

Medford Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
23 North Fir St., Ph. 772-6141

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

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
June 30, 1953 (Tuesday)
The office of the Oregon Cooperative Snow Surveys, which has been in Medford since the surveys were established, will be moved to Portland.

20 YEARS AGO
June 30, 1943 (Wednesday)
Tomorrow will be an important day in the lives of Medford canines; after today they will be allowed to run at large.

30 YEARS AGO
June 30, 1933 (Friday)
Primo Carnera, heavy-weight champion, defeats Jack Sharkey.

40 YEARS AGO
June 30, 1923 (Saturday)
Southern Oregon Rodeo at Klamath Falls, July 2, 3 and 4, to offer \$4,000 in cash prizes and 700 bucking horses and bulls.

50 YEARS AGO
June 30, 1913 (Monday)
Because the Rogue valley has the most advanced methods in fruit raising in the world, Dr. V. P. Neimetz of the department of agriculture of Russia, asks for a description of methods of spraying and pruning, so that he can instruct his people.

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

- 1. Name the capital of Washington state.
2. An unexpected legacy, profit, or other piece of monetary good fortune is called...?
3. Against which country was the slogan, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute", directed?
4. Which city is nicknamed "The City of Roses"?
5. The name of the 1962 World's Fair was what?
6. What State does Barry Goldwater represent in the Senate?
7. The term "great white plague" is applied to what disease?
8. A clock ticks more loudly when lying on a flat surface than if standing up; true or false?
9. Name the capital of Portugal.
10. David and Bathsheba were the parents of whom?
Answers: 1. Olympia, 2. Windfall, 3. France, 4. Portland, Ore., 5. "Century 21," 6. Arizona, 7. Tuberculosis, 8. True, 9. Lisbon, 10. Solomon.

The Undiscovered Bourne

How does one ever reconcile himself to the inevitability of death? The omnipresent question was given startling immediacy a week ago last Tuesday when we learned of the death of the young Air Force officer from Kingsley Field whom we had known slightly. We sat next to Capt. Harold H. Smith at the dinner honoring Sen. Barry Goldwater a few weeks ago. Seldom have we met such a vital, totally "alive" person. He was interested in his job, devoted to his family and absolutely fascinated with the outdoors of Oregon. One day about two weeks ago his Voodoo jet developed trouble during a flight near Sprague River. His radar observer parachuted to safety, but Captain Smith's body was found a short distance from the wreck of his plane.

WE WOULD not presume on so brief an acquaintance to say that his death was a deep personal loss, for it wasn't. We were shocked mainly, perhaps, because if ever someone was living life to its fullest, and enjoying every minute of it, it was that young officer. Nearly on the instant of reading the newspaper account of his death, we were moved—nay, impelled—to consider once again what a totally haphazard matter this business of dying really is. Man has always, we suppose, attempted to discover some rhyme or reason to why certain people die untimely ("only the good die young"), while others, by common judgment much less worthy, continue to live a normal allotted span. But the frustrating answer seems to be that there really is no explanation to it all. It would seem, at least from a mortal point of view, a situation of complete happenstance.

SINCE it is, obviously, an eventuality that all men of all times have had to deal with, the various civilizations, cultures and religions the world has known have all worked out individual answers (perhaps "responses" is a better word) to the dilemma. It is not our purpose here to survey those widely differing attitudes toward death, but rather to point out that most of them have been premised on the notion that his last breath on earth is not necessarily the end of the individual. Valhalla, the Elysian fields, the "Happy Hunting Grounds" are all creations born of man's necessity to be able to confront the prospect of death with equanimity. Mostly, it seems, man has need of a conviction of the possibility of a "new" life to help him pass out of this one with poise, Too, the hope of an afterlife is often used in some cultures as a lever to encourage moral conduct during life on earth.

WHEN for some reason a culture fails to provide an afterlife, efforts are frequently directed towards making death appear to be a phenomenon that need not be feared. The Roman poet Lucretius, whose irreligious philosophy had some currency during the transition period between the decline of belief in the old adopted Greek gods and the impending rise of Christianity, summed up his point of view in a poem entitled "Why Fear Death?" We quote in part: "But to be snatched from all the household joys, From thy chaste wife, and thy dear prattling boys, Whose little arms about thy legs are cast, And climbing for a kiss prevent their mother's haste, Inspiring secret pleasure through thy breast— Ah! these shall be no more; thy friends oppressed Thy care and courage now no more shall free; Ah! wretch, thou criest, ah! miserable me! One woeful day sweeps children, friends, and wife, And all the brittle blessings of my life! Add one thing more, and all thou sayest is true; Thy want and wish of them is vanished too; Which, well considered, were a quick relief To all thy vain imaginary grief. For thou shalt sleep, and never wake again, And, quitting life, shalt quit thy living pain."

