

MEDFORD, OREGON TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North First St. Ph. 772-4141

By Mail - In Advance Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$18.00 Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 10.00

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

20 YEARS AGO Oct. 28, 1952 (Tuesday) Medford's Greater Chest drive reached 32 per cent of its drive today with \$18,512 turned in as pledges or contributions.

20 YEARS AGO Oct. 28, 1942 (Wednesday) Crater Lake Park Ranger W. T. Frost rescues snow-stranded motorist in north of park; snows close east, north entrances.

30 YEARS AGO Oct. 28, 1932 (Friday) Eugene Thorndike elected chairman of Medford school board.

40 YEARS AGO Oct. 28, 1922 (Saturday) Martial law proclaimed in Italy as fascists begin march against Rome.

50 YEARS AGO Oct. 28, 1912 (Monday) Ground broken for two \$30,000 structures, a theater on East Main st. and a warehouse on South Front st.

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

1. Name the largest present-day land animal. 2. How many hams may be obtained from a single hog?

3. Is the Mississippi, Missouri, Nile or Rhine river the longest in the world? 4. Who served as President of the Confederate States of America?

5. If a pen and ink cost sixty cents, and the pen cost fifty cents more than the ink what did the ink cost? 6. If a President fails to sign a Bill within 10 days while Congress is in session, it does not become law; true or false?

7. How often is a census of population taken in the United States? 8. What is the popular name for the American bison? 9. If you suffered from sleep apnea, would it be loss of sleep, hair, or weight?

10. Which king, during the time of Jesus, "Ruled like a wild beast"? Answers: 1. Elephant. 2. Two. 3. Nile. 4. Jefferson Davis. 5. Five cents. 6. False. 7. Every ten years. 8. Buffalo. 9. Loss of hair. 10. Herod.

Skill and Courage Needed

Three of the columnists who appear regularly on this page (Alsop, Lippmann and Jenkins) plus several writers of Communications today ponder the Cuban situation.

Their concern is justified, for the Cuban crisis is the most hair-raising one we have gone through since the Korean War.

Their views vary, just as the views of ordinary Americans everywhere vary. They run the gamut from the placard-waving "No War Over Cuba" picketers, to the "It's about time" reaction of many who have been advocating intervention for months.

IF THERE can be said to be a national consensus, however, one would have to say that it is in support of the President. This support, again, stems from a variety of reasons.

Our own support is predicated on two facts, the first that the President and only the President has available all the facts on which to base a decision plus the responsibility of making that decision; the second that there is a sharp distinction, in this nuclear-missile age, between weapons of defense and weapons of offense.

This distinction has been explained over and over, but its significance has eluded many. For a wealthy nation of more than 180 millions, most powerful militarily in the world, to crush little Cuba on the basis of tanks, trucks, short-range missiles and technicians, who by no stretch of the imagination could threaten us, would have been the height of folly, and would have held us up to contempt throughout the world.

HOWEVER, when incontrovertible evidence is presented to show that weapons capable of hemisphere-wide destruction are being employed, that's something else again, and justifies us in taking the action we have.

Risky? Of course it's risky. It's a risky world. And the fact that missiles can be tipped with nuclear bombs makes the risk of an entirely different order of magnitude than it was prior to 1945.

Yet, to us, it seems the situation left us no alternative, and that if we are to observe "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" we must act as courageously and forthrightly as we know how, and publish before the world what we are doing and why.

IN THEORY, we strongly support disarmament, suspension of nuclear testing, a world ruled by law rather than brute strength.

That day may yet come. But because we have found it impossible to trust our adversaries, the day is yet to come when we can make any real progress toward those desirable ends.

Meanwhile the balance of terror—the deadly checker game with the future of mankind at stake—continues.

Let us play it as courageously and skillfully as we know how. —E.A.

One Man's Victory

The other day we received in the mail an envelope containing a little pamphlet entitled "Federal Trade Commission — Guides for Shoe Content Labeling and Advertising, adopted October 2, 1962."

On the front of it a note was written in long-hand. It said "Victory after 5 years. (Signed) Wilbur."

Thus Wilbur Gardner proudly but quietly signaled the completion of a long battle, one which led him to voluminous correspondence with Senators and Congressmen and government officials, with moguls of the shoe manufacturing industry, with shoe repairmen throughout the world, and to international honors for his long and ultimately successful struggle.

