

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North 1st St. Phone 2-5251

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERRI GREY, Advertising Manager; GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager; ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; HARRY CHITMAN, Telegraph Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor; DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One Year \$12.00; Daily and Sunday—Six Months \$6.50; Daily and Sunday—Three Months \$3.50; Sunday Only—One Year \$3.50.

Official Paper of the City of Medford, Official Paper of Jackson County, United States Post Office, Second Class, Member of Audit Bureau of Circulation.

Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

10 YEARS AGO June 28, 1946 (It was Friday) Mr. and Mrs. Harold Hulse of Medford buy Valentine's cafe on South Riverside Ave. from H. E. Bush and A. K. Morse.

20 YEARS AGO June 28, 1936 (It was Sunday) Most elaborate water carnival ever held in Ashland planned for July 4 celebration.

30 YEARS AGO June 28, 1926 (It was Monday) Grass fire covers six acres on Siskiyou heights south of Keenway Dr. yesterday morning.

40 YEARS AGO June 28, 1916 (It was Wednesday) Warden stops fencing of Rogue River mouth by fishermen with gill nets.

What's the Answer? Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

1. The longest mainline railroad tunnel is the Arlberg in Austria, the Moffat in Colorado, or the Simplon from Italy to Switzerland? 2. Pernicious anemia, peptic ulcer, and cancer of the stomach may or may not be influenced by heredity?

3. Newly independent Morocco, Tunisia, and the Sudan are or aren't members of the International Labor Organization? 4. The biggest state, next to Texas, is Arizona, California, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, or New Mexico?

5. Spangler Arlington Brough was the real name of Bing Crosby, Edward G. Robinson, Humphrey Bogart, Robert Taylor, or Danny Kaye? 6. About (a) 40, (b) 50, (c) 65, or (d) 85 per cent of the people of the British colony of Singapore are Chinese?

7. Americans spent more or less than a billion dollars on foreign travel last year? The Answers: 1. Simplon, (12 1/2 miles). 2. May be important factor, according to studies at University of Iowa college of medicine. 3. Admitted to ILO June 12, 4. California. 5. Robert Taylor. 6. 85 per cent Chinese. 7. More (\$1.6 billion).

Another \$64,000 Question

Those who think changing from one party to another in mid-stream a capital offense, and Senator Wayne Morse should therefore, be shot at sunrise, are advised to read "A Letter from Washington" in "The New Yorker" of June 23d, by Richard Rovere.

Rovere, who is a well known and gifted news commentator and a strong supporter of President Eisenhower, devotes this week's space as the New Yorker's regular Washington correspondent almost entirely to comments on a book by Robert J. Donovan soon to be published, giving the inside and heretofore confidential story of the Eisenhower cabinet meetings to date.

ROVERE reveals that not only have the cabinet meetings been far from harmonious at times, but during his first two years as President, "Ike" became so exasperated, frustrated and discouraged particularly with the ultra-conservative wing of his party, that he seriously considered, quote:

"...leaving the Republican party and starting a party of his own, as Theodore Roosevelt did. He was dissuaded by the very recollection of Roosevelt's unhappy experience. But he continued to ask whether, after all, the present Republican party was represented by men of sufficient vision and understanding of what was required to lead the country through the perils of the mid-20th century."

WE CAN THINK of no better description of Wayne Morse's line of thought preceding his departure from the Republican party than the above, the only material difference being that he considered and became an "Independent" and then a Democrat, instead of considering the establishment of a Third Party—and eventually abandoning the idea.

In other words, the squads of GOP sharpshooters now being formed to perforate the head and two-term record of Oregon's senior senator, for daring to leave the Republican party during his second term, because he questioned its capacity to successfully meet the impending crisis in domestic and world affairs, better keep a watchful eye on their aim. If they don't watch out, they may be hitting the record of their revered leader, and casting stones of disapproval on the purity of HIS motives and the extent of HIS devotion to the Grand Old Party.

That would, brethren and sistern, be something horrible to contemplate, particularly in the midst of an "I love Ike" coat-tail campaign!

