

Medford Mail Tribune

Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune... Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor... HERB GREY, Advertising Manager... GERALD F. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.

Subscription Rates: Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00... Daily and Sunday—6 mos. \$10.00

Member California Newspaper Publishers Association... Member 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: Oct. 16, 1953 (Friday). John B. Wosky, superintendent of the Crater Lake National Park and Oregon Caves since March 1, 1952, is being transferred to Hawaii as superintendent of the Hawaii National Park.

20 YEARS AGO: Oct. 16, 1943 (Saturday). Ships being built at Kaiser yards in Portland to be named for Jackson county historical places.

30 YEARS AGO: Oct. 16, 1933 (Monday). Special session of legislature to be called to consider work and school relief legislation.

40 YEARS AGO: Oct. 16, 1923 (Tuesday). First Baptist church to dedicate new pipe organ.

50 YEARS AGO: Oct. 16, 1913 (Thursday). Construction of Gold Hill cement plant to start soon.

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

TV: News and Other Things

Basically, television brings four types of news coverage. First is the bulletin—an interruption of a program to bring a concise announcement of a major news break.

Second is the regular news show—usually in 15 or 30 minute format. Third is the documentary—when some story is studied in detail.

And fourth is the direct broadcast of an event—such as the magnificent coverage given the flights of the American astronauts from Cape Canaveral.

THE LATTER two, because they are less limited in time, and can have been prepared for well in advance, pose in some ways less of a production and editing problem than do the regular "roundup" type news broadcasts.

The news shows, however, do present formidable problems. For instance, the actual word content of a 15-minute news broadcast is roughly similar to the content of three columns of newspaper news; a 30-minute show roughly comparable to six columns of printed news.

Trying to condense a full 24 hours of news developments into such a time slot takes expert editing and expert presentation. When it is well done, as it usually is by the major networks, the results are excellent.

IT IS EXCELLENT, that is, if the objective is to give the viewer a necessarily brief, necessarily condensed overview of the happenings of the day, sacrificing much of the detail and background which are necessary for an understanding of a complex story.

Thus television cannot compete with a daily newspaper in thoroughness of daily coverage, just as a daily newspaper cannot compete with a weekly news magazine in presenting news with perspective and balance.

All news men, whether reporters or editors, and whether working in the broadcast media or the printed media, face similar problems of space and time. There are always deadlines to be met, and just so much news space (or time) to be filled.

WHAT ALL newsmen seek—and do not, alas, always attain, is unbiased reliability and comprehensiveness.

Being human, reporters sometimes fail. So do editors and announcers. But those who are worth their salt always keep striving to achieve these ideals, not only as a matter of professional pride, but, even more basic, as a matter of survival.

All are faced with the problem of believability. If too many people, over too long a time, refuse to believe what they read or hear as news, then the news medium—whether radio, TV, newspaper or magazine—is failing in its function.

BELIEVABILITY in a newspaper must be achieved over a period of time. If readers come to know that, most of the time, the paper's staff is reporting the news as it happens, and as honestly and accurately as possible, believability is achieved.

It is a little different when one can watch the reporter or announcer. Often it is the personality of the man as a fellow human being, his manner of speech and appearance, rather than what he says, that creates an aura of believability.

Television has the added advantage that, for some stories, the viewer can "see for himself" what is happening, and not have to take a reporter's word for it. This, naturally, is a big factor in believability. And it is one which has had a salutary effect on some reporters for printed news media.

ALL THESE matters, and many others, were given thorough discussion last week at a two-day symposium in Portland on the subject, "Television: Its Role in the Democratic Process."

The consensus appeared to be that, as a recent entry in the communications field, and a vastly important one, television does indeed have a major role to play in the democratic process, but no one is quite sure, just yet, of its scope.

Some of the questions were: "How effectively does television provide the information and informed opinion essential for wise decisions by the individual viewer on matters of public policy? What is the relationship of television to social issues and conflicts? What is the relationship of television to political action which results from public concern with social issues? What is the relationship and responsibility of television to domestic politics?"

THERE are no hard and fast answers to any of these questions. But they are important questions, and deserve thought.

For example, it is a certainty that the famous TV debates between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy in the 1960 election had some effect on the outcome of the election. But no one knows, for certain, just how much of an effect, or just how the outcome of the election was influenced.

Television has such a vast potential that it is sad to see so much of it wasted on trivia.

But too, it is good to know that responsible leaders of the industry are engaged in a continuing process of soul-searching. Some of it is defensive, some of it is questioning, some of it is boastful.

But it is all to the good.—E.A.

"It's Peacemongering And Creeping Private Enterprise, That's What It Is!"



... 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.

No Santa Claus: To the Editor: Referring to your editorial of Oct. 3 on the subject of juvenile delinquency and its possible causes, also my letter on the same subject which was published on the 4th, here is another point of discussion relating to the matter worth consideration.

There is no delinquency among Chinese youngsters who have been taught the ethics of Confucius. Also, the Japanese never strike a child and sparing the rod does not spoil him.