IT WAS five years ago that Wilbur Gardner became irritated beyond bearing at the use, without notice or warning, of sub-standard materials in the shoes brought to him to be repaired in his little shop on East Main street. He decided to do something about it, personally.

Letter after letter, petition after petition flowed from his typewriter. Gradually he gathered support, some of it from powerful organizations. But he met strong opposition, too, from many shoe manufacturers who did not want to be put to the bother of telling people what materials they were using in making shoes, and who feared economic loss if forced to do so.

Undeterred, Wilbur Gardner launched his one-man campaign, although by this time he had hundreds, perhaps thousands, of supporters and adherents.

THE NEW Guides were published in the Federal Register on Oct. 12, and become operative 90 days thereafter.

In general, they provide that manufacturers and retailers cannot use misleading advertising (such as claiming a shoe is made of leather, when only part of it is); or using words which suggest that leather is used when it is not; requirements that "simulated or imitation leather" be called what it is; and further requiring that the materials in shoes be identified.

Now in a world preoccupied with naval blockades and United Nations debates, such an order for the protection of consumers and Wilbur Gardner's customers may not seem of earth-shaking importance.

But it is comforting to know that one man, if possessed with sufficient determination and a good cause, can achieve a desirable end, even in the huge and slow-moving structure of the Federal government. —E.A.

"I May Still Have To Rely On Reckless Inaction"



Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

THE TRAP THAT WAS LAID

Washington — As more and more information seeps out about the President's grim, courageous decision on Cuba, the crisis that he confronted appears more and more terrible. The urgent political reasons for the President's decision have already been summarized in this space; but it now appears that these were not, after all, the dominant reasons. In Cuba, Nikita S. Khrushchev had in fact laid a vicious military trap for President Kennedy. All other considerations were dominated by the need to spring this trap while it was still relatively harmless.

To understand the trap's nature, it is necessary to understand the existing balance of nuclear striking power of the delicate balance of terror that preserves freedom. For the Soviet trap was designed to upset this balance decisively.

IN BRIEF, the Soviets do not now have what some of the experts call "free first strike capability," because they do not have enough long range missiles to cover the essential targets in this hemisphere. They would have had this kind of capability if they had gone all out to build ICBMs at the time when a missile gap was very sensibly feared.

But at that time, three or four years ago, they sought to economize by limiting their quantity production of missiles to MRBMs and IRBMs — ballistic missiles of 1,100 and 2,000 miles range, respectively, in the current models. Thus they could threaten all European targets, but could not seriously threaten the U.S.

Contrary to Soviet expectations, this MRBM-IRBM threat to Western Europe failed to procure a surrender at Berlin. Quantity production of Soviet ICBMs was thereupon ordered. But almost simultaneously, after the election of President Kennedy, the U.S. long range missile program was greatly stepped up.

IN LONG range missiles, the current balance is therefore almost even, and within 18 months the U.S. will have no less than 500 operational ICBMs in hardened launching pads. This means that in 18 months the U.S. will have a close-to invulnerable deterrent, at least until another great change in the grizzly missile art again alters all the equations.

One can hardly doubt that the prospect of this immense increase in U.S. nuclear striking power importantly influenced the Soviets to begin pushing the Berlin crisis towards a final climax. But while the Soviets still lacked "free first strike capability," the risks of pushing too hard and too fast were unavoidably very terrible.

"Free first strike capability" (which the U.S. long enjoyed but never used) may be defined as the power to take out enough of your opponent's nuclear strength with your own first strike, so that his counter-strike will be reduced to a point considered acceptable.

THE Soviets were in fact seeking to gain this kind of freedom to strike first by installing large numbers of MRBMs and IRBMs in Cuba. The President's action has halted them in good time, but if they had not been halted, the upset in the nuclear balance would have been drastic indeed.

To be specific, the weight of the unfavorable American retaliatory strike might have been reduced from many hundreds of H-bombs to some-where in the neighborhood of

50 bombs. In any exchange, this many H-bombs could still have been launched from Polar submarines and the few SAC bombers that would have escaped a Soviet first strike. But the Soviets could also hope that the U.S. might give way rather than risk a nuclear exchange, after the great upset in the balance which they hoped to achieve in Cuba.