INDEED, in some cultures, death under certain conditions, such as on the battlefield, has been glorified to such an extent that it is actively sought, or at least approached without the slightest evidence of dread. Probably the best contemporary example of this were the Japanese Kamikaze pilots during World War II. Whatever the a priori intellectual set, whatever emotional preparation the deceased may have had before he died, one thing is certain. The pain of death is with the quick—who must go on living—and not with the dead. And while it is no consolation to someone who is suffering from the knife-edged pain of losing a dear one, it is also certain that life always goes on. And death, however one regards it, comes to be for the mature person just another part of life.—G.H.B.

"Never Mind the Fine Print, Son — How Would You Like To Win That Girl?"



Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
The President's German speeches must have been prepared as a series which was to reach a logical and dramatic climax in West Berlin. At the airport near Cologne and in his press conference at Bonn, Mr. Kennedy talked to the Old Guard in Germany. He did his best to convince Dr. Adenauer and his followers that the United States in general and he as President are reliable — which for the Old Guard means that not only are we prepared to defend West Germany with nuclear arms, but also that the United States will give West Germany the veto on any negotiations about Germany.

resolved conflict in the Western Alliance over whether the initiative shall lie in Paris, with the support of Bonn, or in Washington. BECAUSE the President was acutely aware of the fact that his leadership of the West is challenged, he could not and did not go beyond ideals and his general assurances to any kind of definition of the policy which might achieve what he is talking about. The fact is that there can be no definition of a European policy without an understanding with General De Gaulle. For there is not the smallest evidence that the cheering German crowd means that there is in West Germany the will or the power or the political courage to challenge General De Gaulle's primacy on the western continent. And even if there were such an inclination on the part of the Germans, France's strategic position and economic power are such that she is an essential partner in any Western Alliance. The President, who was walking a slippery path, was sure-footed in Bonn and Frankfurt, and he was bold in Berlin. But there is less doubt than ever that a serious discussion of transatlantic affairs will have to lie between Washington and Paris.

BEFORE such a discussion could become profitable, the President will have to dispel the idea that our conception of Europe and of the Atlantic Community is bound in the end to prevail over the false ideas of General De Gaulle. It is intoxicating to believe that the tides of history are with you, that you are the wave of the future. But history is not often a sure thing, and men living amidst it rarely know which way it is going. General De Gaulle, who has now acquired a very important following all over Western Europe, may not be, as the administration likes to think, a mere voice of the past. For while his haughtiness and elegance are by modern standards archaic, his judgment about the cold war and his estimate of the role of alliances in the nuclear age may be prophetic. For myself, I have come to think more and more that the revival of the Western Alliance depends upon a very good understanding of the new ideas that are coming out of France.

IT WAS, of course, unavoidable that in none of the speeches was there a hint of how reassurance, liberalization and the reconciliation are to be brought about. In his news conference, the President seemed to imply that the solution of the practical problems was not near enough to talk about it. For the reunification of Germany, he seemed to rely on "time." For the reunification of Europe, he relied on "the winds of change." But the real difficulty in making a western policy for the unification of Germany and of Europe is not that these problems are vague and distant and shrouded in the fog of Eastern Europe and Communist Russia. The real difficulty is that there is an un-

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

ation, a sick dream from the past of the European insanity, hanging on in the insanity, if not content, so there are now one or two stations at the infamous Wall — including the place where the President stood — which Berlin friends will describe to one as "just tourist trap." History moves rapidly in this century; what may be the first city wall to be constructed in Europe since medieval times already looks old as sin as well as ugly as death; each stretch and turning of the grey cement is already invested with story and legend; the Wall has a sated air of permanence about it. Still, it does not hint of the future half so explicitly as it calls up the past. To stand by it in the grey gloom of evening, at the Potsdamer Platz, once the bright, busy heart of greater Berlin, to see the cement blocks, the tangles of barbed wire, the rows of steel-studs, tank traps beyond it to be transported back to the war and the Siegfried Line. In the twilight and the rain the Platz is an island of desolation.



"What are you, some kind of an intellectual nut or something?"

GREAT IDEAS...

From the Great Books
By Mortimer J. Adler
Dear Mrs. Sharpe: What did the framers of Utopian societies intend to prove by their theories? Were they applauded or viewed with alarm? What have been the main arguments for and against Utopian thought? Are there any Utopian thinkers at the present time? Mrs. Eileen Sharpe 1207 W. 97th st. Chicago 43, Ill.

