

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"  
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.  
33 North Fir St., Ph. SP-2-5141

ROBERT W. RICH, Editor  
HERB GREY Advertising Manager  
GERALD LATHAM, Business Mgr.  
ERIC ALLEN, Jr. Managing Editor  
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor  
HARRY SHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor  
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor  
OLIVE STARCHER, Society 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: Copy 10c  
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$13.00  
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$8.00  
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$4.25  
Sunday Only—One year \$4.20

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford  
Ashland—Central Post, Eagle  
Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill,  
Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River,  
Talent and on motor routes.  
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00  
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$11.00  
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$6.00  
Carrier and Dealers—copy 10c  
All Terms Cash in Advance

Official Paper of City of Medford  
Official Paper of Jackson County  
United Press—Full Licensed Wire  
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU  
OF CIRCULATION

Advertising Representatives  
WEST-HOLIDAY CO. INC., Of-  
fices in New York, Chicago, De-  
troit, San Francisco, Los Angeles,  
Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, At-  
lanta, Vancouver, B. C.

1958  
NEWSPAPER  
PUBLISHERS  
ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL EDITORIAL  
ASSOCIATION  
FIDELITY MEMBER

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

10 YEARS AGO  
July 27, 1948 (Tuesday)

"No left turn" signs will be installed this week at the Main st. and Sixth st. intersections of Central ave.

A substantial decrease in truck rates between the Klamath Basin and the Rogue river valley is announced.

20 YEARS AGO  
July 27, 1938 (Wednesday)

Lightning storms this afternoon brought new fire threats to local timber.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Snugglers" column: "Weather conditions are now such the Olden Girls complain of the cold in the morning and the heat in the afternoon."

35 YEARS AGO  
July 27, 1923 (Friday)

Herbert Hoover, presidential nominee, has accepted an invitation to spend Sunday night on the Rogue river with the provision that politics be taboo during his stay.

A white-haired woman scientist is collecting fungi at Crater Lake.

40 YEARS AGO  
July 27, 1918 (Saturday)

The Dixie society of Jackson county is planning a southern fried chicken picnic in the park at Ashland.

The WCTU will hold its annual election of officers Friday with "a good program and social" to follow.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

- 1. The short full skirt worn by Greek men is called a pantanella, fustanella, or skirret?
- 2. Does the zebra have a black or blackish background with white or buffy stripes, or vice-versa?
- 3. A combination of mist and fumes, which reduces visibility to a few hundred yards is called s...?
- 4. Name the largest library in the world.
- 5. Which great dam is located on the Colorado River?
- 6. In the duel between Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr, who was wounded?
- 7. What is the name given to the food of the larvae of queen bees?
- 8. Which of these is NOT a variety of cheese: Edam, Cheltenham, Cheddar, Camembert?
- 9. What sort of creature was Cerberus, the guardian of the entrance to Hades?
- 10. What country has the oldest parliamentary assembly in the world?

Answers: 1. Fustanella. 2. Vice-versa. 3. Smog. 4. Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 5. Hoover Dam. 6. Hamilton. 7. Royal Jelly. 8. Cheltenham. 9. Three-headed dog. 10. Iceland.

BILL BECOMES LAW

Washington—President Eisenhower signed into law Friday a bill to extend for another four years the agricultural conservation program under which farmers receive cash subsidies to reimburse them for part of the expense of approved conservation practices.

## Water for the Future

It's been a wet spring and summer in the Rogue valley.

Looking at the lush fields and green lawns, it is a bit difficult to imagine that the time may come when water will be one of our most precious commodities.

But it is already. And it will become more so. Steps are being taken to conserve it so that careless use, and destructive practices, will not forever leave us in short supply.

Without abundant supplies of water, nothing is possible — certainly not a highly developed civilization.

JOHN Gribble, the "old forester" who is one of Medford's most ardent conservationists, called us the other day to discuss the problem, which had been in his mind since reading a recent Mail Tribune story by a UPI correspondent.

