world famous.

It is a complete encyclopedia on how people should behave in all kinds of situations. In it, she gives rules for all occasions. But she emphasized above all her own belief that good manners are less a matter of rules than, in her own words, "a sensitive awareness of the needs of others."

She was able to adapt herself to changing social conditions and revised her book at frequent intervals to include new practices of polite behavior.

SUGGESTION to Mr. Kroosh: Buy yourself a copy of Emily Post's book. Study it carefully, thoughtfully - even prayerfully. Note its disapproval of those who make themselves out as in china shops. Heed its precepts - especially those having to do with the importance of a sensitive awareness of the needs of others.

As for me, I am proud to be an American citizen. Here in the U.S. I can vote for whom I want to be my leader. He might not win, but I have the freedom to vote. I wonder how many common people in Communist countries have this freedom?

Yes, our government has restrictions on us as right but, for every restriction there are freedoms too many to write in this space.

He spoke of losing his property to the government. Well, he's lucky. The people in Communist countries don't own any property to lose.

If Communism is so wonderful, why is it that for every person who leaves the West and goes to live in the East, we have a million or two who leave the East and come to the West to live? When they are asked why they left their homeland of Communism, they all say, we wanted to have freedom.

So my friend, I think you should count your blessings while you still have some to count. Don Turnbaugh, (A Korean Vet) Box 18-A, Applegate, Ore.

Thanks To the Editor: We would like to thank the residents of Medford for the kind reception given us on our recent candy sale for the Oregon Crippled Childrens Hospital School in Eugene. This school is for children from any part of Oregon who need special schooling and therapy because of physical handicaps. Because of the generosity of the people in this area we were able to send over \$300 to the school. Deepest thanks from Alpha Lambda and Delta Omega chapters. Mrs. C. R. Harrison Secretary, Alpha Lambda Epsilon Sigma Alpha Int'l Medford.

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

Oct. 2, 1950 (Monday) Some residents of Rogue River still protest the naming of a new bridge there "Tail-hol" and claim that proponents of that name "railroaded" it through the county court.

The annual Jackson County Community Chest opens its drive tomorrow with its 1950 goal set at \$75,000.

20 YEARS AGO

Oct. 2, 1940 (Wednesday) Joseph O. Gray, long-time Medford resident and former member of the Medford district school board and city council, died Tuesday after a brief illness.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "The weather is uncertain. It's too warm for an overcoat, and too cold to run around without a hat. In the rural areas it's too wet to plow, but not to go deer hunting."

30 YEARS AGO

Oct. 2, 1930 (Thursday) The county court has announced plans to improve county roads as a means of providing relief employment. The Fruitgrowers' League yesterday voiced a protest over the government's policy of charging for fruit inspection.

40 YEARS AGO

Oct. 2, 1920 (Saturday) The county court has decided to put a measure on the ballot proposing transfer of the county seat from Jacksonville to Medford. A meeting of all interested persons will be held at Crater Lake Monday to seek ways of bettering conditions there.

50 YEARS AGO

Oct. 2, 1910 (Sunday) Postal receipts in Medford have increased 98 per cent this month over last month to a new record high of \$4,044. The Rogue River Valley University club, an organization of male university graduates, held its first meeting here last night with 75 persons attending.

What's Your I.Q.?

Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

- 1. Does a planetarium house exotic plant life or marine life?
2. Amyl acetate has an odor like which fruit?
3. In which state of the U.S. did the Whiskey Rebellion occur?
4. Of the big game animals hunted in the U.S., are there more moose, deer or bear?
5. Who was responsible for the "Massacre of the Innocents" at Bethlehem?
6. Is the right side of a ship (looking forward) the starboard or the port side?
7. "The Three Sisters," "Rainier" and "Hood" are all what?
8. What did Napoleon say an army marched on?
9. Did Leon Trotsky, who was banished from the USSR, die a natural death in Mexico?
10. "Pickett's Charge" occurred in what decisive battle of the War Between the States?
11. Neither, (Mödel or representation of the planetary system); 2. Bananas; 3. Pennsylvania; 4. Deer; 5. Herod; 6. Starboard; 7. Mountains; 8. Its stomach; 9. No, he was assassinated; 10. Gettysburg.