Dear Mrs. Sharpe: Utopia—the ideal state of human affairs—has been a perennial theme of Western thinkers ever since Plato's day. Through their descriptions of imaginary societies, authors have presented their views of the perfection of our present state and how it should be changed. Plato's "Republic," for example, provides a magnificent vision of the good society, in which justice and harmony pervade the individual soul and the political community. This type of literature is more closely connected with speculative thought than with entertaining romances of the science-fiction variety. The Utopian thinker has a definite idea of the nature of man and society, of what they can be and should be, but are not now. Hence, he presents us, not in abstract theory, but in concrete imagery, with a fictional society which embodies human reality more fully than the actual society in which we live. The argument for Utopian writings is that they enable us to get a fresh picture of man's nature and destiny, undistorted by our customary way of looking at things. The Utopians do not describe how human affairs are conducted in Athens or Podunk, but how they might be handled in Utopia, which literally means "nowhere." This is a true picture of the human community, says the Utopian, not as it is today, but as it may be tomorrow—in "the journey of ten thousand years."

The opposition to Utopian thought is also of ancient lineage. Aristophanes wrote a play making fun of Plato's Utopian ideas of feminine equality and communism. Rabelais, Swift, Aldous Huxley, and George Orwell have also contributed satires to the anti-Utopian tradition. The burden of these works is that Utopian thinkers present an unrealistic and unrealizable picture of man and society. In striving for an impossible perfection, they achieve instead a ridiculous or horrible state, much worse than before. It is better, says the anti-Utopians, to start out on the customary way of doing things and work for their improvement rather than to attempt to imitate some imaginary ideal. Karl Marx's criticism of the nineteenth-century Utopian socialists, such as Fourier, Proudhon, and Owen, was somewhat different. He agreed with them that a perfectly free and equal society can be established in which man will achieve perfect fulfillment of his capacities. But he considered them unrealistic visionaries because they proposed to accomplish this purely through voluntary and spontaneous activity, inspired by reason and justice. Marx, on the contrary, held that the new age would come through inevitable historical processes, determined by material forces, and marked by cataclysmic wars and revolutions. He himself, however, was open to the charge of being Utopian, since he pointed to a state of affairs that had never existed and which required a radical change in human nature.

The death of Utopian thinking in the past few decades has alarmed reactions from commentators who feel that this points to a dangerous lack of vision in our age of conformity and affluence. One noted or notorious present day Utopian thinker is Paul Goodman, a sort of post-Freudian Thoreau. In a recent work, "Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals," he vigorously scorns the view that Utopian thought is impractical. It is the Utopians, he says, who are the practical realists, and who believe in really useful machines, really productive work, and in policies aimed at the common good. (You can win a 54-volume set of the Great Books of the Western World by writing a letter, not to exceed 150 words, incorporating a question of general interest for Dr. Adler to consider for inclusion in this column. Each week he will select as first prize winners the writers of the three best letters. He will use ONE of these letters as a basis for a future column and will answer it in terms of the intellectual heritage of the Great Books—443 works by 74 authors, spanning 30 centuries of thought. Address the letters to Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, in care of this newspaper.)

Over on the other side of the fence, in California, Governor Brown wanted a withholding tax as a device to raise money in the seemingly least painful way. The California legislature refused to give it to him. He indicated that he will be willing to "retreat" from the withholding tax plan if the legislature at a special session to be called to begin on July 8) presents him with "alternate financing methods which will achieve long range budget solutions."

WHAT is a withholding tax? Withholding takes it out of the paycheck—meaning that on each payday the employer withholds a certain amount from the employee's wages and turns the amount withheld over to the government. THE REMEDY—If any? Well, it would help if government would SPEND LESS. If government didn't spend so much, it wouldn't have to TAX so much.

WHAT HURTS. So. The recipients of paychecks demand an INCREASE so that their take-home pay may be the same as it was before

which seems quite logical and as it should be. BUT—There's a catch to it. The increased wage (to give the employee as much take-home pay as he had before the withholding started) increases the employer's COSTS. SO—Having had his costs increased, the employer is compelled to raise his prices. Whereupon the employee, when he begins to put two and two together, discovers that while his TAKE HOME pay (after his wage increase) is the same as it used to be before the withholding rigmarole started his KEEP AT HOME pay is considerably reduced by the higher prices for the things he has to buy.

WHAT IS A WITHHOLDING TAX? Withholding takes it out of the paycheck—meaning that on each payday the employer withholds a certain amount from the employee's wages and turns the amount withheld over to the government. THE REMEDY—If any? Well, it would help if government would SPEND LESS. If government didn't spend so much, it wouldn't have to TAX so much.