The prize, in short, was very great. The plan gaining this great prize may properly be described as a trap for three reasons. First, the work of missile emplacement was begun at the last possible moment, under cover of Hurricane Ella (and long after Senator Keating said offensive missiles were being employed, when nothing of the sort was happening). Second, when once begun, the work was carried forward with a speed both impressive and alarming, with the obvious aim of creating an accomplished fact as soon as possible.

THIRD, every effort was meanwhile made to confuse, delude, and falsely reassure the American government, by Ambassador Dobrynin's oily promises that long range missiles would never be sited in Cuba, by Foreign Minister Gromyko's outright lies to President Kennedy, and by the phony-jolly professions of peaceful intent with which Khrushchev himself welcomed Ambassador Kohler to Moscow.

This was, in truth, a darkly Machiavellian scheme. If the U.S. had waited until faced with the accomplished fact of the important Soviet nuclear striking power in Cuba, one can easily imagine the sequel. Khrushchev might well have come to the U.S. next month, as he has been saying he would, but with what new trumps in his hands? And when Khrushchev delicately referred to his new "free first strike capability," and angrily demanded surrender at Berlin, President Kennedy would have had no alternative except to offer his submission or order an American first strike on the spot.

But that cannot happen now, because the U.S. sprang the Soviet trap while it was still relatively harmless.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann (c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

BLOCKADE PROCLAIMED

It is Wednesday morning as I am writing this article, and the President's proclamation of a selective blockade has just gone into effect. We are now waiting for the other shoe to drop. There are a number of Soviet and Communist bloc ships on their way to Cuba. One in particular is presumed to be carrying contraband. There has as yet been no contact between these ships and our forces and we do not know what orders Moscow has given to the ship captains.

For these orders, all depends upon the present. As of the present moment we do not know whether the orders are to turn away from Cuba, to proceed and submit to search, or to proceed and to refuse to submit to search.

UNTIL we do know, we can only speculate as to whether the Soviets will engage themselves at sea on the way to Cuba, will submit to the blockade and retaliate elsewhere, or will limit themselves to violent statements without violent action.

There are those, for whose judgment I have profound respect, who think that it is now too late for this country to influence the decisions of the Soviet Union and that the President is now irrevocably committed to a course which can end only with a total blockade or an invasion of Cuba.

They may be right. But I have lived through two world wars, and in both of them, once we were engaged, we made the same tragic mistake. We suspended diplomacy when the guns began to shoot. In both wars, as the result, we achieved a great victory but we could not make peace. There is a mood in this country today which could easily cause us to make the same mistake again. We must in honor attempt to avoid it.

I SEE danger of this mistake in the fact that when the President saw Mr. Gromyko on Thursday, and had the evidence of the missile build-up in Cuba, he refrained from confronting Mr. Gromyko with this evidence. This was to suspend diplomacy. If it had not been suspended, the President would have shown Mr. Gromyko the pictures, and told him privately about the policy which in a few days he intended to announce publicly. This would have made it more likely that Moscow would order the ships not to push on to Cuba.

But if such diplomatic action did not change the orders, if Mr. Khrushchev persisted in spite of it, the President's public speech would have been stronger. For it would not have been subject to the criticism that a great power had issued an ultimatum to another great power without first attempting to negotiate the issue.

By confronting Mr. Gromyko privately, the President would have given Mr. Khrushchev what all wise states-

men give their adversaries — the chance to save face.

THERE is, I know, no use crying over spilt milk. But I am making the point because there is still so much milk that can be spilt.

We have, we must note, made two separate demands. One is that no more "offensive weapons" shall be brought into Cuba. On this demand, we shall soon have a showdown. Considering the unanimity of the other American states, considering the strategic weakness of the Soviet Union in this hemisphere, there is reason to hope that the quarantine of Cuba will work, though we must expect retaliation elsewhere.

But the President has laid down a second demand, which is that the missile installations already in Cuba be dismantled and removed. How this is to be done is a very great question, even supposing that there is no shooting conflict at sea. And it is here, I believe, that diplomacy must not abdicate.

There are three ways to get rid of the missiles already in Cuba. One is to invade and occupy Cuba. The second way is to institute a total blockade, particularly of oil shipments, which would in a few months ruin the Cuban economy. The third way is to try, I repeat to try, to negotiate a face-saving agreement.

