

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturdays by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., Ph. 772-6141

ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
HERB GREY, Photo Editor
Gerald T. Latham, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
PAUL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHAPMAN, Tel. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail—In Advance
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$10.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$5.00
Sunday Only—1 year \$10.00
Single Copy—5c

By Carrier—And Motor Route
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$21.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$12.00
Sunday Only—1 year \$11.00
Carrier and Vendors—Copy 10c

Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International
Full Leased Wire
U. P. Telephoto News Pictures
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

Advertising Representative:
Nelson Roberts, ASSOCIATES, Offices in New York, Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, Portland

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
ASSOCIATE MEMBER

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

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
Nov. 11, 1952 (Tuesday)

Plans for the Talent division of the Rogue valley development project, now under study by the Bureau of Reclamation, are virtually complete, according to the regional director of the bureau.

Sixteen recent burglaries—11 in Medford and five in Ashland—have been solved by Medford city police in cooperation with local citizens and Ashland police.

20 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1942 (Wednesday)

One Medford boy dies, two others injured when car hits culvert on Crater Lake highway near McAndrews rd.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "Coffee hoarders are reported thwarted by grocers punching a hole in the airtight can. One of these days a hoarder will turn tinsmith and thwart the grocer by soldering the hole when he gets home."

30 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1932 (Friday)

Final tabulation of votes shows S. A. Kroschel elected to city council by margin of nine votes over Walter E. Rowley.

Hood River high school refuses to play Medford high football team for mythical state championship; local athletic officials hope to schedule title game with La Grande.

40 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1922 (Saturday)

Railroad conductor fined \$10 in Eugene when train blocks crossing; item reported as "good news to Medford residents who have had to wait at local crossings."

Five men fined \$250 each in Medford court on charge of violating prohibition law.

50 YEARS AGO
Nov. 11, 1912 (Monday)

Judge J. H. Canon, Medford, announces he is candidate for U.S. marshal for Oregon; reports much encouragement from Democratic party leaders.

Medford police open traffic regulation enforcement program; Chief Hittson stands at intersection of Main and Front sts. for several hours "nanking teams, automobiles and even bicycles make the corner properly."

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. Who was Noah's grandfather?
2. How many feet are in 60 fathoms?
3. Is a carillon a form of square dance, kind of antique cannon, or a set of bells tuned to play the full scale?
4. Is the Ruhr in western or in eastern Germany?
5. Who was the "Man of Destiny"?
6. Osaka, Kobe and Yokohama are large cities in which country?
7. Which floats more readily, a fat or lean person?
8. Which country is called "the land of the midnight sun"?
9. How many sessions must a Congressman attend in order to qualify?
10. Name the Nobel Prize winner who wrote "Main Street" and "Babbalanza".

Answers: 1. Methuselah, 2. 360, 3. Set of bells, 4. Western, 5. Napoleon, 6. Japan, 7. Fat person, 8. Norway, 9. One, to be sworn in and seated, 10. Sinclair Lewis.

Steinbeck's Prize

The recent award of the Nobel Prize for literature to John Steinbeck is, apparently, not being well received by the critics.

Oddly, the ones who are complaining the loudest over Steinbeck's selection are his fellow countrymen, the Americans.

Prize winners have been panned or attacked before. Some of the critics have tastes so refined that no choice could ever please them.

In the case of Boris Pasternak, the Russians were unhappy about his selection because his writings didn't square with the party line.

But with Steinbeck, the critics are derogating the choice because they feel he didn't merit it, because his work is not of sufficient quality to receive that highest of all literary honors.

FOLLOWING the death of William Faulkner some months ago, we attempted an evaluation of the current American literary scene.

We found it bleak, and suggested that unless the Nobel Prize committee should see fit to honor aging Poet Robert Frost, it might be a decade or more before an American would again be named.

In the same appraisal, we remarked that Steinbeck's pen "still had some power," but, somehow, the prospect of him winning the prize seemed too remote and unlikely to be seriously considered.

We've been wrong before, but seldom so happy about it.

WITH all due deference to those immensely larger talents who have pooh-poohed Steinbeck's selection, and wagged a for-shame finger at the committee for its less than elevated taste, we must say we think it an apt and deserved nomination.

We can't agree with the committee which found Steinbeck's work to be of equal rank with his contemporaries, Hemingway and Faulkner, but at the same time his rather considerable contribution to literature should not be minimized or cavalierly dismissed as inferior.

Both from the standpoint of quality and quantity, Steinbeck is a major writer. His mind has been fertile, his themes varied, and his output consistent, readable, interesting and at times provocative.

