NBC digest

JULY 1947 VOL. 1 NO. 4

DISCUSSION • COMMENT • DRAMA • HUMOR

Published quarterly by the National Broadcasting Company

15 CENTS

Ben Grauer of NBC broadcasts a description of the eclipse of the sun from a platform in Bocayuva, Brazil, on May 20th. The sun was in a state of partial eclipse when this picture was taken. *For the text of Grauer's broadcast, turn to page 28.*

THE PICTURE ON THE FRONT COVER:

George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, wartime Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Secretary Marshall's report on the Moscow Conference, held in March and April, is the first article in this issue.

NBC digest

VOLUME 1 JULY 1947 NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

NBC digest

Published quarterly in New York, N. Y., by National Broadcasting Company, Inc. Price, 15 cents in United States and Canada; 50 cents for one year's subscription, $1 for two years' subscription.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, INC.

A SERVICE OF RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA

NILES TRAMMELL, *President*

LEWIS MACCONNACH, *Secretary* R. J. TEICHNER, *Treasurer*

30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, New York • Merchandise Mart, Chicago 54, Illinois • Sunset Boulevard and Vine Street, Hollywood 28, California • 14th Street and New York Avenue, Washington 5, D. C. • 1625 California St., Denver 2, Colorado • 815 Superior Avenue, N.E., Cleveland 14, Ohio • Taylor & O'Farrell Sts., San Francisco 2, California.

The Moscow Conference

GEORGE C. MARSHALL

TONIGHT I hope to make clearly understandable the fundamental nature of the issues discussed at the Moscow conference of Foreign Ministers.

This conference dealt with the very heart of the peace for which we are struggling. It dealt with the vital center of Europe – that is, Germany and Austria – an area of large and skilled population, of great resources and industrial plants, an area which has twice in recent times brought the world to the brink of disaster.

In the Moscow negotiations, all the disagreements which were so evident during the conferences regarding the Italian and Balkan treaties came into sharp focus and remained, in effect, unsolved.

Problems which bear directly on the future of our civilization cannot be disposed of by general talk or vague formula – by what Lincoln called "pernicious abstractions."

They require concrete solutions for definite and extremely complicated questions – questions which have to do with boundaries, with power to prevent military aggression, with people who have bitter memories, with the production and control of things which are essential to the lives of millions of people.

There was a reasonable possibility – we had hoped a probability – of completing in Moscow a treaty for Austria and a four-power pact to bind together our four governments to guarantee the demilitarization of Germany. As for the German peace treaty and related but more current German problems, we had hoped to reach agreement on a directive for the guidance of our deputies in their work preparatory to the next conference.

In a statement such as this, it is not practicable to discuss the numerous issues which continued in disagreement at the conference. It will suffice, I think, to call attention to the fundamental problems whose solution would probably lead to the quick adjustment of many other differences.

It is important to the understanding of the conference that the complex character of the problems should be understood, together with

---

This straightforward account by the Secretary of State of the problems, national viewpoints and disappointing results of the four-power conference of foreign ministers, which convened in Moscow March 10 and adjourned April 24, was broadcast over the NBC network April 28, 1947.

their immediate effect on the people of Europe in the coming months.

To cite a single example, more coal is most urgently needed throughout Europe for factories, for utilities, for railroads and for the people in their homes. More coal for Allied countries cannot be mined and delivered until the damaged mines, mine machinery, railroad communications and like facilities are rehabilitated.

This rehabilitation, however, depends on more steel, and more steel depends in turn on more coal for steel making. Therefore – and this is the point to be kept in mind – while the necessary rehabilitation is in progress, less coal would be available in the immediate future for the neighboring Allied states.

But less coal means less employment for labor, and a consequent delay in the production of goods for export to bring money for the purchase of food and necessities. Therefore, the delay necessary to permit rehabilitation of the mines so vitally affects France that the settlement of this matter has become for her a critical issue.

All neighboring states and Great Britain and the Soviet Union are directly affected in various ways, since coal is required for German production of goods for export sufficient to enable her to buy the necessary imports of foods, et cetera, for much of which the United States is now providing the funds.

Moreover, in the background of this coal issue, which is directly related to steel production, is the important consideration of the build-up of heavy industry in Germany, which could later again become a threat to the peace of the world. I cite this single example to illustrate the complications which are involved in these negotiations.

THE Allied Control Council in Berlin presented a detailed report of the many problems concerned with the political, military, economic and financial situation under the present Military Government of Germany. In connection with these matters, the Ministers considered the form and scope of the provisional political organization for Germany, and the procedure to be followed in the preparation of the German peace treaty.

The German negotiations involved not only the security of Europe and the world, but the prosperity of all of Europe. While our mission was to consider the terms of a treaty to operate over a long term of years, we were faced with immediate issues which vitally concerned the impoverished and suffering people of Europe who are crying for help, for coal, for food and for most of the necessities of life, and the majority of whom are bitterly disposed toward the Germany that brought about this disastrous situation.

The issues also vitally concern the people of Britain and the United States who cannot continue to pour out hundreds of millions of dollars for Germany because current meas-

ures were not being taken to terminate expeditiously the necessity for such appropriations.

The critical and fundamental German problems to which I shall confine myself are: The limits to the powers of the central government; the character of the economic system and its relation to all of Europe; the character and extent of reparations; the boundaries for the German state; and the manner in which all Allied states at war with Germany are represented in the drafting and confirmation of the treaty.

ALL the members of the Council of Foreign Ministers are in apparent agreement as to the establishment of a German state on a self-supporting, democratic basis, with limitations imposed to prevent the re-establishing of military power.

This issue of the degree of centralization of the future German state is of greatest importance. Excessive concentration of power is peculiarly dangerous in a country like Germany which has no strong traditions regarding the rights of the individual and the rights of the community to control the exercise of governmental power.

The Soviet Union appears to favor a strong central government. The United States and United Kingdom are opposed to such a government, because they think it could be too readily converted to the domination of a regime similar to the Nazis. They favor a central government of carefully limited powers, all other powers being reserved to the States, or *Laender* as they are called in Germany. The French are willing to agree only to very limited responsibilities for the central government. They fear a repetition of the seizure of power over the whole of Germany carried out by the Hitler regime in 1933.

Under ordinary circumstances, there are always strong and differing points of view regarding the character of a governmental reorganization. In this case there are great and justified fears regarding the resurrection of German military power, and concern over expressed or concealed desires for quite other reasons.

REGARDING the character of the German economic system and its relation to all of Europe, the disagreements are even more serious and difficult of adjustment. German economy at the present time is crippled by the fact that there is no unity of action, and the rehabilitation of Germany to the point where she is self-supporting demands immediate decision.

There is a declared agreement in the desire for economic unity in Germany, but when it comes to the actual terms to regulate such unity there are wide and critical differences.

One of the most serious difficulties encountered in the effort to

secure economic unity has been the fact that the Soviet-occupied zone has operated practically without regard to the other zones and has made few if any reports of what has been occurring in that zone. There has been little or no disposition to proceed on a basis of reciprocity and there has been a refusal to disclose the availability of foodstuffs, and the degree or character of reparations taken out of this zone.

This unwillingness of the Soviet authorities to co-operate in establishing a balanced economy for Germany as agreed upon at Potsdam has been the most serious check on the development of a self-supporting Germany, and a Germany capable of providing coal and other necessities for the neighboring states who have always been dependent on Germany for these items.

After long and futile efforts to secure a working accord in this matter, the British and American zones were combined for the improvement of the economic situation – meaning the free movement of excess supplies or produce available in one zone to another where there is a shortage. Our continuing invitation to the French and Soviets to join in the arrangement still exists.

This merger is bitterly attacked by the Soviet authorities as a breach of the Potsdam Agreement and as a first step toward the dismemberment of Germany, ignoring the plain fact that their refusal to carry out that agreement was the sole cause of the merger. It is difficult to regard their attacks as anything but propaganda designed to divert attention from the Soviet failure to implement the economic unity agreed at Potsdam. Certainly some progress toward economic unity in Germany is better than none.

The character of the control over the Ruhr industrial center, the greatest concentration of coal and of heavy industries in Europe, continues a matter of debate. It cannot be decided merely for the purpose of reaching an agreement. Vitally important considerations and future consequences are involved.

THE question of reparations is of critical importance as it affects almost every other question under discussion. This issue naturally makes a tremendous appeal to the people of the Allied states who suffered the terrors of German military occupation and the destruction of their cities and villages.

The results, of the Versailles Treaty of 1919 regarding payment of reparation on a basis of dollars, and the difficulties encountered by the reparations commission appointed after Yalta in agreeing upon the dollar value of reparations in kind, convinced President Truman and his advisers considering the question at Potsdam that some other basis for determining reparations should be adopted if endless friction and bitterness were to be avoided in future years. They suc-

ceeded in getting agreement to the principle of reparations to be rendered out of capital assets – that is, the transfer of German plants, machinery, et cetera, to the Allied powers concerned.

It developed at the Moscow conference that the Soviet officials flatly disagreed with President Truman's and Mr. Byrnes' understanding of the written terms of this agreement. The British have much the same view of this matter as the United States.

We believe that no reparations from current production were contemplated by the Potsdam Agreement. The Soviets strongly oppose this view. They hold that the previous discussions and agreements at Yalta authorize the taking of billions of dollars in reparations out of current production.

This would mean that a substantial portion of the daily production of German factories would be levied on for reparation payments, which in turn would mean that the recovery of Germany sufficiently to be self-supporting would be long delayed. It would also mean that the plan and the hope of our Government, that Germany's economic recovery by the end of three years would permit the termination of American appropriations for the support of the German inhabitants of our zone, could not be realized.

The issue is one of great complications, for which agreement must be found in order to administer Germany as an economic whole as the four powers claim that they wish to do.

There is, however, general agreement among the Allies that the matter of the factories and equipment to be removed from Germany as reparations should be reexamined. They recognize the fact that a too drastic reduction in Germany's industrial set-up will not only make it difficult for Germany to become self-supporting but will retard the economic recovery of Europe.

The United States has indicated that it would be willing to study the possibility of a limited amount of reparations from current production to compensate for plants, previously scheduled to be removed as reparations to various Allied countries, which it now appears should be left in Germany; it being understood that deliveries from current production are not to increase the financial burden of the occupying powers or to retard the repayment to them of the advances they have made to keep the German economy from collapsing. The Soviet Government has made no response to this suggestion.

THE issue regarding boundaries to be established for Germany presents a serious disagreement and another example of complete disagreement as to the meaning of the pronouncement on this subject by the heads of the three powers.

In the rapid advance of the Soviet Armies in the final phase of the

war millions of Germans in eastern Germany fled to the west of the Oder River. The Soviet Armies, prior to Potsdam, had placed Poles in charge of this area largely evacuated by the German population. This was the situation that confronted President Truman at Potsdam.

Under the existing circumstances the President accepted the situation for the time being with the agreed three-power statement, "the heads of government reaffirm their opinion that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace settlement."

The Soviet Foreign Minister now states that a final agreement on the frontier between Germany and Poland was reached at Potsdam and the expression I have just quoted merely referred to the formal confirmation of the already agreed upon frontier at the peace settlement, thus leaving only technical delimitation to be considered.

The United States Government recognized the commitment made at Yalta to give fair compensation to Poland in the west for the territory east of the Curzon Line incorporated into the Soviet Union. But the perpetuation of the present temporary line between Germany and Poland would deprive Germany of territory which before the war provided more than a fifth of the foodstuffs on which the German population depended.

It is clear that in any event Germany will be obliged to support, within much restricted boundaries, not only her pre-war population but a considerable number of Germans from Eastern Europe. To a certain extent this situation is unavoidable, but we should not agree to its aggravation. We do not want Poland to be left with less resources than she had before the war. She is entitled to more. But it will not help Poland to give her frontiers which will probably create difficulties for her in the future.

Wherever the frontiers are drawn, they should not constitute barriers to trade and commerce upon which the well-being of Europe is dependent. We must look toward a future where a democratic Poland and a democratic Germany will be good neighbors.

THERE is disagreement regarding the manner in which the Allied powers at war with Germany are to participate in the drafting and confirmation of the German peace treaty. There are fifty-one states involved. Of these, in addition to the four principal Allied powers, eighteen were directly engaged in the fighting, some of course to a much greater extent than others.

It is the position of the United States that all Allied states at war with Germany should be given an opportunity to participate to some degree in the drafting and in the making of the peace treaty, but we recognize that there would be a very practical difficulty, if not impossibility, in attempting to draft a

treaty with fifty-one nations participating equally at all stages.

Therefore, the United States Government has endeavored to secure agreement on a method which involves two different procedures, depending on whether or not the state concerned actually participated in the fighting. And all would have an opportunity to present their views, and rebut other views, and all would sit in the peace conference to adopt a treaty.

It is difficult to get the agreement of the countries that have suffered the horrors of German occupation and were involved in heavy losses in hard fighting to accept participation in the determination of the treaty terms by countries who suffered no losses in men or material and were remote from the fighting. The United States, however, regards it as imperative that all the states who were at war with Germany should have some voice in the settlement imposed on Germany.

The proposal for the four-power pact was advanced by the United States Government a year ago. It was our hope that the prompt acceptance of this simple pact insuring in advance of the detailed German peace settlement that the United States would actively cooperate to prevent the rearmament of Germany would eliminate fears as to the future and would facilitate the making of a peace suitable to Europe's present and future needs.

It was our hope that such a commitment by the United States would relieve the fear of the other European powers that the United States would repeat its actions following the first World War, insisting on various terms for the peace settlement and then withdrawing from a position of any responsibility for their enforcement. It was thought that the compact of the four powers to guarantee the continued demilitarization of Germany would reassure the world that we were in complete accord in our intention to secure the peace of Europe.

However, the Soviet Government met our proposition with a series of amendments which would have completely changed the character of the pact, making it in effect a complicated peace treaty, and including in the amendment most of the points regarding the German problem concerning which there was, as I have pointed out, serious disagreement.

I was forced to the conclusion by this procedure that the Soviet Government either did not desire such a pact or was following a course calculated to delay any immediate prospect of its adoption.

Whether or not an agreement can finally be reached remains to be seen, but the United States, I think, should adhere to its present position and insist that the pact be kept simple and confined to its one basic purpose—to keep Germany incapable of waging war.

THE negotiations regarding the Austrian treaty resulted in agreement on all but a few points, but these were basic and of fundamental importance. The Soviet Union favors and the other Governments oppose the payment of reparations and the cession of Carinthia to Yugoslavia.

But the Soviet Government attached much more importance to its demand that the German assets in Austria, which are to be hers by the terms of the Potsdam Agreement, should include those assets which the other three powers consider to have been taken from Austria and the citizens of the United Nations by force or duress by Hitler and his Nazi Government following the taking over of Austria by military force in March, 1938.

The Soviet Government refused to consider the word duress, which in the opinion of the other three powers would be the critical basis for determining what property – that is, business, factories, land, forests, et cetera – were truly German property and not the result of seizures by terroristic procedure, intimidation, fake business acquisition, and so forth.