The story pointed out that water supplies are almost bound to be one of America's foremost problems within the next 20 years.

Industrial use of water, a major use these days, has increased 11 times in the past half-century, and the rate of increase is going up all the time — both because of new methods and new techniques which require more water, and because of the tremendous expansion of industry.

Municipal use of water has also increased, as the population has grown and as more efficient municipal water systems have been installed.

THESE are only examples.

But they serve to hint both as to the importance of water and as to the future inadequacy of the supply.

And is anything being done about it? Yes, quite a lot — although far from enough to meet the problem.

One of the most important steps (and one little-recognized by the public at large) is the improvement in logging practices.

Forested land holds water; it prevents erosion; it tends to limit floods, and release water throughout the year.

Forests which are cut indiscriminately, however, lose those properties. Land erodes, floods can result, and what is a mud-field one day can be a parched area the next.

On federally-administered lands, now, and increasingly on privately-owned lands, good practice requires reforestation, care to prevent erosion, and other methods which minimize or eliminate the dangers.

OREGON is a pioneer in the study of water resources.

It was the first state to enact a water resources code, and name a water resources board. The board has been hard at work for several years now, studying water utilization and conservation.

They don't have all the answers yet, but they are finding many of them. And, with some exceptions, Oregon still has a tremendous water resource to call on. With the start the state has, the chances are good that much or most of it can be saved for use at its maximum potential.

SOME people feel that the state's entering into this field constitutes an invasion of individual rights — that it has no right to tell people what they can or can't do with the God-given water of the state.

Once — when people were few and water abundant — this attitude made sense. But it does no longer.

For water is vital to every man, woman and child in the state, and to most of them in more than one way. And the state must step in if the supplies for the many are threatened for the benefit of the few.

Therefore, rivers must be studied to determine the extent of the resource, and the greatest beneficial uses. In the process, someone is going to be limited in his use of water. This must be so if the right of the majority is to be protected.

ALSO, the state's "ground water" code was enacted to protect the water tables from depletion.

If, say, one man drills a number of wells, thereby lowering the water table so that other men's wells go dry, he is robbing those other men just as surely as if he'd sneaked into their house and stolen a wallet.

It is a vastly complicated study, and, those who are working on it tell us, a fascinating one, and one which still has a long way to go.

A FINAL mention should be made of efforts now under way to tap, for human use, the one inexhaustible source of water — the oceans. These waters, now unusable because of their salt, are the ultimate source of all our water.

If we can by-pass the cycle of nature to obtain our water from the ocean directly, and if we can do it sufficiently inexpensively to make it practicable, one of our greatest problems will be solved. We cannot do so yet. But experiments, both by government and by private companies, are being performed. They show progress, and hints of ultimate success.

Particularly when atomic energy becomes available in large quantities, and inexpensively, the problem, both of converting sea water to fresh, and pumping it to where it is needed, should be solved.—E.A.

## Dennis the Menace



\*NOW CALM DOWN, MRS. WADE, AND SAY THAT AGAIN. MARGARET WANTS TO JOIN DENNIS' NUDIST COLONY? WHAT NUDIST COLONY?\*

## Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

WHERE WE STAND NOW  
Washington — This is a moment when it is important to know just where we stand

now; and for this purpose, it is essential to note the great gap at the very center of the picture. We have troops in Lebanon. The British have troops in Jordan. But the United States and Britain do not have a Middle Eastern policy.

This is the only way to sum up the unhappy results of widespread inquiry in authoritative quarters. You cannot get an answer to the question: "Where do we go from here?" or rather, you only get vaguely mumbled prayers that somehow or other, some day or other, the combination of the Marines and special Ambassador Robert Murphy will achieve a political compromise in Beirut.

A good many people seem to believe that this is a workable Middle Eastern policy, fit to compete with the cruelly shrewd, arrogantly bold policy of Nikita Khrushchev. But this widespread belief is only a testimonial to the Administration's success in blurring or concealing all the facts that count.