His characterizations are vivid and memorable, and his sense of human relationships, while perhaps too often larger—or less than—life, is accurate and sure.

THE bases of the attacks against Steinbeck have, to be sure, some real validity.

He has been too often preoccupied with patently socio-economic themes. His life philosophy is rather more shallow than profound.

His handling of sentiment—true human emotion—lapses an uncomfortable number of times into a mawkish, maudlin sentimentality.

And when he gets a gimmick hobbyhorse going for him in his novels, more often than not, he rides it and rides it long past the point where a more talented writer would have changed mounts.

In "East of Eden," for example, the work "timshel" seemingly occurs (it really doesn't) on every other page. He even ended the book with it.

His ability to develop allegory, as in "Winter of Our Discontent," is mediocre at best when compared with the real masters of that most difficult of all literary devices.

BUT if success and reader popularity have any meaning at all (we're vulnerable here, we know), then Steinbeck did himself an injustice when, upon being told he had won the prize, he said he didn't deserve it.

His "Grapes of Wrath" is clearly one of the major works to come out of the great depression period. Its accuracy and validity have never been successfully questioned, and it has been frequently said to have been instrumental in causing legislation to be enacted which better protected the migrant worker from exploitation.

It has been translated into several languages, and is standard required reading in most American literature courses on campuses throughout the country.

It will be read as an important document of that unhappy period in American history so long as the United States and its people are of consequence in the world.

TOO often in recent years, the committee has succumbed to its esoteric, if not "precious" tastes, in its selection of a prizewinner in literature.

We would not suggest for a minute that the committee total up book sales for the year and then award the prize to the writer who has made the most money.

But neither would we completely turn a cold shoulder on the tastes of the ordinary reader. Wide popularity is not necessarily a prima facie case for indifferent quality.

The King James translation of the Old Testament has been read with incalculable enjoyment by countless millions. And Shakespeare did not write his plays for the exclusive pleasure of the literati.

Steinbeck doesn't really deserve to be mentioned in the same breath with the previous examples, but his staying power and wide readership do, we think, speak for themselves—and more than certify him as a valid and meritorious winner of the Nobel Prize for literature.—G.H.B.

"Of Course I Know—It's Mrs. Roosevelt"



Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE DOMINANT AMERICAN MAJORITY

As I read the election returns on Wednesday morning, the dominant majority, not only in the country as a whole but also within each of the parties, is not on the left or on the right but in the center.



Lippmann, in New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan—were won by conservative but progressive men—Rockefeller and Javits, Scanton and Romney. (I do not know about Mr. Rhodes in Ohio.) The biggest Republican defeat—that of Mr. Nixon in California—was the defeat of a politician who does not have the confidence of moderate men.

There is nothing in the returns to suggest that there is a Republican majority, much less a popular majority, for Sen. Goldwater and those to the right of him. The Republican party will have to go to the country in 1964 as the conservative and progressive party of Rockefeller, Javits, Scanton, and Romney.

THE Democrats have lost. If indeed they have lost them, only a handful of seats in the House. According to the rules of the political game as played for half a century, when the party in power loses little if anything in a mid-term election, it really wins a victory. President Kennedy has had a sizeable vote to approval.

I do not know, and it may be impossible to know, how big a part the Cuban affair played in the outcome. But in the long view President Kennedy, who is a man of the center, is entitled to feel that he represents and reflects a great centrist majority.

To be a man of the center is to be at once conservative,

liberal, and progressive. Mr. Kennedy has always been a man of the center and in leading the Democratic Administration to the center position, he has led the Democratic party to the place where the big majority live.

THE election has shown that the Democrats are still the majority party in the country. But, of course, they are not a united party. They are divided into three wings—a very conservative wing based on the South, a liberal and progressive wing based on the industrial centers in the North and East, and a centrist wing which might just as well be called the Kennedy administration wing.

If we ask ourselves whether President Kennedy can turn his victory in the election into hard votes for his legislative program, I would guess that he will not be able to do that in any large measure. He is likely to do something better on certain of his welfare measures because the Rockefeller-Romney-Scanton Republicans will want to identify themselves with measures that are popular in the great urban centers. There is also a chance that, because Governor Rockefeller is a modern educated man in economic theory, the President may win support for the critical and important matter of installing an expansionary fiscal policy.

BUT if the President makes some headway in these matters, it will not be spectacular. There is no popular support for innovations at home. The President's great support is in the field of our vital national and international interests.