The Soviet Union also refused to consider any process of mediation to settle the disputes that are bound to arise in such circumstances, nor would they clearly agree to have such property as they receive as German assets subject to Austrian law in the same manner as other foreign investments are subject to Austrian law.

The acceptance of the Soviet position would mean that such a large portion of Austrian economy would be removed from her legal control that Austrian chances of surviving as an independent self-supporting state would be dubious. She would in effect be but a puppet state.

All efforts to find a compromise solution were unavailing. The United States, in my opinion, could not commit itself to a treaty which involved such manifest injustices and – what is equally important – would create an Austria so weak and helpless as to be the source of great danger in the future.

In the final session of the conference, it was agreed to appoint a commission to meet in Vienna May 12 to reconsider our disagreements, and to have a committee of experts examine into the question of the German assets in Austria. Certainly prompt action on the Austrian treaty is necessary to fulfill our commitment to recognize Austria as a free and independent state and to relieve her from the burden of occupation.

COMPLICATED as these issues are, there runs through them a pattern as to the character and control of Central Europe to be established. The Foreign Ministers agreed that their task was to lay the foundations of a central government for Germany, to bring about the economic unity of Germany essential for its own existence

as well as for European recovery, to establish workable boundaries, and to set up a guaranteed control through a four-power treaty. Austria was to be promptly relieved of occupation burdens and treated as a liberated and independent country.

Agreement was made impossible at Moscow because, in our view, the Soviet Union insisted upon proposals which would have established in Germany a centralized government, adapted to the seizure of absolute control of a country which would be doomed economically through inadequate area and excessive population, and would be mortgaged to turn over a large part of its production as reparations, principally to the Soviet Union. In another form the same mortgage upon Austria was claimed by the Soviet delegation.

Such a plan, in the opinion of the United States delegation, not only involved indefinite American subsidy, but could result only in a deteriorating economic life in Germany and Europe and the inevitable emergence of dictatorship and strife.

Freedom of information, for which our Government stands, inevitably involves appeals to public opinion. But at Moscow, propaganda appeals to passion and prejudice appeared to take the place of appeals to reason and understanding. Charges were made by the Soviet delegation, and interpretation given the Potsdam and other agreements, which varied completely from the facts as understood or as factually known by the American delegation.

However, despite the disagreements referred to and the difficulties encountered, possibly greater progress toward final settlement was made than is realized.

The critical differences were for the first time brought into the light and now stand clearly defined, so that future negotiations can start with a knowledge of exactly what the issues are that must be settled. The deputies now understand the precise views of each government on the various issues discussed. With that they can possibly resolve some differences and surely can further clarify the problems by a studied presentation of the state of agreement and disagreement.

That is the best that can be hoped for in the next few months. It marks some progress, however painfully slow. These issues are matters of vast importance to the lives of the people of Europe and to the future course of world history. We must not compromise on great principles in order to achieve agreement for agreement's sake. At the same time, we must sincerely try to understand the point of view of those with whom we differ.

In this connection, I think it proper to refer to a portion of a statement made to me by Generalissimo Stalin. He said, with reference to the conference, that these were only the first skirmishes and brushes of reconnaisance forces on this question. Differences had oc-

curred in the past on other questions, and as a rule, after people had exhausted themselves in dispute they then recognized the necessity of compromise. It was possible that no great success would be achieved at this session, but he thought that compromises were possible on all the main questions, including demilitarization, political structure of Germany, reparations and economic unity. It was necessary to have patience and not become pessimistic.

I sincerely hope that the Generalissimo is correct in the view he expressed and that it implies a greater spirit of cooperation by the Soviet delegation in future conferences. But we cannot ignore the factor of time involved here.

The recovery of Europe has been far slower than had been expected. Disintegrating forces are becoming evident. The patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate. So I believe that action cannot await compromise through exhaustion. New issues arise daily. Whatever action is possible to meet these pressing problems must be taken without delay.

FINALLY, I should comment on one aspect of the matter which is of transcendent importance to all our people. While I did not have the benefit, as did Mr. Byrnes, of the presence of the two leading members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I did have the invaluable assistance of Mr. [John Foster] Dulles, a distinguished representative of the Republican party as well as a recognized specialist in foreign relations and in the processes of international negotiations and treaty-making.

As a matter of fact, the bipartisan character of the American attitude in the present conduct of foreign affairs was clearly indicated by the strong and successful leadership displayed in the Senate during the period of this conference by Senators [Arthur H.] Vandenberg and [Tom] Connally in the debate over development of our foreign policy. The fact that there was such evident unity of purpose in Washington was of incalculable assistance to me in Moscow.

The state of the world today and the position of the United States make mandatory, in my opinion, a unity of action on the part of the American people. It is for that reason that I have gone into such lengthy detail in reporting my views on the conference.

What is it?

(For the answer, turn to page 14)

Mr. and Mrs. David Fleay of Victoria, Australia, recent 15th wedding anniversary guests on NBC's "Honeymoon in New York," explained, "It's a 22-inch animal with a duck-like bill, seal-like fur, a beaver-like tail and a dog-like bark — but it lays eggs!"

Resting Place of Heroes

HOWARD L. PECKHAM

THE American Graves Registration Command supervised the significant ceremony that was held today in our United States Military Cemetery at Hamme, just outside of this beautiful capital city of Luxembourg. Similar Memorial Day ceremonies were held in all of the other 36 cemeteries which are under the supervision of this command. At Lisnabreeny in Ireland; at Cambridge and Brookwood in England; at Malmo, Sweden; Munsingen, Switzerland; at our three cemeteries in Holland, four in Belgium, and 24 in France – in each of these cemeteries also there was an impressive and dignified ceremony.

Some 156,000 men and women of the United States lost their lives in the European theater during the course of World War II. This is more than half of the fatal casualties suffered by our country. Of those who lost their lives in the European theater, 144,000 are now resting in these cemeteries. Many of the cemeteries were established during combat, often of necessity upon the battlefields themselves.

After V-E Day the American Graves Registration Command was formed. Landscape architects and horticulturists were brought over from the United States to give technical advice with respect to the planting of shrubs, grass and flowers. These battlefield sites have now been developed into the beautiful park-like resting places where our ceremonies have been held today.

The search for our 12,000 who have not yet been found is continuing. All means are being used to obtain information that might lead to their recovery. Posters, appeals in newspapers and on the radio, the local governments – all are used to make known to the peoples of these lands over here that the army is searching for its missing. Trained investigators and search teams sift the information that is supplied and often find many leads themselves. During 1946 our search and recovery teams covered an area of approximately one and one-quarter million square miles. They penetrated 300 miles beyond the Arctic

---

In the American Military Cemetery at Luxembourg are buried 8,412 soldiers of the U. S. Third Army, including their commander, General George S. Patton. This statement by Brigadier General Peckham, Commander of American Graves Registration in Europe, was broadcast from overseas to the network audience in connection with NBC's observance of Memorial Day, 1947.

Circle. They recovered our dead from the islands of the Azores, a thousand miles off the coast of Portugal. Their operations extended through Czechoslovakia and into the Ploesti oil fields of Rumania. No clue that might lead to the recovery of an American has been overlooked. No clue that may lead to the recovery of an American will be overlooked.

To establish positive identification of our dead, the experience of American Police Departments has been combined with the discoveries and developments of our own identification experts. Scientific processes and equipment are in constant use. The fluoroscope, the x-ray, infrared photography, measuring devices of all types – all of these are used in our identification procedures. All care is taken to insure that identification is positive. Unless it is positive, no identification is accepted.

I think you would like to know that the chaplains of the American Graves Registration Command visit all of our cemeteries frequently and that religious services are often conducted in the cemetery chapels by the local people. From the outset, the peoples of the liberated countries have shown in many ways their gratitude to your sons and husbands and fathers. Not a day goes by that does not see groups of grateful people of Holland, Belgium, France and Luxembourg visiting the cemeteries.

Soon the program for the return of our soldiers who lost their lives in World War II will begin and those whose next of kin elect to have them returned to the United States will begin the long, long journey home. The program is scheduled to begin in the early fall of this year and many of the men and women to whom we have paid our respects today will be in family burial plots or in national cemeteries in the United States when Memorial Day of 1948 comes around. I wish to assure you – all of you who have loved ones in our cemeteries over here – that my command will never forget the reverence and respect to which they are entitled. Our preparations have been extensive to insure that the greatest care shall be given to all of your deceased, whether they are to be returned to the homeland or are to remain over here in the lands that they fought to liberate. I want all of you to know that the American Graves Registration Command will do its utmost to fulfill its obligation to those who died in the service of our country.

The answer to the question on page 12: A platypus. Mr. Fleay, who is director of the Sir Colin Mackenzie Sanctuary for Native Fauna in Victoria, recently brought three platypuses to the Bronx Zoo in New York City. Only one other ever has been taken from Australia.

The Stirring Blood

A "Cavalcade of America" Drama

EDITOR: *(Angrily)* I don't care where he is . . . get him here! Get Dave Evans in this office in three minutes, or I'll fire the whole staff! *(Phone rings)* You heard me! *(Receiver down . . . another up)* City desk. Oh, Collins . . . good . . . you'll do. Now look . . . get out to LaGuardia Airport right away. There's a plane due in from London . . . I want you to wait for it. *(Door opens)* Well, well, well . . . Dave Evans. I've been trying to get hold of you for an hour. What are you, a reporter or—

DAVE: I got your message at the hospital . . . came as soon as I could get away.

EDITOR: Hospital? What's the matter, sick? Get sick on your own time! I had to send Collins out to LaGuardia to cover a story that should have been your assignment.

DAVE: Wait a minute. I've got a story. Right here in my pocket. Big . . . page one. I just came from the hospital. Eye-witness. A miracle! I got the whole thing exclusive.

EDITOR: Save the build-up—give me the story!

DAVE: Here it is. A scoop. By applying the RH blood factor, they've solved a case of erythroblastosis.

EDITOR: What was that?

DAVE: Erythroblastosis.

EDITOR: Are you gagging?

DAVE: I'm giving you a page one scoop!

EDITOR: For what—the encyclopedia?

This dramatic story of medicine's recent discovery of the RH factor in the blood, and of the method of overcoming the effects of mismatched blood in newborn infants, was written by Halstead Welles for Dupont's CAVALCADE OF AMERICA. *The professional cast was headed by Lee Bowman, who took the part of Dave Evans, and Una Merkel, as Opal. First broadcast over the NBC network on March 10, 1947, "The Stirring Blood" evoked such a flood of letters expressing interest and appreciation—particularly from doctors, nurses and expectant mothers – that the program was repeated on June 2.*

DAVE: I'm telling you, I've got a story. It's one of the greatest medical miracles that ever–

EDITOR: What's the matter with you? Best man on the staff and suddenly you go crazy over some crack-pot medical item.

DAVE: Crack-pot? It's the most fantastic life-saving miracle that ever happened.

EDITOR: But it isn't news, Dave. This is a newspaper.

DAVE: Chief, it's the biggest news since Noah struck land.

EDITOR: Dave, will you get out of here before I throw you out?

DAVE: You've got to listen to this, Chief. It's a miracle. I saw it happen. When you get a baby with erythroblastosis–

(Editor fumes . . . throws down a book)

Go ahead! Bust the furniture . . . tear your hair. But I'm going to write this story. And what's more, I'm going to do a Sunday feature on it. And if you don't want to even listen to it, I'll write it for somebody else.

EDITOR: Oh, cut it out . . . don't be so touchy. Sit down. I'll listen to it. But I won't understand it. Dave . . . this is a newspaper . . . not the Doctor's Quarterly. There's no way to get that scientific stuff clear to our readers.

DAVE: How about giving me a chance? Listen–see that girl out there at the third desk?

EDITOR: Which one?

DAVE: The one with the toothpick.

EDITOR: What about her?

DAVE: She's the dumbest blonde in this office. Give me ten minutes with her and if I can't get this story through her head in that time, I'll spend the rest of my newspaper days on the society page. Is that a deal?

EDITOR: *(Laughs)* You're gonna explain the thing to Opal?

DAVE: I will.

EDITOR: You got yourself a deal. Wait a minute. *(Calls)* Opal . . . Opal! Hey–wake up.

OPAL: *(Coming in)* Did you call me, Chief?

EDITOR: Yeah. Okay, Dave–she's all yours.

OPAL: Now just a minute–what is this?

DAVE: It's all right, Opal. Now–sit down. Have some gum?

OPAL: No, thanks–I'm chewin' some.

EDITOR: Look, Opal–Dave wants to tell you a little story. It's about–the RH blood factor and erythroblastosis.

OPAL: Whaaaat? *(Giggles)*

EDITOR: See? She's hysterical already.

DAVE: Just a minute, Chief. Opal . . . That's a beautiful ring you've got. Engaged?

OPAL: Mmmhmm. To my man.

DAVE: Fine—that's good, Opal. But—did you know that before you get married you ought to find out what kind of blood your man has?

OPAL: Blood? It's red, I guess.

DAVE: Yeah . . . but I don't mean that. I mean before you marry, you ought to find out his RH factor and *your* RH factor.

OPAL: Are you kidding!

DAVE: No Opal, I'm very serious. You see, if a woman's blood is what they call RH negative, and a man's RH positive, there's danger their children may not live.

OPAL: Oooh! You mean that could happen to me?

DAVE: Sure. If you're RH negative and he's RH positive.

OPAL: Well, I know he's awful positive about certain things.

DAVE: Opal, I don't mean that.

OPAL: Then what're you talking about? We're not sick, if that's what you mean.

OPAL: No, no. This thing happens to perfectly healthy people. Now, Opal—just remember this—there's blood that's RH negative and RH positive. Got that?

OPAL: Yeah. Negative . . . and positive. Just the opposite to each other.

EDITOR: Sheer genius.

DAVE: Quiet, Chief. Listen, Opal . . . before we start on that big word . . . erythroblastosis . . . we've got to work backwards. First, types of blood, and second, the RH factor in blood. Now, take another stick of gum and relax. *(Background music)* You see, Opal . . . inside us there's a wonderful organ called the heart. It beats . . . steadily . . . quietly. And because it beats, the blood flows through our bodies. The heart throbs, the blood flows. It seems so simple, so natural. But blood isn't simple. Somewhere in the blood lie murderous elements. Back in 1900 they gave transfusions. They thought blood was just blood. Everybody's the same. If a man needed blood, they gave him a transfusion. But . . . *it didn't always work.* The same blood that saved one man on Sunday would kill another on Monday. What was this killer in the blood?

Doctors were baffled. Now there was one particular doctor—his name was Karl Landsteiner. He and other doctors worked night and day in the laboratory, trying to track down this killer in the blood, trying to learn why a transfusion saved one life and snuffed out the next.

(Music fades out. Sound of test tubes and laboratory apparatus)

LANDSTEINER: Robert, that makes ten samples of blood, from ten different people, including you and me.

