

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
123 North 2nd St. P. O. Box 1411
MEDFORD, OREGON 97504

Giles French's Paragraphs

A number of Oregon newspapers, this one included, recently bemoaned the fact of Giles French's "retirement." Like Mark Twain's death, it was greatly exaggerated.

French, the crusty small-town newspaperman who owned and operated the Sherman County Journal in Moro, sold his paper to insure its continuity. But, despite misgivings to the contrary, his "vigorous editorial voice" was not stilled.

In our view, his paragraphs are the more important.

A "PARAGRAPHER," in newspaper parlance, is one who can take a subject and deal with it adequately in one or two, sometimes three, sentences. The late Arthur Perry of the Mail Tribune was one such, and many of his pithy comments still are printed in our "Flight O' Time" column.

French is another, and his paragraphs, contained in his column entitled "These Things We Note," have made him one of the most widely quoted of Oregon newsmen.

Here are a few samples of French's trenchant style:

"The Civil Defense controversy proves how hard it is to get rid of a government project no matter how useless it proves to be."
"We would be happy if there was as much concern over the condition of education at Portland State as there is over its athletic program."
"Whatever this country needs is a profitable use for cheap grass."

"Some experience with interim tax committees leads to the conclusion that the addition of persons not legislators is of more importance than who is chairman. In fact, a committee of plain citizens would be best, but would find legislative prejudice against their conclusions."

"It is only the inferior who aspire to be average."
"Our experience with food vending machines is that they are excellent for dieters."

"Riders of Hondas and other similar bikes are having a gay time on the highways and byways these days. The foreign made smooth-running machines sound like they are traveling at least 80 miles an hour, but they only sound that way."

THAT GIVES YOU an idea of French's style in paragraphing. It is a rare talent, and the hardest part of it to achieve is the deceptive appearance of simplicity.

Most of us who write editorials for a living have neither the time nor the patience to turn out smooth, polished paragraphs that say something pithy or amusing, or both, on a variety of subjects. Too often we're apt to use a full column to discuss a matter which French could polish off in a paragraph.

We're glad he's still around. — E. A.

John Boyle's Role

The role played in the development of southern Oregon by John C. Boyle can hardly be exaggerated. The list of honors he has won in his profession is a long one. He was, in real truth, a pioneer in the electric utility business.

These things are known to his colleagues and co-workers.

But to the citizen who has never had a chance to get acquainted with this dignified, kindly, white-haired and determined man, Boyle's accomplishments can be summarized by saying that he and his engineers are responsible for the burgeoning industry in southern Oregon, and for the fact that when the switch is flicked, the light goes on.

We wish Mr. Boyle many long and productive years in his new role as consultant and elder statesman in his field. — E. A.

The Language Grows

There was an interesting article in last Sunday's Mail Tribune, telling of the debate over the Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged.

The book is far more "permissive" regarding the use of English than the famous Second Edition, which cautioned readers that certain words are colloquial or idiomatic or not in good usage. The Third attempts to record language as it is spoken, not as the purists would like to have it spoken.

The debate about "purity" vs. "reality" in language is an old one, and it will continue.

WE SEE merit in both sides of the argument. We like to read and hear correct English. But we do not blink at the fact that it is usage—everyday conversation—which in the long run determines what is "correct."

The Royal Bank of Canada's Monthly Letter recently said:

"Language did not start in a grammar book; it started because people wanted to talk with one another. To build it up over the centuries has been a grand adventure in which we can still join."

The "grand adventure" of building the language goes on, right now probably faster than at any time in history, as the nuclear and space age have forced upon us a whole new family of words. English, one could say, is going into orbit.—E.A.

A five-volume set of books is placed in order on a shelf. A bookworm starts at the outside of the front cover of Volume I and eats his way to outside the back cover of Volume V. The pages of each book total one inch in thickness; each cover is one-eighth inch thick. How far does the bookworm travel? — E.A.



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.

America
To the Editor: Flag day has past and the Fourth of July will soon be here; so some of my friends said they wished I'd send in my poem I wrote about America; so here it is. Thank you.

Columbus sailed an unknown sea
To find a shorter route for trade, to be,
But God had a hand in it we see,
He found another country, for you and me.

With streams and lakes to water the land,
Mighty Mountains, carved by the Maker's hand,
Hidden mines, with treasures rare,
Giant trees, as though planted with loving care.

'Tis a wonderful land and beautiful to see,
Nothing to mar it, but men like you and me,
God created it, and called it good,
Man could make it an Eden, if they only would.

Not by their ways, in this Eden, they'll tread,
Not by their pride in what they have got,
Not by their wealth, made by tilling the sod,
Not by their might, but by doing the will of God.
Mabel Harmon
1035 Cherry st.
Medford.