I HASTEN to talk at once and do not believe in a "Cuba-Berlin" horse trade. Cuba and Berlin are wholly different cases. Berlin is not an American missile base. It is not a base for any kind of offensive action, as Cuba is by way of becoming.

The only place that is truly comparable with Cuba is Turkey. This is the only place where there are strategic weapons right on the frontier of the Soviet Union. There are none in Norway, there are none in Iran, there are none in Pakistan. There are some in Italy. But Italy is not on the frontier of the Soviet Union.

There is another important similarity between Cuba and Turkey. The Soviet missile base in Cuba, like the U.S. NATO base in Turkey, is of little military value. The Soviet military base in Cuba is defenseless, and the base in Turkey is all but obsolete. The two bases could be dismantled without altering the world balance of power.

IF, as the first concrete step in the disarmament we've talked so much about, there could be an agreement to remove offensive weapons from fringe countries, it would not mean, of course, that Turkey would cease to be under the protection of NATO.

Norway does not have strategic weapons on her soil and she is still an allied nation. Great Britain, which is a pillar of NATO, is actually liquidating U.S. missile and bomber bases on her own soil in accordance with Western strategic doctrine.

For all these reasons I say that an agreement of this sort may be a double and that there may exist a way out of the tyranny of automatic and uncontrollable events.



"Actually, there's not much we as individuals can do—you can try praying, if you'd like . . . !"

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

EDITH HEAD, famous Hollywood dress designer, bemoans the fact that the glamour girls on the screen in 1962 don't seem to care much about style. "In the good old days," recalls Miss Head, "our big stars had enough sense to have a trademark. Jean Harlow and her white satin dresses. Dietrich and her tailored slacks. Garbo and her slouch hats and trench coats. Colbert and her Peter Pan collars. Crawford and her tailored suits. Nowadays? Bah! They all buy the same dress and wear it at the same party and, no one even gets angry!"



Mrs. Thompson had a dim opinion of the way her neighbor kept house. "I'll tell you what a mess her place is," reported Mrs. Thompson to her husband. "While I was having a cup of coffee with her yesterday afternoon, her telephone rang—and she couldn't find it!"

Howard Lindsay tells of a chum who saw a cat in the top-most branches of a tree, and climbed aloft to rescue the poofting. It turned out to be a wildcat. Recalled the rescuer later, "I never got so tired of one cat in all my life."

Erasmus High School boasts an intriguingly built sophomore who's constantly mimicking Miss Bridot. Classmates have affectionately dubbed her the "Brooklyn Brigitte."

© 1962, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

The week's BIG news: KROOSH chickened. That should tell us everything we need to know.

WHAT of the future? Let's speak softly, of course. But—Let's CARRY A BIG STICK, and leave no doubt in anybody's mind that we will USE IT if anybody tries to bluff us. That's the lesson of the past few critical days. Let's heed it.

THOUGHT for the future: Let's bring the Monroe Doctrine back to life. Let's make it the NUMBER ONE credo of our foreign policy. If it is true that the

Monroe Doctrine has been getting somewhat out of date, let's bring out a new model, tailored to the needs of our world of today. Let's make it plain that if any foreign nation, or any combination of foreign nations, or ANY FOREIGN IDEOLOGY tries by force, or by guile, or by fraud, to impose its system upon the Western Hemisphere, we will FIGHT—at the drop of a hat, if need be.

THEN—Having made that plain—Let's be decent and reasonable. Having made it clear that the Western Hemisphere is our part of the world and that we have pledged our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the task of keeping the Western Hemisphere the kind of world we want to live in, let's perhaps be a little less brash in our ideas of how the rest of the world ought to be run.

SO MUCH for our future job. Another job faces us NOW. Our Defense Department announces that it has UNDENIABLE intelligence (meaning information) that more than 30 missiles (capable of being used offensively against us) and more than 20 Russian-built jet bombers (capable of dropping nuclear bombs on us) still remain in Cuba.

WHAT shall we do about that? The answer is plain: Tell Castro to TAKE 'EM OUT—and to give us dependable proof that he has done so. And that if he doesn't take them out, WE WILL. By FORCE, if necessary.