BUT THERE CAN be no doubt of the truth of this declaration. Not only is Rovere strongly pro-Ike and highly regarded, but Donovan, the author of the book, "Eisenhower, the Inside Story" is the star correspondent of the 100% Republican newspaper, the New York Herald-Tribune and the latter is syndicating the offering as a news feature throughout the country.

Not only is this admission made as far as Mr. Eisenhower's judgment of his party's calibre in 1953 is concerned, but it is shown that the President favored more drastic tax cuts for lower bracket incomes before the Democrats made it part of their program and that, quote:

"This presidential heresy had to be exorcised by the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who when the Democrats got around to advocating the plan called it 'silly' and a 'quickie gimmick'."

Imagine that! The most influential and highly respected member of the Eisenhower cabinet, accusing his "great leader" of having advocated "silly" proposals and "quickie gimmicks" in the all-important realm—to Sec'y. Humphrey particularly—of national finance.

OTHER cabinet clashes are recorded. Secretary of State Dulles questioned the competence of many of the "security boards" while Vice President Nixon wanted more security boards and a larger crop of security risks while he is shown as in almost continuous dispute with Postmaster General Summerfield, who wanted to raise postal rates and put his department on a "sound business basis."

Although proud of the Big Business record of the GOP, VP Nixon became less and less in favor of increased postal rates as the presidential election year came nearer, and finally was heard to express a judgment almost as heretical as the President's, when he declared:

"There are some things more important than a sound business basis and one of them is political support of the kind that might be lost through an increase in 'mailing costs'."

Needless to say, PM Summerfield lost, and VP Nixon won!

IT IS ALSO recorded in this book that one cabinet member asked if Senator Bricker, author of the controversial Bricker amendment, could not be liquidated by an atomic bomb. This was a joke, but putting it in public print probably will bring no loud guffaws from the senior senator from Ohio!

OF COURSE these extracts are not typical of the book as a whole but as correspondent Rovere concludes "it is a unique piece of work in that it is a campaign document that provides as much ammunition for one side as the other."

ROVERE is frankly puzzled by this, as is the writer, particularly coming out at this time, when the leaders of both parties are not disposed to pass out any ammunition to their opponents that can possibly be avoided.

As this is the first time in history that minutes of cabinet meetings have been taken, and more important the first time they have been made public, such revelations a few weeks before the presidential campaign will be in full swing, could have been avoided, and undoubtedly would have been if any member of the cabinet or the President himself had raised the slightest objection.

Why none of them did, is, at the moment the \$64,000 question.—R.W.R.

'Third Force' Role Eyed for Commonwealth by Anthony Eden

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

Prime Minister Anthony Eden has set out to make the British Commonwealth of Nations a "third force" in world affairs.

First, Eden hopes that the Commonwealth can bring the United States and Soviet Russia closer together.

Second, he wants to unify and strengthen the Commonwealth to meet economic competition with the United States as well as Russia.

Eden is outlining his plan at the conference of Commonwealth prime ministers now meeting in London.

The plan is based on his firm belief that a new era has opened in world relations.

H-Bomb's Influence He believes that the H-bomb has almost ruled out the threat of a third world war because its dreadful destructive power would offer nothing but ruin to victor as well as vanquished.

Eden believes that the end of Stalinism in Russia really has brought a historic change in the policies of that country.

Because of that change, he believes that the new world era is one in which economic competition will supplant the competition in armaments that has preoccupied the great powers since the end of World War II.

Eden also believes that the Commonwealth must safeguard itself against American economic penetration as well as Russian penetration.

Aid, Trade Included The American penetration, as he sees it, is facing the Commonwealth not only because of direct trade rivalry but because of the United States foreign aid program.

In keeping with his views, Eden already has decided not only to increase British trade with Russia materially but to cut down and revise Britain's defense program radically.

The British Commonwealth, as a unit, is potentially the greatest force in the world in an era of what is called co-existence.