Birch View of Court
To the Editor: Jesus said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Little children may no longer approach Him, however, through the public schools of America. In their recent prayer and Bible reading decision, eight justices of our Supreme Court have forbidden it.

This is the second time within a year that this high court has perpetrated the evil and disgraceful act of banning Almighty God from the schools of our land. This is not separation of "Church and State." It is separation of God and Country. Our First Amendment is so clear and unambiguous that it says: "Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Since Congress has never made any such law, the high court has no authority to act on the subject. But it HAS acted, and in doing so has itself violated the Constitution by prohibiting the free exercise of religion to the school children of America. Like so many, many decisions before it the above ruling is a deep-hued, pro-communist red, and gives aid and comfort to our mortal enemy. For one of the most important communist aims is to destroy all religion, particularly now in America.

In case you have forgotten, with the "Steve Nelson" decision Chief Justice Warren and his Court left our sovereign states helpless against communist treason. Because of the "Slochower" ruling communists teaching in our schools cannot be fired, or even questioned. The "Konigsberg" and "Schware" decisions allow the Communists' constitutional wrecking crew of lawyers to legally practice law. Because of the "Suververe Federal Employees" ruling communists can now legally work in our government. The "Watkins" and "Sacher" decisions muzzled, hamstringed and crippled our Congressional committees. And the "Jenks" decision handcuffed the FBI, leaving them almost helpless

THEY are warm and friendly words. They are TRUTHFUL words. But they are spoken under peculiar circumstances.

THEY are warm and friendly words. They are TRUTHFUL words. But they are spoken under peculiar circumstances.

THEY are warm and friendly words. They are TRUTHFUL words. But they are spoken under peculiar circumstances.

THEY are warm and friendly words. They are TRUTHFUL words. But they are spoken under peculiar circumstances.

Both Egypt, U.S., Have Tiger by the Tail in Yemen; Peace Hangs in Balance

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst
When, last December, the United States recognized the revolutionary

the desired results, the United States took two more steps. It prodded the United Nations into entering the dispute in the role of mediator. And it sent one of its most successful negotiators, Ellisworth Bunker, to the Middle East for on-the-ground talks with President Abdel Gamal Nasser and with Prince Faisal, premier of Saudi Arabia.

Out of this came Egyptian agreement to withdraw its troops from Yemen and Saudi Arabia and Jordanian agreement to cease their aid to Yemen's deposed Imam.

It also led to a U. N. decision to send a peace-keeping team under a Swedish General to Yemen to make sure the agreements were carried

out. In the long-range, the United States also sought to cut off what rapidly was becoming an all-out test of strength between Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Direct conflict between these two held out almost limitless possibilities, and in direct possibilities, and in direct notice of its own interest in the conflict, the U. S. warned Egypt that any attack on Saudi Arabia would set it on collision course with the United States.

Since there is reason to believe that the Egyptians not only were flying Russian planes in Yemen but that some of them were flown by Russian pilots, there then came the possibility of another U. S. confrontation with the Soviet Union.

There the situation roughly stands today. The trouble with the overall strategy seems to be that it reckoned without the termination of the deposed young Imam now fighting to regain his throne.



Diplomacy Is A Stuffed Egg

By Arthur Hoppe

Washington—I hope you remember my best friend, Mr. Dick Tuck. He is the distinguished political scientist who traveled faithfully with Mr. Nixon in the last two campaigns and, though very modest, helped the reporters make crowd estimates. Which were very modest. Perhaps, I suppose, because Mr. Tuck was working for the Democrats.

Since then the question "Whatever happened to Dick Tuck?" has been asked by many people, most of them creditors. And I'm glad to report that he's right here in Washington, moving in diplomatic circles, primarily from the hors d'oeuvre table to the bar and back again. "It's a living," says Mr. Tuck modestly. "If you like stuffed eggs."

As there are only two or three diplomatic receptions out on Embassy Row a week, Mr. Tuck does have his lean days. But he has put his keen, analytical mind to work and now has great plans for the future. He told me about them when we went out to say good-bye to the Afghanisthanian Ambassador, who had requested the pleasure of the company at his farewell party of a friend of Mr. Tuck's, who couldn't go, fortunately.

It was a garden party. Perhaps a half hundred guests who had come to bid a fond farewell to the good old Ambassador from Whatsname, as one lady put it, were milling about.

Mr. Tuck selected several high-protein hors d'oeuvres and a waiter handed him a drink with a warm smile of recognition. I said I hadn't realized Mr. Tuck was so well known in Afghanisthanian circles. "Oh no," said Mr. Tuck. "Actually, the food, the

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(c) 1963, The Washington Post

THE PRESIDENT ARRIVES IN GEMANY
Before the President left Washington, General De Gaulle withdrew the rest of the

French navy from the NATO command. The timing of the action and the blunt and curt manner in which it was done have to be taken as notice to the President that France will not only refuse to help the revival of NATO, but will act positively to obstruct the revival.