Here his stature has grown greatly since he first went to the White House, and with the new international prospects that are opening up since Cuba and the Chinese-Indo war, it is good to know that in the search for peace with honor he can count upon such substantial popular support.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Americans are in complete agreement that in the death of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt we have lost one of our greats.

Often cynical Frank Lloyd Wright once said of her: "She fully justified the giving of the vote to women."

William D. Hassett, who served on the staff of President Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1935 until his death in 1945, describes her as "easily the world's foremost humanitarian," and adds:

"Of course, she made powerful enemies, but when necessary she could always defend herself with a free conscience and the courage of a mighty heart."

LET'S put it this way: Lake Sir Galahad, Eleanor Roosevelt could always say—no matter how rough the going might be.

"My strength is as the strength of ten."

"Because my heart is pure."

People like that are GREAT.

FROM Portland: Portland voters tightened the city's purse strings in the Tuesday election, defeating ALL MONEY MEASURES on the municipal ballot.

Question: Could that be a straw in the wind?

MORE on the election: With the vote count complete, daylight saving in Oregon wins decisively—

Yes 379,057
No 224,511

How come, after all these years? The answer seems to be that most of us finally came around to the conclusion that next summer we'd like to know what time it is.

MORE election aftermath: In Oklahoma on Tuesday, a man by the name of Henry Bellmon achieved a political miracle. He became the first Republican in Oklahoma's 55-year history to win the state's highest office—the governorship.

How did he do it? The dispatches report that in his campaigning his favorite story concerned a farmer who had a cow for sale.

The buyers asked him about the cow—what is her pedigree, how about the butterfat content of her milk, and so on.

This was his answer: "All I can tell you is that she's an honest, hard-working old cow, and she'll give you all the milk she's got. That's what I'll do if I get elected governor of Oklahoma."

THE moral: Maybe, like the Republican party needs more candidates of that sort.

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE PRESIDENT'S SURPRISE PACKAGE

Washington—For President Kennedy, the remarkable election result is a victory, and a potential trap—in short, a triple-threat surprise package.



About the President's victory, there cannot be much doubt. The pattern of recurring off-year losses by the party in power is well-established. By all the rules, the Democrats ought to have suffered a sharp setback this year. Instead, the President's party has gained on balance.

The Republican successes in the Governorship contests were important, especially the victories of Rockefeller in New York, Scanton in Pennsylvania, and Romney in Michigan. But these successes no more than compensate for the Republican defeats, and, above all, the defeat of Richard M. Nixon after a very strange uphill, downhill, uphill fight. The California outcome probably puts the nation's largest state into the Democratic column for some time to come.

THE Democratic gain in Senate seats was solid and impressive. As for the House of Representatives, the Southern seats gained by the Republicans were taken from anti-Kennedy conservative Democrats. Hence the change in the real line-up of the House is just about nil. With good luck and good management, the President should even find the new House easier to deal with than the old House.

These are the reasons why the final score is clearly in the President's favor. As to why it is in the President's favor, the answer is equally clear.

Until only a fortnight ago, the atmosphere of the Democratic campaign was downright dank, to put it mildly. The President's barnstorming on domestic issues had lighted no bonfires among the voters. There was no enthusiasm, no spark to ignite the faithful with excitement.

Then came the Cuban crisis. The President not only took the kind of action most Americans wanted to see taken. In a moment of grave danger, he also acted prudently but firmly, bravely but very adroitly. Cuba was the spark that had been lacking before. In some states, the way the resulting fire singled the Republicans was easy to see.

IN INDIANA, for instance, this reporter found two emotions among the voters—a great impatience with the Cuban problem, and a general lack of enthusiasm for Sen. Homer Capehart, despite widespread support for the Capehart approach to the Cuban problem. When the President in effect crossed Cuba off the list, the Indiana voters plainly decided that there was no longer any reason why Capehart should not be crossed off the list, too.

In most states, it must be admitted, the political effects of Cuba are less easy to pin down. But there is no doubt that they were very important indeed. This is the opinion, both of the wiser Republican leaders and of the President himself and his chief political advisors.

county's economic engine and promote corporate growth and individual jobs. The kind of legislative acts that have such effects are the acts that the last Congress did indeed perform, although in restricted degree in some areas. After all, it did pass the historic foreign trade bill. It did raise the minimum wage level. It did extend unemployment compensation, order heavy foreign aid spending, heavier military and space spending, and it raised federal pay levels.

What it did not do, producing the President's extraordinarily heated intervention in the campaign, was to give him his department of urban affairs, Medicare under social security, federal intervention in education, a reorganization of farm policies, of transportation and of the basic tax structure. These changes would have only a marginal economic effect. Their real effects would be of an organic or structural nature, no doubt admirable in most cases. But they would not make our economic pulse beat much faster, and that is what most Americans take to be the meaning of the phrase about the country moving again.