IT IS hard to believe that President Eisenhower purposely misled the Congressional leaders, at the July 14 meeting when he first revealed his intention to send troops into Lebanon. A President who leaves the entire, day-to-day task of policy-making to his Secretary of State can quite easily misconceive the choice he has to make, when he must suddenly make a very hard choice with great speed. At any rate, the misrepresentation of the Middle Eastern situation was begun by the President himself, at this first moment of disclosure.

Three different kinds of false impression were conveyed to the Congressional leaders. The President first of all said that he had received an "ultimatum" from President Chamoun, threatening the effective abdication of the Lebanese government if the Marines were not sent "within 48 hours."

In reality, President Eisenhower had long since promised President Chamoun to send troops to Lebanon, if the Lebanese government desired him to do so. Now Chamoun had simply requested Eisenhower to keep his freely given promise. He had also warned that the seismic shock of the coup d'etat in Baghdad would quickly destroy the government in Beirut, unless the American promise were quickly kept. Being on the naked brink of immediate defeat, he had asked for the American answer within two days. This was the Chamoun "ultimatum."

SECONDLY, both the President and Secretary of State briskly threw Allen Dulles to the wolves, by intimating that they had been taken by surprise by the coup in Iraq. Hence the Senate is now busily investigating the C. I. A.

But in reality the President and Secretary of State had long been warned that indecision about Lebanon would lead to a coup in Iraq. The warnings had come, not only from the C. I. A., but also from the murdered Iraqi leader, Nuri Pasha, from the governments of Pakistan, Iran and Turkey, and from many other sources. All the C. I. A. failed to do was to say: "On this particular day, in this particular regiment, a military coup will be organized."

This was the extent of the "surprise," and this much "surprise" all governments must expect.

Finally, and perhaps worst of all, the President also indicated to the Congressional leaders that the American problem centered in Lebanon, rather than in Iraq. It was true, of course, that he had to make an immediate choice between keeping his promise to Chamoun or dishonoring the country's word. That was the first part of the problem, which could only be solved as it was solved.

BUT the heart of the problem lay, and it still lies, in Baghdad rather than in Beirut. The British and American governments jointly decided not to attack the heart of the problem in Baghdad. The consequences of this decision must be faced, therefore, before the two governments can fill the great gap in the center of the picture, which is their present lack of any real Middle Eastern policy.

The first consequence concerns Lebanon and Jordan. No matter what compromise is reached in Beirut (and a successful compromise seems unlikely) it can only afford a pretext for the withdrawal of our troops. After Nasser's triumph in Iraq, no government in Lebanon can survive his pressure, once the Marines go out. By the same token, King Hussein cannot survive in Jordan, if the British paratroops depart. And Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Coast oil Sheikdoms are also sitting birds for the next conspiracy Nasser chooses to hatch.

In these circumstances, only three courses of action deserve the name of a Middle Eastern policy. We can defy Khrushchev and deal sternly with Nasser himself. Or we can defy world opinion, and get ready to hang on by our toenails to the oil in the fairly easily defensible Persian Gulf area. Or we can take the bold and painful measures inside the Western alliance, which may protect the West against the worst effects of Nasser's onward march. Those are the choices. Take your pick.

(C) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

## 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 an eye 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.

### It's a Tanager

To the Editor: Perhaps a birdwatcher can tell me what kind of birds are at my place. The bird has a beautiful yellow body, black wings with three white stripes on a scarlet red neck and head, larger than a sparrow.  
(Name on File)  
Medford

(Editor's note: Our birdwatcher informs us the bird is a Western Tanager.)

### Illinois Man Named GOP Group Chairman

Washington—(UPI)—Spencer T. Olin, Alton, Ill., industrialist and banker, was named Friday to be chairman of the Republican Finance committee.

His selection was announced by GOP National Chairman Meade Alcorn. Olin succeeds Charles S. Thomas who resigned July 2 to become president of Trans World Airlines.

## Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

### DEAD END STREET

As things stand at this moment, the notion of a summit meeting

of New York City has the characteristic of one of those nightmares in which one feels compelled to do what one desperately does not want to do. At this time, a public confrontation between Eisenhower and Khrushchev would be a ghastly spectacle, almost certain to poison the air still further with charges and countercharges. Moreover, there are great risks that the local police would not be able to maintain perfect law and order during the visit of a man who has in the cosmopolitan city of New York more than many embittered enemies. Beyond that, there does not now exist as between Washington and Moscow a basis for negotiation. Both have talked themselves into extreme positions from which it is most awkward to make any concession.

Yet the fact is that the President has been pushed and pulled by the British government, and by widespread public opinion in Germany, in Scandinavia, in Japan, and elsewhere, to a grudging acceptance of the idea of a summit meeting on the Middle East. Why, we must ask ourselves, do Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles find themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea, between having a conference which would now be dangerous and refusing to have one, which is dangerous too?

THEY find themselves in this dilemma because they have no Middle East policy and have therefore lost the diplomatic initiative. The right and effective answer to Khrushchev's call for a summit conference was not to refuse it and leave it there, was not to accept it and to be entangled from there on. The right answer would have been to propose the terms of a settlement which included but extended beyond the withdrawal of the Marines. Such a proposal would be something substantial to talk about in place of the talk about where and when to talk.

Unfortunately, we do not have negotiable terms of settlement to propose. The Anglo-American intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan was carried out to prevent their collapse. But this was a hurried reaction to the unexpected news from Iraq. It was not a deliberate act of policy.

We find ourselves, therefore, in a dead end street. The presence of our troops not only does not promise a settlement of the revolutionary condition which caused us to send them in—the longer the troops stay, the harder it will be to withdraw them without precipitating the disaster they are meant to prevent.

THUS, it is true that neither the Lebanon nor Jordan can be stabilized and made secure without a wide settlement beyond their frontiers. There is a school of thought both here and in Britain which argues that the only settlement which is acceptable and which will really settle anything will be one which followed a restoration in Iraq and the elimination of Nasser. They would do now what Eden and Mollet attempted to do at the Suez some two years ago. They are prepared to defy the Soviet Union and they would by force of arms establish a British-American protectorate in the Middle East.

There is a kind of logic in this view. But those who hold it are living in the wrong century. Relatively speaking, particularly in the Middle East which borders on Russia, the Soviet Union is incomparably a stronger power than was Czarist Russia in the 19th century. The Arab revolution, of which Nasser is the most conspicuous but not the only champion, did not exist at all in the imperial days of the last century. Moreover, and this must not be overlooked, the democracies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization must be considered. They cannot be counted upon to go all the way in case of a military showdown over an Arab country in the Middle East.

IF, THEREFORE, the day is past and gone forever when the Middle East can be stabilized by Western military power, we must seek an accommodation with the new powers in the Middle East—namely with the Soviet Union and with Nasser's Confederation.

What other line of policy

is conceivable? None, unless it can be called a policy to do nothing but dig in where we are in Lebanon and in Jordan, and for the rest to trade insults with Nasser and Khrushchev. We shall get the worse of the exchange of insults, in that it is always easier to denounce intervention than to defend it. Let us have no illusions then that we can dig in, and sit it out hoping that something better will turn up.

Unless there is a reasonably prompt settlement in the Lebanon with the Marines withdrawing, their continuing presence will embarrass us everywhere in the world. They were sent in order to prove to the Turks and the Pakistanis and others that our military promises will be honored. But if the Marines stay on and become an army of occupation, there will be some serious second thought not only among the nations guaranteed but also here among ourselves who must provide the guarantees.

IT IS, therefore, a very great interest, one might without exaggeration call it a vital interest, of the United States to work out by negotiation an honorable exit for the Marines. This may be impossible, given the revolutionary character of the Nasser movement. But it may not be impossible, if it is seriously and thoroughly attempted, given on the one hand the military weakness of the Arab states and on the other their great need of the West in the oil business and in their economic development.