There is little question that General De Gaulle has the power to force the issue if he chooses to do so. Strategically, the NATO command and the core of its communications and supply are on French territory, and there is no telling how long France, which has withdrawn its navy and most of its army, will leave the arrangements as they are. Certainly, General De Gaulle has very strong bargaining power in any discussion about the future of NATO.

He has also a very powerful leverage on the other five members of the Common Market. By withdrawing from it, he can destroy it, and the career of the general shows again and again that one of the weapons he uses most efficiently and is most likely to use is to abstain and withdraw. None of his fellow members in the Common Market is prepared to risk a dissolution. That is one of the compelling reasons why we can afford no illusion about the chances of West Germany challenging General De Gaulle effectively for the leadership of Europe.

IN HIS welcoming speech at the airport near Cologne, Chancellor Adenauer wasted little time on the diplomatic niceties. He read the President a lecture which was sharp notice that while the United States must guarantee the military security of Western Europe, the President must not challenge the primacy of the Paris-Bonn combination in making the policies for dealing with the Soviet Union.

He went so far as to quote to the President sentences taken out of the context of what the President said at American University. The President will be making several speeches in Germany, and it will be important to see

if and how he extricates himself from the position to which Dr. Adenauer nailed him on his arrival at the airport. In any event, the chancellor's speech may be taken to mean that, unless his successor makes a sharp break with present German policy, West Germany will remain completely dependent on Paris. For only Paris will support Bonn on an absolutely hard line about East Germany and Berlin. In all the other allied countries, including the United States, there is an inclination to explore the possibility of reunification to be brought about by dealing with the two German states. This is what Dr. Adenauer had in mind when he lectured the President at the airport. As long as he continues to speak for West Germany, Bonn is inescapably tied to General De Gaulle.

WE MUST not let ourselves be misled by the plea that the Germans and the other Europeans need to be reassured once more that the United States will wage a thermonuclear war to defend them. The real situation is not nearly so simple as that.

The French, who are more frank and lucid than most, say that in the nuclear age no ally can be counted upon to risk its own overwhelming destruction in order to protect the national interests of another ally. Therefore, no matter how often the President pledges the country to do or die, the French, and a growing number of Europeans, will not believe him. For a promise to commit national suicide is not, say the annoying French, entirely credible.

At the same time, the French are a very long way from having a nuclear deterrent of their own capable of dealing with the Soviet Union without the help of the United States. The question, then, is: why do they treat us so scornfully? The answer is that they are entirely certain that there is no real danger of Soviet military aggression against Western Europe.

That is the missing key to the Gaullist policy which seems so destructive and so reckless. The French do not believe that NATO will be needed. That is why they are pulling it apart. They do not think that the American alliance is really necessary. In the French view, even if it were necessary, the United States could not be counted upon as a result of promises and pacts.

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris
(c) Field Enterprises, Inc.

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE
The cant that is spoken in the political sphere is equalled, if not excelled, only by the cant that is spoken in the artistic and cultural sphere. The most absurd and inflated claims are made by proponents in both worlds.

I was, therefore, pleased to read recently the transcript of some talks given by Arthur Schnabel, the pianistic genius, a few years before he died. Among other blunt and honest comments, Schnabel had this to say: "All my life I have heard this talk about the power of art to bring people nearer to each other, that world peace will come only if more music is circulated and exchanged. Yet I have seen people deeply moved — as deeply moved and affected by music as is possible — and the next morning they would go into activities which you might call criminal and inhuman."

The fact that the Russians love Van Cliburn's artistry, and we love Gilels or some other Russian performer, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with musical activities, either individually or nationally. The Germans were the greatest music-lovers in the world — they would sob over Schubert and moan over Mozart — but the cause of international understanding

was not forwarded one inch by such appreciation. And, much as I applaud their good intentions, I feel the same way about the people who devoutly believe that speaking a common language would make mankind act more like brothers. There may be some good practical reasons for an international language, but it is sentimental nonsense to think that it would promote amity among mankind.

One of the most distressing lessons on history, in fact, is that the fiercest wars and persecutions often obtained among peoples who spoke the same language. The early Greek city-states fought among themselves with unparalleled ferocity; so did the later Latin cities and duchies. The English behaved most atrociously toward the Irish, and our own Civil War indicates that a common tongue did not prevent horrible fratricide.

Music is not an "international language," nor are any of the arts. There are only two things that will bring people closer together — one of them is positive, and the other is negative. The positive thing is love, and the negative thing is fear. And since we are not good enough to love one another, we will be brought together (if ever) only by fear — by the very real fear, which exists today as never before, that destruction is indivisible, that we are all sitting in the same little boat in the middle of the sea, and to drill a hole under anyone's seat is to sink us all. This is the one international language time will force us to learn to speak.