WHAT HURTS. So. The recipients of paychecks demand an INCREASE so that their take-home pay may be the same as it was before

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

plained. I said, "Well, you're a German, aren't you?" "I'm a Berliner!" he stated firmly. He was convinced the people of Berlin were different, superior to the generality of Germans, even those in the western Republic. He did not feel a spiritual identity with them. "Would they give up their TV sets and their new cars if that were the price of reunification?" he said. "I wonder!" I suspect he would be proved wrong, were that test to come about. In spite of appearances, the Germans are not essentially a materialistic race; materialism happens to be the onlyism around for the following at the moment. They have shown their capacity for self-conscious sacrifice before, to everybody's sorrow, often enough. This country is struggling toward a new role in the world, truncated though it is; and it feels the strength, more and more. It is perfectly aware that it provides most of the conventional defense against the East; that its bank balances are bulkier than any others in Europe; that it is shoving Great Britain out of her third place among the world's industrialized nations. It remains intensely aware of what it owes to the United States, even if Britain and France have forgotten, but it

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop
LILY WHITE VS. LIBERAL
Washington — Civil rights long since divided the Democratic Party into hostile northern and southern wings. And now the mounting racial crisis promises to an equally bitter division in the Republican Party. As yet, only the first grumblings and mutterings of the coming battle are to be heard in various Republican quarters. But on present form, it is a reasonable prediction that the next Republican convention will be dominated, and its outcome may be decided, by a knock-down-drag-out fight about the Republican stand on civil rights.

There are three reasons for this prediction. In the first place, the recent Republican rally at Denver rang with sanguine discussion of the Republican Party's chance of victory as a "white man's party," with the hero of the Southern conservatives, Sen. Barry Goldwater, as its standard-bearer. Secondly, both sides have already thrown down their gauges of battle—although surprisingly little attention has been paid to this striking fact. SENATOR Goldwater, for his part, while saying that he was for some sections of President Kennedy's civil rights bill, has taken his stand four-square with the Southern Democrats on the guts of the matter. In other words, he has attacked the proposal to desegregate public facilities as an offense against states' rights, and he has sworn that he will never vote for cloture to get a civil rights bill through the Senate. Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has responded to Goldwater by coming out for the entire civil rights bill without qualification, and urging all Congressional Republicans to support it. In reality, Governor Rockefeller now conceives his fight for the Republican Presidential nomination quite largely in terms of a fight against the "white man's party" theory of Republican strategy. Third and most important of all, the presidential aspirants are not the only leading Republicans who are squaring off for the fray. The extremely able and astute Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania is a declared non-conciliator. But he is also firmly determined to use every Pennsylvania delegate to block the Republicans who want the 1964 election to be a "lily white versus liberal fight."

THIS was a primary motive, in fact, of Governor Scranton's decision to become a favorite son candidate, and thus to establish iron-clad control of Pennsylvania's large convention delegation. The other motive was the Governor's desire to teach a lesson to the Republicans who have been saying the "north-east can be written off" — who are precisely the Republicans talking about a "white man's party." In every one of the states with large convention delegations — California, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio and so on down the line — the need to make the choice already made by Governor Scranton is also causing heart-searching and position-taking. In California, to name the most notable example, a primary fight is rather plainly shaping up. A pro-Goldwater delegation is already in formation. And the more moderate California Republicans are already pressing Sen. Thomas Kuchel to stand as California's favorite son at the head of a moderate delegation, if this is needed to whip the Goldwaters. Every kind of attempt will of course be made to blur the issue which has just begun to divide the Republicans, as it has already divided the Democrats. It will be pointed out, with pious indignation, that Senator Goldwater is no racist, which is certainly true; and much will be made of the fact that as a young man, he helped to desegregate the Phoenix, Ariz., school system.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

But in the present context, these facts are almost as irrelevant as the fact that Goldwater is an extremely pleasant human being. He advocates a Republican strategy primarily keyed to an appeal to Southern conservative votes. He wants his party to put states' rights above civil rights. He is against cloture, even if needed to pass a civil rights bill. That adds up, nowadays, to being against civil rights. If the Republican Party nominates a standard-bearer who is against civil rights for all practical purposes, the Republican Party will then, quite unavoidably, assume the role of the "white man's party." The practical temptations to do this are obvious. Indeed, they have been forthrightly underlined by Senator Goldwater himself, who has often pointed out that "the Republicans can never get Negro votes anyway."

But this is a moral decision, as well as a political decision; and it is to be hoped that a majority of Republicans will see it that way.

(Distributed 1963, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.) (All Rights Reserved)

(Distributed 1963, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.) (All Rights Reserved)