ROBERT: Yes, sir. Ten centimeters each—

LANDSTEINER: So we have ten different bloods. We'll start with a simple experiment. Your blood we will use first. Get me four test tubes. *(Sound of glassware)*

ROBERT: Here they are.

LANDSTEINER: We're going to divide your blood into five equal parts.

ROBERT: Two cubic centimeters in each tube?

LANDSTEINER: Correct. *(Sound of liquid pouring)* We'll leave two CC in the original test tube, keep that pure and unmixed. The others we'll mix with different bloods. The next one is Arthur's blood. We'll pour two cubic centimeters of his blood into yours. *(Pouring)* Mark this one Robert-Arthur and put it on the rack. The next one is Lillian's. *(Pouring)* We'll pour two CC of her blood into yours. Mark it Robert-Lillian. *(Music: Up, down and out)*

ROBERT: Thirty-eight—thirty-nine—forty. Right, Dr. Landsteiner—forty mixed and ten unmixed.

LANDSTEINER: Uh huh. Now—the microscope, Robert—please . . .

ROBERT: *(Excited)* Dr. Landsteiner! Doctor . . .! Look!

LANDSTEINER: What is it, Robert? What's the matter?

ROBERT: Look what's happened to this mixed sample . . . mine and Joseph's . . . but look at what's happened.

LANDSTEINER: Blood is clumped, all clumped up!

ROBERT: That's funny—

LANDSTEINER: *(Quiet excitement)* And the next one—Joseph; and Lillian's—that, too.

ROBERT: Nothing wrong with this one—Joseph's and Arthur's.

LANDSTEINER: Mmmm. Clumping of blood. *(Slowly)* Robert—Robert, of course! Don't you see? Some bloods will mix and some won't!

ROBERT: That's what it looks like.

LANDSTEINER: That's what it's got to be! Why—if this thing happened in the body—the person would die. *Does* die.

ROBERT: The transfusions that fail . . .

LANDSTEINER: Exactly. We've got the beginning of an answer to the problem of transfusions.

ROBERT: *(Excited)* Why—it's so simple—some bloods will mix, some won't.

LANDSTEINER: *(Chuckles)* Simple, Robert?

ROBERT: Well, isn't it?

LANDSTEINER: No—I don't think so. There is always the big word . . . why? Why does it happen? You see—now we must find out what it is that causes this—this fatal clumping of the blood cells. Quickly now, Robert—the microscope . . .

(Music: Bridge)

DAVE: Well, Opal—that was the start. The first step—and a big one. Now they knew that there were different kinds of blood—and one kind wouldn't mix with another—like oil and water. Get it?

OPAL: Oh sure—like the Red Cross has—the A-B-C types.

DAVE: Exactly. Only there are *four* types and every person, regardless of race or color, belongs to one of four different blood groups: A, B, AB, and Group O.

OPAL: Oh—anybody knows blood types—that's easy.

DAVE: Easy? Well—maybe it *sounds* easy, Opal, but it wasn't.

(Music: With rhythm resembling heartbeat)

It wasn't easy because it took years and years just to find it out. And the heart beat on—pumping blood through our bodies—day in and day out. And Dr. Landsteiner and his assistants worked until they found the different types. The discovery was so important, saved so many lives, that in 1930 Dr. Landsteiner was awarded the Nobel Prize. Doctors breathed a sigh of relief because it seemed the mystery was solved. The killer in the blood stream was caught. But deep down in the blood stream—pumped through by that quiet throb—was another killer. One afternoon at the hospital one of the doctors who'd been working with Dr. Landsteiner was giving a blood transfusion. Suddenly everything went wrong. He sent for Dr. Landsteiner . . .

(Music fades out)

WIENER: I'm very sorry to have got you to the hospital this way, but . . .

LANDSTEINER: Not at all, Dr. Weiner. What's the matter?

WIENER: Come along and take a look at a patient of mine. He was admitted to the hospital, in need of a transfusion, but he reacted so violently that the transfusion had to be terminated.

LANDSTEINER: That sounds as though there were an error in grouping. Was there?

WIENER: No, sir. I checked everything myself. Both donor and recipient were group A.

LANDSTEINER: Hmmm—it's very odd.

WIENER: It happens occasionally. Why—at this hospital alone, there have been more than half a dozen cases where the transfusions had to be stopped despite the fact that the groups were right beyond any doubt.

LANDSTEINER: How about other hospitals? What do their records show? You've looked into that?

WIENER: Yes. Similar cases. Some deaths have occurred. Patient's in here, Dr. Landsteiner . . .

(Door opens and closes)

Well, Mr. Gordon—feeling better?

GORDON: Yes, thanks, Dr. Weiner.

WIENER: Good, Mr. Gordon—this is Dr. Landsteiner.

GORDON: How do you do, doctor.

LANDSTEINER: Mr. Gordon—I'm just going to ask you a few questions. Did you get a backache during the transfusion?

GORDON: Yes, I did.

LANDSTEINER: You also had severe chills?

GORDON: I shook like a leaf. Fainted a couple of times.

LANDSTEINER: Yes . . . I see. Thank you, Mr. Gordon. I will stop in later.

(Door opens and closes)

WIENER: Well, Dr. Landsteiner, what do you think?

LANDSTEINER: Mr. Gordon has a slight jaundice and a marked anemia. Definite sign of incompatability of blood.

WIENER: Yes, I know, sir. But—the blood matched. The donor was group A. Mr. Gordon's is group A.

LANDSTEINER: Mmmhm. And what conclusion do you draw from that, Dr. Wiener—from Mr. Gordon's case and the others?

WIENER: *(Slowly)* Well—there's only one conclusion I can draw—

LANDSTEINER: That there's something in the blood we don't know about? Something beside the grouping we already know?

WIENER: Yes—I do think that.

LANDSTEINER: I think so, too. All right, Dr. Wiener—meet me at my laboratory tomorrow as usual. There's only one thing to do—continue our research until we find out what else is in the blood that kills!

(Music: Bridge)

DAVE: Now, Opal—you've got it straight?

OPAL: Oh sure, I ain't so dumb! This Dr. Landsteiner found out there were different blood types. Some went together like ham and eggs—good, I mean. But other ones—well—they just didn't get along but even if they matched, *blooey*—like Durocher and an umpire!

DAVE: Not bad, Opal, not bad. Well, Dr. Landsteiner and Dr. Wiener found that out. Group A blood sometimes didn't work with the *same* group in *another* person. Three out of every hundred cases went wrong.

EDITOR: Look, Dave—time's wasting—what's the gimmick?

DAVE: Gimmick? You won't believe it when I tell you.

EDITOR: Why not?

DAVE: Because—the gimmick is—*a monkey!*

(Sound: Chattering of monkeys)

WIENER: *(Laughing)* I never get tired watching these little clowns. These Rhesus monkeys are delightful.

LANDSTEINER: Yes—they are very easily domesticated, too. But we have work to do, Dr. Wiener.

WIENER: Want to read our notes, so far?

LANDSTEINER: Yes—I do. Let me see—six weeks ago we injected five CC's of a Rhesus monkey's blood into a guinea pig.

WIENER: I've drawn off the serum from the guinea pig. It's all ready, divided up into twelve test tubes. And we've got twelve different samples of human blood.

LANDSTEINER: All right, Dr. Wiener—let's add one CC of different human blood to each tube of the serum.

WIENER: I'll work from this end. You can start from where you are.

(Sound of glassware)

LANDSTEINER: No reaction from this first tube—or the second—or the third—or the fourth—or the fifth—or the sixth—

WIENER: None here—or here—or here—or *(Excitedly)* Look here, Dr. Landsteiner . . . this one—

LANDSTEINER: The blood is beginning to clump up!

WIENER: There *is* a reaction!

LANDSTEINER: *(Excited too)* Yes . . . yes. . . . You see, Dr. Wiener—there *must* be another substance in the blood. No matter what the blood group is, there must be another factor that can kill!

WIENER: I knew it was there. Those transfusions that went wrong—there *was* something in the blood that caused it. We'll have to give this factor a name . . . but what . . .

(A monkey chatters excitedly)

(Laughs) There's a name—use the first two letters of Rhesus—RH. Name it after the Rhesus monkey.

LANDSTEINER: Good, good. RH it is—the RH factor. It must be the same factor discovered three years ago by my pupil, Dr. Levine.

WIENER: Now we've got to find out how it works in the blood stream. How many people have it. How many don't. And what blood that has the RH factor does to blood that doesn't have it. I've got a hunch that the secret lies there.

(Music: Bridge)

DAVE: Now, Opal . . . Most people have the RH factor in their blood. So they're called RH positive. Those who don't have it are called RH negative.

OPAL: Uh-huh. Then what?

DAVE: So, nowadays when they give transfusions, they not only match the blood type but also the RH factor.

OPAL: If a person who's RH negative gets a transfusion of RH positive blood—does he die?

DAVE: Not at the first transfusion.

OPAL: But you just said they hadda match.

DAVE: I know. But there's this. RH negative blood hates RH positive. Puts up a battle. But to fight a battle, it needs an army—to raise that army takes time. More time than the transfusion takes. But between the first and second transfusion, the RH negative blood has raised an army to fight the positive—and the killing starts.

OPAL: Who kills who?

DAVE: The army that the RH negative blood has built kills all the RH positive blood.

OPAL: So—the negative wins. Then what?

DAVE: Aha—that's where you're wrong, Opal. The RH negative wins the battle at first. The enemy is dead, sure. But thousands upon thousands of the dead enemy are floating down the arteries. And what happens? This – the dead enemy clogs and clumps—literally *chokes* the life out of the victor. So it's no victory after all.

EDITOR: How do you like that!

OPAL: Have you got a piece of paper?

DAVE: Yeah, sure—You want to write some of this down?

OPAL: Gotta get rid of my gum. I been chewing so hard my jaws hurt.

EDITOR: Here you are, Opal.

(Rattle of paper)

OPAL: Thanks. Now, Mr. Evans—tell me about when I get married.

DAVE: First I've got to clear up one more thing. Opal, suppose an RH negative person gets a transfusion of RH positive blood. What happens?

OPAL: You just told me: there's lots of trouble—the second time.

DAVE: Good. But now remember I said that most transfusions worked even *before* the RH factor was discovered?

OPAL: I remember.

DAVE: Know why? Because if you're RH positive and get a transfusion of RH negative, there's no trouble at all, no matter how many transfusions you get—and eighty-five out of a hundred people are RH positive.

OPAL: I get it. That makes only fifteen out of a hundred people RH negative. So, if there's a hundred transfusions, maybe eighty-five of them would be RH positive, and they could take either negative or positive without konking out.

DAVE: Opal, I love you. You see, Chief – most of the transfusions were successful because *more* persons were RH *positive*. But if an RH negative person had to have a transfusion . . .

OPAL: You see, Chief . . . it'd be like having eighty-five red hats in a room with fifteen green ones. If you hadda reach in the dark and grab one, you'd probably get a red one because there are more of them.

EDITOR: Opal, I'll switch to your brand of chewing gum.

DAVE: She's right, Chief. Before the RH factor was discovered, it was like reaching in the dark. Doctors would match blood groups of donor and recipient, but knew nothing

about the RH factor. And if an RH negative person was getting the transfusion, chances are the donor was RH positive. And that caused trouble.

OPAL: I get that – but now how about me getting married and having babies?

DAVE: That's my last point. What happens to a baby if one parent is RH negative, and the other is RH positive?

OPAL: Does he die?

DAVE: That's what the doctors had to find out. Does the blood of the unborn baby fight the blood of the mother? Does the blood of the mother kill the baby? Well, one day another doctor came to see Dr. Wiener . . .

(Music: Bridge)

LEVINE: Dr. Wiener, may I introduce myself. I'm Doctor Levine from the Ortho Research Foundation.

WIENER: I've heard about you and I've always wanted to meet you.

LEVINE: Thank you. I don't want to take up your time, but there's something I must talk to you about.

WIENER: I'm free for an hour. Please sit down.

LEVINE: Thanks. Well – we've been spending a lot of time on erythroblastosis. You know what it is, of course?

WIENER: Well, I've never had any direct experience with it. I know it strikes at unborn or newly born infants.

LEVINE: Yes . . . well, it's not exactly a disease, Dr. Wiener. There are no germs, no observable cause. A baby might be born and appear normal and healthy. A few hours after birth it becomes jaundiced and death inevitably follows.

WIENER: Yes, I've heard that. Strikes haphazardly, too, doesn't it? I mean, there's no set pattern.

LEVINE: As far as we know it could happen to any mother in any family. I'm almost certain the RH factor is involved, and that it is identical with the one I discovered in 1937.

WIENER: Of course, we know that the RH factor is inherited. If both parents are RH positive, so the child will be. No harm can come from that.

LEVINE: Yes, but suppose the parents are opposite?

WIENER: Then the chances are the child will be positive, because that's the dominant trait. Dr. Levine, if there's any connection between erythroblastosis and the RH factor, it might lie right there – that is, if a negative mother is carrying a positive child.

LEVINE: I've been working along that line. Now, I should like to try your serum . . . go back and determine the RH factor of the parents whose infants have this disease.

WIENER: Of course. I'll do everything I can. And whenever you want me – any time – just call me.

(Music: Bridge)

DAVE: And so, Opal, Chief – the clue that Dr. Wiener gave Dr. Levine led straight to the fact that there was a connection between erythroblastosis and the RH factor.

OPAL: You mean . . . Gee, you mean if I'm negative and my man is positive we can't have any kids?

DAVE: No. Your first child will be all right. It takes time for the RH negative mother to build the armies that attack RH positive blood.

EDITOR: Dave, what about the second child?

OPAL: I guess he dies.

DAVE: Not necessarily. Even now they don't know everything. There's lots to be learned about these factors. They only know that *sometimes* the unborn baby's blood gets into the mother's bloodstream, or vice versa. Then again, the mother's and baby's blood don't get together at all. In that case the RH negative mother can keep on having healthy RH positive children. So don't be scared, Opal – have all the children you want.

OPAL: But . . . the chances . . . what are they?

DAVE: The chances of a child being hit by erythroblastosis are only one in three or four hundred. But suppose that chance comes up. There's where the biggest miracle of all comes in. Can that child be saved? Well . . . listen . . .

(Music: Bridge)

LEVINE: I'm glad you got here in time, Dr. Wiener. We've only a few minutes.

WIENER: The child isn't born yet, Dr. Levine?

LEVINE: No. This way, please.

(Sound of footsteps)

LEVINE: I'll fill you in briefly. This woman – about to have her third child . . .

WIENER: What's her factor?

LEVINE: RH negative. In here, please . . .

(Door opens, closes)

LEVINE: We'll scrub up first . . .

(Sound: Water turned on. Then sound of scrubbing hands which continues intermittently through dialogue)

WIENER: You said the mother's RH negative. And the father?

LEVINE: Positive.

WIENER: What about the first two children?

LEVINE: The first, perfectly normal. Second, born dead. This third one . . . Well, death is almost certain unless we can do something about it.

