

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE CO., 33 North Fir St., P.O. Box 6141

ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GEO. T. LATAM, Bus. Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Tele. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor
DALE FRICKSON, 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

Daily and Sunday — 1 year \$18.00

Daily and Sunday — 6 mos. 10.00

Daily and Sunday — 3 mos. 5.00

Sunday Only — One year \$5.00

Single Copy (Mailed) 20c

By Carrier — As per Motor Route

Daily and Sunday — 1 year \$21.00

Daily and Sunday — 6 mos. 12.50

Sunday Only — 1 year 7.50

Carrier and Vendors — Copy 10c

Official Paper of City of Medford

Official Paper of Jackson County

United Press International

Full Leased Wire

U. P. I. Telephone Newspapers

MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver.

NEWSPAPER 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. 16, 1952 (Wednesday)

Mrs. Frank Farrell injured by stray bullet while attending large tea at home of Mr. and Mrs. Bert Lowry near Phoenix.

Annexation of Verde Hills subdivision, north of Medford, approved by Medford City Council.

20 YEARS AGO

Sept. 16, 1942 (Thursday)

Office of price administration announces rent controls will go into effect in Jackson county on Oct. 1.

From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "Now it is Indian summer hereabouts. If it was May, many would say they have spring fever, and the calendar to the contrary notwithstanding, they have."

30 YEARS AGO

Sept. 16, 1932 (Saturday)

Representatives of all sections of Jackson county meet to endorse candidacy of ex-Medford Mayor C. E. Gates for Jackson county judge.

Jackson county announces arrangements to trade 500 cases of tomatoes for Klamath Falls potatoes.

40 YEARS AGO

Sept. 16, 1922 (Sunday)

Five persons hurt as race car jumps through fence at Jackson county fairsgrounds.

United States Forest Service announces first 30 lots for homesites at Diamond lake will go on sale soon.

50 YEARS AGO

Sept. 16, 1912 (Tuesday)

Capt. Thomas B. Merry, 77, pioneer Jacksonville and Yreka newspaper editor, dies in Portland.

McArthur Brothers and Perks start survey for Rogue River-Coquille railroad.

What's Your I.Q.?

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

1. In what country would you expect to find the Apian Way?

2. In what year did Henry Ford Sr. market his first automobile?

3. The buffalo is the central figure on the seal of which Federal Government Department?

4. What lands or countries were ruled by the House of Bourbon?

5. Which planet is farthest from the earth?

6. Is coral a plant or an animal?

7. Graphology is the study of what?

8. By what process can fresh water be obtained from salt water?

9. How is the area of a circle determined?

10. In baseball, which base is called the keystone sack?

Answers: 1. Italy. 2. 1903. 3. Department of Interior. 4. France and Spain. 5. Pluto. 6. Animal. 7. Handwriting. 8. Distillation. 9. Radius squared times 3.1417. 10. Second base.

The Struggle for Objectivity

Objectivity—blessed word—is a quality as illusive in this world as the Holy Grail and as unattainable as peace of mind.

But newsmen, as is true with few other daily craftsmen, must constantly pursue and court it with the ardor and fervor of a swain after a maid.

Even the pursuit of objectivity is difficult to learn, for it is in man's nature to relate everything to himself, to pass judgment, to evaluate and approve or reject.

Thus it is that editors are necessary (if not cherished) with their fiendish blue pencils. It is their task to read a reporter's copy and mercilessly strike out any vestiges of subjectivity that even the warriest writer inevitably lets creep into his stories.

ALL of this comes to mind because of a memo which E.A., the managing editor, thumb-tacked to the office bulletin board one day last week:

"The fall election campaign is (sob) upon us. "Once again it is time for us to be reminded of what we all know—that our news reports of campaign activities are to be just as fair and objective to all candidates as we know how to make them.

"Once again it will take close coordination between the city desk and the wire desk to avoid duplication of stories. We cannot, of course, attain inch-for-inch equality of space between candidates, but we can strive for fairness and general equality in the campaign weeks as a whole.

"The editorial support or opposition of the Mail Tribune editorial page as to candidates is to have NO influence on campaign reporting."

SEEMS clear enough, and of course all staff members assigned to cover a political event will do their level best to adhere to the admonition.

They would have anyway, even without E.A.'s managerial caveat.

But all of us know that in the purest sense, absolute objectivity is totally impossible and beyond—seriously beyond—mortal grasp.

