

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by
MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North St. P. O. Box 2-6141
MEDFORD, OREGON

ROBERT W. RUBLE, Editor
GEOFFREY L. LARSEN, Business Mgr.
E. H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY HIRMAN, Teleg. Editor
RICHARD J. FLETCHER, Sports Editor
OLIVE STAR, News Editor
DALE E. KIRKIN, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$8.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. \$4.25
Sundays Only—1 year \$5.00

Advertising Rates
First insertion—10¢ per line
Continuing—7¢ per line
Special display—by arrangement

MEMBERS OF ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA

MEMBERS OF PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

Flight 'o Time
Medford and Jackson County
History from the files of The
Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40
and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Sept. 22, 1949 (Thursday)
The Mail Tribune tops the
13,000 figure in circulation for
the first time, reflecting popula-
tion growth in Medford and
environs.

20 YEARS AGO
Sept. 22, 1939 (Friday)
Billy Ousterhout of Little
Butte is the grand champion
exhibitor at the 4-H livestock
show closing here today.

30 YEARS AGO
Sept. 22, 1929 (Sunday)
Elimination of the "death
curve" on Crater Lake high-
way near Prospect is sought.
Deer are reported plentiful
and tame in the hills of the
county.

40 YEARS AGO
Sept. 22, 1919 (Monday)
Miss Mary Truax will leave
next week to enter OAC.
Eight-hundred Elks and their
families attend a picnic at the
new grounds of the lodge on
the Rogue river.

50 YEARS AGO
Sept. 22, 1909 (Wednesday)
Burglars make off with
\$1,000 worth of loot from the
Deuel and Kentner store.
Medford dons purple and
white as "Bill Elk" arrives
for the installation of an Elks
lodge here.

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

1. For what purpose did
the ancient Egyptians and
Greeks use papyrus?
2. Is linseed oil obtained
from cottonseed, hempseed,
or flaxseed?

3. What religious system did
Mary Baker Glover Eddy
found?
4. Did the feudal system
ever exist in England?

5. Is beer a distilled beverage?
6. What is an auk?
7. Where did Little Jack
Horner sit?

8. What fur of royalty
comes from weasels?
9. The Immigration and
Naturalization Service is in
which Department of the U.S.
Government?

10. The next Presidential
term will begin when?
Answers: 1. As writing ma-
terial. 2. Flaxseed. 3. Church
of Christ Science. 4. Yes.
5. No; it is a brewed bever-
age. 6. A sea bird. 7. In a
corner. 8. Ermine. 9. Depart-
ment of Justice, 10. Jan. 20,
1961.

1,685 New Students
At Portland State
Portland—Starting this week,
college, opening this week,
had more than 1,685 new stu-
dents including 645 transfers.
Registrar Howard Impeoven
said this was an increase of
nine per cent over the 1958
figure.
Estimated total fall PSC
enrollment is 4,100.

Pride and Prejudice

There has long been rivalry between the University of Oregon and Oregon State College—rivalry which extends beyond the gridiron and into the fields of curriculum and enrollments and faculty.

At times it has been bitter. Until the state board was formed, a chancellor appointed, and all state-operated schools of higher learning integrated into the state system, each was independent and sought state appropriations as individual organizations—often in competition with the others.

Now the state system prepares and submits a combined budget request to the state legislature, and the board controls the size of the allocation to each school.

THE system has worked well. It has, in fact, been watched and imitated by many other states. Its advantages are obvious.

Each college and university in the system has, and should have, an individuality; each should have pride in itself, and each should hold a respected place in the state.

Each, within limitations, should have ambitions for growth and excellence.

Yet, at the same time, each should subordinate itself to the greater good of the system as a whole. And the board should be decisive and strong-minded in choosing what the role of each must be.—E.A.

OSC's Ambitions

Oregon State College wants to become Oregon State University.

It also wants to have the right to issue degrees to liberal arts majors—an authority which it does not now have. The University of Oregon, which is the major liberal arts institution in the state system of higher education, resists this. But if it is granted, the University undoubtedly will ask for the right to grant degrees in engineering.

This situation is the crux of a dispute between the two schools, now in the lap of the state board of higher education.

It boils down to this: Do we want (or can we afford) two big schools which offer just about everything? Or shall we continue, within certain limits, to "specialize" in education?

IT IS not that science, engineering, agriculture or forestry majors at OSC cannot get liberal arts courses. They can.

But for a student to graduate in the liberal arts field, he must go to Eugene, not Corvallis.

And for a student to graduate as an engineering, forestry, agriculture or engineering major, he must go to Corvallis, not Eugene.

