

Medford Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., Ph. 5F-4-4141

Subscription Rates
By Mail - In Advance Copy 15c
Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$8.00

Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County
History from the Medford Mail Tribune, 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
All members of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce received instructions in the mail today for an intensive program to increase the membership of the group.

20 YEARS AGO
Medford high's Black Tornado will play Astoria or The Dalles Nov. 21, Thanksgiving Day, in an elimination game to help determine the state football championship, it was announced today.

30 YEARS AGO
A series of revival meetings started this week at Williams creek.
A recount is being demanded by the unsuccessful candidate in the city's mayoralty race.

40 YEARS AGO
Work has resumed on the Ruch highway after being delayed temporarily by rain and stormy weather.
A proposal has been made to the local school board to erect bleachers at the high school football field.

50 YEARS AGO
Bank deposits in the four Medford banks have increased 22 per cent during the past 10 months.
The Southern Pacific rate hearings progressed in Medford today with railroad officials apparently unable to justify why freight costs more to ship from Medford than Portland.

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

1. What was the name of the woman who was called "Princess Alice"?
2. Name the American woman who was known as "Angel of the Battlefield"?
3. Who recently wrote of an episode in her life in a book entitled "I'll Cry Tomorrow"?
4. Name the famous woman saloon wrecker of pre-prohibition days.

5. It is a quarter to 10 o'clock; if the minute and hour hand were reversed, what time would it be according to the clock?
6. What relation is a daughter of my mother's niece to me?
7. How many States begin with the letter "E"?
8. In what continent are the ten highest mountains of the world?
9. What is the source of the Mississippi river?
10. Unscramble these pieces of common furniture: TAPNODREV and NIDSROW IRACH.

Answers: 1. Alice Longworth Roosevelt, 2. Clara Barton, 3. Lillian Roth, 4. Carrie Nation, 5. Eighty-five, 6. Second cousin, 7. None, 8. Asia, 9. Lake Itasca in Minnesota, 10. Davenport and Windsor chair.

Electoral College

When will the United States elect its new President? Silly, (do you say?) we elected him a week ago. No, He'll be elected in January, and not until then. For authority, let's go to the Constitution (which a lot of people talk about, but few take the trouble to read).

It says: Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the state may be entitled in the Congress, but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector. The electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for President, and Vice President...

THERE'S more, spelling out in detail what happens if no individual receives a majority of the votes of the college of electors. But in essence, that's it.

In Oregon, electors are named at the general election. (Did you know you were voting for electors and not for either Kennedy or Nixon? You were. Their names were in small print on the ballot just under the names of the candidates they were supporting.)

In other states, electors are named by various different systems. In Oregon, at one time, electors were named in the primary election.

THUS the electoral college actually names the new president under a system dating back to 1789, and modified somewhat in 1804.

Over the years, many attempts have been made to change it, so that the electoral college will either be eliminated, or will reflect more accurately the popular vote.

A president can, in fact, receive a majority of the popular vote and still lose the election. It has happened. And it came close to happening in 1960, too.

How can this be? It is because the electoral college, like the Congress itself, in effect represents states, not people.

FOR instance, a candidate could be elected president by carrying only 12 states—New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Texas, California, Michigan, Missouri, Georgia, North Carolina, Massachusetts and Wisconsin, with a total of 272 electoral votes.

Say he carried each of them by only 51 per cent of their popular votes.

And say the other candidate carried all the 38 other states, and say, further, that he carried them by tremendous majorities. He would have a big majority of the popular vote of the entire nation, but he would lose, because the minority candidate had the majority of electoral votes.

In 1960, it appears that Kennedy will receive a bare majority of the popular vote. But his electoral vote victory is overwhelming.

NO FEDERAL law says that electors have to vote for the winning candidate of their party. As a matter of fact, several southern states this year ran slates of "unpledged" electors, who if elected would be free to vote for any candidate they wanted.

In Alabama, six unpledged electors were elected; in Mississippi, all eight electors are unpledged.

But ironclad tradition, and in some cases state law (as in Oregon), pledges most electors to vote for their party candidates.