That is why if on some rare occasion you should happen to tell a reporter that you think he handled some controversial situation in an objective manner in his story, he'll be more complimented than he will be able to tell you.

Let's review some of the problems attendant to this matter of just telling the facts in a news story.

A REPORTER who goes to cover a politician's speech is, chances are, either a Republican or a Democrat, and the speaker will probably be either a Republican or a Democrat, though it is sometimes difficult to tell from his speech alone.

Immediately, two biases are either in perfect sympathy, or in utter nose-to-nose conflict.

In addition, the reporter and the speaker may or may not be personally acquainted. If the two are friends, it is potentially one situation, and obviously the reverse is true if the two don't happen to know or like each other.

THEN there is the matter of the crowd reaction.

A good reporter will have his antennae out at such a gathering, and if only at the subconscious level, he is bound to be influenced somewhat by what others think. He won't want to and he'll resist it, but he will be.

No mental set is sufficient guard against some factors: Is the speaker well dressed in an expensive suit, while the reporter sits and glares at the frayed cuff of his five-year-old sport coat? Is the speaker a tall, straight man, while the reporter has always hated being short and stout? Is the speaker a member of a profession to which the reporter had once unsuccessfully aspired? Is the speaker's facility with the English language such that it will command the reporter's respect, or elicit his scorn and derision?

Granted, these are far-fetched examples, but they are intended merely to suggest some of the myriad psychological possibilities that are involved in the speaker-reporter situation.

INNUMERABLE other factors each contribute an insidious influence: Was the room ventilated? Did the reporter want the assignment, or did he have to cancel some personal appointment to cover it? What is the state of his health? His mood? Was the seat comfortable? Could he hear? Was it easy to take notes? Will he have to go back to the newsroom that night and write the story when he is dead tired, or will he have time the next morning to write it when he is rested and feeling refreshed? And on and on...

The reporter when he sits down to write the account is not unaware of the cliché, "the power of the press." He knows that upwards of 75,000 persons may read his story of the speech, and by the very nature of things, will more or less have to take his word for what the speaker said and the manner in which he said it.

HE will be torn between a desire to make his story vivid and colorful so that it will be read, and a wariness about making it too strong so that it will appear biased either for or against the speaker.

Total objectivity, then, is a myth.

But since it is so desirable, conscientious reporters will constantly work toward it, and until the day arrives when we are all perfect, newspaper readers will have to be charitable and tolerant of human frailty, and cling to a justifiable faith in the good intentions of the working American press.—G. H. B.



Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

DE GAULLE - AND KHRUSHCHEV TOO?

Bonn-Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was the last of a long series of visitors to hear Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Khrushchev, who was going to grab Berlin soon, and without having to fight for it.

The Khrushchev-Udall meeting has made a considerable ripple here. It must have had its comic aspects—this confrontation between the high-minded nature-lover and the bloody-minded power-lover.

Yet it is no laughing matter when Khrushchev flatly informs a member of the U.S. Cabinet that he is going to take Berlin; that the Europeans will be powerless to act without the United States; and that the United States do nothing about it in the end.

And this, in summary, is what Khrushchev reportedly had the ugly gall to say to Udall.

Even after due discounts have been made for Khrushchev's habitual bluster, the incident lends added credence to a view that has been gaining ground, of late, among Western policymakers on this side of the Atlantic.

To be blunt about it, more and more people think that Khrushchev drew the wrong conclusions from his Vienna meeting with President Kennedy.

THE American policymakers believe that Vienna and the post-Vienna increases in the U.S. defense effort convinced Khrushchev that mistakes at Berlin would lead to a big war. The Europeans, or at any rate a good many of them, now believe the opposite.

Nor is this really surprising. Unfortunately, for it Khrushchev genuinely supposes that the U.S. will not risk a war to defend Berlin, he no more than shares the opinion of one of the President's major partners. For it can be stated on unquestioned authority, that the secret of Gen. Charles de Gaulle's peculiar management of the Berlin crisis is the belief that the U.S. will not stand and fight when the crunch comes.

This belief of De Gaulle's, if you think about it, explains much that has seemed quite inexplicable. In the context of this belief of De Gaulle's, what has seemed mere haughty paltering was in fact sound tactics. The De Gaulle scheme for the Berlin crisis is plainly to stand aside, to force all responsibility onto the United States, and to pick up the pieces in Europe when his cynical expectations have been fulfilled.