It is loosely knit. Its larger members are independent, India and Pakistan, for example, are now republics. There are Canada and the other dominions, and there are countless protectorates and crown colonies in every continent and every ocean.

Vastness of Commonwealth The Commonwealth totals 647,000,000 people and 12,992,102 square miles of territory. The United States has a population of 170,000,000 and an area of 3,628,130 square miles.

Russia's population is about 200,000,000, its area 8,600,000 square miles.

Eden's conception of the new world situation is bound to bring some disagreements in policy with the United States. In Washington, there is great suspicion of the Moscow new look.

British-American disagreement on defense is shown in Congress, where the Senate has approved a \$960,000,000 rise in Air Force appropriations even though the administration opposes it.

But Eden seems to be completely convinced that his own course is right.

As part of his course, it is reported in London that he will outline to his fellow Commonwealth prime ministers a plan to try to arrange for a new "summit" conference with Russia early next year.

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

CLOVER FOR THE KREMLIN

Washington — The more you study the Middle Eastern crisis, the more you suspect that the essential preliminary of the Soviet intrusion in the Middle East was the famous summit meeting at Geneva, with all its adman's hopes and glories.

Tentative discussions of the crucial Soviet-Egyptian arms deal had of course been opened in the month or two before the Summit. Yet before he boldly probing for the very vitals of the Western Alliance, the Soviet leaders must at least have wished to know how the West would react. They got the answer at the summit.

The President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France went to Geneva with the singular purpose of proving that the great powers of the West were passionately, unshakably dedicated to peace at any price.

There was no better way to encourage the Soviets to take any cold war risk they chose.

IN ADDITION, it is now known that President Eisenhower actually mentioned the Soviet offer to sell arms to Egypt to Bulganin and Khrushchev. According to authentic report, the President was slyly told that this was "just an ordinary commercial transaction." Apparently this piece of arrant nonsense was not treated with the contempt and indignation it deserved. So the Soviet leaders left Geneva with complete assurance that they could safely stick a shiv right into the most vulnerable point of the Western Alliance.

Even then, energetic action might well have prevented the worst from happening. Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser had asked for a small quantity of American arms long before he began his talks with the Soviets. His sole concern was then to get some arms — any arms at all — to satisfy the army on which his power depended. All competent observers in Cairo agree that Nasser did not force the volume results that the Soviet arms deal would produce.

ON THIS point, the American government had received a long series of frantic warnings from our ambassador to Cairo, Henry A. Byroade (who is now, apparently, to be made a scapegoat). These warnings were ignored. The American arms were withheld. The Soviet-Egyptian arms deal went through.

Thus Nasser emerged as the predominate figure in a greatly strengthened Arab nationalist movement, made independent of the West by Soviet support. Thus the Soviets took the first long step towards capturing Arab Nationalism, and using this nationalist movement as the instrument to strike at the vital Middle Eastern oil sources of the Western Alliance.

The American reaction to these tremendous developments was uncertain to say the least. After the fall of Glubb Pasha in Jordan, however, the British reaction was violent. The British cabinet decided that Britain would use troops in the Middle East, if this were needed to save the oil that is Britain's lifeblood.

WISELY or unwisely, they proved their resolution by ordering the fight for Cyprus. Such was the situation when Bulganin and Khrushchev went to London. It can now be revealed that British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden and Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd used the strongest tone possible in their discussion of the Middle Eastern problem. They flatly accused the Soviets of an intentional attack on an area of vital British interest. They warned they would fight to avoid losing the oil.

Khrushchev and Bulganin only replied by hinting that they might agree to limitation of arms shipments to the Middle East if the British would abandon the

In The Day's News By Frank Jenkins

Foreign affairs again:

Iceland's conservative Independence party, which wants to keep American troops on the strategic island's NATO bases, LOST GROUND in the recent parliamentary election.

A preliminary count indicated that the alliance of Progressives and Social Democrats, sponsors of the drive to OUST U. S. forces from the Iceland bases, came within a hair of winning a clear majority of the seats.