Confucius was a Chinese philosopher whose entire teaching was practical and ethical rather than religious. He held that proper outward acts based on the five virtues of kindness, uprightness, decorum, wisdom and faithfulness comprise the whole duty of man.

Sorter's Lament: To the Editor: We'll always remember the fall of '63. Sorting pears is no great spree. We have bosses three, and four... There's one coming through the door.

They say, "Take this out...leave this in." We wonder where we should begin. We are so tired, we wish we could sit.

But they just turn the dumper up a bit. Our back aches, our eyes are sore. Yet the packers yell they want some more.

There are punctures, box cuts, rot and red scale. There is damage by birds, bugs, frost and hail. When we think we are doing real good, Placing every pear where we should, We glance up and there stands the boss.

We wonder why he looks so cross... "Leave this in; throw this one out!" Then we hear another shout: "Somebody is throwing away good pears!"

It's no wonder we're getting gray hairs. Now that the season is over and work's almost done, We know we'll miss it all... it was fun.

We are beginning to feel a bit sad. Now, sorting pears really wasn't so bad. The work was hard and we got tired, But we'll be back next fall... if we don't get fired!

A Sorter Medford

Not Italian: To the Editor: I am always at a loss to know why Italians go jubilant on Columbus Day, Oct. 12. Columbus got no inspiration from Italy, no maps from Italy, no financial assistance from Italy, no sailors from Italy, no vessels from Italy, did not sail from nor return from Italy in any of his voyages, never signed his name in Italian, did not write Italian, did not speak Italian, did not act like an Italian (important to those who know characteristics—psychology), and, if I am to believe

Education, Then and Now: To the Editor: Just to get some people straight that have derisive things to say about the earlier methods of education: When we older people went to school in a one room school building we were taught all rules and tables thoroughly, giving a firm foundation for the lessons to follow.

The same thoroughness was used on spelling. I once knew a young woman that could spell every word correctly, and never was dunned at a spelling bee, like was popular in those days.

Some don't stop to think when they may answer "No" if asked if they went to high school. We had all the grades known by number to the 10th in that one country school.

After getting good grades in these, you could go to what they called Normal if you wanted to be a teacher of all these grades.

Naturally one had to know more than if you just wanted to be a 3rd, 4th, and so on teacher. Those few families that could afford to send children to college did so on their own. And why shouldn't they do so in these days. Higher education is no concern of the general public.

Listening to Dr. Peterson on TV he says there aren't jobs for all that are graduating now days. He says the reason many young ladies go to college is to catch a good financial husband. Who should the public pay for that?

He also said many students that are financially able to go to college are dropping out from boredom because they are smarter than their teachers.

I have known people that could add faster in their heads than those that had gone to school. Today they have machines that do this for you. I was in a store some few years ago, and the adding machine wasn't working. The clerk had to figure orally. What a time he had. He hardly could tell what 4 plus 3 was. The editor of one time one Journal once said "you can't

New President Assumes Near-Impossible Task of Keeping Argentina a Democracy

A white-haired, fragile-appearing country doctor has taken over the job of proving that Argentina can exist as a practicing democracy.

He is Dr. Arturo Umberto Illia, under whom Argentina returned last week to constitutional government. His chances for success will depend in large part upon the control he is able to exercise over Argentina's military factions on the one hand and the followers of former dictator Juan D. Peron on the other.

For the more than 10 years since Peron's fall, the two groups have kept the nation in an unceasing state of turmoil. From the vantage point of a recent visit to Argentina, it is possible to predict that President Illia is in for some lumps at home and at least occasional clashes with the United States.

For one thing, he has been accused of being a rabid Argentine nationalist. He already has announced plans to annul the foreign oil contracts which

helped to make Argentina self-supporting in oil. These will be taken over by

the state-owned Y.P.F. Oil Company. He also has been accused of being pro-Communist. This he denies, but he believes Communist should have the right to organize and express their views.

The Venezuelan regime of President Romulo Betancourt held similar views in its earlier days and learned the hard way that Communist expression of views comes in violence and in unceasing conspiracy against existing order.

The view is certain to bring him into conflict with Argentina's military and suggests a leniency toward Castro's Cuba which will not endear him to the United States.

The enormity of his task at home is illustrated by the fact that Argentina's deficit this year will run to around \$200 million, that economic development is at a standstill and that unemployment in a country of around 21 million now is estimated at around the million mark.

The two sorest spots in the Argentine economy are the state-owned railroads and the Y.P.F. Oil Company. Among other things, Illia has promised "efficient administration" of the railroads, a task no Argentine leader before him has been able to accomplish.

Like the Y.P.F. company, the railroads are heavily feather-bedded. The railroad deficit this year will just about equal the national deficit of around \$200 million.

Past government efforts have resulted in a reduction of railroad employes from 226,000 to around 141,000. But the system is in bad repair and Argentine farmers refuse to trust it with their crops. U.S. experts believe at least 15,000 to 20,000 miles of track should be abandoned.