If America fails and Berlin is lost and Germany is permanently partitioned, that will give De Gaulle no pain, at least in private. Everything makes sense, in truth, except De Gaulle's central assumption that President Kennedy does not mean what he says about defending Berlin.

DE GAULLE's making this assumption about his chief ally, who bears almost the whole burden of the defense of the West, can only be described as carrying arrogance to the point of moral squalor. And De Gaulle's way of acting on this assumption can only be described as carrying Machiavellism to the point of folly.

Few Americans have admired De Gaulle more than this reporter, but it must be added that when the French leader makes a real mistake, the results can be quite exceptionally ugly.

De Gaulle's way of acting on this assumption has quite certainly made the Berlin crisis more dangerous, by increasing the Kremlin's doubts about the resoluteness of the U.S. One way for the Presi-

dent to carry conviction in Moscow, therefore, is to carry conviction in Paris. That may not be easy. But some brutally plain speaking, of a sort De Gaulle is not used to, is rather clearly in order.

As for the central problem of directly impressing on Khrushchev himself the magnitude of the Berlin risks, there is still room for a little hope that the problem may yet be solved. There may be rather more time than most people now think. For the East German military program is the heart of the Kremlin's preparations for a final test at Berlin; and the improved and rearmend East German divisions will hardly be fully ready until next spring.

IT IS notable, too, that the preparations have been long and careful. Seen in perspective, in truth, the Berlin wall itself was almost certainly the first step in these preparations. The large call-up of young men and the sharp depression of the standard of life in East Germany, both necessitated by the new defense program, would both have been utterly impossible without the wall making all of East Germany a prison camp.

Furthermore, a Berlin test with East German forces in the forefront, which is the kind seemingly being prepared, will be a limited test, at least in the first stage. These facts suggest that Khrushchev is merely uncertain whether Kennedy really means to defend Berlin—uncertain enough to gamble on the President's doing nothing but talk in a crunch, but also uncertain enough in the other direction to wish to keep some control of events.

The question of how to remove Khrushchev's uncertainty is therefore urgent. Reasonable behavior, "keeping talking," endlessly professed willingness to negotiate—these methods have been exhaustively tried out. Perhaps the time has come to get angry. Perhaps it would have been better to throw back in Khrushchev's face the recent outrageous note about Cuba and Berlin as "unacceptable and non-received."

There is much to be done which has nothing to do with the cold war. Franco-German enmity must be buried. The perennial British intervention in continental affairs must be ended off. The unnatural pre-eminence of United States as a European power must be superseded.

FOR us this is a strange and unfamiliar way of looking at the world. But before we make up our minds as to whether it is right or wrong, prophetic or wishful thinking, we had better take it in.

THE great obstacle to this is Herr Ulbricht and the odious character of his East German regime. If Ulbricht were replaced by a German Gomulka, if East German communism became like Polish communism, resistance would disappear in Bonn and in the West to dealing with the framework of eventual reunification.

Mr. Khrushchev wants the West to sign peace treaties with the two Germanys. As long as East Germany is a Stalinist state, that cannot be done. Not only is it impos-

sible for us to seal the delivery of the East Germans to the Ulbricht regime, but it will be impossible for Ulbricht to negotiate reunification with the West Germans.

We do not suppose that Mr. Khrushchev will replace Ulbricht because we ask him to. But we have to keep in continual diplomatic contact with him about Germany in order to make it ever clearer to him that the West is not refusing to negotiate with the Soviet Union or even in the long run with East Germany. It is refusing to take the step which would compel it to negotiate with Ulbricht.

The necktie is another article of apparel which, while it

hasn't actually vanished, has undergone some startling changes.

The "bolo tie" is one. It is nothing but a cord—plaited leather or plastic or some such—with decorated ends and a gadget that holds it together at the neck, usually containing a decorative stone or piece of metal. They make some people feel manly and outdoorsy. But the same advice pertains to them as that for 10-gallon hats.

Then there's the little tie that goes around the neck and buttons—yes, BUTTONS—in place, with one end draped across the other. It's sort of an unhappy cross between a scarf and a bow tie.

The knitted tie is not new, but it has experienced a resurgence in popularity in recent years, presumably because it is easy to tie, doesn't crush, gray stains come off easily, and is comfortable. It has the added advantage that it will cover up the evidence when one surreptitiously unbuttons the collar on a hot day.