(c) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

## POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

The word "catskinner" is so admirably descriptive and flavorful that it has come to be fully accepted in these parts, where the big crawler tractors are seen so frequently, and play so large a role in our economy.

But it is a bit baffling sometimes to newcomers. One such, a young man on our staff, was overheard the other day diffidently asking a colleague if it was a usable word, and just what it meant.

The meaning became plain when the parallel with "mule skinner" was outlined.

The word seems solidly entrenched, probably to the mixed pleasure and pain of the Caterpillar Tractor company, which makes every effort to protect its trademarked name (insisting that the word "Cat" be capitalized when used to mean its variety of tractor), but which cannot but profit from the notion that all crawler tractors are "Cats."

Glenn Jackson (whose nickname of "General" is used by his friends both descriptively and respectfully) was probably the proudest man in town last week, when news of the arrival of Glenn Jackson Ford, Grandchild No. 1, was announced. It was, to his relief, a boy — bringing the family odds down to something like seven to three. Presumably the youngster could start out as "Corporal" and work up from there.

County Judge Rod Keating, whose mane of gray-

white hair is one of his most distinguishing characteristics, probably got a few new white ones the other day when, flying back from a conference in Montana, the plane's two engines both quit over rugged mountain country.

Happily the pilot got them started again (he'd inadvertently switched to an empty fuel tank). But Rod says that everyone aboard, including the dead-pale but self-possessed young stewardess, was real shook up.

"I began to think that \$1.25 I'd spent on air-trip insurance was the best buck and a quarter I'd ever paid out," he said, mopping his brow at the memory.

Ever had fried al fresco for dinner? We suspect you haven't, but that's what an M-T story recommended the other day — inadvertently, of course, in a story which said, "If you haven't tried fried al fresco dining, you may be missing a lot of eating enjoyment..."

And, speaking of errors, the M-T gave a Talent woman a shock the other day. She thought she'd lost several days out of her life when she picked up a paper and saw "Sunday, July 27" in capital letters on page one.

What had happened was this: Each week the "date-lines" for the paper for a full week are set into type, then each day the printers pick out the right one for use that day. Last Tuesday one of them picked up the wrong one, dropped into place without checking it carefully enough, and no one noticed it until several hundred papers had come off the press — and some of them carted away by carriers.

The error was caught and corrected for most of the press run—but we wish to apologize to the lady who had that sinking feeling that Tuesday to Sunday had vanished, and to any others similarly discomfited.

Well, it's been hot lately. And there have been a lot of thunderstorms. Some people swear they haven't seen weather like it for 30 years. A newcomer to the valley observes, "You know, I've never been anywhere yet where people will admit that the present poor weather is the usual and expected thing."

Tradition requires that when a youngster loses a tooth, he must place it under his pillow at night so "the fairy" will come during the night and exchange it for a dime. (It used to be a nickel, but inflation, you know.) One local mother recently sneaked into her daughter's bedroom to "play fairy," and left a dime under the pillow, even though, fumbling in the dark, she couldn't find the tiny tooth.

The next morning the child happened to mention that she'd "hidden the tooth from the fairy" to save it to show to a playmate. Whereupon the mother hastily and secretly returned to the bedroom and retrieved the coin for later use.

"Life," our sports editor remarked wistfully the other day, "is just a bowl of Cheerios..."

Two of Medford's busiest men—one a businessman, the other a public official — took off for the high country recently undecided as to whether to spend one day, or two, or even three at a mountain lake.

After the first day the businessman said to his friend that they'd better decide whether to go back to town. The public official looked at him wearily. "Don't bother me," he said. "I don't even want to think. Just tell me what we're going to do, and we'll do it."

That man's been working too hard.

We have been told about the small foreign car which dashed into the street between two pedestrians, and was damaged.

We've also been told, this time on the level, about another small car with a Canadian license plate, which was parked in a service station. Another vehicle drove up behind, but was prevented from getting to the gasoline pumps because the small car was in the way, and its driver refused to move, even when courteously asked to do so by the attendant.