The President simply ran

THE President's opportunity flows from his victory. If the election had followed the traditional off-year pattern, giving the Republicans really substantial gains in the House, for instance, one can easily imagine the displays of ferocious partisanship by Rep. Charles Halleck and others of his ilk. The U.S. government would then have been hopelessly divided, and therefore stalled on dead center.

AS IT IS, the President can expect reasonable Congressional responsiveness to his leadership in the next two years, if he is wise enough to recognize the potential trap that his victory also constitutes. He is likely to fall into the trap, however, if he complacently says, "Well, we did very well, and we can go on from here with real confidence."

The Democrats most emphatically did not do very well because the President stumped the country talking about Medicare and related matters. Social welfare issues are important, beyond doubt. But at this juncture in history, unless the U.S. heads into a depression, the American voters mainly judge a national Administration by its performance in the fields of foreign and defense policy.

That was why, of course, Cuba was so important for the Democrats. It is contemptible and silly to suggest that the President was even thinking about domestic politics when he took action risking an H-bomb war, and took this action, final tick of time. But it will also be unwise for the President to ignore Cuba's political lesson.

THE lesson is not that the President must instantly seek more conspicuous successes in the world arena. That would be both imprudent and impractical.

The lesson is, rather, that the President needs to convince the country that the same prudent firmness shown in the Cuban crisis characterizes all the painstaking drugery, all the endless struggle with intractable, relatively undramatic problems, which is day-to-day foreign policy-making. The country needs to be persuaded that adroitness and courage are not just kept in store for the hours of dramatic crisis.

It will not be an easy point to get across. And it may not be possible to get across, unless the President recognizes the risks he runs from having an official foreign policy team that is still visibly afflicted with schizophrenia of viewpoint.

Prospect Logging Firm Is High Bidder

S & W Logging, Prospect, was high bidder on Nov. 5 for 620,000 board feet of National forest timber in the Needle Creek select area, Prospect Ranger district, Rogue River National forest.

Forest Supervisor C. E. Brown reported the high bid totaled \$12,572. This is identical with the Forest service appraised price for the timber. There were no other bidders.

The timber in this unit consisted of 540,000 board feet of Douglas-fir bid at \$22.20 per thousand and 80,000 board feet of white fir and other species bid at \$7.30 per thousand board feet.

Thanks—and a Lesson

To the Editor: Yesterday afternoon I met two fine gentlemen and probably won't ever see them again. It happened on the 99 Freeway south of Eugene, just after bringing my car to a halt after experiencing a real blow-out (the kind that scatters rubber



"He used to be 'Top Advisor' around here—kept telling Khrushchev the Americans would never fight! Al—most got us into a thermonuclear war, the idiot!"

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.

Make Your Voice Heard

To the Editor: Saying the U.N. can't work is Communist propaganda!

You have a voice in international politics?

How did you feel when you realized the full implication of President Kennedy's decision to stem the tide of missiles to Cuba? You certainly applauded him, but did you feel a little helpless not knowing exactly what to do next? Was it too late to have that shelter built?

You will note that during the first days of Cuban crisis, the Russians did not stand before the court of world opinion out in the Atlantic Ocean; they stood in a General Assembly of the United Nations; before representatives of practically every sovereign nation in the world, and in a FEW MOMENTS the basic issues were revealed in a manner that could not be construed or suppressed by radio jamming or censorship.

Once again, the United Nations proved to be the effective and ultimate instrument in taking the first positive step away from global war.

The United States delegation to the U.N. is highly sensitive to your opinion, through such agencies as the Jackson County U.N. Association. If you would like to see how this works, join us at the Red Cross Auditorium, 7:30 p.m., Nov. 13; when five community leaders, under the moderation of Omar Bacon, will discuss major issues before the 17th General Assembly of the U.N. Questions will be invited from the audience.

If you are a responsible citizen, your voice has just been heard in the recent elections; it is equally your responsibility to make democracy work on the international level.

Jackson County Chapter, Oregon United Nations Assn., Medford.

Mississippi Program

To the Editor: Much has been written and said about Mississippi in the past few weeks. Unfortunately, the Mississippi viewpoint and the reasons for Mississippi's situation and attitude seldom get a hearing before Northern audiences.

The Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, upon invitation, will send volunteer speakers to recognized service clubs and civic organizations to present in a factual manner what we call "A Message From Mississippi." All expenses of the speakers will be borne by the Sovereignty Commission.