The tie-it-yourself bow tie is a genuine rarity, and only a skillful few know how to manage it—whether it be the old butterfly shape, or the newer narrow band.

The cowboy, happy man, can solve the whole problem by wrapping a bandana handkerchief around his throat.

Yes, the hatted man CARES. But what does he care ABOUT? That's the question.

It is true that hats are becoming less and less of a thing with the American male. Perhaps it's President Kennedy's influence.

Anyway, hats have given way to two things—bare heads, and caps, the kind that used to be reserved for baseball players and skiers. They serve all the essential functions except when it rains. They keep the hair in place to a certain extent, exclude dust, and shade the eyes. But they do not prevent the rain from running down the back of your neck.

Some men prefer the cowboy hat. It is, of course, highly utilitarian. It shades the eyes, protects from rain, and can be used as an emergency water container. feed bag, pillow, fan, and what have you.

But they are not for everyone. They can be worn gracefully by slender, bow-legged men in Levis and high-heeled boots. But they look pretty silly on plump city-type men.

The necktie is another article of apparel which, while it

hasn't actually vanished, has undergone some startling changes.

The "bolo tie" is one. It is nothing but a cord—plaited leather or plastic or some such—with decorated ends and a gadget that holds it together at the neck, usually containing a decorative stone or piece of metal. They make some people feel manly and outdoorsy. But the same advice pertains to them as that for 10-gallon hats.

Then there's the little tie that goes around the neck and buttons—yes, BUTTONS—in place, with one end draped across the other. It's sort of an unhappy cross between a scarf and a bow tie.

The knitted tie is not new, but it has experienced a resurgence in popularity in recent years, presumably because it is easy to tie, doesn't crush, gray stains come off easily, and is comfortable. It has the added advantage that it will cover up the evidence when one surreptitiously unbuttons the collar on a hot day.

The tie-it-yourself bow tie is a genuine rarity, and only a skillful few know how to manage it—whether it be the old butterfly shape, or the newer narrow band.

The cowboy, happy man, can solve the whole problem by wrapping a bandana handkerchief around his throat.

Yes, the hatted man CARES. But what does he care ABOUT? That's the question.

It is true that hats are becoming less and less of a thing with the American male. Perhaps it's President Kennedy's influence.

Anyway, hats have given way to two things—bare heads, and caps, the kind that used to be reserved for baseball players and skiers. They serve all the essential functions except when it rains. They keep the hair in place to a certain extent, exclude dust, and shade the eyes. But they do not prevent the rain from running down the back of your neck.

Some men prefer the cowboy hat. It is, of course, highly utilitarian. It shades the eyes, protects from rain, and can be used as an emergency water container. feed bag, pillow, fan, and what have you.

But they are not for everyone. They can be worn gracefully by slender, bow-legged men in Levis and high-heeled boots. But they look pretty silly on plump city-type men.

The necktie is another article of apparel which, while it

hasn't actually vanished, has undergone some startling changes.

The "bolo tie" is one. It is nothing but a cord—plaited leather or plastic or some such—with decorated ends and a gadget that holds it together at the neck, usually containing a decorative stone or piece of metal. They make some people feel manly and outdoorsy. But the same advice pertains to them as that for 10-gallon hats.

Then there's the little tie that goes around the neck and buttons—yes, BUTTONS—in place, with one end draped across the other. It's sort of an unhappy cross between a scarf and a bow tie.

The knitted tie is not new, but it has experienced a resurgence in popularity in recent years, presumably because it is easy to tie, doesn't crush, gray stains come off easily, and is comfortable. It has the added advantage that it will cover up the evidence when one surreptitiously unbuttons the collar on a hot day.

The tie-it-yourself bow tie is a genuine rarity, and only a skillful few know how to manage it—whether it be the old butterfly shape, or the newer narrow band.

The cowboy, happy man, can solve the whole problem by wrapping a bandana handkerchief around his throat.

Yes, the hatted man CARES. But what does he care ABOUT? That's the question.

It is true that hats are becoming less and less of a thing with the American male. Perhaps it's President Kennedy's influence.

Anyway, hats have given way to two things—bare heads, and caps, the kind that used to be reserved for baseball players and skiers. They serve all the essential functions except when it rains. They keep the hair in place to a certain extent, exclude dust, and shade the eyes. But they do not prevent the rain from running down the back of your neck.