OREGON'S Republican electors will meet in Salem Dec. 19 to cast their ballots for Richard M. Nixon for President.

Of course, it will be nothing but a formality, in conformity with the constitution and with state law.

And when Congress reconvenes, the electoral votes will be opened and counted and (surprise!) John F. Kennedy will be found to have gained a majority of the nation's electoral votes.

Then, and not until then, will he be formally President-elect of the United States.

IT IS a bit ironic that the Constitution directs the President of the Senate to open and canvass the electoral vote.

For, on Jan. 6, 1961, the President of the Senate will be the Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, whose term runs until Jan. 20, 1961.

Mr. Nixon thus is in the position of having to open the electoral votes and proclaim that his opponent, John F. Kennedy, has been elected President.

UP TO now attempts to abolish, or change, the electoral college have failed—probably, as Lyle Wilson pointed out on this page yesterday, at least in part due to the opposition of voting "bloes" who find the system to their advantage.

But the closeness of the 1960 election may once again stimulate action along these lines. It would take a Constitutional amendment to change the system, and it takes several years, usually, to get such an amendment approved. —E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"RUFFS BURYIN' HIS BONE... AN' I'M BURYIN' MY PEANUT BUTTER SAMMICH!"

In the Day's News

As this is written, Kennedy's POPULAR vote is some 350,000 in excess of Nixon's popular vote—a lead of about 1 per cent. His lead in the ELECTORAL COLLEGE vote is overwhelming—about 62 per cent.

That suggests the challenging thought that a candidate for President could get a majority of the popular vote and still lose out to his opponent in the electoral college.

AS a matter of fact, THAT HAPPENED ONCE. It was in 1876. In that election, Democratic Candidate Samuel J. Tilden of New York received 4,300,590 popular votes. His opponent, Republican Candidate Rutherford B. Hayes of Ohio, received only 4,038,298 votes—a POPULAR majority of 262,292 for Tilden.

In the electoral college—After a bitter battle, full of shenanigans and lasting more than three months, HAYES WON BY ONE VOTE IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE, and became President.

IT'S a long story. Oregon entered into it in quite a big way. In the 1876 Presidential election, Oregon WENT FOR HAYES in the popular vote.

When his electors came up for certification, it developed that one of the REPUBLICAN electors (a man named Watts) was employed as a fourth class postmaster at an annual salary of \$268. This office was held to be one of "trust and profit," and as such prohibited by Presidential electors by Article II, Section 1 of the constitution.

So—Oregon's Democratic governor, L. F. Grover, with the enthusiastic encouragement of his fellow partisans, state and national, ruled that Watts was ineligible and replaced him with a DEMOCRATIC elector. This action resulted in a row that rattled the rafters not only in Oregon but all over the country and had immense connotations in the final outcome of the Tilden-Hayes contest.

OREGON then had four electoral votes—two for its two senators and two for its two representatives in the congress. On the day the Oregon electoral college was scheduled to meet, the four electors met in a room in the state capitol set aside for their use.

When they were assembled, the secretary of state arrived with the electoral certificates and HANDED THEM TO CRONIN, the Democrat appointed by Governor Grover. The three Republican electors asked for their certificates. Cronin refused to surrender them.

Thereupon the three Republican electors proceeded to organize THEIR OWN electoral college. The Democrat, Cronin, retired to a remote corner of the room and turned himself into a ONE-MAN electoral college. His first act was to declare that TWO vacancies existed. He filled the "vacancies" at once, naming TWO DEMOCRATS—who just happened to be waiting outside the door.

AS THE national situation then stood, after a bloody battle in the South, especially in South Carolina, Florida and Louisiana, Tilden needed only ONE more electoral college vote to win. So, to make things look good, this rump electoral college in Oregon gave one vote to Tilden and TWO to Hayes.

That was a fatal error. In the general all-over result in the national electoral college make-up that followed the ruckuses in the South, it turned out that Tilden needed TWO electoral votes from

Mounting Unrest, Civil Disturbances, Noted In Many Latin American States

By PHIL NEWSOM UPI Foreign Editor
One of the many suggestions fired in the direction of President-elect Kennedy is that he undertake a pre-inauguration, get-acquainted tour of Latin America.