If any clubs in your area would like to have a Mississippi program, or any combination of clubs, please write Public Relations Department, Mississippi Sovereignty Commission, New Capitol, Jackson, Mississippi.

Erle Johnston, Jr., Public Relations Director, Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, Jackson, Miss.

Tide of Government Shifting to States

By ERIC SEVAREID

Meanwhile, back at the White House . . .



The foreman and his head wranglers are now looking over next year's herd, testing horns and withers of the Congressional bulls.

What he failed to get from Congress this past year and very much wants to sort out our collective affairs, but it is hard to see that it would speed up the

county's economic engine and promote corporate growth and individual jobs. The kind of legislative acts that have such effects are the acts that the last Congress did indeed perform, although in restricted degree in some areas. After all, it did pass the historic foreign trade bill. It did raise the minimum wage level. It did extend unemployment compensation, order heavy foreign aid spending, heavier military and space spending, and it raised federal pay levels.

What it did not do, producing the President's extraordinarily heated intervention in the campaign, was to give him his department of urban affairs, Medicare under social security, federal intervention in education, a reorganization of farm policies, of transportation and of the basic tax structure. These changes would have only a marginal economic effect. Their real effects would be of an organic or structural nature, no doubt admirable in most cases. But they would not make our economic pulse beat much faster, and that is what most Americans take to be the meaning of the phrase about the country moving again.

The President simply ran

into an economic downswing last year, and would have done so almost no matter what the Congress gave him or withheld. Indeed the whole western world seems to have headed into a period of general deflation, and if action by the federal Congress is going to take up the slack it will have to be action directed in kind and in orders of magnitude from the specific actions the President has been keeping on his "must" list. It is my guess, though only a guess, that by midwinter the President will have considerably revised his list.

In any case, most of the truly urgent structural changes required in American life are local or regional and the arms of government that must come to grips with these awful necessities are the local and state arms even more than the federal. We are now an urban people, but our urban life is rapidly becoming planless, without order, fantastically overcomplicated and overcostly. The great cities are doubling and tripling in size, while at the same time dying as true cities, as true communities of men, utterly losing what unity they had in their spirit and their practices.

The President simply ran

into an economic downswing last year, and would have done so almost no matter what the Congress gave him or withheld. Indeed the whole western world seems to have headed into a period of general deflation, and if action by the federal Congress is going to take up the slack it will have to be action directed in kind and in orders of magnitude from the specific actions the President has been keeping on his "must" list. It is my guess, though only a guess, that by midwinter the President will have considerably revised his list.

In any case, most of the truly urgent structural changes required in American life are local or regional and the arms of government that must come to grips with these awful necessities are the local and state arms even more than the federal. We are now an urban people, but our urban life is rapidly becoming planless, without order, fantastically overcomplicated and overcostly. The great cities are doubling and tripling in size, while at the same time dying as true cities, as true communities of men, utterly losing what unity they had in their spirit and their practices.

The President simply ran

into an economic downswing last year, and would have done so almost no matter what the Congress gave him or withheld. Indeed the whole western world seems to have headed into a period of general deflation, and if action by the federal Congress is going to take up the slack it will have to be action directed in kind and in orders of magnitude from the specific actions the President has been keeping on his "must" list. It is my guess, though only a guess, that by midwinter the President will have considerably revised his list.

In any case, most of the truly urgent structural changes required in American life are local or regional and the arms of government that must come to grips with these awful necessities are the local and state arms even more than the federal. We are now an urban people, but our urban life is rapidly becoming planless, without order, fantastically overcomplicated and overcostly. The great cities are doubling and tripling in size, while at the same time dying as true cities, as true communities of men, utterly losing what unity they had in their spirit and their practices.

The President simply ran

into an economic downswing last year, and would have done so almost no matter what the Congress gave him or withheld. Indeed the whole western world seems to have headed into a period of general deflation, and if action by the federal Congress is going to take up the slack it will have to be action directed in kind and in orders of magnitude from the specific actions the President has been keeping on his "must" list. It is my guess, though only a guess, that by midwinter the President will have considerably revised his list.

In any case, most of the truly urgent structural changes required in American life are local or regional and the arms of government that must come to grips with these awful necessities are the local and state arms even more than the federal. We are now an urban people, but our urban life is rapidly becoming planless, without order, fantastically overcomplicated and overcostly. The great cities are doubling and tripling in size, while at the same time dying as true cities, as true communities of men, utterly losing what unity they had in their spirit and their practices.

The President simply ran