Is this bad? We don't think so. It fits the pattern laid down when the state system was organized under the board in 1931; it is somewhat less expensive than two major, broad-spectrum universities would be, and it permits each institution to concentrate on excellence in its areas of major interest.—E.A.

Other Colleges Too?

Another major factor in the problems of higher education is the rapid growth of the "smaller" colleges—Portland State, Eastern Oregon and Southern Oregon Colleges, and Oregon College of Education at Monmouth.

The growth of SOC is too well known in this area to need review. It will continue to grow, and more and more fulfill what seems to be its destined role as a regional college, serving more than just future teachers.

But the most significant growth of all is at Portland State College, where, with a downtown location and a half-million residents within a radius of a few miles, PSC gives promise of becoming the largest of all the state institutions of higher education.

IF THE board of education, attempting to provide an educational opportunity to every Oregon student capable of benefiting by it, allows Oregon State to become a fully-rounded, non-specialized school, what possible excuse would it have for denying similar status to the other colleges—and particularly Portland State?

And, in a time when cries of "high taxes" are heard on all hands, can the state afford three full-scale, big-time institutions of higher education, with no pretense of specialization—and, possibly, no pretense of "quality" education?

The board faces difficult decisions. But we fail to see any urgency in making such a change—if indeed it ever really need be made.—E.A.

OSC to OSU?

As to OSC's desire to be called a "university," it now has enough schools and departments to make this name correct.

Mostly it is a matter of semantics and prestige, for "college" as accurately describes the institution as does "university." But, particularly in Europe, the latter title carries with it the feeling of greater size, importance and excellence.

So—let OSC become OSU if it wants, even with the attendant minor confusion.—E.A.

Or OAU?

Or, harkening back to the "cow college" days when it was Oregon Agricultural College, it could become Oregon Agricultural University. Couldn't it?—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



Mr. Wilson says if he had a nice house like mine, he'd stay inside all the time!

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 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.

Against Proposal
To the Editor: Just a few lines to clarify a statement made in the Sunday, Sept. 20, issue of the Medford Mail Tribune.

The Tribune stated that the residents of an area between Rocky Point bridge and Fiddlers Green had submitted a petition to be included in the Rogue River School district. This is not true, as the petition was circulated by several Rogue River businessmen, not residents of the area that is affected. The paper does not state that there was a counter petition submitted by this area which had almost double the signatures than the Rogue River petition had.

Our local petition had a large number of names on it that were also on the Rogue River petition, ours having been signed at a later date.

It is not hard to understand why Rogue River wishes to have us included in their district. It is always a great help to have someone else pay your taxes.

It is my understanding that the reorganization board wishes to establish high school districts which can graduate 100 students each year. If this is true Rogue River should join a larger district.

I still say, why should we trade a "whole loaf" for just a small slice?

Arthur H. Boye,
Route 1, Box 193,
Gold Hill, Ore.

Police Problems
To the Editor: Your Editorial, "Oregon's Police Defaults" relating to techniques in law enforcement, is most interesting and relates to a subject which should merit continued concern by the public.

Last fall I addressed the Oregon Sheriff's Association with respect to two specific ways in which I feel the State of Oregon can assist in improving techniques in law enforcement. They are, first, establishment of a Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, which would effectively coordinate the efforts of state police, county sheriffs and municipal police departments; and, second, the establishment of a police academy for the training of police officers in their offices and city police departments. I drafted legislation for both proposals which then were sponsored bi-partisanly, but unfortunately neither program was adopted. The Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation passed both Houses but the Legislature adjourned before the Senate could vote on concurrence to the House amendments. A resolution for an interim study of a police academy failed to get out of committee.

These measures which I sponsored are important for adequate law enforcement. The public is entitled to inquire of legislative candidates their stand on these matters.

Carl H. Francis
State Senator
Dayton, Oregon

Hatfield's Reply
To the Editor: On September 11 you carried the full text of Senator Neuberger's five paragraph telegram to Governor Hatfield. The Governor was asked by the Senator for his comments. Excerpts follow:

"Dear Dick"
"From your expensive, duplicate, three-page telegrams the contents of which could as easily and almost as quickly by air mail, I judge that your concern might be filed in the category of your re-election

bid and perhaps the cost could properly be charged to the campaign chest. . . . "Now as for your disturbance at newspapers labeling Mr. Gunnar as my personal choice for chairman of the party may I make it emphatically clear that Mr. Gunnar was elected by the 36 county representatives to the Central Committee. . . .