If the missiles are left in Cuba, Castro will use them to blackmail the Western Hemisphere. THESE past few days have been ROUGH days. But they have brought some pleasing developments. During these days of trial and tribulation, it has been made quite clear to us that when all the cards are down, when it is a choice between the American way of life and the communist way of life, our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere would rather have OUR way of life than the COMMUNIST way of life.

That's something worth knowing. I asked if he thought he would win the election. He hesitated, blushed and said, "I don't want to mislead you, but they tell me a candidate must appear confident at all times. So yes, I will win." (Distributed 1962, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.) (All Rights Reserved)

Campaign Shows California's 3-Way Split

By ERIC SEVAREID

Los Angeles—California is not a state of mind, as alleged; it is at least three states of mind. It is a personality split three ways like a rapidly rising in a yeasting, which it also is.



There is the California of the pleasure seeker, the sun-worshiper, the love god, the drosses of Muscle Beach, the hot rollers and the strolling blonde with sun glasses and manicured poodle, pretending that Hollywood still exists.

There is the California of the pure intellect, working at the highest growing points of modern thought, trying to master the Age of Overkill and represented by the best laboratories in the world, the world's greatest concentration of Nobel Prize winners, and by some of the most effective continuing seminars in the humanitarian studies this country knows.

And there is the California of the retired Iowa farmer and small town banker with his half-rim eyeglasses and string tie, of the white Baptist church, the mission society, of front parlor anti-communism, anti-vice, anti-alcoholism, and anti-godless frowns. This third California frowns with extreme distaste

upon the California of the first part, and looks with wonder and fear at the California of the second part, so busy taking apart the complicated universe which God put together in exactly six days of twenty-four hours each.

This third California also regards standard California politics, with its Nixons and its Browns, as hopelessly impure, and so it has put forward a third candidate for governor, a tall young man the rest of the country has NOT heard about, but a young man who just might decide this election and subsequent national events by pulling in enough extreme right Republican votes to guarantee the defeat of Richard M. Nixon.

Thirty-five year old Robert L. Wyckoff, who practices medicine and law — and now oratory — could win a quarter million votes, and in a condition where Democratic registration is far higher than Republican registration, that just might put period to the career of Mr. Nixon, now in his seventh crisis.

Trailing a ton of electronic clutter for the purposes of the CBS Report, we descended on the candidate of the Prohibition Party (now undergoing a name change to the American Party) because it will settle for state liquor stores and charging the beverage industry with the cost of treating alcoholics, which sounds like a fair idea in one of those curving canyon streets of end-

less, modest ranch style houses with their built-in garages, built-in kitchens and total, built-in uniformity.

It was no surprise to find that Mr. Wyckoff is not a very smart man; but there is a difference between smartness and intelligence and it was a surprise to find him a very intelligent man. He is currently pursuing a doctorate in medical law at Yale, between dosing patients and trotting around to the neighborhood schools and church meetings with his "campaign manager."

He must have been born grave of mien and mind; he looks at one with the steady, but slightly shy and soulful gaze of the reformer who has seen the light, and the old-fashioned courtliness of his manner was a positive refreshment in this era and region of sloppy, cocky youth. You can't help but like him and you can't help but admire his total integrity, slightly suffocating as it is.

It is pretty hard to make fun of an earnest, unworshiped man who believes that only morality and applied Christianity will save this state, nation and world — who's to say him nay? The night before my visit one of the successful wisecrackers who command large audiences as "commentators" in the Disneyland of Los Angeles television had made merciless public fun of Dr. Wyckoff in an interview. "Oh dear, but it was humiliating," said the

candidate. "I just crept out of there like a whipped dog." But Californians, like other Americans, quickly sense the presence of a decent man, and it was the wisecracker who was tongue-whipped by hundreds of indignant phone calls. The rating of the commentator must have gone down, that of the candidate, up.

Dr. Wyckoff wrung his hands over the clutter of papers on the table in his dining room. "I have to do all my own research," he said, "and it's so terribly time consuming." He has an idea that taxes could be controlled or reduced by a \$50 per semester increase in university and junior college tuition, now ridiculously low by most standards. He has an idea much of the state bureaucracy could be eliminated by a private unemployment insurance plan whereby one day's pay is withheld each of the first twenty weeks of a person's employment, to be handed over when and if he loses his job, and state aid given to him only when that fund is exhausted. Offhand, I couldn't see what was so terribly wrong with either idea.