Another straw in the wind: For the first time in the Icelandic parliament's thousand-year history, more than 90 per cent of the qualified voters cast ballots. That indicates strong popular interest in the issue.

WHAT is to say: The Icelanders want to get rid of us.

LET'S be logical. If Icelandic troops were parading our streets, WED WANT TO GET RID OF THEM. In time of peace, NO PEOPLE wants foreign troops on its soil. The presence of foreign troops in ANY country leads inevitably to the thought among the natives that they're there for no good purpose.

If we're to be logical, we must remember the long centuries of history when foreign troops on native soil almost certainly meant EVENTUAL CONQUEST AND LOSS OF LIBERTY. America is practically the first nation of world power size that doesn't want conquered territory.

When we consider the long and bitter experience of the past, we can hardly blame the people of other countries for suspecting that when we keep troops on their soil EVEN WE have in mind the thought of ultimate conquest.

WHAT shall we do about it? I don't know. I'm no military strategist. But it is rather obvious that the communists are sure that in our foreign military bases they have a good propaganda weapon. They are using it for all it is worth. And, in

every country where we have bases, they are having a lot of luck in turning the people against us.

IN the senate—following the vote in Iceland—Democratic Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington made this statement: "The truth is that our overseas bases are becoming less and less reliable to support our air-atomic power... From Iceland to Okinawa, our key strategic bases are under political attack."

He added: "If our overseas bases are lost, we will need more long-range bombers capable of operating FROM THIS COUNTRY."

IT IS seldom enough that I find myself in agreement with Sen. Henry Jackson, but in this case it looks like he is talking sense.

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 initials for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Vanport Death Loss To the Editor: In your June 20, 1956 issue, you said that not too many more than a dozen were killed in the Vanport flood. That is not true for I was there on May 31, 1948, and more people than I can count were killed... I wish you would tell whoever gave you this information that they would tell and print the truth for if you don't they can get in a lot of trouble... Clifford Hirsch 505 North Riverside Ave. Medford, Ore.

Editor's note: The editorial reference, relying only on the memory of the writer, was "...the dike at Vanport gave way and a dozen or more people lost their lives, and it was miraculous that the loss was not more." After the above letter was received, the State Civil Defense Agency was queried, and replied: "There were 14 known drownings and one other death attributable to drowning or injury at the time." It was not until two months after the disaster that the death count was final because of high water and stacked-up debris at the site in the interval. That the death toll was not higher was attributed by authorities to the fact that it was Memorial day and many residents of the housing projects had left their homes for the holiday. Estimates of the loss made during the confusion of the flood ranged upwards into the hundreds, but were later shown to be wrong.

Congressional Quiz (Copyright, 1956 Congressional Quarterly) Q—How many signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty besides the U.S. can you name? (There are 14 others.) A — Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey and West Germany. The first 11, along with the U.S., were original signers; the last three acceded later.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE PERSONAL EQUATION Three official visitors have come to Washington since the President was taken to the hospital—from Germany Dr. Adenauer, from France M. Pineau, and from Canada Mr. Pearson.

All came hoping to find common ground where, with the United States leading, the Western Allies could unite.

Now that the visitors have come and gone, it is only too evident that there was no serious effort to find a common ground and to negotiate a common policy.

That was the kind of thing that the President, had he not been ill, might well have attempted. Mr. Dulles did not attempt it. He understood Dr. Adenauer without qualification or reservation, an act which ruled out the chance to negotiate with M. Pineau, as well as much hope of a successful outcome of the labors of Mr. Pearson and the other two "Wise Men" of NATO.

THE net result of this month's diplomatic coming and going has been to put on public display the disunity of the Western Alliance on the crucial question of how to deal with the Soviet Union about Germany.

There has been put on public display the unwillingness of Mr. Dulles, when he is on his own without President Eisenhower's guidance, to meet the responsibility of the leader of a great coalition—which is to look for the common ground on which the coalition can stand together.

For NATO the question of how the two Germanies are to be reunited can be made or broken. Instead of looking for the ground on which France, Germany, Britain and the United States can work together on the German question, Mr. Dulles let Dr. Adenauer commit him to terms which are so extreme that they foreclose serious negotiation.