WIENER: We can try, Dr. Levine.

LEVINE: I know now that erythroblastosis is brought on by the two different RH factors of the parents.

WIENER: Yes . . . but, if we should draw out all the child's blood and then transfuse it with RH negative blood that's never had any contact with positive blood, we might save the child.

LEVINE: It's the only way, I'm sure.

(Heartbeat music, this time lighter and more rapid to simulate that of a child)

WIENER: We're ready . . . 300 CC of RH negative blood to use if it's necessary. But we'll take a test of the infant's blood first.

LEVINE: I've explained it to the obstetrician. He's cooperating with us all the way.

(Door opens . . . sound of infant's cry)

NURSE: *(Coming in)* It's a girl, Dr. Levine. Seems all right.

WIENER: Let me look at her.

LEVINE: She looks normal, Dr. Wiener . . . but her skin color . . .

WIENER: *(Crisply)* Bronze – usually a sign of blood disease . . . Better take a blood count right away.

NURSE: Yes – that's indicated . . .

(Baby's cries weaken. The musical heartbeats begin to slacken)

NURSE: *(Quickly)* She's getting pale . . . her breathing's shallow . . . rapid.

WIENER: No time for a blood count. Nurse, the syringe valve – we'll draw off the blood and inject fresh blood right now.

LEVINE: How much does that make it?

WIENER: Two hundred fifty CC's of new blood.

NURSE: Her color's coming back.

LEVINE: Heartbeat?

(Musical heartbeat becomes stronger)

NURSE: Stronger . . .

LEVINE: Hemoglobin level – 75%. *(Pause)* She . . . she's out of danger.

(Baby's more vigorous cry)

WIENER: Nurse – you can take her back to the nursery now. She'll be all right.

(Music: Stronger, then stops suddenly)

OPAL: Gee – they did that?

DAVE: They did that, Opal.

OPAL: Like the kid was a crankcase and they were changing oil for the winter.

DAVE: That's right.

OPAL: Wait'll I tell my boy friend and . . . say, Mr. Evans, how do you know so much about it?

DAVE: My wife's RH negative . . . I'm positive. And Opal, that was *our* baby the doctors saved.

(Pause)

OPAL: Gee – think of that.

DAVE: Well – is there a story in it, Chief? It took a little longer than ten minutes, but . . .

EDITOR: Take as long as you want on it, Dave . . . but write that story.

DAVE: Does it make a Sunday feature?

EDITOR: Yes – go ahead!

DAVE: All right. I want to write about those men – Dr. Karl Landsteiner, Dr. Alexander Wiener, Dr. Philip Levine. I want people to know how much we owe to the doctors that work quietly, year after year, beating back death and rescuing lives by the million. Conquering the unknown. Opening another medical frontier. Here, a baffling, terrifying puzzle that confronted the world for years has at last been solved through the painstaking effort of scientific research. Again in America, a challenge has been met and another fear banished. I'm going to sing about these doctors in headlines. They made the blood flow again. They made the heart beat firmly – and surely.

(Music; curtain)

Total Eclipse

BEN GRAUER

THIS whole smooth area is marked off with barbed wire fences, and behind those fences are lined up perhaps 300 people, many of them in the dress of cattle ranchers of Brazil. Just three and a half minutes from now our expedition camp and this whole vista of rolling hills will be plunged into darkness as the mid-morning sun is excluded in the most dramatic spectacle of nature, the total eclipse of the sun. And then for barely another four minutes, our world will be dark and people along the path of the shadow will stand in wonder and awe. But in those precious 228 seconds a group of famous scientists who have been planning and drilling for this moment for many months will make observations which will increase our knowledge of our universe, test the proof of the Einstein theory, speed the flight of airplanes or guided missiles in the upper air. Only at eclipse time will the sun give up those secrets. And eclipses like this one happen so rarely that our scientists are actually approaching right now the most valuable four minutes in their lives in eight years.

Hence all the time and energy and great expense in planning and transforming and setting up this expedition in this faraway spot. This is one of the most thrilling gambles in all science.

A tiny cloud over the sun may spoil everything; and today the gods of chance have just finally, as we approach totality time, given us their broadest smile. The skies are clear and almost cloudless. The weather, which was poor last week, turned to ideal.

Exactly an hour and ten minutes ago, the first phase of the eclipse began. The paths of the moon and sun crossed, the moon made its first contact exactly as predicted at 8:22 Brazil time and started to slide over the face of the sun, started to nib-

---

At Bocayuva, in the interior of Brazil, the total eclipse of the sun on May 20, 1947, lasted less than four minutes. To report this event to American radio and television audiences NBC flew four men and a ton of equipment to Bocayuva—Ben Grauer, two radio engineers and Leroy G. Phelps, television cameraman. Phelps' films, flown back to the United States, were on the air via NBC television less than sixty hours after the eclipse—a clean scoop for the benefit of more than 100,000 televiewers. A portion of Grauer's eye-witness narration, told to the radio audience during the eclipse, is reported herewith.

ble away, as it appears to us, at that blazing disk in the sky. First a little nick in the top rim, then as the moon slid slowly down the nick grew through the past hour from a small crescent to a larger, larger one, the ends pointing always upward. For awhile the shape was like a baby's bib, then like the outline of a hammock.

Now, as I adjust these smoked glasses again – although the sun's almost 95 per cent gone it would still burn my eyes – as I look upward now the moon has moved slowly on down leaving the very thinnest of crescents, almost like the paring from a finger nail.

In the background you can hear the steady drone of the loudspeaker calling off the seconds before the instant of totality.

Forty seconds to go. Father Heyden of Georgetown University is counting those seconds with his hand swinging down in the gathering gloom while the loudspeaker ticks out those seconds, to get his picture of the exact second of totality.

I see standing about fifty feet from me American Ambassador to Brazil William Pawley, and other dignitaries. The darkness is creeping upon us. With twenty seconds to go there is just the merest little sliver of the sun left and there's darkness descending fast upon us. In just a few seconds we will have totality, we will have the zero hour. You can hear the tick in the background counting off those seconds.

AND now, all of a sudden in the last five or eight seconds the light is going out, zero totality . . . the sun is eclipsed! The whole landscape, which was bathed in light to the very last instant, was suddenly darkened as though a window shade was drawn down.

I'm looking at a spectacle which few people ever see in their lives – the shadow of the moon, which is racing eastward from the Pacific at thirty miles a minute, has fallen upon us. Looking up where the sun was a moment ago I can see only a black circle of the intensest, deepest black, and streaming out from the circle, a most magnificent, awe-inspiring spectacle, the corona of the sun – creamy white with long streamers to the east and west and even longer ones to the north and south. They compare with the diameter of the sun about two to three times as wide as the sun, which would make them about three million miles in extent.

I'm looking around at the stars now, and yes, I do see some of the stars starting to come out, and planets too. There, just below the sun, I am sure that's Mercury, and there, clearly shining in the sky in the middle of the morning, is Venus and another attendant star. There's a warm yellow glow on the horizon itself, but the rest of our entire scene is shrouded in darkness, just about the kind of darkness you'd have on a brilliantly lit moonlit night.

I can look down on the observation strip and make out the forms

and figures of the various scientists busy at their equipment. Right now here at this large telescope and camera the scientists from Georgetown University are waving their hands and counting off the seconds as they time every phase of the eclipse.

Alongside Dr. Kiess, during these two minutes to go – we're in the middle of the totality, the very middle of the totality – Dr. Kiess is now switching his spectrograph from position "A" to position "B" so he can photograph the flash spectrum as the sun starts to leave and starts to appear at the other rim of the moon.

A little further on down I see Dr. Van Biesbroeck, who is conducting those most important experiments which will determine some of the validity of the Einstein theory. Dr. Van Biesbroeck has to take two shots of the sun, one straight ahead of the sun, the other at a 90-degree angle. We hope this experiment comes out – it's particularly complicated.

Another glance at the sun itself. The brilliantly glowing p e a r l y haze of the corona, such a light as one never sees except at this moment of totality, a light which has a luminosity to it, a glow which is indescribable, a pearly, soft, creamy glow in a magnificent crown or rather halo, around the entire surface of the sun.

I've just seen a prominence – yes, clearly at what would be approximately 1:00 o'clock on a clock – a brilliant red, coral-red prominence shooting out almost about one-tenth of the diameter of the sun, which would make it about 80,000 miles high – incandescent hydrogen gas.

In these moments these scientists clicking their cameras, fixing their films, are able to penetrate those inner secrets of the sun which can be determined only at the precious moments of totality. The corona seems to glow, it seems to grow bigger, it now extends in a haze of chromosphere which extends probably another 100 or 200,000 miles around the sun before the streamers start going out with their infinitely long stretches and tentacles. There are ten seconds to go, just a few; they are ticking off before the sun bursts through and the upper rim reveals to us that the moon has made its course.

And there is the first blinding, shining light! I can't look at it. I have just turned my face – my eyes were unprotected – and the first blazing pearly bead on the top northern rim of the sun shone down upon us. "End of totality," says the loudspeaker, and the earth returns to normalcy.

Wars, war, wars! The next time there's a peace conference and they pass around the pipe of peace, I sure hope somebody inhales.

– Judy Canova

We Have the Power to Make Peace

ANNE O'HARE McCORMICK

IT'S hard to be an American these days. We used to think the lot of the American was easy and fortunate. We looked out on the world in the mood of the Pharisee, thanking God we were not as the rest of men, and taking considerable credit to ourselves for our immunity from the ills that beset poorer, more troubled or more backward nations. This feeling reached its peak in the late war when a whole generation of young Americans went abroad and came home blessing the luck that made them citizens of "God's country."

Now we know that being an American is not easy. It's a back-breaking, brain-wracking job. It imposes terrible choices – terrible compulsions, rather, for we are pursued by a destiny we cannot escape.

Just now we are making decisions we cannot retract. The question at issue is not Greece. It is not a $400,000,000 relief program. It is not what kind of government Greece has, or Turkey has, and whether we can improve it by directing how and for what our money shall be spent. It is not a question of "making the world safe for democracy," although anyone who compares President Truman's message to Congress with the speech of Woodrow Wilson as we entered the First World War must be struck with the similarity of the arguments.

All these questions come into the debate, but only as they bear on the new position of the United States in the world. We are weighing our awful responsibility as a – as *the* – great power, the great democracy and the founder of the United Nations. There is nothing else to talk about today because this issue over-rides all others. No matter on what terms we go into Greece, we are taking a fateful step on a new course. We are indeed adopting a doctrine of intervention which staggers the internationalist who thought our whole interna-

---

The President's request to Congress on March 12 for aid to Greece and Turkey received no more thoughtful endorsement than this address by the brilliant editorial writer of the NEW YORK TIMES, *nor have the responsibilities of our power in world affairs been more clearly defined. Mrs. McCormick spoke in Washington before the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, and over the NBC network, on March 29, 1947. The Greek-Turkish aid bill was passed by Congress, and signed by the President on May 22.*

tional duty was to participate in a collective security system.

The crisis that hangs over our heads isn't a Greek crisis. It's an American crisis. In the confusion and agony of judging between risks, of balancing one obligation against another, of seeing ourselves for the first time as making the historic motions instead of seconding them, we have at last grown up. I don't recall another instance, in our history or in the history of any other country, where a whole people were consciously deciding policy.

We are not balking at taking over a task Britain failed in even before she gave it up for lack of means to carry on. Britain has already spent more in Greece than we are asked to give. The United States itself, through UNRRA and direct grants, has spent nearly twice as much as the sum proposed now. All this economic aid has not availed to save the situation.

My own hope is that Britain will stay with us in Greece until the United Nations relieves us both. But this is not what troubles us most. It is characteristic of Americans to believe that we can succeed where the other fellow fails. We don't want to prop up the ruins of empire or governments in bankruptcy, but our reluctance is not due to an inferiority complex. No; the reason the President's message shocked us is that it suddenly showed us exactly where we stand, with nothing between us and whatever danger there is. Wherever the front line is, there are we, exposed and responsible.

IT'S hard to be an American, and it's hard for an American to take over world leadership. Throughout the war we kept repeating that the struggle for peace would be more difficult than the military battle, but we did not really believe it. Since the fighting ceased we have preened ourselves on having learned from experience. In proof of our final conversion from isolationism to internationalism we took the lead in sponsoring and organizing the United Nations. We outdid every other nation in supporting it. We gave it a home. We have treated it more or less as an American institution—and that's what it looks like, don't forget, from Europe, Asia or South America. We told ourselves and everybody else that we meant to base our policy on it.

This was and is our firm intention. It is our first and over-all commitment to ourselves and the world. If the United Nations cannot be built up to take the place of national armies; if an international mind cannot be slowly shaped out of the clash and conflict of national minds; if on this little, brittle globe, in its envelope of danger-infested air, a sense of community cannot be developed out of the knowledge that no man is safe unless all men are safe, then there is no sense in

anything and no hope of peace or human progress.

No American is pessimistic enough to accept the alternative to the United Nations, which is chaos, war or death. No American dare accept it, and neither, I should judge, does Russia, for of all the member states, the United States and the Soviet Union should be the most concerned to strengthen it. Small nations might possibly take shelter behind the great, especially if the world is divided into two rival constellations. But the solar bodies have no shield. If there is war, they will bear the brunt and cost of it. Both would be immeasurably weakened and one irretrievably defeated.

This country cannot afford to assume international obligations except in some sort of association with the United Nations. This is important for the United States and even more important for the United Nations, because the world organization can never achieve authority to take over all international obligations – as eventually it must if it is to fulfill its mission – unless it draws authority from powers that are at present stronger than itself. It can only be strong, in other words, as it is made strong by its members.

It can be argued that it is more desirable for this government to strengthen the United Nations than to strengthen Greece. In the long-range view that is beyond question, and all of us would be opposed to strengthening Greece at the *expense* of the United Nations.

But I do not think that is the choice we face. The choice is between shrugging off or shouldering our responsibility as a great democratic power. Certainly it would be easier to turn the question over to the United Nations. Some of those who protest against "by-passing" the United Nations really want to by-pass the question itself. They want an alibi for inaction, an excuse to do nothing.

Nothing is the one thing we cannot do. We are caught in a tremolo passage in the grand concerto of history, a movement of transition in which old institutions are in process, we hope, of giving place to new. But the movement is as slow and painful to listen to as the practice hour of a child who keeps on playing the first bars of an etude over and over. The United Nations can be invoked, as it should be; it can be associated in action, as it should be; but it does not yet command the funds, the means, the speed, and above all the unity, to enable it to act in an emergency.

And that means that it isn't enough for us to belong to the United Nations. The Greek issue is a turning point precisely because it shows how easily the United Nations, just because it is still young and weak, can become a way of escape – the new refuge of the isolationist, or the refuge of the new isolationist.