"May I suggest that you and Mr. Tupling begin a correspondence with Mr. Gunnar directly because after all he is one of your constituents and a respected member of our community and state. I am sure he would be delighted to hear from you.

"I am glad to have you tell me that you have told the Senate you think the President is 'sincerely interested in world peace.' That is a wonderful statement. I have never heard it said that the President is 'sincerely interested in war. I am sure he appreciated your speaking up for him.

"Now as for what action you take in supporting the President's position this is up to you and your conscience. Certainly I would hate to think that any fear of possible denunciations would deter you from the course of right and just. . . . I have long thought how marvelous would be if our congressional delegation and the chief executive of the state could sit down together every once in a while to work together on our common problems. Instead I find now that you and your assistant are apparently trying to develop a feud between Mr. Gunnar and myself or between you and me. I refuse to dignify such silliness with further silliness. . . .

"This office will not pick on you. It will differ with you when in fundamental disagreement. You have a big job to do there and I shall give you no cause for unnecessary diversion from it. Many of my friends are amazed that you have tried repeatedly to rupture what could have been a remarkable friendship."

Travis Cross
News Secretary to
Governor Hatfield
Salem, Oregon

Other Dangers
To the Editor: In light of Mr. Khrushchev's visit, I am reminded of a short story. Cherry Blossom was a Japanese girl here to attend school. One Christmas she was invited by her American roommate home for the holidays. A week later Cherry Blossom was ready to depart. Her motherly hostess asked her, "What do you think of us Americans?" "Well," she replied, "I've enjoyed it very much here, and have seen how you Americans live, but how in Japan we have a God shelf in our homes where we worship our God. Where is the God in your homes?" I just wonder sometimes if our friends and visitors have to leave our homes as empty-headed as did this dainty Japanese girl. I wonder if Nikita Khrushchev and his family will go back to Russia with the same feelings.

All of us are aware of the Goddess attitude that exists in Russia. Our hearts should go out to the individuals held under such conditions. Yet I fear we are too quick to denounce and throw insinuating remarks. Because Nikita's wife is not bedecked with glittering jewelry, or her lips are not painted barn red, or that her shoe heels are not high enough to cause her to wobble as she walks, she is

Washington Report

By William S. White

NEUTRALITY

Washington—One elevated factor and one distinctly down-to-earth factor are making it increasingly unlikely that President Eisenhower can or will long maintain his declared neutrality as to whom the Republicans should nominate as his successor.

If he does not in the end flatly come out for Vice-President Richard Nixon, circumstances themselves may well do this job for Eisenhower, willy-nilly.

The whole Republican Administration—and the whole Republican party, despite the anguished protests from some of its right-wingers—is increasingly committed to negotiations for easing the cold war. This above all. The final and climactic record of eight years of Republicanism in the White House, the last and most remembered part, will be tied to the one overmastering issue of "peace."

Nixon is inescapably involved in the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchanges, no matter if he never sat in on a single one of them. He is thus inescapably involved with this ultimate and decisive issue of these Republican years.

THE Administration cannot succeed in finding peace without succeeding for Nixon, too. And, of course, its failure there would be a Nixon failure, too.

Few politicians in either party now believe, therefore, that the President can long sustain the amiable position of the present. This, roughly, is that the Republican party has many good Presidential prospects for 1960—so why ask me to decide which one would be best? To sustain it to the end, that is, up to the time of the Republican National Convention, would be, by ordinary political standards, incredible. It would be doubly incredible because of present circumstances.

For Eisenhower and Nixon must, and do, march together, and more and more they will so march. This is the central, the unchangeable reality.

Indeed, the fact that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York is uttering few hurrahs for the new ice-bawing diplomacy seen here as a reflection of this central reality, Rockefeller, Nixon's prospective rival for '60, by necessity cannot expect to run on the Eisenhower Administration's record.

NIXON, again by necessity, cannot possibly do otherwise. (Though it is possible that those who know him well suspect that sometimes he wishes he were not bound so

held as an object of mild derision.

We Americans get the idea sometimes that our ideas are just it and that's all. If all of us were to act as some Americans do we'd have quite a place in which to exist.

Communism, with all that it stands for, is not desired by freedom-loving Americans. Yet while we decry its dread aspects, we have at work as never before right here in America, other forces far more sinister than communism. I dare not name openly what I refer to. We have freedom of the press it is true, but one must weigh the words. When God-fearing men even have their lives threatened for exposing such abomination, it's time to awaken to the danger right here.

Henry Johnson Jr.,
2400 Highway 66
Ashland, Ore.