ALMOST certainly this is a piece of bad judgment which we shall come to regret and shall have to try to repair. The Adenauer terms are not only certain to be rejected by the Soviet Union; they will not command the support of the other allies, or, for very long, of the West Germans themselves.

How could they? Under these terms none of the allies would be permitted to come to agreement with the Soviet Union until Moscow has surrendered on the German question — until Moscow has abandoned East Germany and has agreed to a United German rearmament within the NATO military alliance. On such a line as this Mr. Dulles has a poor chance of holding together, much less of re-inspiring and re-invigorating, the Western Alliance.

It will be impossible to commit the Alliance to the view that the paramount interest of the Western world is to reunify Germany on the terms laid down by Dr. Adenauer. It would be impossible to do this if Dr. Adenauer had the overwhelming and ardent support of his own people. But in fact he can no longer count on so effective support in West Germany. "Instead of being able to rely on a sound parliamentary majority," wrote the correspondent of the "Times" (London) shortly after Dr. Adenauer returned from Washington, "he is now faced with widespread dissatisfaction in his own party and a united opposition."

IS IT necessary, and is it wise, we may ask, for the United States Government to be more

inflexible and more extreme than are the Germans themselves? Dr. Adenauer has done a great work. But he is a very old man, and those who succeed him will not, we may be sure, be bound by his views. Why should we, at this late date, let ourselves be bound by them? Is it good leadership to subject the Atlantic allies to the strain of a deep disagreement over a policy which none of them really believes in?

There is supposed to be at issue a deep disagreement as to whether in post-Stalin Russia there is a decisive change or a mere shift of tactics, propaganda, and public relations. I have heard this question discussed by a considerable number of men here and abroad who are as qualified as any one is to form an opinion. (They do not include the naive who are of two sorts — first, those who would like to think that the changes, which are undeniably taking place, are making the Soviet Union into a liberal democracy; and second, those who think that the Soviet system is immutable, that it must stand or fall but that it cannot change from within.)

These naive apart, more and more I have come to think that the real differences in judgment about how to deal with post-Stalinist Russia do not arise from objective evidence. Men appraise the same evidence differently, and they do this, I believe, because they have differing temperaments and because, subjectively, they have a different approach to human experience.

THIS difference is exemplified strikingly by the President and Mr. Dulles. Both men would take an oath, that they are in full agreement. Yet there is no denying that the whole world is so conscious of a contrast between them that they are credited with having opposing policies. Why is this? Is it not because while they may think they think alike, they do not feel alike, and that the people can feel the difference?

Do they not at bottom feel differently about the wickedness of their adversaries—Eisenhower being ever hopeful that he can draw them into the fold, Dulles being unwilling to shake the hand of the unrighteous until they have repented publicly and have confessed their sins?

These differences in evaluation of other men become tantamount to differences in policy. In the Eisenhower feeling about other men, there is always a willingness to explore, to negotiate, and to take risk, often to over-simplify, but always hoping that out of good there will come more good.

BUT to Dulles, the distinction between friend and foe, between the righteous and the wicked, is sharp and is hard, and the policies that arise from this feeling tend to be inflexible about and insensitive to the varieties of other men's feelings.

No judgement of what is going on in the Soviet Union can be guaranteed and conclusive. We can judge only tentatively, trying as best we can to discount our hopes and our fears. For such is the scale and the tempo of these events that while we are judging the changes they are already changing.

Every practical judgment of how to deal with these changes is at bottom, when we have weighed all the evidence available, an act of faith.

Copyright 1955, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

NUDISTS BANNED Berlin (U.P.)—East German Communists Wednesday banned nudist societies "to protect the working class from disturbance during vacations."

At the Hour of Need PHONE 2-8030 DAY OR NIGHT A Reverent Tribute CHAPEL MORTUARY Across from the Courthouse Frank Morgan - Harold Snodgrass FUNERAL DIRECTORS