THE American dilemma is that we stand as the leader of the democratic forces of the world, and also as the chief architect of an international structure in which opposing systems – democratic, totalitarian and their in-between variants – are supposed to work together. This opposition is the chief source of weakness in the United Nations; if you doubt it, look at the line-ups and the votes and observe how easy it is for the democracies on one side and the Soviet group on the other to reach agreement among themselves.

The first question is: What is the duty of the United States as a democracy? To my mind our paramount obligation is to work for a free world, for one world without freedom would be just one big prison. Surely we have to work to enlarge – or at least to prevent the progressive narrowing of – the area of freedom. To the extent of our power we have to see that as many countries as we can reach – and we *can* reach Greece and Turkey – are left free to choose their own form of government.

The next question is: What do we mean by democracy? Three Americans have lately offered resounding definitions – the President in enunciating a new policy to support free people to resist attempted subjugation; Secretary Marshall in laying down Jeffersonian doctrine before his colleagues at the Moscow Conference; David Lilienthal in reminding Congress of the fundamental principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Despite their different application, the definitions echoed; they prove that Americans have no doubt of the meaning they attach to a word that others use to express something entirely different. But the important thing about these credos is that the speakers felt impelled to make them. No longer can we take for granted, as we did for a long time, that the world accepts our definition, or believes we have the best form of government. We cannot take for granted that anyone else will take a stand for the democratic system unless we do.

Here, I think, we reach the point of decision. We live in a hungry world, a world of want and fear, a world of lost homes, lost values, lost souls. We Americans inhabit a kind of plateau of our own, above the poverty and gloom in which our allies and our former enemies share a common misery. The upper level isn't very safe in these circumstances, and I need not tell you that we aren't greatly loved by the people down below.

We are in danger, moreover, of being left alone on our plateau with the freedoms we consider essential to our national existence. When I was in Europe this winter what worried me more than the physical suffering was the sagging spirit of the democracies. People have to have a minimum ration of bread and work and hope before they begin to care for freedom, and even those who do care are getting tired. Almost everywhere

democratic parties are under attack by a Communist minority that never tires and brings to the political battle the discipline and *elan* of a well-trained army.

The danger is democratic defeatism; the discouragement of democrats, the feeling that the democratic system is somehow obsolete and that the cards are stacked against it in a world too bankrupt to maintain economic freedoms. The many-sided pressures to give up the fight for individual freedom and national independence are almost irresistible. You may be sure that if the leading democracy does not take a stand for democracy, this defeatism will deepen and spread. And that spells disaster for us. Strong as it is, our system cannot function, politically or economically, in splendid isolation, and it may well be isolated unless we help democratic government to survive, not only where it is directly threatened, as in Greece, but where it is weakening, as in France.

If we agree that the United States cannot let democracy wither in the world, the third question is: What is our duty to the United Nations? I see no way out of the American dilemma except to seize both horns at once. We have to use our power to the utmost to support the United Nations and democracy at the same time. It's a job for both hands — and this is one case where the right hand must always see what the left hand doeth! — and a job for both lobes of the brain, for so far in the world affairs we have used all our powers more effectively than our brain power. Senator Austin clarified the question when he said that it is by combining national and international action of both immediate and long-range character, and aimed both at the security and economic aspects of the problem, that the members of the United Nations can advance the cause of collective security.

We have to play the dual role and we have to play it spectacularly, so that no man anywhere can doubt that we believe as ardently in an organized world community, limiting national sovereignty by international law, as we believe in defending and extending human freedom. Surely there is no contradiction there. The more free governments and free men we have the more quickly the United Nations will develop into the bulwark of freedom and justice it must be if it is to become the bulwark of peace. We are trying to create a security system, but at the same time we are creating the world order which that system has to maintain, and if the order is not sound — if it fails to satisfy the conscience and aspirations of mankind — all the ivory towers on the East River cannot make the system endure.

I KNOW no other way to strike out for the long and rocky road to peace except to take the risks and follow the direction we believe will lead to peace. There is risk in

any positive policy. My guess is that the President made a major issue of the Greek crisis to warn the Soviet leaders that they were running into the danger of war. Whether the alarm signal will cause them to stop, look and listen is somebody else's guess. I believe it will buck up democratic forces in Europe and silence doubts as to whether we are going to stay in the war and the world to the end.

But to prevent those doubts from turning into fears that America comes as "protectors" have come before — as imperialists — it is important to carry out simultaneously a whole complex of other international policies, such as making room for displaced persons, supplying materials and opening markets for the projects of other countries, renewing and extending reciprocal trade agreements, insisting on a German settlement that will give hope and the means of self-support to Germany and speed the economic revival of Europe. Helping Greece and Turkey as strategic points of defense puts our motives under suspicion unless this help is part of a great program of general construction.

All Europe is more or less under the same pressure and shaken by the same fears we act to allay in the eastern Mediterranean. Now that we have started being bold, why not be bold in a big way and set in motion a master plan for the resurrection of Europe? Not alone, of course — not as Santa Claus — but as a great country with faith in the future and audacity enough to invest our substance in building it. If we don't gamble greatly on the human race, who shall save it? If we don't gamble greatly on the human race, how shall *we* be saved?

We are too much afraid. We are too much afraid of Communism. It is troublesome as an instrument of Russian expansion, but as a doctrine and way of life it "takes" only among the impoverished, the dispossessed and the frustrated. Not a nation in the world outside of Russia has ever cast a majority vote for this system.

We are too much afraid of Russia. Russia is the biggest and most undeveloped of empires. Victory has weakened it as it has weakened every victor except the United States. The iron curtain is not opaque enough to hide the signs of its postwar crisis. Russia isn't ready to fight, has no will to fight and will back down before any threat of a first-class scrap.

We are too much afraid of war. We are in a period of profound struggle — a contest of ideas, of incompatible systems, of clashing worlds that have never met before, of words that don't mean the same thing and clocks that don't tell the same time. If we once convinced ourselves that this is the only kind of war we're going to fight for years to come, we'd take it in our stride and buckle down to the works of peace.

We are too much afraid of the cost of peace. We don't realize that if wars can be made by words,

as Germany taught us, then peace can be made by words, thoughts, processes of education. When I looked at the rubble of Berlin, I shivered at the power of words. For surely that ruin is less the work of bombs than of the bombardment of words that pulverized the reason and moral sense of a people before it pulverized their cities. I saw then that the atom bomb will not destroy us unless we first destroy ourselves. And when I looked at the Germans, the living ghosts in that awful limbo, I saw that you can never kill your enemy. At the end of all wars you can only live with him. Our problem is to find the way, and surely for Americans, who are part of all the enemies they have fought, that isn't an insoluble problem.

Our problem is to get through to people, to find words that mean the same things in all languages. Peace is one of the words nobody mistakes. But how say it loud enough, so that the Russian people can hear us, for example? The power of the uncommunicated word is nil. Communication is about the most difficult of all our problems. Yet this country has the power to make itself heard and felt. No American dare underestimate that power, for we alone, at this particular moment of history, have the strength, the energy and the means to swing the balance of the world.

NO one else has the power to make peace. And there is where we come in. To sum up what I have been trying to say, I think Americans have no choice but to fight for a civilization that guarantees individual liberty under the reign of law. There can be no peace unless the human being feels secure in his inalienable right to life and liberty. The way to peace is by opening doors – to trade, to people, to communication, to the spread of truth and light, which is the function of UNESCO, and of compassion and justice, which is the function of humanity.

Don't let's mark down or limit our aims. If we need a whole world, we need whole men and women to make it – men and women to whom nothing human is alien, and to whom no man-made problem seems beyond the capacity of men to solve. And don't let's underestimate our power as citizens. It was never so clear as now that public opinion makes policy in this country, and never so clear that this country makes policy for the world.

Yesterday, a fellow jumped in a cab and said, "Drive on, I've just found a place to live!" And the driver said, "Yeah, where is it?" and the guy said, "This is it."

— RED SKELTON

A Birthday Message

PRINCESS ELIZABETH

ON my twenty-first birthday I welcome the opportunity to speak to all the peoples of the British Commonwealth and Empire, wherever they live, whatever race they come from and whatever language they speak.

Let me begin by saying "thank you" to all the thousands of kind people who have sent me messages of good will. This is a happy day for me, but it is also one that brings serious thoughts – thoughts of life looming ahead with all its challenges and with all its opportunities.

At such a time it is a great help to know that there are multitudes of friends all around the world who are thinking of me and who wish me well. I am grateful, and I am deeply moved.

As I speak to you today from Capetown I am 6,000 miles from the country where I was born, but I am certainly not 6,000 miles from home. Everywhere I have traveled in those lovely lands of South Africa and Rhodesia my parents, my sister and I have been taken to the heart of their people and made to feel that we are just as much at home here as if we had lived among them all our lives.

That is the great privilege belonging to our place in the world-wide commonwealth – that there are homes ready to welcome us in every continent of the earth. Before I am much older I hope I shall come to know many of them.

Although there is none of my father's subjects from the oldest to the youngest whom I do not wish to greet, I am thinking especially today of all the young men and women who were born about the same time as myself and have grown up like me in the terrible and glorious years of the Second World War. Will you, the youth of the British family of nations, let me speak on my birthday as your representative?

Now that we are coming to manhood and womanhood, it is surely a great joy to us all to think that we shall be able to take some of the burden off the shoulders of our elders who have fought and worked and suffered to protect our childhood.

We must not be daunted by the anxieties and hardships that the war has left behind for every nation of our commonwealth. We know that these things are the price we cheerfully undertook to pay for the high

---

Her twenty-first birthday found the future Queen of England in Capetown, South Africa. Her address to the British Commonwealth of Nations was heard over the NBC network, April 21, 1947.

honor of standing alone seven years ago in defense of the liberty of the world.

Let us say with Rupert Brooke, "Now God be thanked, who has matched us with His hour."

I am sure that you will see our difficulties in the light that I see them, as the great opportunity for you and me. Most of you have read in the history books the proud saying of William Pitt that England had saved herself by her exertions and would save Europe by her example. But in our time we may say that the British Empire has saved the world first and has now to save itself after the battle is won. I think that is an even finer thing than was done in the days of Pitt, and it is for us who have grown up in these years of danger and glory to see that it is accomplished in the long years of peace that we all hope stretch ahead.

If we all go forward together with an unwavering faith, a high courage and a quiet heart, we shall be able to make of this ancient commonwealth which we all love so dearly an even grander thing — more free, more prosperous, more happy and a more powerful influence for good in the world — than it has been in the greatest days of our forefathers. To accomplish that we must give nothing less than the whole of ourselves.

There is a motto which has been borne by many of my ancestors — a noble motto — "I serve." Those words were an inspiration to many bygone heirs to the throne when they made their knightly dedication as they came to manhood.

I cannot do quite as they did, but through the inventions of science I can do what was not possible for any of them. I can make my solemn act of dedication with a whole empire listening.

I should like to make that dedication now. It is very simple.

I declare before you all that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service and the service of that great imperial family to which we all belong. I shall not have strength to carry out this resolution alone unless you join in it with me, as I now invite you to do. I know that your support will be unfailingly given.

God help me to make good my vow, and God bless all of you who are willing to share it.

VERA VAGUE: Wait till you see the new styles. Women's dresses are getting longer and necklines higher.

HOPE: What will this all lead to, Miss Vague?

VAGUE: Spinsters.

— BOB HOPE

Aggression in Children

A University of Chicago Round Table Discussion

MR. HAVIGHURST: The problem of aggression or hostility in children is a major concern for parents and teachers. The young child is often openly and unashamedly aggressive. He is aggressive long before he knows the difference between right and wrong. Adults are aggressive after they have learned this difference. The child is made aggressive by the prohibitions which parents and teachers use in training him. This is an inescapable part of the process of growing up in a civilized society. The child learns how and when to be aggressive. He may learn to strike people or to go into a temper tantrum or to call names or any of a variety of kinds of behavior which are openly or secretly aggressive. Thus, the problem of aggression in children is a problem of our society, or civilization, as well as of the training and education of children.

Robert J. Havighurst is professor of education, and Dr. Adrian Vander Veer, assistant professor of child psychology, at the University of Chicago. Dr. Arnold Gesell, the author of many books on the problems of children, and a pioneer in this field, is director of the Clinic of Child Development at the Yale School of Medicine. This discussion was broadcast over the NBC network on May 25, 1947.

DR. GESELL: Aggression begins with the birth of the baby, if one thinks of aggression as a more or less angry form of self-assertion. Even a young baby resists restraints and sets up his protests when necessary. Perhaps he is born with something which we later call the spirit of liberty. To understand the origins and the nature of undesirable aggression, we must know how it grows and how it takes shape in the child as the child matures. At fifteen months, the baby has left his crib; he is learning to walk; and he does not like to be held back; he pulls himself free. At eighteen months he may scream and kick and, as you say, throw a tantrum. But let us not be too discouraged. Pick him up as though he were a bundle of rags, with a little lighthearted humor. Struggle dissolves, and he resumes his peaceful activities.

MR. HAVIGHURST: You think of aggression, then, as having a kind of natural history in the life of a child.

DR. GESELL: Exactly. And, having a natural history, we can look at the subject in perspective – we need the perspective of develop-

ment. Let us take that two-year-old child. He is already less aggressive. At two-and-a-half years, however, he has a new awareness of himself and of his possessions. He disputes possession of toys; he grabs the toys of others; he may even kick. On the surface, again, this looks discouraging, but if we do the right thing and do not meet his aggression with aggression, we will find that at the age of three years he has settled down into a stage of relative equilibrium. He is more self-contained, less vigorously self-assertive.

DR. VANDER VEER: I think of aggression in somewhat different terms from what Dr. Gesell does. I look on it essentially as a hostile response to frustration of the child's needs or wishes. In clinical practice we always try to trace the manifestations of the aggression — the biting, the wetting, the soiling, the tantrums — to the frustrations which have caused them and then try to correct those frustrating circumstances in the home.

MR. HAVIGHURST: Dr. Gesell, you say that aggressive behavior is to be expected as a natural part of the process of growing up and that there are natural kinds of aggressive behavior at various ages. But Dr. Vander Veer sees aggression as a response to frustrations imposed by parents and teachers and others. This raises the question of whether aggression is inborn, innate. For example, is there such a thing as a naturally mean child — a child who is going to be mean no matter what we do about it?

DR. GESELL: Of course I am not going to stand for innate depravity in these days; it is a developing concept of aggression which I am holding for. Aggression is the result of at least three factors — inborn temperament, maturity, and experience. These three factors determine the manifestations of aggression.

MR. HAVIGHURST: I would accept the analysis of three factors. I suspect that we would differ in the amount of weight which we put on the factors. I would say that experience or training determines, to a large extent, the forms of aggressive behavior in the child.

DR. GESELL: But we must not forget that adults differ in temperament and that children foreshadow these differences. There is a good-natured, relaxed, sociable adult; there is the restrained, inhibited, tense adult, who prefers solitude to noise and company; and then there is the energetic, assertive, noisy, aggressive individual. These temperamental differences are foreshadowed in babies, in the preschool children, and in the school children.