Some men prefer the cowboy hat. It is, of course, highly utilitarian. It shades the eyes, protects from rain, and can be used as an emergency water container. feed bag, pillow, fan, and what have you.

But they are not for everyone. They can be worn gracefully by slender, bow-legged men in Levis and high-heeled boots. But they look pretty silly on plump city-type men.

The necktie is another article of apparel which, while it

hasn't actually vanished, has undergone some startling changes.

The "bolo tie" is one. It is nothing but a cord—plaited leather or plastic or some such—with decorated ends and a gadget that holds it together at the neck, usually containing a decorative stone or piece of metal. They make some people feel manly and outdoorsy. But the same advice pertains to them as that for 10-gallon hats.

Then there's the little tie that goes around the neck and buttons—yes, BUTTONS—in place, with one end draped across the other. It's sort of an unhappy cross between a scarf and a bow tie.

The knitted tie is not new, but it has experienced a resurgence in popularity in recent years, presumably because it is easy to tie, doesn't crush, gray stains come off easily, and is comfortable. It has the added advantage that it will cover up the evidence when one surreptitiously unbuttons the collar on a hot day.

The tie-it-yourself bow tie is a genuine rarity, and only a skillful few know how to manage it—whether it be the old butterfly shape, or the newer narrow band.

The cowboy, happy man, can solve the whole problem by wrapping a bandana handkerchief around his throat.

Yes, the hatted man CARES. But what does he care ABOUT? That's the question.

It is true that hats are becoming less and less of a thing with the American male. Perhaps it's President Kennedy's influence.

Anyway, hats have given way to two things—bare heads, and caps, the kind that used to be reserved for baseball players and skiers. They serve all the essential functions except when it rains. They keep the hair in place to a certain extent, exclude dust, and shade the eyes. But they do not prevent the rain from running down the back of your neck.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

PARIS AND MOSCOW

There is a puzzling difference between the world as seen from Washington and the world as seen from Paris. On this side of the Atlantic we are preoccupied with the Soviet challenge in Cuba and Berlin and elsewhere.

Across the Atlantic the focus of interest is how the Western community is to organize itself, and where are to be the centers of power and decision. Our European allies are concerned with the internal relations of the Western coalition. We are concerned with its external relations in Germany, South Asia, and Latin America.

European and American feelings differ about how urgent, immediate, and earth-shaking is the Soviet challenge. Our European allies are not getting ready to call up reserves, and they are much less hot and bothered about Mr. Khrushchev than we are. Their attention is on the efforts of Gen. de Gaulle to woo and envelop West Germany in order to create a new center of world power.

Quite evidently, though as well aware as any man of the challenge from the Soviet Union, Gen. de Gaulle does not consider it a risk to sidetrack Great Britain, to alienate the Commonwealth, and to coldshoulder the United States.

YET we must remember that Gen. de Gaulle has rarely if ever been wrong in judging the balance of power. It is impressive to find him acting now on the assumption that the Soviet Union cannot face war with the West, and that in conflicts short of war—as, for example, East German harassment of West Berlin—the retaliatory means available to the West are preponderant. For Gen. de Gaulle, there is no great urgency in the skirmishes and scuffles of the cold war, and it is quite unnecessary, indeed undignified and foolish, to let Moscow hypnotize us and monopolize our attention.

Thus for Gen. de Gaulle the challenge and menace of the Soviet Union are transitory, and in the course of time, if firmly contained, Russia is destined to rejoin the Europe to which she belongs. For Europe, in Gen. de Gaulle's mind, extends from the Atlantic "to the Urals." In the meantime, history goes on and we cannot be stopped in order to listen to the latest tidbit from the Kremlin.

There is much to be done which has nothing to do with the cold war. Franco-German enmity must be buried. The perennial British intervention in continental affairs must be ended off. The unnatural pre-eminence of United States as a European power must be superseded.

FOR us this is a strange and unfamiliar way of looking at the world. But before we make up our minds as to whether it is right or wrong, prophetic or wishful thinking, we had better take it in.

THE great obstacle to this is Herr Ulbricht and the odious character of his East German regime. If Ulbricht were replaced by a German Gomulka, if East German communism became like Polish communism, resistance would disappear in Bonn and in the West to dealing with the framework of eventual reunification.

Mr. Khrushchev wants the West to sign peace treaties with the two Germanys. As long as East Germany is a Stalinist state, that cannot be done. Not only is it impos-

sible for us to seal the delivery of the East Germans