Whereupon the attendant looked at his assistant, nodded his head, and the two of them lifted and rocked the little car so that it just rolled away from the pump.

## Washington Report

By William S. White

### COURAGE, DECENCY AND NECESSITY

Washington — The courage and decency—and allied necessity — of the Allied intervention in Lebanon and Jordan is being submerged in a sea of collateral arguments and valid complaints that the future is far from bright.

It is plain that legitimate questions — but secondary questions all the same — are causing many to lose sight of the central problem. This problem was and is simply the salvation of the Middle East from an ugly chaos that would lead in time to the enfeeblement, if not the destruction, of the free world.

The problem is not whether intervention will settle everything; nobody ever supposed it would. It is, regrettably, not even whether the uninvolved world likes what we have done. And it is not of controlling significance whether the chaos was being prepared on direct Moscow orders or by what is called by the curiously soft term of Nasser "Nationalism."

WHOEVER was preparing it, was demonstrably just what President Eisenhower said the other day it was—"Violence, murder and terrorism as instruments of international policy."

This may be the new "nationalism"—that movement so attractive to so many in their recoil from "colonialism." But in a less sophisticated time it would have been called in plain truth by another name. That name is gangsterism.

Even those who have most ably opposed the landings in Lebanon and Jordan have not offered much alternative apart from one form or another of diplomatic negotiation. While talking things over is a useful and civilized device, it has its limitations. Even in the United Nations.

The dead bodies in the little palace of Iraq might well have been followed by dead bodies elsewhere if President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan had not sent troops rather than notes.

But the heavy pressures on Macmillan by the undoubtedly strong and high-minded public pressures on Mr. Eisenhower here are clearly weakening Western will. Many—including this correspondent in a small way — had long criticized Mr. Eisenhower for not acting in the world drift.

MOST of these critics now upbraid him for the action he has taken. This does not prove that they are wrong now. But it puts a burden upon them to face up to the real, the central, issue and not to speak as though there had

been all the time in the world to make a tidy response in the Middle East.

It is being said of the troop landings, "well, yes, perhaps they did have to do it—but what is the policy now?" There is a rhetorical pseudo-logic in this question. But there is a plain answer: "We don't yet know just what the policy will be. Let us have some chance to prepare one. For the moment, at any rate, our plan is very clear. This is not to allow the plotters—or the aspiring nationalists, if you prefer—to sink the Western position. For the moment, we have kept our young friends from drowning. Don't require us just now to plan their future through college."

Those who demand a total "plan" in crisis overlook this fact: war—or, as in this case, a somewhat convulsive defensive military movement—never was a final solution, and nobody ever claimed it was. Yet is an act of desperate necessity to avoid imminent defeat while one maneuvers as best he can to bring off some tolerable victory, some tolerable conclusion, somewhere ahead.

THEN it is said that our policy has "the smell of oil."

Of course it has. Middle East oil is not merely desirable to our European allies; it is indispensable to their lives. And oil is really not inherently evil. Like coal, or sugar—or food—it is neither moral nor immoral. It is only necessary.

And, indeed, it is true that certain large oil corporations may have their interests protected if we continue to protect the higher general interests of the West itself in the Middle East. It may even be that their profits will be sustained. If so, then it could be said that the producers of every strategic necessity whatever—aircraft, tanks, ships, as well as oil—have always had their profit. Generally speaking, this has seemed the best way to have the strength required.

Finally, it is said that we are looking under the bed for Communists; that the Nasser Arabs really only want their own way of life. While it is not necessary to prove an imperialist Communist connection to justify action against government by homicide, plenty of evidential proof of such a connection is, in fact, at hand.

Professional Western and pro-Western military men—not "politicians" and not "propagandists"—have files full of documented information of Soviet and Soviet-bloc arms, officers, technicians, trainers operating in Nasser's group of countries. If these are not placed to serve Russian interests, Moscow has been generous to a fault. (Copyright, 1958, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)