DR. VANDER VEER: Certainly temperament has something to do with it, but I would like to point out another factor which we have not mentioned in relation to frustration. It is, namely, that the threshold of frustration for a child is a function of his maturity. If we retard his

maturity by certain mistakes in raising him, then we increase his frustrability and therefore his hostile reactions to it. Some of the methods of child-rearing which retard emotional maturation are, for example, bottle-feeding which is prolonged after the age of fifteen months, spoon-feeding of the child after he is a year and a half old, allowing him to sleep in the bed of the parents, or a complete dressing or bathing of the child by the parents after about the age of five.

MR. HAVIGHURST: Why do these retard his development? Is it because he has not learned more mature ways of channeling and formulating his aggressive drives?

DR. VANDER VEER: No, it is not only that; but the more psychologically immature he is, the less he can postpone satisfaction, and the more quickly and the more readily he gets frustrated.

MR. HAVIGHURST: Speaking as an educator and also as a social scientist, it is, of course, natural for me to take the position that the social environment, which operates on the child through the parents, teachers, and so on, teaches the child what kind of behavior is appropriate for his aggressive feelings. I would argue that the boy, for instance, may vent his aggressive emotions in a hard game of some sort, or the girl may take hers out by studying hard to become a leader in her class at school. In these we have fairly desirable ways of organizing and giving vent to one's aggressive feelings.

DR. VANDER VEER: But there are certain kinds of primitive aggressive behavior which the child does not learn. You do not have to teach him to bite or to wet.

MR. HAVIGHURST: I grant that. I am sure that the young child has some natural or "innate" responses to the frustrating circumstances which bring out aggressive impulses. But let us take the problem which all fathers, I think, meet in connection with their sons. Do you think that it is desirable to teach the child to stand up and fight for his rights, especially if he is a boy?

DR. GESELL: Here again is one of those questions which cannot be answered flatly in terms of absolutes – and again because the age of the child makes all the difference in the world. We do not want our children to be "Milquetoasts," but we must respect their immaturity and not try to make them brave and bold beyond their years. A wise parent will probably never call his child a coward or shame him into a sense of unworthiness. A wise father will talk things over with his son, and when his boy reaches the age of nine or ten, this boy generally uses pretty good judgment as to when and whether he will strike out and fight back. But, before that age, discretion is often the better part of valor, and parents should help children to avoid rather than to seek trouble,

and parents should remember also that there is an aspect of withdrawal which must counterbalance self-assertion.

DR. VANDER VEER: At what age does that withdrawal begin?

DR. GESELL: There is a very nice example of it in the case of the seven-year-old child. But, since we are thinking developmentally, we will have to think, at least for perspective reasons, of three ages. I am going to say something briefly about the three ages, five, six, and seven. The five-year-old does not get into too much difficulty on account of aggressive behavior, because he is relatively well adjusted to his home, to his family, and to himself. He does not expect too much; he does not make excessive demands; he tends to be self-dependent and obedient.

The six-year-old, on the other hand, is more explosive. He is more brash; he breaks out with bursts of activity. These b r a s h reactions often have the appearance of aggressive behavior, but they are not necessarily hostile. They are due to new tensions of growth. The child is breaking away from the five-year-old's moorings. He is at the mercy of contradictory impulses. His behavior is rather unpredictable and is certainly inconsistent, because, at one moment, he showers his mother with affection, and, at another moment, he castigates her with aggressive language. Let us note, also, his social approaches to his baby sister. He may be very good to her for a brief period and affectionate, but, the same afternoon, he may also show an awkward type of at least experimental antagonism. This is not true hostility; it is really a form of awkwardness due to his immaturity which must be carefully watched. But he is too young consistently to stand up for his own rights, and he must be managed with the utmost patience.

Now we are back to the seven-year-old. He has himself better in hand. The seven-year-old is much less explosive and less impulsive; he is more reflective; he goes into musing moods; he broods a little bit; and he shows more shyness than brashness. Often he displays a kind of pensiveness which has to me genuine charm when one realizes that now he is more quietly organizing his emotions and inhibitions. You see, there are rhythms of growth which now accentuate negative withdrawal rather than positive aggression. The pendulum has to swing. For this reason, the typical seven-year-old is not too pugnacious. If he gets into a complex situation on the playground, he is not likely to attempt to solve it by physical force. When things go badly, it is rather natural for him to withdraw and to turn his footsteps homeward. Perhaps he mutters as he goes, "Well, I'm quittin'. It's a gyp. It's unfair." That is no time (you were talking about the father, Havighurst) for a father to intervene, urging his boy to fight for his rights. It is no

time to call this boy a coward. This boy is working out his problem in the way which is suited to his stage of maturity. In due course he will acquire the moral fiber which we would like to have him have.

DR. VANDER VEER: It sounds to me, Dr. Gesell, as though you are talking about the child as if he grew up in a vacuum. We have to remember that he grows up in a family situation, and, at the age of six, he is leaving that family situation to form emotional ties to other people – to his teachers and his schoolmates. With the formation of these emotional ties and the breaking-off of his attachment to his mother, he becomes a little freer to express some of the hostile feelings which have been generated in him by previous experiences at home.

MR. HAVIGHURST: Dr. Gesell has suggested, in any case, that by the time a boy is nine or ten he ought to be able to stand on his own feet. Dr. Vander Veer, how would you advise a father who has a boy who is rather shy at the age of nine or ten? Would you advise, for example, that the father should buy boxing gloves and teach the boy to box?

DR. VANDER VEER: No, I am afraid I could not do that, because a father who bought a shy boy boxing gloves at that age would only succeed in making him more shy and more afraid of his own aggressive impulses.

DR. GESELL: Perhaps we could say a word in favor of wrestling here instead of boxing. I am wondering, however, whether aggressive play would not be a very good outlet for some of these problems.

DR. VANDER VEER: There is something which we see in the play of children all through their development. Cops and robbers, click guns, bows and arrows, and so on, give the child a very natural and a very healthy outlet for his aggressive impulses. Also, he finds considerable release in imagination by going to gangster pictures, by hearing wild radio programs, and even by reading the wild comic books – of which I am very much in favor.

MR. HAVIGHURST: I accept the argument as to the desirability of aggressive play, but I do not believe that I can go so far with you on the desirability of the gangster movies, the radio programs portraying criminals, and the like. It seems to me that it is pretty well established that a good many children suffer from nightmares after having been exposed or having exposed themselves to this kind of experience.

DR. VANDER VEER: That is perfectly true. There is a group of children who become quite anxious after seeing aggressive movies. But it has been my experience that if the parents do not try to legislate too strongly the amount of stimulation which the child gets, he is pretty well able to control it himself. He turns off the radio or stays

away from the movie when it begins to frighten him.

MR. HAVIGHURST: You suggest, then, that the parents simply stay out of the picture and let the child dose himself. I would say, as a parent, that it would be a little hard for me to accept that advice, even from a specialist in behavior problems of children. For example, I would find difficulty in accepting that kind of advice because of the fact that it might seem to me that my children were giving too much time to the movies, the radio, and the comic-books to be able to learn to read properly or to spell properly.

DR. GESELL: You are right, for the children in this country need a better-balanced diet. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the violent features of the radio, the comics, and the picture magazines should be reduced a little bit to protect the mental health of the children exposed to their impact. This can be done, however, only through more creative art.

DR. VANDER VEER: I just wonder if either of you gentlemen ever saw a child who could be made to learn to read. And, you know, I have some real questions about whether the more gentle comics which Dr. Gesell advocates will do adequate justice to the really gory fantasies which occupy the minds of children.

MR. HAVIGHURST: I would certainly have to argue that the child cannot be counted upon to solve his own problems of aggression. I would argue that there has to be a certain amount of control on the part of parents, teachers, and others.

DR. VANDER VEER: We could all agree, I think, with that.

MR. HAVIGHURST: We were speaking a few minutes ago about various forms of aggressive behavior. Dr. Vander Veer, as a psychiatrist, you, I think, make a distinction between what you might call "normal" and "abnormal" forms of aggressive behavior. What about some of the abnormal forms?

DR. VANDER VEER: The distinction is not so easy to make. It is more a question of degree and time rather than of kind. I would say that a form of aggression is abnormal when it exceeds the average for the child's age or when it indicates the carrying-over of an immature form of aggressive response into later years. For example, a child who bites after three is behaving abnormally for a three-year-old; and his biting is probably related to forced feeding or sudden weaning earlier in his life. It is similar with a child who wets or soils after four. He probably has been forcefully toilet-trained or toilet-trained too early in life. The same goes for violent temper tantrums after the age of six, which frequently reflect tantrums in the parents. Or it is also true of truancy or dislike for school and even

of stealing, which may express the wish for a bigger allowance but often also a need for more affection.

MR. HAVIGHURST: Some of these kinds of behavior would certainly not be recognized as the results of aggressive feelings in the children, but I take it that all these more abnormal forms of behavior would require some kind of outside help. That is, the parents would not be able to handle problems of this sort alone.

DR. VANDER VEER: Yes, I think that parents do not seek outside help as often as they could use it. It seems to me that specialized help is needed whenever the child becomes a problem to himself, his parents, his school, or his playmates and when common-sense measures have not corrected the difficulty. There is quite a variety of sources of help which the parent can seek. He can go to a child psychiatrist or to a child guidance clinic, or he can seek advice from his pediatrician. If he is fortunate enough to live in a community which has a good social agency, he may go to the social agency for help or to the school psychologist or to a guidance counselor at school. The kind of help which he will get will vary, of course, a good deal. But there will be one common characteristic in all these sources of help – namely, that the parents will not be criticized for mistakes which they have made with the child, because they will have made these mistakes out of ignorance or emotional difficulties of their own.

MR. HAVIGHURST: There is another motive or driving force in human behavior just as powerful as aggression – that is, love. Love and affectionate behavior appear in the child's life almost as early as aggression does. The child experiences the pleasure of loving and being loved very early in life and from then on. Should we not say that human living is a delicate balance between the aggressive tendencies and the loving, affectionate, cooperative tendencies?

DR. VANDER VEER: Yes, to be sure. And if we reduce to a minimum the frustrations which are inherent in any child-rearing practice, then we will find that the child's capacity to love is freed of restraint. A child, for example, whose basic needs for love, food, and, particularly, being respected as an individual are well satisfied in his home has little need to be aggressive if his parents respect his own tempo of development and are predictable and reliable in their relations with him.

MR. HAVIGHURST: That is, in the course of the parental training of the child, you believe that it is possible to cut down a great deal on the amount of frustration and, therefore, to cut down on the

amount of aggressive behavior which the child is likely to show.

DR. VANDER VEER: Yes, that is true. And I also think that the necessary frustration should be introduced gradually into the child's life. Weaning ought to be spread out over a period of several months; toilet-training, over a period of two years; and it is most important that the child not be expected to accommodate to more than one training procedure at a time.

I would like to say a last word on discipline, maybe. When one considers discipline, it should be considered as what it should really be, not as punishment for wrongdoing or as an outlet for the parent's angry feelings but as a way of helping the child to control himself.

DR. GESELL: As for the matter of discipline, let us remember this simple doctrine – that aggression excites aggression, and gentleness breeds gentleness – and that takes care of that fundamental factor of affection.

But you have raised a rather mighty question here as to whether the culture can control excessive aggression. Can we stop war, which is, by common consent, the greatest failure of our civilization? We cannot hope to prevent war without political, economic, and technological controls. But, to achieve fundamental control, we must reach the psychological level in which wars have their origin. Our American culture often puts excessive stress on fierce competition and strife. We must say, I think, that our radio, our motion pictures, our comics, are often too violent, too noisy, too furious. Surely there is much room for gentler forms of art which will hold a better mirror up to life. We need more artists who will use their genius to reveal the mental world of the child to himself, guiding him into more genial pathways, so that he will learn sympathy through humor, and affection through works of beauty projected on the screen and on the air and on the pages of his books.

Perhaps, after all, wars begin in the relationships between the minds of adults and children. There is one magnificent experiment which the race has not yet achieved. We have not yet tried to reach the growing minds of children on a grand scale and in such a way that war will become impossible because it is unthinkable.

We need all the resources of science, of the humanities, and of religion, but, above all, we need a science of child development, so that we may guide intelligently the growth of anger and fear and self-assertion in the rising generation. If we provide wise guidance, we can hope to control hostile aggressions and war at their psychological source.

Johnny Appleseed

JACK WILSON

THIS is a springtime story . . . a story the spring breezes begin to whisper out in the Alleghenies of Western Pennsylvania . . . they murmur about it when they meet at dusk in the valleys of Ohio . . . and they sigh about it on a spring morning as they wander over the greening fields of Indiana. Yes, the winds of March are glad that spring is here again . . . but they're still lonesome for the friendly leaves. And as they wait for the leaves to return, they remember springs of long ago . . . and they remember the story that my Dad used to tell to me about Jonathan Chapman. He's dead these hundred years – yes, just exactly a hundred years, come next summertime. You won't find his name in the history books, nor the encyclopedias – most of them anyway.

Jonathan Chapman was the man they called Johnny Appleseed – a man who became a legend, a legend that lives on in our time. Maybe you thought that Johnny Appleseed was just a myth – a story to be told. But he was real enough, and what he did was really something. Maybe you've never even heard of Johnny Appleseed. Well, time was when he was known in every log cabin from the Ohio River to the Northern Lakes, and westward way out to the prairies of what they now call Indiana . . .

No one can tell you the truth and the whole truth about Johnny Appleseed, and I can only tell you what I've heard. But it's true that he was born up Boston way in 1775, and his folks took him on the long trip to Pittsburgh, back when people were starting to move west. He stayed there for a while and watched the settlers pushing on westward . . . moving westward on the wilderness rivers and over the wilderness trails.

As they faded from sight, Johnny's mind saw even past the horizon. Somehow he caught a

---

The printed page does not quite do justice to this bit of American folklore. It was written to be recited with background music and a sprinkling of old-time songs – the "Ballad of Johnny Appleseed," "Beautiful Ohio" and "The Banks of the Wabash." The author is a member of NBC's Script Division. He and his associates turn out five stories a week – of which this was one – for the morning program, "Once Upon Our Time." Jack Kilty, whom thousands have seen and heard as Curley in the musical hit "Oklahoma," does the reciting and singing.

glimpse of all those wooded hills and valleys and all those rolling plains that were to be America. He saw the winding roads, the lonesome clearings, and the far-flung farms of a vast country. It must have been in spring – it must have been on a spring night when the air was filled with the scent of apple blossoms, and the moonlight gleamed on the blossoming apple trees, that Johnny saw his vision . . . . a vision of a flowering wilderness, a land of orchards.

Oh, I don't know. Perhaps there'd been a tree he loved . . . an apple tree back home when he was little. And when he saw children and children yet unborn growing up on far-off farms, he simply felt that everyone should have a tree, every home an orchard. At any rate he set out for the first time on a journey – carrying with him appleseeds.