If he does, there will be plenty to occupy his attention, from Salvador, smallest of the Latin Republics, to Brazil, the largest.

Excluding Cuba, which must remain the No. 1 hemispheric headache, the new president will find U.S.-Latin American relations embrace just about every problem in the book.

Here are a few for instance: A mixed civilian-military junta has just taken over Salvador, nestled between Guatemala and Honduras on the Pacific, after a coup which toppled President Jose Maria Lemus. The United States has been slow to recognize the new regime, apparently suspecting of pro-Castro, leftist leanings.

The new government says it has been convicted without a trial and resentment against the United States is mounting.

Nicaragua and Guatemala are in trouble. Armed attacks by rebels have occurred in each. Officials charge the rebels wear Fidel Castro uniforms and are supplied by Cuba.

States of siege have been imposed in Nicaragua and Guatemala. In Costa Rica, rebels killed the national guard commander in a border skirmish. Costa Rican troops have been fighting for some time against forces planning an attack on Nicaragua, long a particular target of the Castro regime.

In Venezuela, President Romulo Betancourt's three-party coalition seems on the verge of falling apart, partly because of economic difficulties and partly because of divergent views toward Castro. Betancourt himself is markedly cool to the Cuban revolutionary regime.

Mounting unrest plagues the governments of Chile, Brazil and Argentina. A strike called to enforce demands for wage parity with

the armed services paralyzed Brazil's transport system last week.

Other Strikes Expensive strikes also hit Argentina and Chile where government austerity programs are unpopular. The strikes were suspiciously coincidental with Moscow's observance of the 43rd anniversary of communism's "October revolution."

To these situations may be added increasing U.S. concern over the enormous flow of communist weapons to Cuba, far above any normal defense requirements. It is suspected that some of these arms are intended for other Latin American revolutionary groups.

Latin America hailed Kennedy's election in the belief it heralded a new era of "good neighborliness." But Latin Americans long have been both suspicious and resentful of their big northern neighbor, and their attitude also will be one of wait and see.

Matter of Fact by Joseph Alsop

KENNEDY AND THE LIBERALS
Washington—The main decision Senator Kennedy made as the immediate aftermath of his victory, was to make no further decisions at all until he had had a rest.

His staff began to press for answers to a thousand questions, as staffs will. He told them, reportedly, that he was dizzy.

JOSEPH ALSOP with the fatigue of the campaign, and would therefore give no answers until he returns from Florida.

Thus he went off for his vacation with every basic issue unresolved, except for his announcement that he was asking Allen Dulles and J. Edgar Hoover to continue at their posts. This he had wisely decided upon many weeks ago, when he first began to think about what shape a Kennedy administration ought to take.

Meanwhile, the biggest of the unresolved issues centers in the Secretaryship of State. It is an inflamed issue, because the liberal wing of the Democratic party is campaigning hard to secure the first place in the Cabinet for Adlai Stevenson, and if Stevenson does not succeed, to insure the alternative appointment of Chester Bowles.

ALL the forces that opposed Lyndon B. Johnson's nomination to the vice-presidency are again being mobilized to plead for Bowles, or better still, for Stevenson. Even the chief of the C. I. O., the redoubtable Walter Reuther, is reputed to be ready to plunge into the fray. The campaign's clarion call has already been publicly sounded, with an extremely able leading editorial in "The New Republic."

The parallel with the row about the Johnson nomination is instructive, because the Johnson nomination row revealed the persistent flaw in American political liberalism. This flaw is an incurable tendency to put shibboleths ahead of practical facts. Lyndon Johnson, for no logical reason at all, was a black shibboleth of evil to liberal eyes. Kennedy's choice of Johnson was therefore decried as a "betrayal," which was pure folly as the event proved.

In the same manner, though with better reasons, Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles are the liberals' shining shibboleths of virtue. Hence there will be renewed cries of "betrayal," if Kennedy does not name either Stevenson or Bowles to the Secretaryship of State.