The Y.P.F., in addition to its own enterprises, at present takes all the crude oil produced by the foreign companies. But it also is heavily in the red, and has been unable to pay its producers. In theory it should contribute substantially to the country's highway and power projects, but in these programs also is far in arrears.

Illia says he has a program to restore full employment within a year and at the same time protect wages and currency from inflation. He will need to be the miracle man of the year.

Strictly Personal

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

GENIUS MISUNDERSTOOD: Perhaps the two most influential men of the 20th century—in terms of changing the moral and intellectual climate of our times—have been Einstein and Freud.

Yet, by the paradox that always accompanies their kind of greatness, neither of them is really understood, not only by the masses, but even by the majority of educated people.

Of course, their technical theories need not be understood; what I mean is that not even their basic premises are grasped accurately and clearly. To most people, Einstein said, "Everything is relative," and Freud said, "Everything is sex."

Both these statements are totally false, and would have horrified the men to whom they are ascribed. Leaving Einstein aside for the moment, let us consider the widespread distortion of Freud's view into "Everything is sex."

Some psychiatrists in the past believed this. They were known as "pansexualists." Freud fought these men vigorously and relentlessly. But at the same time, he was fighting conventional society, and forcing us to recognize that many kinds of "non-sexual" behavior had deep sexual roots.

What we have forgotten—if we have ever known it—is that Freud also demonstrated the opposite: that, in neurosis,

what seems to be sexual conduct is not really sexual at all.

Take, for example, patterns of adultery and promiscuity. These certainly seem to be motivated by sexual drives. Yet, in many if not most cases, the sexual "acting out" is merely a symptom of other discontents and dissatisfactions.

Of the people who behave this way, relatively few are driven by genuinely sexual needs. They are unhappy in other ways, they are enslaved by infantile fears or conflicts never resolved within themselves—and their sexual misconduct is simply a symptom of their deeply unconscious problems.

Freud showed that many things we do not commonly think of as "sexual" are sexual in origin; but he also demonstrated the contrary—that "pseudo-sexuality" is one of the prime ways in which the disturbed or immature personality tries to come to terms (unsuccessfully, of course) with its conflicts. This is why, as he pointed out, there is no real joy or lasting satisfaction in such compulsive behavior.

The finest tribute humanity can pay its great men is to understand them. Instead they are venerated or condemned, out of blind admiration or blind ignorance, which is why Freud said, "I am not a Freudian."

Test: Are You A Good Dictator? By Arthur Hoppe

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON—I am hustling to Washington because my country needs my expert advice. On how to tell a good dictator from a bad dictator.

As you know, our State Department's efforts to spread democracy, especially in Latin America, have been producing kind of a mixed bag lately. Most of them brand new dictators. And the State Department's getting a mite defensive. It keeps issuing statements saying: "Well, we must realize that some dictators are better than others." And we certainly must. For it's our firm policy never to give our money and support to bad dictators. Only good dictators.

But you can see the problem. Every time a democratic president is overthrown by some army colonel, the State Department must decide: is the colonel a good dictator worthy of our largess? Or a bad dictator? What we obviously need is a simple test.

Luckily, I happen to be an expert in this field. Because for years I've read those Sunday supplement articles headed "Test yourself. Are you a good husband?" Or "Are you a good mother-in-law?" I find I always make a good mother-in-law. So I foresee no difficulties in devising a simple State Department test for new dictators.

—Do you wake up in the morning: (a) grumpy; (b) awfully grouchy; (c) terribly grouchy?

—Do you tell your people you love them: (a) often; (b) sometimes; (c) never; (d) what for?

—Do you try to hide the fact that you are a creature of the state?

the breakfast table; (b) at the conference table; (c) when visiting the dungeons?

—Do you get crochety when: (a) production figures plummet; (b) associates defect; (c) the firing squad misses?

—Do you make friends easily: (a) mad; (b) in enemies; (c) dead?

—Can you manage a pleasant smile when the waiter spills soup down your neck? And he is (a) boiled in oil; (b) drawn and quartered; (c) shot?

—When you make a mistake, do you blame: (a) the Yankee imperialists; (b) the Communist saboteurs; (c) so who makes mistakes?

—When your wife dents a fender on the family tank do you seek: (a) an adult discussion; (b) a friendly talking things out; (c) a submarine gun?

—Do you consider yourself: (a) infallible; (b) omnipotent; (c) indestructible; (d) all three?

And so forth. Oh, how happy the State Department will be to have a simple test to tell the good dictators from the bad. How easy it will be to distinguish between the good dictators we can support like Mr. Chiang, Mr. Franco and (formerly) Mr. Trujillo. And the bad dictators like Mr. Castro, Mr. Mao and (lately) Mr. Diem.

But, you will ask, how do we grade the answers to these nine questions? Well, actually, we don't. Under this bold new plan of mine, we throw those nine away and decide whether or not the prospect is a good dictator or bad dictator solely on question No. 10. Which is: "Will you do what we tell you to do?" (a) yes; (b) no.

So what else is new?



"This is the 'Game of the Week' and we're being televised nationally. Let's go out there and get a good Nielsen rating!"