Bill Is Passed
To the Editor: Now that the President has signed the bill giving broadcasters relief from the Larceny decision, I want to thank you for the editorial help you gave to the cause of remedial legislation in The Medford Mail Tribune.

The amendment to Section 315 of the Communications Act goes a long way in making it possible for radio and television to give adequate coverage of political affairs in news, news interviews, news documentaries and on-the-spot coverage of news events. To a very considerable extent, this modification of Section 315 is the result of vigorous, clear-sighted editorials and forceful news coverage by the newspapers of this country and another dramatic demonstration of the classical role of the press in a democracy.

It is now up to broadcasters to put these new freedoms to good use in the public interest and justify your effective support. With the new rights we must accept new responsibilities.

Frank Stanton,
President,
Columbia Broadcasting System,
New York, N.Y.

De Gaulle's Bold Move To End Algerian Crisis Faces Blocks

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign Editor

French President Charles de Gaulle has made his bold move to restore peace to revolt-torn Algeria.

The question now is will it work.

There is general agreement that De Gaulle is the man in France who could have offered the Algerians self-determination, meaning complete independence, if they so desire, and gotten away with it.

And even he probably could not have done it without the backing of the new French constitution which took away from the quarrelling French deputies the right to topple governments at will or to prevent legislation simply by their own inability to agree.

Self-determination, De Gaulle said, would come not later than four years "after the effective return of peace."

Feel Strong Militarily
Militarily, the French now feel they have the upper hand in Algeria, with no sizeable areas any longer under rebel control.

But it was an indication of the deplorable state of affairs in Algeria that De Gaulle could define peace as a state in which no more than 200 persons per year were killed in ambushes and attacks.

De Gaulle saw three possibilities to every part of the White House policy.

Actually, the Vice-President is not at all desperate for public salutes from the President. In fact, a hands-off policy by the White House at the convention would not plunge him into despair; he thinks he can win the nomination on his own. But he knows that any prospect of a final White House stance of total neutrality is wholly unrealistic.

How unrealistic it really is may be seen by examining the second, and comparatively low-level, reason for the slow, inevitable destruction of Eisenhower "neutrality."

All pleasant public statements to the contrary, the GOP National Committee is pro-Nixon by better than 4 to 1. Its chairman, Senator Thurston Morton of Kentucky, has said repeatedly that Rockefeller will get a fair shake so far as this committee is concerned. By this Morton actually means so far as such a situation can be said to be meaningful—but this is not very far.

FOR NIXON is the entrenched and natural heir of organization Republicanism; the fact that in the housekeeping and surface sense the organization will be "neutral" does not change this heirship. And the Vice-President is certainly being done no harm in the 30,000-mile speaking tour on which Chairman Morton is now engaged, crying out to the Republican faithful. "Recruit for '60' Before Morton has done, he will have been in 30 states holding 355 of the 537 Presidential electoral votes.

Everywhere he goes he will point out what the present Administration is doing for "peace." You cannot carry presumed "neutrality" to the point where you speak as though Nixon were not a part of that Administration. And Morton is not even trying, as he made plain recently in Chicago by saying that, of course, the Khrushchev visit had "plus value" for Nixon and the GOP.

(Copyright, 1959, by United Features Syndicate, Inc.)

Transportation Changes Planned
Salem—(UPI)—Public Utility Commissioner Jonel C. Hill today announced plans to combine the PUC motor regulation and rail transportation divisions into a single department of transportation.

Hill said the present positions of director of rail transportation and of superintendent of motor regulation would be abolished in favor of a new director of transportation.

"These plans have been in progress for some time," Hill said. "It is expected they will be completed shortly."

Personnel of the motor and rail rate departments already have been integrated, Hill said. The new division will handle regulatory matters concerning motor, rail, and water transportation and also air traffic "as we are interested," Hill added.

Husbands! Wives! Get Pep, Vim; Feel Younger
Thousands of couples are weak, worn-out, exhausted because body lacks iron and Vitamin B₁₂. For a younger feeling after 40, try new, improved OTCOR Tonic Tablets. Contains iron and high-potency dose Vitamin B₁₂. For quick, new, younger pep, vim, energy, get acquainted, size only 69¢. Or 3-day test-quantity, size only \$1.67. All drug stores.

to understand French problems.

De Gaulle still is far from being out of the woods.

The French already have said they will boycott any debate on the subject in the United Nations. But they desperately need support, and for this they are looking to the United States.

There also is evidence the French army in Algeria does not wholly back the De Gaulle plan. On the night following De Gaulle's announcement army patrols went through Algiers pasting up posters proclaiming "Algeria Forever French."