There would indeed be grounds for complaint, if Kennedy failed to offer important places to both of these men. Obviously, however, he will not fail to do so. But he may well fail to offer either of them the one job their friends want for them. The reasons for suspecting this outcome are apparent. They all lie on the surface of the situation.

THE first reason is the one already noted—the apprehensive tone of the campaign in favor of Stevenson and/or Bowles. The Stevenson-Bowles backers would hardly be so insistent if they did not have some cause, apparently of a private character, to fear a different choice.

The second reason is the character of Kennedy's specifications for Secretary of State, already listed above. It points toward the kind of man who will be temperamentally sympathetic to Kennedy, who will be primarily a first-rate technician, and who will give his entire energy to executing a Kennedy policy instead of pressing for an alternative policy.

Despite all the admirable qualities of Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles, it is at least doubtful whether either Stevenson or Bowles is quite the kind of man Kennedy's specifications point toward. In addition, there is the urgent need to unite the country, after a narrow electoral victory with very rough going ahead. The truth is, there is more need to unite the country now, than there was a need to unite the Democratic Party at Los Angeles, when the disputed choice of Johnson produced the necessary result. That, surely, is the point that has to be most carefully weighed.

(c) 1960, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Washington Report

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

NIXON
Washington—Though it lost the presidency only by the most desperately thin popular margin in three-quarters of a century, the Republican party is in a bad way nationally.

It is in so bad a way, indeed, that the outlook is extremely gloomy for its defeated champion, Richard M. Nixon, to gain a second presidential nomination in 1964.

Paradox is the word for the present position of the G.O.P. If it is short on followers, it is, in a curious way, long on leadership—that of Nixon. For he picks himself up from the dust as still not only the strongest man in his party but also as the one man likely to become absolutely indispensable to it for the big race four years from now.

Yours in so narrow a way, as the candidate of a party which went into battle trailing by 4 to 6 in voter registration, he has at any rate won a bright party future for himself. It is, in football terms, far from a disgrace to lose by a single field goal when the odds had favored your opponent by a couple of touchdowns.

NIXON is in defeat but by no means in discredit; in his case there is not the slightest reason even to contemplate unconditional surrender.

For he has actually become more than ever necessary to the G.O.P. because of the after-effects of the very election he lost: He is today the only man around who is reputedly capable of keeping alive the whole vital center of the G.O.P.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, the favorite of the fragmentary liberal wing of the party, is beyond doubt headed down and not up. The loss to the Republicans nationally of his own state, by a majority so tremendous as to have few parallels in history, has marked Rockefeller as the man who could not or would not deliver for his own party when the bitter chips were most bitterly down.

It is thus just short of inconceivable that he could have any wide influence at the 1964 Republican National convention.

He will be in perfect position to do the job: Out of the responsibilities of public office; but possessed of the vast advantages of his titular party leadership. No longer compelled by loyalty to defend the weaknesses of a retiring administration. Rid at last, because of a decent and fair campaign, of the old whisperer suggestions that there was "something wrong" with Richard Nixon.

Nixon himself is a walking casualty sure to recover for more warfare. But a permanent and buried casualty now will be that old Epithet which so long punished him: "Tricky Dick."

(Copyright, 1960, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

Chelsea, Mass.—(AP)—Gen. William J. Keville, 83, World War I commander of the Yankee Division and former Massachusetts adjutant general, died Monday.

CRUMBLER A VERY FAT MAN to his 8-year-old son on the sands of Miami Beach. "I brought you all the way from Indianapolis to swim in the salt water of the Atlantic. So why don't you be a brave boy and plunge into those waves?"

"I will, Daddy, I will," his son responded earnestly—"Just the second you stop standing on one of my flippers."

The "dust unto dust" idea is developed along these lines by Prof. Richard Armour, of Scripps College.

The tusks that clashed in mighty brawls Of mastodons, are billiard balls. The sword of Charlemagne the Just Is ferric oxide, known as rust.

The grizzly bear whose potent hug Was feared by all, is now a rug. Great Caesar's bust is on the shelf— And I don't feel so well myself!

(c) 1960, by Bennett Cert. Distributed by King Features Syndicate