It was a long, hard trip – carrying appleseeds to the western frontier. How long? Well, he was a strong young man in his twenties then, and his travels lasted until his beard was white and he was bent with the weight of seventy-two years. Yes, for almost half a century he walked alone over the country-side . . . pausing at every log cabin and every farm-house to plant his seeds. And where settlers were few and far-between, he sought out the open spaces that border the creeks . . . and there planted orchards that belonged to everyone.

In early years his wanderings were through Ohio – and there this spring his work will be rewarded when it's apple blossom time again, although no man now alive will remember Johnny's visits, except as he remembers the stories old folks told when he was a child.

As America turned further west, so did Johnny Appleseed. He was a strange yet familiar figure now – in tattered clothes, a make-shift hat, and barefoot, like as not. He traveled light and took food and shelter where he found it. There was never a cent in his pocket – but he always carried his leather bags of appleseeds and his dream. He was strange-looking and wild in his ways, but no one laughed at him. If nothing else they remembered the dreadful days when the Indians had set out in vengeful fury . . . Indians ready to strike swiftly and cunningly at the unprotected. And it was Johnny Appleseed – knowing every Indian sign – who ran through the heat of the sun and through the moonlit night spreading the alarm, pushing on without rest until every settler was warned. But now civilization was closing in, so once again he turned his face to the setting sun. He pushed on and on – across Indiana now – scattering his apple seeds as he went. Along rivers and creeks they took root and grew . . . and there are apple blossoms, too, in the moonlight out where the Wabash flows . . .

Yes, for half a century Johnny Appleseed followed the streams, plunged through the forests and

walked the roads of what was then frontier America. He seemed to become part of the countryside itself. Johnny would be gone a long time – be nearly forgotten – then reappear as suddenly as the buds blossom in springtime.

It was in summer just a hundred years ago – it was a hot summer day that found him plodding along a dusty road moving west toward Fort Wayne. The going was slow, for here and there he had to stop at a roadside orchard to visit for a moment with his old friends, many of them now huge, spreading trees gnarled by time themselves, but surrounded proudly by young apple trees which would carry on when they were gone. Even so he walked his twenty miles before he stopped at a friendly farmhouse. They were proud to have him there and offered him their best, but it was a warm, star-filled night and Johnny insisted on sleeping out of doors.

Usually he was gone before the mists of morning cleared – but this time he slept late – for he was an old man and he was very tired. They found him there in the morning and on his face was a radiance brighter than the spring dawn. There was a gentle smile, for in the night the breeze had blown from the orchard on the hill. It had whispered, "Come along, Johnny. You can't walk any further. But come along with me and we'll visit your apple trees wherever they are." So Johnny had smiled . . . and his spirit followed the summer breeze . . .

And so when springtime comes even in our time, Johnny Appleseed sets out again to make his rounds. He travels even lighter now as he follows the trail of flowering apple trees. And they say that on a spring night, that soft blue mist you see that blows down the valleys and hangs along the hills is smoke from Johnny's campfire.

Garden Stuff

A garden is like a little cross-section of life, a tiny city in itself. See those ants over there? Probably just coming home from a hard day's work at the eggplant.

– Bob Burns

Kay: This morning I went out and planted some potatoes with a hammer.
Verne: What kind of potatoes can you plant with a hammer?
Kay: Mashed potatoes.

– Kay Kyser

A brussels sprout is a cabbage after the withholding tax has been deducted.

– Abbott and Costello

Displaced Persons—Do We Want Them?

An "America United" Discussion

MODERATOR: Two years after the war, there are still some 850 thousand people in Europe who live in detention camps. These men, women and children are the displaced persons—the survivors of the Nazi concentration camps, and they represent many countries and almost all religions. The United Nations established the International Refugee Organization to deal with the displaced persons problem, but the IRO cannot solve the problem unless the immigrant-receiving countries make special provisions to receive a fair share of displaced persons.

Representative Stratton introduced a bill in Congress this week providing that 100 thousand displaced persons be admitted into the United States each year during the next four years.

Participating in this discussion were Representative William G. Stratton of Illinois; Robert J. Watt, American Federation of Labor; Julia Fiebeger, U. S. Chamber of Commerce; and Russell Smith, National Farmers' Union. They were heard over the NBC network on Easter Sunday, April 6, 1947.

Congressman Stratton, why was special legislation in the form of your bill necessary to permit entry of these people? Couldn't they enter legally by virtue of the immigrant quotas which remained unfilled during the war?

MR. STRATTON: No, these quotas lapse when they are not used at the end of each year. They are not cumulative. So consequently there is no way that those quotas can be used after the time has elapsed. To help these people we had to write special legislation.

MODERATOR: Mr. Smith, do you feel the farmers would oppose the entry of 100 thousand displaced persons a year?

MR. SMITH: I am afraid they would right now. Somebody first would need to explain to them why it was necessary to take such a step. If the facts were taken to them, I think probably they would support it.

MODERATOR: Mr. Watt, perhaps you can give us some of those facts in relation to this problem of displaced persons.

MR. WATT: As you said, there are approximately 850 thousand displaced persons who cannot or will not return home for various rea-

sons. There are Greeks and Baltics, Czechs, Poles, Jugoslavs. I believe they represent about 20 different nationalities. There are approximately 100 thousand Protestants, 500 thousand Catholics, and 250 thousand Jews.

MODERATOR: Congressman Stratton, can you fill in for us briefly on what your bill would do to accomplish this purpose?

MR. STRATTON: My bill would permit 400 thousand out of these approximately 850 thousand displaced persons to enter this country, over a period of four years; and during those four years no more than 100 thousand per year.

Now, in addition to letting these people in, this bill insists that they must still meet the standards set up under our present immigration laws. By that I mean: they must be people that have no contagious disease; they are mentally and morally sound; and in addition, they must not be public charges when they get here – in other words, they must have a way to support themselves. They must have some sponsor and there must be some arrangement for them to live after they reach this country.

In addition to that, I would like to point out that this 400 thousand figure is considerably less than the number that would have come in during the past five years under present quotas if it hadn't been for wartime conditions. In other words, this isn't a great departure from our immigration standards. We are not trying to open the country, to flood it with immigrants.

MR. WATT: But outside of any other reasons we may have, sentimental or otherwise, Congressman, isn't this a good investment? How much is it costing the Government of the United States now to maintain the displaced persons?

MR. STRATTON: It runs into the millions of dollars – well over a hundred million at present either directly or indirectly. And I am glad you made that point, Mr. Watt; because these people will not be brought over here at government expense. There are agencies set up, various private agencies, who will see that these people are brought over and will give them adequate homes.

MR. WATT: But these people are workers, are they not, too?

MR. STRATTON: Yes, they will contribute something. This isn't a charitable proposition. These people have always contributed in times past to building up our country. And certainly any of these people who have survived these terrors, who stood up against aggression, whether Naziism or Communism, certainly are people that we need over here. They are people of character, people who can stand up against adversity, and I believe lead decent, useful lives in this country.

MISS FIEBEGER: Congressman Stratton, the Chamber of Commerce has

not yet adopted a policy on this particular subject because Chamber policies are adopted by a very democratic process that takes some time. It does, however, have a long-standing policy in support of the quota principle of the immigration laws. Would your bill change that principle?

MR. STRATTON: The quota system has not been used, you see, during the war years. It was on the books but these people couldn't take advantage of it during those years. And actually this is temporary legislation and in no way changes the quota system.

MR. WATT: From a purely business point of view we are faced, it seems to me, with a fairly simple problem. We have 850 thousand displaced persons on our hands. We are paying for their upkeep. Do we decide to leave them in those dreary, miserable camps all over Europe, or do we decide to join with other nations in providing an opportunity for those people to live like decent folks? That is the problem, as I see it.

MR. SMITH: Bob, let me take another piece of that same question, and that is whether our economy can absorb these people. If I am not mistaken, the general estimate is that we need 59 million jobs to provide full employment, jobs for everyone. If you take 400 thousand more jobs and add them on to 59 million, I don't think you can tell the difference. In other words, if we are going to have full employment we are going to have it, and if we are going to have a depression, we are going to have it, whether we let these people in or not.

MR. STRATTON: I would like to point out that some of these people would be children. I get your point, but it doesn't mean, when you let 400 thousand in, that that automatically means there are going to be 400 thousand jobs right there. Because some of these people have families, and one worker will be supporting a wife and so many children, you see.

MR. WATT: And the record shows that over 50 per cent of the displaced persons are women and children. In fact, there are 150 thousand children below the age of 17. And of these, 70 thousand are estimated to be under six years of age.

MR. STRATTON: I would like to point out in that respect that my bill gives priority to people who are relatives of United States citizens, or who are relatives of people who served in the United States armed forces.

MR. WATT: You see, there is opposition – let's not disregard it – in this country to this type of a plan. We found that out when the American Federation of Labor at their recent convention in Chicago unanimously recommended that we approve the immediate entry of immigrants composed of displaced

persons in Europe without changing in any way the existing immigration laws. However, since that time opposition has developed on the basis that many of these people may have ideologies which would be foreign to our American concept. I am personally of the opinion that that is bunk. And I will tell you why: These 850 thousand provide the hard core of people who have demonstrated their dislike for dictatorship; not only the Nazi form of dictatorship, if you please, but the red kind of dictatorship which we know as Communism. I am convinced that there are very, very few people among the 850 thousand displaced persons who have not demonstrated that they are fighters against dictatorship and totalitarianism.

MR. STRATTON: That is right; plus the fact that under this bill they would still have to be screened and meet the requirements of the present immigration laws, which will not let anyone in who does not believe in our American system of Government.

MR. SMITH: What is the responsibility of the United States, Congressman? That is one thing that our people are certain to ask. Not just to save money; but otherwise, why should we do this?

MR. STRATTON: The big responsibility we have is that we have taken the lead in endeavoring to keep these people out of the satellite countries and out of Russia. Russia would like to have them come back to Poland and Latvia and Lithuania and Yugoslavia. But these people fear persecution if they go back to these countries; and probably rightfully so.

MR. WATT: After all, those are the people who have demonstrated, over a considerable period of years, that religious and political freedom is more important to them than even security. Those are the people who have demonstrated all of the traits that have made America great; who have made the great sacrifice. And it seems to me that outside of the need to get rid of the huge cost, that is running between 150 and 200 million dollars a year for the maintenance of those displaced persons, we have a responsibility to repay those people for the fortitude they have shown and the fight they have made for many years.

MR. STRATTON: And the longer they stay in these camps, just that much faster are these people bound to lose their morale and to go down. A large portion of them can be salvaged today if you give them that hope of leading decent lives under a free system of government. But the longer they stay cooped up in those camps, that much more of them you are going to lose, because they will become just human derelicts.

MISS FIEBEGER: I was reading about those two boatloads of Baltic refugees coming to Florida. Are there

more people, among the displaced persons, of that type?

MR. STRATTON: There are many of them of that type. In fact, the Baltic countries are, next to Poland, the largest suppliers of these people. Esthonia, Lithuania, and Latvia have, next to the Polish, the largest single group.

MR. WATT: And as a matter of fact, Congressman, won't you admit that what they call the IRO, the International Refugee Organization, will not work unless our country assumes its full responsibility?

MR. STRATTON: Unless we do our share of it; that is right. In other words, we should take this many people, give them this opportunity, and then I think other countries will come along with us on that basis; the British, for instance.

MR. WATT: What actually happened in the establishment of the IRO is quite similar to what has been happening in the establishment of practically every other international agency. The USSR, the Soviet Union, got in on the preliminary work of it. They weakened it. They argued. And finally, when they were convinced it wouldn't work, they said, "Well, we are not going to join anyway. You go ahead and make it work." It is an old technique, and it is one, of course, that our people are becoming more aware of.

MR. SMITH: What you said awhile ago, Congressman, struck a chord for me: about these people growing more and more useless if they stay in these camps. It seems to me to illustrate what a fantastic sort of a world we have gone into since the war. After the war we had a right to expect that we had cleaned up one mess and now we were going ahead into a period of abundance and prosperity. Instead, we seem to be in a period where some human beings are supposed to be useless. And I don't believe that.

I think this is one positive decision we can make and one firm step we can take – in a period which is confusing and difficult. We say we are in the atomic age. We have just discovered the secret of the sun's power. Yet we don't know what to do with it. We are much more afraid of it than we are rejoiced about it. And it seems to me that one thing we must do is to remember that each one of these persons is a human being, and he is valuable. He is not just a problem.

MR. STRATTON: That is right. The policies we have always followed in this country have led us to welcome that sort of person. It has happened after every major disaster in Europe – after the Irish famine, the German revolution in the 1840's.

MR. SMITH: You know, down here on Lafayette Square we have a cor-

ner dedicated to a great man of different nationality who helped us gain our independence, Kosciusko. And in a sense, I suppose you could say we were just repaying a debt if we take these people in.

MR. WATT: I think that the 850 thousand who are left represent the cream of people who believe in basic freedoms. If they weren't, they would have been sent back to where they came from. As a matter of fact, every person from Lithuania, Esthonia, Latvia, Poland or any other country is a person who values his freedom more than he does his security. Because after all UNRRA, even when it was under American leadership, did everything that it possibly could to persuade those people – and I mean "persuade" in more ways than one – to go back to Russia and other lands. And they have refused. Therefore I think they would be a real asset.

MR. STRATTON: Many of these people flocked into the American occupation zones when our armies moved in. We, the Americans, were the only people they had confidence in. That was the only place they felt they would be respected and their beliefs would be respected. That is why they flocked into the occupation zones in Germany and Austria.

MR. SMITH: Another thing our people would be interested in, Congressman, is the question of whether some of these people are fascists who have simply fled for protection. I take it the screening process would insure against that.

MR. STRATTON: Absolutely. In other words, we don't want any people of that stripe in this country, fascists or communists, who believe in some other form of government, one that doesn't recognize the dignity of the human individual as we do.

MODERATOR: We have been speaking of the responsibility of the United States. A number of people would like to know what other countries have been doing in the same direction; England, for example.

MR. WATT: I believe that from the discussions which took place in the IRO, the International Refugee Organization, none of the other countries will do much that is worthwhile until such time as the United States assumes the leadership and does something about this problem. I am sure the Congressman will agree with me on that statement.

MR. STRATTON: Definitely.

MODERATOR: What percentages of the various skills of workers, Mr. Watt, do you think there are in these 850 thousand?

MR. WATT: To the best of our knowledge, there are approximately 77 thousand agricultural workers, and some 20 thousand domestic servants. The others are skilled workers. There are some professionals, and some business people.

To come back to your other question, Mr. Ludlam – what we do, I repeat, will have a great deal to do with what other countries do. Because everyone admits that the IRO itself cannot even begin tackling this problem unless all the countries, which over a long period of years have received immigrants, work out arrangements and make special provisions to absorb a certain percentage of those immigrants themselves.

MODERATOR: How would we handle these people as regards housing? Do you think there is going to be an overflow or will they all be housed by relatives or friends?