On her side, France accused the Western allies of failing

abilities for the Algerians: outright secession; complete "Frenchification" as a part of metropolitan France, or a government of Algerians within the framework of the French community to which other areas of former French-held Africa now belong.

The Algerian revolt has been the source of steadily increasing irritations between France and her NATO allies. The revolt forced France to go back on her commitments to NATO and to place the cream of her army in Africa.

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

THE BAD OMEN
Washington—The genial phronesis of Nikita S. Khrushchev's U. N. proposal for "general disarmament" is proven by a single blood-stained name: Hungary. It is even better proven by adding four names more: Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Romania.

If the Red Army were to be totally disbanded, in accordance with Khrushchev's offer, all these provinces would be lost to the world Communist Empire within a matter of months. Even in pliable Romania and cautious Czechoslovakia, nothing but the Red Army sustains the native Communist regime. They live by the "right of re-entry" which the Red Army exercised in Hungary.

In Poland, Wladyslaw Gomułka is still respected and admired; but Gomułka's Communist Party also lives by the Red Army. So does the sordid Ulrich government in East Germany, whose true situation is shown by the endless, heartrending outflow of refugees.

THEREFORE, it is not necessary to analyze the transparent fakery of Khrushchev's remarks on international control of disarmament. It is a waste time to explore the other implications of the program Khrushchev presented to the U. N. It is only necessary to look at Khrushchev's own situation. Far more than Winston Churchill, Khrushchev has not become the head of state "to preside over the liquidation of the empire." Since his U. N. program plainly involves the automatic abandonment of much of the Soviet Empire, it is a grinning fraud.

Normally this would not be particularly disturbing, since the Kremlin has been practicing the most shameless frauds in the field of disarmament for the last four decades. But in the present circumstances, on the eve of Khrushchev's crucial conversations with President Eisenhower, the announcement of this grinning fraud is very disturbing indeed.

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

wise and expert men, including the American Ambassador to Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, made the argument above-cited for inviting Khrushchev.

Unhappily the one topic on which it really seemed possible that Khrushchev might have something vital and private to say to President Eisenhower was the topic of disarmament. Of course he may still have something to say on this topic. He no doubt wants to press for his interim program, including the dubious Rapachi Plan among other things, which was embedded in the larger program he outlined to the U. N.

But after the kind of frivolous propaganda gesture Khrushchev made at the U. N., the odds against any fruitful discussion of disarmament have a certain increase. They were heavy enough already, in view of Khrushchev's grimly rigid stand against any workable control system, taken at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow last February. And if serious talk about disarmament is ruled out at Camp David, the President and Khrushchev will almost be in the situation of the guests in the old cartoon by the forgotten Fish depicting a Belgian Beach dinner disrupted by a servant's strike. The caption remarked that the dinner were "Face to face with starvation, and what was worse, with one another."

INDEED, the Camp David scene will be even more unhappy; for the President and Khrushchev will also be face to face with Berlin, and with Laos too. In the hulla-balloo about Khrushchev, no one even seemed to notice the extraordinary extent of the commitment to defend Laos, which Secretary of State Christian R. Herter made at the U. N. the day before Khrushchev spoke. But it is in fact the settled policy of the U. S. government to use American military force if need be, to safeguard Laos against the current Communist attack.

The explosive character of the situation in Laos is not at all diminished because the Communists have decided on a lull. The explosive character of the Berlin crisis has no way been diminished, either, just because Khrushchev has been taking his time about bringing the crisis to a head. Nor is the American government ready to surrender at Berlin.

What is done about Berlin and Laos will be the acid test of the Khrushchev visit, and the result at Camp David may yet be good. But it must be admitted that what Khrushchev said at the U. N. was a bad omen, precisely because it was too good to be true. (c) 1959, New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE explosive character of the situation in Laos is not at all diminished because the Communists have decided on a lull. The explosive character of the Berlin crisis has no way been diminished, either, just because Khrushchev has been taking his time about bringing the crisis to a head. Nor is the American government ready to surrender at Berlin.

What is done about Berlin and Laos will be the acid test of the Khrushchev visit, and the result at Camp David may yet be good. But it must be admitted that what Khrushchev said at the U. N. was a bad omen, precisely because it was too good to be true. (c) 1959, New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence for this mysterious something, and

THE one solid argument for the Khrushchev visit was the belief that Khrushchev had something serious to say, which he wished to say only in person and only to the President of the United States. This mysterious something always seemed a bit like the Monster of Glamys, which was the only known head of the house and only shown to his heir, from father to eldest son for generation after generation. Yet there was good evidence