MR. STRATTON: They would have to be housed by relatives, friends or interested organizations, who would guarantee that when they brought them over here. In other words, we don't plan on bringing over people to be public charges or to keep American citizens here out of housing accommodations.

MODERATOR: Mr. Smith, I think it has been shown – in immigrations of large quantities of people at one time – that a number of them are prone to settle in the metropolitan areas. Have we any organizations that can channel these people into parts of the country where they can do the most good; say, as farm workers? Can we get them out of the city and into the country?

MR. SMITH: Under the Congressman's bill, the operation of the channels would be almost automatic, I take it. If it were not done by an organization – and there are organizations that would sponsor them – then it would be done by individuals.

MR. STRATTON: Well, this provision of the bill would merely give the people the opportunity to come in here. The Government itself would not accept responsibility for their care or feeding or housing.

MR. WATT: Under the present immigration laws of the nation?

MR. STRATTON: That is it, exactly. We are taking them off a relief status over there and allowing them to come in and stand on their own feet. And there are many organizations, running into the hundreds, that want to help these people if they have an opportunity to do it.

LANG: Pardon me, clerk. I want to get some invisible hairnets for my wife.

COSTELLO: Okay. Here you are. That will be two dollars.

LANG: Are you sure these hairnets are invisible?

COSTELLO: Invisible? Brother, I've been selling them all morning and we've been out of them for two weeks.

– ABBOTT AND COSTELLO

Asia's Role in World Affairs

Ambassadors from China and India Discuss Foreign Policy

DR. KOO: The greatest threats to peace in the world today are political instability, economic distress and social disorders. These are factors which create or intensify fear, discontent and chaos. The indefinite continuance of such conditions is bound to endanger peace and freedom throughout the world. In this connection I recall the wise words of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, in his speech on the United States foreign policy last October: "I do not believe that any responsible official of any government wants war. The world has had enough of war. The difficulty is that, while no nation wants war, nations may pursue policies or courses of action which lead to war. Nations may seek political and economic advantages which they cannot obtain without war. This is why if we wish to avoid war, we must try to avoid not only war but things which lead to war."

Chinese Ambassador Wellington Koo and India's first ambassador to the United States, Asaf Ali, took part in this discussion on the program entitled "Our Foreign Policy," conducted each week by Sterling Fisher, Director of the NBC University of the Air. Broadcast over the network June 7, 1947.

Although the world has just overthrown the Axis powers of the East and the West bent upon aggression and conquest, not all the members of the community of nations seem to have learned the lesson. Some countries seem to be pursuing a sinister policy of expansion and domination and in pursuit of that policy they seek to prolong the unsettled conditions and prevent the early rehabilitation and reconstruction which alone can restore the world to security, peace and prosperity.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Asaf Ali, do you consider the same factors threats to peace?

MR. ASAF ALI: The human motives which have tended to become the worse menace to the world's peace in the past are the tendencies of organized powers to impose their way of life on others, and to try to dominate the weaker nations with a view to exploiting the resources of poorly defended countries. I may sum it all up as the human failing which inclines those who are in a position to do so to follow the policy of "grab whatever you can." This tendency, in my opinion, is held by India as the greatest threat to world peace, and it may be traceable among the aggressive elements of any part of the world. If human conscience, which

has been awakened by the catastrophic results of the last two devastating wars, asserts itself through the United Nations Organization, we may hope to keep this menacing element of human nature within controllable bounds, and thus expect to eliminate, or at least keep in check, the possibility of another cataclysmic disturbance of the world's peace.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Asaf Ali, what sort of lead does India hope for from this country?

MR. ASAF ALI: The last war brought the United States to the footlights of the international stage in more ways than one, just as it brought some other countries, especially Russia, before the world's eyes. Again, in spite of the disastrous consequences of the last two wars, the United Kingdom still carries the prestige of an experienced European power with a consistent history of some centuries behind it, while the other great powers which have so far been recognized by the United Nations are China and France, while India is still bringing up the rear. It would be nearer the mark if I said that in my country the United States and Russia are regarded as the two outstanding giants who can play a decisive role in the postwar world.

MR. FISHER: Yes, and what we should be interested in knowing, Mr. Ambassador, is what your countrymen think that role may be.

MR. ASAF ALI: A very great deal depends on how these two giants are going to adjust their relationship between themselves, and to what extent they will be guided by the judgment of the United Nations. In any case, the United States fills a role in the postwar world which can be of the utmost importance in shaping human destiny. The United States has been granted a great abundance of material, scientific, political, and moral resources.

It would, therefore, be only reasonable for any peace-loving people who want an orderly settlement of the world's problems to expect the United States to give a lead to the postwar world in the moral, the economic and the political field. Again, it would not be unreasonable to expect a similar lead from the other great powers to the extent of their influence in the postwar world. In any case it is my firm conviction that India will not be found wanting in extending the fullest cooperation to the United States and to the other powers of the world in all the three fields I have mentioned.

DR. KOO: Not only China but all Asia looks to this country to lead the world in striving together for advancing the cause of peace, freedom, justice and prosperity. The United States has today reached an almost incomparable position of power, success and greatness in the family of nations. With this position goes inseparably a responsibility for leadership in the postwar world.

To achieve the objective sin-

cerely desired by the peoples of all countries, the world must be first placed upon a moral foundation. The principles of international law and justice must be upheld, not as convenient instruments for propaganda, as practiced by some countries, but as a firm basis of relations between nations. Loyalty to covenants, respect for the pledged word, and, as General Marshall recently stressed, the diffusion of truth, are principles which should guide all nations in their mutual intercourse.

With the exception of the United States and the very few countries which remained neutral during the recent war, the world as a whole is economically sick. Before the wheels of the world's economy can be made to run smoothly again, the existing economic ills must first be remedied. Here the tremendous economic power of the United States should be able to play its vital role of aid and assistance in order to restore and promote the economic well-being of the freedom-loving peoples. The economic aspect of the world's problem is closely related to its political aspect.

MR. FISHER: Will you tell us what you think China believes about the United Nations? Do you believe it is maturing towards the point where it can guarantee security and peace to the world? And if you do, what do you think are the most important points to be decided to reach this goal?

DR. KOO: The people of China believe in the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter because, as recently stated by the Chinese Prime Minister, General Chang Chun: "What China sincerely hopes to see in the field of foreign relations is a peaceful, righteous, friendly and cooperative world. . . . In the interest of world peace, China will exert her utmost to increase mutual understanding and harmony among her war time allies." In the view of China, the United Nations Organization is still in the period of growth from infancy to adolescence and maturity.

MR. FISHER: Do you mean it is not sophisticated enough to handle adult problems?

DR. KOO: It has still to perfect its machinery and provide itself with the necessary teeth before it can effectively guarantee security and peace to the world. Thus, the Security Council must work out a satisfactory solution of such problems as the control of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction; the organization of an international police force, together with the establishment by agreement with the different member states of military bases and facilities for use against any act of aggression or threat to world peace. The Council must also be able to reach agreement on the question of the reduction of armaments in general, and an effective system of inspection and control in particular.

MR. FISHER: I think in examining the role of Asia in the world today we must necessarily consider Japan. For instance, before she was defeated, Japan was unquestionably a strong, stabilizing power in the Far East. Obviously she is no longer in that position. Is such a power in Asia necessary?

DR. KOO: Stability is needed in the Far East, as it is in other parts of the world. But that does not mean that any single nation should become a dominant power, and, as President Chiang Kai-Shek has said more than once: "China does not wish for the unworthy mantle of Japan." China believes in international cooperation for the maintenance of security and peace.

MR. FISHER: Currently there is talk of a loan by the United States to China. I would like to ask you the grounds on which China rests her case for such a loan. For instance, do similar reasons to those we advanced for the Greek-Turkish loan apply in the case of China?

DR. KOO: China is desirous of obtaining financial aid from the United States in order to hasten her economic recovery and increase her agricultural and industrial production. For only with such increased production can trade between China and the United States be more rapidly developed and a valuable contribution be made to world prosperity. She has no intention of utilizing any aid from abroad for political purposes, such as balancing her budget. Such budgetary deficits will be met by a policy of retrenchment as regards non-productive expenditures, by measures to increase the revenue of the Treasury, and by the sale of many of the present government-operated industrial plants and mills. China is anxious to expedite her economic development also because of the fact that in the global defense of world peace she occupies one of the most strategic fronts. The sooner she builds up her strength, the quicker will she be able to make her full contribution to the stabilization of world conditions and the advance of world prosperity.

MR. FISHER: I want to drop back to the question of Japan, for a moment, Dr. Koo. During the war she had an effective propaganda slogan: Asia for the Asians. Has that slogan left any after-effects? Is it tending to draw Asia away from the principle of One World —say, in the direction of an Asia isolated from other continents in order to work out her own problems and her own destiny?

DR. KOO: Mr. Fisher, this phrase simply means that the Asiatic people must bear a primary responsibility for their home continent. The underlying principle is no less sound than that of Pan-Americanism where the peoples of North, Central and South Americas believe in their primary responsibility for the welfare of the western hemisphere.

Japan, knowing the natural sen-

timents of Asiatic peoples, made a sinister use of it as a propaganda slogan to further her design of domination and conquest. Her thinly disguised trick was transparent to the freedom-loving peoples of Asia, especially the Chinese people. With a few exceptions among the diverse nations of the Asiatic continent, the Japanese slogan did not succeed in fooling many people. Today one may say that the sentiment of "Asia for the Asians" remains, but only in the sense that they acknowledge that a greater measure of responsibility falls upon the people of Asia for the welfare and future of their own continent than upon peoples from other parts of the world.

MR. FISHER: As you know, Dr. Koo, one of our basic economic beliefs is in freedom of enterprise. The success of that doctrine depends, in part at least, on overseas markets. Does Asia believe that such a system is suitable for her and can raise her standard of living and give her industrial development? This, I think, is a very important question with us.

DR. KOO: In China – and also in many other parts of Asia – the spirit of free enterprise is deep-rooted. Thus the Persian, the Parsee, and the Chinese merchant are well known for their enterprise and skill in trade from time immemorial. As regards China, while the government will continue to own and operate most of the railroads and telegraph communications and some heavy industries, especially those connected with national defense, private ownership will be encouraged to control the remaining bulk of other industries and business enterprises. The people of China for centuries have been taking care of their means of livelihood without depending much upon assistance from their government, and no doubt they will continue to prefer the traditional system of free enterprise and accept only a limited measure of state ownership or control.

MR. FISHER: I'd like to ask you, Mr. Asaf Ali, what does Asia consider to be the most important contribution she can make to the concept of "One World?"

MR. ASAF ALI: It is universally recognized that Asia has been through uncounted ages the cradle of the spiritual and material developments which have deeply influenced the structure of human civilization. Whether you take the ancient Egyptian religions based on the conception of a single creator and ruler of this universe in the name of Amen Ra or Amen Aten, or Confucianism, Buddhism, Brahmanical Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism, or Islam – whether in the original and pristine form or in their subsequent variations – all of them owe their genesis to the great thinkers and prophets who rose in Asia. The primary object of all these religions appears to have been the hewing down of all barriers between men

and men, and knitting the whole of humanity into one moral fabric. All other religions, whether of Greek or Roman origin, appear to have been based on a conception of segmentary racialism.

Asia has always endeavored to conceive in her purer thought, that the whole of mankind should be regarded as one family, which is the cardinal principle from which alone the concept of "one world" can arise. But the concept of "one world" today goes further in its totality, because we find — after the shrinkage of time and distance — that the economic structure of this planet, and the distribution of human beings around the globe, are so connected with one another that happenings in one part of the world cannot leave the other parts unaffected. What important contributions Asia will make to the development of this concept will depend on what the rest of the world is prepared to receive from Asia.

MR. FISHER: I think, Mr. Asaf Ali, we'd be interested in what you think we might be prepared to receive.

MR. ASAF ALI: I may hazard a guess that Asia's most important contribution should, in its last analysis, be a judicious harmonization of the material and the moral resources of this world for the ever progressive benefit of the entire human race. Perhaps I may conclude my answer by reminding you of Asia's greatest contribution to the western world, which is contained in these words of Jesus Christ: "I bring unto you a new commandment that ye love one another," and these words were and are meant for the whole of humanity; if only the momentary intoxication of power will permit success-drunk human beings to heed these words.

BITTERSWEET

"Why not give the radio audience a break and cut this 'corn' off the air permanently? These comedians, who seem to get more enjoyment out of their programs than do the listeners, could be replaced with some more entertaining programs."

— NBC listener in Baltimore, Md.

"I want to thank you for many happy hours spent listening to your excellent programs. You are to be congratulated on the choice of the best talent in the field of radio, screen and theater."

— NBC listener in New York City

"Laughter oft is but an art"

MARY: Jack, how do you like my new perfume?

JACK: Swell! What kind is it, Mary?

MARY: Oh, it's some new perfume called "Get away from me, boys—I'm going steady."

—JACK BENNY

•

VERA VAGUE: Mr. Hope, those eastern fellas are quite cultured, I had a date with one during our New York trip. We spent the evening discussing books, music and art . . . but in the last minute he tried to kiss me.

BOB: In the last minute? What did you do about it, Miss Vague?

VERA: Gave him five minutes more.

—BOB HOPE

•

GERANIUM: I sure wish I had money.

JUDY: Geranium, you ought to know that money doesn't always bring happiness.

GERANIUM: No, ma'am, but if you've got money, you can pick out the kind of misery you enjoy the most.

—JUDY CANOVA

•

COSTELLO: This morning I woke up with the feeling that I'd like to take an ice cold shower, box seven or eight rounds and then take a 10-mile hike!

ABBOTT: What did you do?

COSTELLO: I stayed in bed till the feeling went away!

—ABBOTT AND COSTELLO

•

EDDIE: Prices are fantastic today. Remember the sign in the market that used to say, "Count your change before leaving."

HARRY: Yes.

EDDIE: Now it says, "Don't count on leaving with any change."

—EDDIE CANTOR

•

GRACIE: George won't give me money for a new hat.

BILL: Hasn't he been told he can't take it with him?

GRACIE: He's been told that, but he wants to experiment.

—BURNS AND ALLEN

•

FIBBER: I can darn socks. I did it before I was married, by George, and I can still do it.

MOLLY: Yes, and I know how you did it too. You puckered the cloth up around the hole, tied a string around it, and pounded the lump down with a hammer.

—FIBBER MCGEE AND MOLLY

NBC Television at the Polo Grounds, N. Y.

This season all the home games, whether day or night, of New York's National League baseball team – better known as the Giants – are televised by NBC and broadcast over Station WNBT, New York, and the eastern television network. For each game, three television cameras and a staff of fifteen men are on the job at the Polo Grounds.

Alec Templeton, blind pianist, is the feature attraction on a half-hour program of fun and music heard over the NBC network each Sunday evening at 8 p.m., New York time, while Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy are on vacation. The show is sponsored by Standard Brands, Inc.; the advertising agency is J. Walter Thompson Co.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

A SERVICE OF RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA