

NEWS ON THE AIR

Paul W. White

070.46
9/58n

NEWS ON THE AIR

by Paul W. White

10971

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY, NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1947, BY

PAUL W. WHITE

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the publisher.

[c·2·49]

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CBS Studio 9 on V-J Day.
Bob Trout, John Daly, the
author, William L. Shirer,
and Larry Lesueur (*Photo*
by Toni Frissell, PIX)



To my wife Peggy, without whose
unflagging enthusiasm and untiring as-
sistance, this book could have been com-
pleted months earlier

AUTHOR'S NOTE

THIS is two books in one. It's a textbook for beginners who may be attracted to a young and dynamic profession. It's also a book for those who already have served their apprenticeship in radio journalism and are full-fledged members of the craft.

As a textbook, I think it has several unusual qualities: It doesn't pretend to know all the answers. I concede very quickly that every classroom teacher is far more capable than any book can be in dealing with immediate news at hand. Standards of news are ever changing. I know of no way of forecasting how the news of tomorrow is to be written or played. The teacher, dealing with news as it develops, has by all means the most important role in individual instruction.

When I was hiring newcomers to a network staff, I nearly always said, "I doubt very much if you'll begin to earn your salary for the first three months." That was a pleasant lie. Actually, I knew it would usually take six months. At the end of a half year, through some process of osmosis, the employee managed to learn most of what it was all about. There was simply no substitute for time. But in this book I've tried to re-create something of the aura in which the beginner will find himself. I hope it will save him months, weeks, or days in his orientation.

Another unusual quality is this: You'll find no footnotes. However valuable they may be in other news media, however essential, in fact, they may be to *Time Magazine*, they have no place in radio. And to as great an extent as possible, I've tried to write the book with radio technique in mind, even hoping that it was conversational enough to be read aloud.

To those already in the radio news business—I refer to it as a profession, a craft, a business, and I'm not sure which is the accurate word—I bow an apology. There are many sins of omission. I would have liked to include any number of outstanding news broadcasts, but there wasn't room. I would have liked to tell in detail many of the zany, implausible, *impossible* stories, already a part of the radio news tradition—such as how a network special events man helped swing the 1940 Republican convention to Willkie simply by attending a caucus of the key Pennsylvania delegation and by voting for him there.

But such stories are outside the scope of the present book. They will be told and retold, though, in countless taverns where radio men and women go for a quick one after the sign-off cue has been given, "And that's the news to this moment."

Paul W. White

*San Diego, California
Pie Town, New Mexico
New York, New York
Iowa City, Iowa*

Summer-Autumn, 1946

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TO ALL OF THESE I owe and now try, in too small measure, to pay a debt for assistance in the preparation of this book.

For the use of news copy and scripts I'm grateful to Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, American Broadcasting Company, Columbia Broadcasting System, Mutual Broadcasting System, and National Broadcasting Company, *Time Magazine*, the *New York Times*, *Broadcasting Magazine*, *Radio Daily*, *Billboard*, *The Saturday Evening Post*, and *World Report*. Individually, I'm indebted to Cecil Brown, George Putnam, Cedric Foster, Robert Trout, Lowell Thomas, Morgan Beatty, Elmer Davis, Bill Henry, Gabriel Heatter, and Charles Collingwood. Also, of course, to all those who participated in the D-Day broadcasting described in Chapter 18.

For the use of dramatic news scripts, I thank Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, the March of Time, Young & Rubicam, and Columbia Broadcasting System. I bow also to the individual kindness and the skills of William N. Robson, Max Wylie, Margaret Miller, and Bill Slocum, Jr.

For permission to reprint from their writings, I'm grateful to A. A. Schechter, Jr., Ed Anthony, Seymour Berkson, Earl Johnson, Tom O'Neil, Phil Newsom, Cabell Greet, Paul H. Wagner, Helen Sioussat, Eric Hodgins, Edward Klauber, Paul W. Kesten, John W. Vandercook, C. W. Pettigrew, Charles B. Driscoll, Elmer Davis, John W. Gerber, William Benton, Oliver Gramling, William F. Brooks, Edward R. Murrow, Quentin Reynolds, Paul Hollister, Robert Strunsky, and William C. Ackerman.

For statistical background and assistance, I'm indebted to the

National Opinion Research Center, Elmo Roper, C. E. Hooper, Frank Stanton, Paul Lazarsfeld, Elmo C. Wilson, Wilbur Schramm, and Ray Huffer.

For information specifically requested I thank Oliver Gramling, C. Edmonds Allen, T. Wells Church, A. A. Schechter, Jr., Thomas Velotta, and Adolph Schneider, as well as their secretaries. Also, John Aaron, Ralph Childs, Arthur M. Barnes, Sig Mickelson, Al Haugner, A. H. Petersen, Westbrook Van Voorhis, I. Keith Tyler, William C. Ackerman, Bill Forbes, Webley Edwards and, of course, Fred S. Siebert, whose libel lore is visible in Chapter 11.

For the use of material in the *Journalism Quarterly* of June, 1946, ably edited by Raymond B. Nixon of Emory University, I am especially indebted.

For counsel after they read the book in manuscript, I am particularly grateful to Wilbur Schramm, Floyd Baskette, W. J. McCambridge, and Edward R. Murrow.

The list, despite its length, is obviously limited. Because I owe, and know well that I do, everyone who worked with, over, for, and against me in radio news. They taught me far more than I'm able to impart.

PWW

CONTENTS

1	OBITUARY ON FIVE "W'S" AND AN "H" An Inverted Pyramid Toppling Over	1
2	SOME ASSETS AND LIABILITIES A Comparison of Radio and Press	18
3	GROWING PAINS The Story of the Press-Radio War	30
4	WEATHER CLEAR, TRACK FAST Radio News Makes Its Bid	43
5	IT ISN'T DONE WITH MIRRORS Some Notes on Personnel and Technical Operations	50
6	HOW TO AND HOW NOT TO Advice on Radio News Writing	62
7	READIN', 'RITIN', AND 'RITHMETIC Preparing a News Program	82
8	HOW THE PRO'S DO IT Examples of Press Association Copy and Scripts	95
9	GO AHEAD AND TALK A Few Notes for the News Announcers	157
10	TEACHING THE UNTEACHABLE News Judgment and Good Taste	170

11	MUSTN'T, MUSTN'T Legal Restrictions	186
12	NO ONE KNOWS THAT MUCH How Much Scope for Commentators?	198
13	THE ABSTRACT SET IN CONCRETE Propaganda—at Home and Abroad	208
14	THE POPULI HAVE A VOX A Study of Surveys and Fan Mail	218
15	THE AGE OF SPECIALIZATION For Women, Children, Sports Fans, Farmers	234
16	SOUND AND FURY, SIGNIFYING HEADACHES The Dramatization of Radio News	249
17	AT THE SCENE The Story of Sports, Special Events, and Interviews	299
18	GREAT DAY IN THE MORNING Radio on June 6, 1944	322
19	SO YOU WANT A JOB? A Discussion of Opportunities in Radio News	358
20	FOREWORD TO THE FUTURE Including a Preview of Television	366
	FOR THE STUDENT	375
	AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	397
	INDEX	415

1. OBITUARY ON FIVE "W'S" AND AN "H"

An Inverted Pyramid Toppling Over

IN THE BEGINNING there were the words. Then along came the invention of the telegraph and the founding of press associations, and pretty soon the words were arranged peculiarly in a form of writing known as journalese. Stories were written this way:

Winning by inches a fierce battle against death, a Pan-American trans-Atlantic Constellation plane carrying 10 crew members and 42 passengers, including Laurence Olivier and Vivien Leigh, English actor and actress, belly-landed safely today at Windham, Conn., after one of the plane's four motors had burst into flame and had dropped from the aircraft in flight, according to reports reaching the New York headquarters of the airline.

Try to read all that aloud. See how soon you run out of breath and how your powers of concentration are taxed by the overwhelming amount of detail put into a single sentence. That is journalese doing nip-ups. Unfortunately, vestiges of this form of literary exercise still survive.

A news-hungry public, having no choice in the matter, long accepted this odd substitute for informative language, and many newspapers prospered. It wasn't until radio really got going that news reached Americans in simple, direct English. The response

was favorable and immediate. People were no longer baffled.

Listeners realized they were getting the news first by radio, they were getting it condensed, with a minimum of furbishes and foolishness. True, newspaper publishers continued to wax fiscally fat, but the days of powerful influence were gone. Something old had been added. People always had been inclined to write news as they talked it, and radio did just that. There was no trick to it. The whole idea was to be natural and conversational, and the result was popularity.

THE PUBLIC TALKS BACK

The Devil, of course, cites Scriptures to further his evil purposes. In news, all media of information cite surveys. If anyone conducts enough surveys in enough places, he can probably prove anything he wants to prove. Later, he can say that he didn't know the questions were loaded. But so many surveys made independently on a nation-wide basis have demonstrated the force of radio in American life that it's unnecessary to be very selective in documenting public approval. In 1945 the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver, asked a couple of searching questions and got a couple of revealing answers.

This was the first question: *In every community, the schools, the newspapers, the local government, each has a different job to do. Around here, would you say that the schools are doing an excellent, good, fair, or poor job? How about the newspapers? the radio stations? the local government? the churches?*

The replies of "good" or "excellent" came out in this kind of percentage breakdown:

	per cent
Radio	82
Churches	75
Newspapers	68
Schools	62
Local government	45

And here's the second question: *Taking everything into consideration, which one of these do you think did the best job of serving the public during World War II—magazines, newspapers, moving pictures, or radio?*

The answers brought these percentages:

	<i>per cent</i>
Radio	67
Newspapers	17
Moving pictures	4
Magazines	3
No opinion	9

The second question, as you will notice, specified public service during World War II. It was expected that listening would drop off in peacetime, but everyone in radio was agreeably surprised to find that audiences stayed large and steady. An unimportant number of news programs was dropped from schedules, but listening to individual programs stayed close to wartime levels.

Indeed, there's some evidence that listening to news has actually increased. Let's take a look at fortnightly rating trends prepared by C. E. Hooper for August, 1945, the month in which V-J Day occurred, for December, 1945, and for December, 1946. (An explanation of the Hooper method of rating programs will be found in Chapter 14):

NETWORK EVENING NEWS PROGRAMS

<i>Month</i>	<i>Fortnightly Rating</i>	<i>Share of Audience</i>	<i>Number of Broadcast Hours</i>
August, 1945	5.8	26.8	10.00
	6.9	29.9	10.00
December, 1945	6.0	17.4	9.50
	6.3	17.3	9.50
December, 1946	8.2	21.9	8.00
	6.8	18.8	8.00

You'll notice that the most recent ratings are a bit higher or at about the same level as in the last month of actual hostilities, but that the share of audience has dropped. That's because there's always more over-all listening in winter than in summer. For one thing the programs, except for news, just aren't as good. For another thing even radio can't compete with the beauties of a languorous summer night.

The fact is that radios are now in nine out of every ten American homes, and that our people spend more time listening to radio programs than they spend doing anything else except working and sleeping. News programs take up less than 20 per cent of the ordinary broadcasting day on most stations, but in terms of public interest that's a highly important 20 per cent. It actually sets the pattern of daily behavior. A man gets up at a certain hour because he wants to hear Joe Whoozis give the news. A woman likes to get her housework completed by noon because she then can tune in Vera Velvet, who tells what has been going on in the world. Night after night dinner isn't served until John J. van Smith has commented on the meaning of this and that. Finally, the hour of bedtime must await a news summary by Sol O'Reilly. Sol doesn't have much late news, except for night sports results and an up-to-the-minute weather forecast, but he or his writer has had time to put all of the important news of the day into sharp focus and so pre-bedtime listening to his program is a habit easy to come by and difficult to break.

JOURNALSE: FROM BIRTH TO MATURITY

Now why do radio news programs have this kind of hold on the public? I suspect there are many reasons but certainly one of the most important is the fact that the news is presented clearly. There isn't any of that nonsense about five "W's" and an "H." Radio doesn't try to put the Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How into a single lead paragraph. There never was much of an excuse for it even in newspaper writing. It was a vicious practice spawned by the telegraph. That instrument was uncertain in its early days, and frequently a correspondent's dispatch would be only partially sent before a technical breakdown occurred. The correspondent realized that his whole story might not reach his office, and he was understandably tempted to put every vital fact into the first paragraph. Then, if the telegraphic circuit clacked to a sputtering death, his editor would still be able to write an entire bank of headlines, and the readers would be deprived only of colorful and explanatory "adds."

At the outset, telegraphic news comprised only a very small proportion of a newspaper, but development of Associated Press,

United Press, and International News Service changed all that. Front pages of daily newspapers the nation over became largely written by press associations. And it was then that the jam-packed lead paragraph really came into its own. The associations were not particularly fearful of faulty circuits, although such things happened on occasion, but they frequently found it was necessary for them to interrupt themselves, and that put a premium on any kind of writing which would tell everything important in one sentence. Let's illustrate with a fictitious but reasonably accurate example:

A press association automatic printer would be tapping out a story such as this:

WNP 76

New York, June X—(WORLD NEWS PRESS)—Demanding the creation of a United Nations subcommittee to study the adverse effects of vivisection, Dr. Rastus McPherson, president of the Neuro-Psychosis Institute of Hoboken, N. J., told the League of American Thinkers today that unless his proposal were adopted there soon would be an international shortage of guinea pigs.

Dr. McPherson said

(more) 3:21 P.M.

At this point the WNP editors decided that a more important story had come along and there ensued the following interruption:

WNP 77

BULLETIN

Washington, June X—(WNP)—The House Military Affairs Committee today reported favorably on the Carruthers Bill which would make it unlawful to export uranium.

(more) 3:22 P.M.

WNP 78

FIRST ADD CARRUTHERS, WASHINGTON XXXXX EXPORT URANIUM.

The committee voted 8 to 5 to recommend the bill for passage.

(more) 3:23 P.M.

WNP 79

SECOND ADD CARRUTHERS, WASHINGTON XXXXX FOR PASSAGE.

This action was taken after the defeat of an amendment proposed by Rep. Fromm Hunger (Populist, N. D.), head of the so-called

"Uranium Bloc," which would have excepted Canada, Mexico, and Newfoundland from the bill's provisions.

3:24 P.M.

And so on and so on. There might now come baseball scores or "must" markets, and meanwhile what Dr. McPherson had said in extenso remained a mystery. Nevertheless, WNP felt it had done its duty. If any telegraph editor anywhere in the nation wanted to use the good doctor's "demand," he had all the relevant facts in the one paragraph already delivered. Sooner or later the "add" or "adds" would come through, and meanwhile the "desk" could get its headlines ready and decide how to play the story.

It can be argued that the press associations themselves were blameless in the creation of such journalistic atrocities. They say, with some justification, that they merely yielded to pressure from telegraph editors. But regardless of the exact spot at which the finger should be pointed, there is no doubt that writing by America's reporters suffered, and suffered badly. You see, the disease had a tendency to become epidemic. Youngsters were mistaught in some journalism schools, although it's only fair to report that journalism teachers seemed more enlightened than many tradition-bound city and telegraph editors. As for those newcomers who rose from the ranks, from copy boy to rewrite desk, they read the front pages of their own newspapers and thought that if that was the way to write—well, that was the way to write.

Stylistically, this method of presenting news even had a name. It was called an "inverted pyramid." Everything of importance was put in the base at the top, and from there the facts angled down until the bottom was scarcely worth the trouble of flipping to an inside page. A man doesn't have to be either a journalist or a geometrician to foretell the fate of an inverted pyramid. Sooner or later, it's bound to topple over of its own weight.

But for the long period of years in which journalism uneasily rested asininely over teakettle, there was rarely a news story that could be read aloud and make much sense to the listener. I made this observation one day to a student in a class I taught at the Pulitzer School of Journalism, Columbia University, and

found him looking doubtful. I asked him to prove it to himself, to pick up a newspaper, *any* newspaper, and read the lead paragraphs of top-head stories on page one. He did, and here, word for word, is what I heard:

(You will notice how outdated these stories have become. I like to think that not only the news itself, but the writing also, has become outdated.)

ITEM ONE:

JERSEY CITY—A spectacular fire, endangering an estimated \$25,-000,000 in defense materials, laid waste an area one-fourth mile square on the waterfront here tonight, and as federal and local investigations were begun, damage was estimated at \$3,000,000, exclusive of the undetermined loss in defense goods.

Comment: Notice the length of this and the multiplicity of commas. Now, using the same material, let's rewrite it for radio:

A spectacular fire laid waste an area a quarter mile square on the waterfront in Jersey City tonight. Damage was estimated at three million dollars, not counting any part of some 25 million dollars' worth of defense materials endangered by the fire. Federal and state investigations are already under way.

ITEM TWO:

AT A BRITISH PORT—Bringing a welcome cargo of more than 4,000,000 eggs, 120,000 pounds of cheese, and 1,000 tons of flour, the first food ship to ferry across the Atlantic from the United States under the terms of the lease-lend act has arrived here.

Comment: A curious inversion of the facts. Radio undoubtedly would open with the second part of the sentence and close with the first. This would be better for the average listener:

Obituary on Five "W's" and an "H"

The first lease-lend food ship from America has reached a British port. The ship carried four million eggs, 120 thousand pounds of cheese, and 1,000 tons of flour.

ITEM THREE:

HYDE PARK, N. Y.—President Roosevelt today made Secretary Ickes virtual czar of the \$10,000,-000,000 American oil industry when he named the Secretary of the Interior as "Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense" and ordered him to make certain that in this emergency "the supply of petroleum and its products will be accommodated to the needs of the nation and the national defense program."

Comment: The unwieldy length of the above is obvious. The use of two quotations within a single paragraph also would probably make this confusing to the ear. For radio:

President Roosevelt has appointed Secretary of Interior Ickes a kind of czar over the 10-billion-dollar oil industry. Ickes has been named Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense, and is ordered to make sure that petroleum and its products meet the needs of the nation and the national defense program.

ITEM FOUR:

SAN SEBASTIAN, SPAIN—Leaving behind 21 members of the British-American Ambulance Corps—a name that helped to supply the final unlucky climax to an ill-starred voyage—119 American survivors of the Egyptian steamship *Zamzam* were released by German authorities today and set out across Spain on their way to home and freedom.

Comment: Here is a complicated sentence structure that no one would possibly use if he were *telling* instead of *writing* this particular bit of news. Again for radio:

A hundred and 19 American survivors of the Egyptian steamship *Zamzam* have been released by German authorities at San Sebastian, Spain. After crossing Spain they'll sail for home and freedom. But the Germans are still holding 21 members of the British-American Ambulance Corps.

ITEM FIVE:

LONDON—An armistice signed in Baghdad late this afternoon brought to an end the rebellion in Iraq against Britain, London learned tonight. Indian fighters of the British forces took up positions in the outskirts of the capital city, from which Premier Rashid Ali el Gailani, leader of the revolt, and all his followers able to do so had fled.

Comment: Notice the superfluous "London learned tonight." This particular type of phraseology is dropped from radio news wherever possible. If a thing has been learned, then it's a fact, and the use of that hanging clause is unnecessary. Now let's rewrite it for radio:

The Iraq rebellion against Britain has ended. Word has reached London that an armistice was signed late this afternoon and that British forces now have taken up positions in the outskirts of Baghdad. The revolutionary premier of Iraq and his followers have fled.

(? Not always.)

ITEM SIX:

VICHY, FRANCE—Upon returning to Vichy today after five days in Paris consulting with the occupying authorities on French-German collaboration, Admiral François Darlan, the Vice-Premier, tonight took the occasion of the British bombings at Sfax, Tunisia, to direct a violent broadside at Britain.

Comment: Here again a strange inversion. For radio:

Admiral Darlan, Vice-Premier of France, tonight directed a violent broadside against Britain, protesting the British bombings at Sfax, in Tunisia. Admiral Darlan had just returned to Vichy after five days in Paris consulting on French-German collaboration.

ITEM SEVEN:

BERLIN—Unified British-Greek resistance on the Island of Crete has been broken on all fronts, German reports state, and the German forces are now engaged primarily in cleaning up scattered remnants of the defenders there. This is the picture of the progress of Axis operations on the Greek island, painted by official army and authoritative German quarters in Berlin tonight.

Comment: A great deal of unnecessary wordage. Compare the paragraph with this type of radio lead:

Official Berlin reports say unified British-Greek resistance on Crete has been broken on all fronts. The Germans say their forces are now cleaning up scattered remnants of the defenders there.

Thirty-one words instead of sixty. Throughout, the radio emphasis is on simplicity.

These examples, which were not especially selected, clearly show the unsuitability of that type of newspaper writing for radio use. There is a theory, to which I once adhered, that writing for the ear is quite different from writing for the eye.

*How much
it is
different?*

This theory led United Press and Associated Press to set up radio wires in contrast to newspaper wires. These radio wires carry "processed" news all ready for delivery on the air. The networks and some of the larger stations, however, subscribe to the newspaper wires and hire their own rewrite men to do the processing. The principal reason for this is that the networks naturally don't want to broadcast the news in exactly the same language that may already have been used by affiliated stations.

Similarly, a 50-kilowatt station in Louisville, let's say, doesn't want to go on the air a half hour later with the same news report that already has been on a rival 250-watt station. There's a noticeable tendency, even in small stations, to reprocess processed news to avoid that type of duplication.

In the early days of radio wires it was the usual practice for an announcer to go to the printer machine, tear off the latest five-minute or fifteen-minute summary, and to read it without any deviation from script on the next scheduled news period. That method of handling may soon be only a memory. In the first place, more and more stations are subscribing to at least two news services and are combining them in the finished product. In the second place, the stations have found that a news editor can increase listener interest by inserting local or regional news into the press association reports. There are many Washington stories that are susceptible to a local angle; an example is a Department of Agriculture forecast.

JOURNALESE: FROM MATURITY TO SENILITY

But to get back to the problem of whether writing for the ear *is* really different from writing for the eye. In recent years there has been a marked decrease in the use of the most objectionable forms of journalism. Participial clauses at the beginning of sentences, delayed source credits, multiple commas, long and complicated paragraphs—all of these are becoming scarcer in the nation's newspapers. Press associations and newspapers are making more and more use of "undated" leads beginning with such words as: "This is the latest news on the labor situation." There follows a series of short, terse sentences giving a summary of developments from all over the country. That is a technique to which radio undoubtedly has given impetus.

Finally, one press association, International News Service, has come right out and spoken up in public about the need for journalistic reform. INS has no radio wire and it may be that since it wants to sell its report to radio stations, its views are commercially suspect. But as early as 1944, INS, through its general manager, Seymour Berkson, took the position that good news

writing was good news writing whether it was to be read or heard. A brochure sent out by that news service gives its point of view in all of the staccato immodesty of the language of sales promotion:

From the writer whose by-line guarantees a reader or listener to the reporter on a routine assignment—all INS staff members write in a modern, simplified style.

There is no secret to the style, but there is an interesting story behind its adoption.

Several years ago, INS editors began quietly, without announcement, a serious re-study of news writing style and readability.

It was recognized that most news writers of that day were suffering an 1890-style hangover. There were too many inversions . . . too many dangling participles, modifying phrases, hanging attributive clauses.

There were too many high-sounding words . . . too many trick phrases . . . too much over-writing . . . too little regard for the desires and capabilities of the average reader.

INS editors went into the whole subject of writing style, as related to the reading level of the public. Surveys were made; tests conducted; words and phrases analyzed.

Bulky research by professors at several colleges and universities was weighed and appraised; studied and restudied.

It was found that rather than a conflict, there was a close relationship between writing for the eye and for the ear.

(Not a particularly startling discovery, as we look back; but it is a fact that if few persons realized it then, still fewer practiced on that theory.)

In both forms, simplicity was the keynote.

The involved sentence that required a second reading for clarity likewise had to be repeated before the meaning was clear when presented orally.

Researchers also made careful note of everyday conversations. The average man-in-the-street told his story much more concisely . . . much more understandably . . . much more interestingly than it would have been presented in the old "newspaper" style.

And he wasn't sacrificing pertinent details.

Out of all of these discoveries and observations, INS editors drew up certain rules for achieving a direct and "streamlined" style that appealed to both the eye and the ear. Its writers began "talking out" their stories—reading them aloud as they wrote them.

Gradually and without fanfare, the INS news wire was restyled to make it easier to handle . . . easier to read . . . easier to broadcast . . . easier to understand.

THE UP TRIES RESEARCH

There was other evidence that good writing was good writing, whether designed for eye or ear, and that the two might be quite similar. In 1945 the United Press arranged for an outside organization to study its news reports. Earl Johnson, UP vice-president and general news manager, later issued a booklet on this study called *Readability in News Writing*, from which the following stories are reproduced by permission of the United Press Associations.

Various UP news stories were rated on a basis of from 6 to 17-plus, these figures corresponding roughly to the number of years of education a person would need to be able to read the stories with least difficulty.

As a basis for comparison, Johnson pointed out that some books in popular literature, such as *Strange Fruit* and *A Bell for Adano*, were said to grade 6—readable, that is, to a youngster who has finished the sixth grade. Average material in *Reader's Digest* tested 7. But of 100 UP stories tested in a single day the average level was 16.6. In other words, those stories could be read and understood only by college graduates, and not even by some of them. Since the average education of Americans is about nine years (they quit school after their freshman year in high school), most of the common, ordinary, everyday news stories tested were beyond the average reader. (*But comprehension increases.*)

It was found that material in which sentences averaged more than 20 words in length began to make reading difficult. It was also found that complex words and phrases made reading harder. Examples: prodigious expenditure for big expense; rendezvous for meeting. The theory arose, too, that people are chiefly interested in people, and that naming people and using other human interest words in a story made the story easier to read.

But let's look at some of the stories and their tested scores, always remembering that here we're after a low score as in golf rather than a high score as in football.

Score 16.5

Chief reason for the high score of this item, indicating lack of readability, probably is the number of foggy words and phrases, added to a general dullness. "Contemplated with enthusiasm," "implement the campaign," and "constructive legislative program as the spearhead" were much too much for those with the average nine-year education.

WASHINGTON, JAN. 2—(UP)—Prospects of a three-way improvement in the Republican national organization in preparation for future campaigns were contemplated with enthusiasm today by GOP congressional leaders.

Plans for party reforms were discussed here yesterday at a meeting between top Republican Congressmen and Herbert Brownell, Jr., GOP national chairman, and later at a reception for all Republican members of the 79th Congress.

Out of the meetings came talk of:

1. Maintaining an enlarged research staff at Republican National Headquarters on which Republicans in Congress can call for speech material and aid in drafting legislation.

2. Enlarging the national committee publicity staff to publicize the legislative program sponsored by Republicans in Congress.

3. Putting the GOP national chairman on a full-time basis to carry on organizational efforts on a year-round schedule.

To implement the campaign, GOP members of Congress would sponsor a constructive legislative program as the spearhead in the drive to win voter confidence in the 1946 congressional elections and the 1948 presidential election.

Score 7.8

WASHINGTON, JAN. 2—(UP)—Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt revealed today that her inauguration costume will be a new blue dress with a three-quarter coat to match.

She said she did not know if a special name had been given to the blue, but that it was just about the same shade as "Eleanor Blue" she has worn previously.

She said she had not ordered the dress, but

This is written in the general style of women's news, and it's somewhat surprising that the score wasn't lower. Possibly, however, "volition" and "invalidation" were

beyond average vocabularies. Note in the third paragraph the improper pronoun "their," referring to a store.

the New York store which has made many of her clothes in the past (Arnold Constable) just undertook the job of their own volition and then informed her when it was finished.

Commenting on her recent nomination as the best-dressed newspaperwoman, Mrs. Roosevelt exclaimed: "I love it. I think it was wonderful. Yes, it was a surprise."

The White House, like many other American homes, was affected by the recent invalidation of food ration stamps and had to rearrange menus, Mrs. Roosevelt said. But no one has complained about the substitute menus, she added.

"I don't think any of us should feel badly treated," she continued. "A look at conditions in other countries should show us that we have really suffered so little in this war."

Score 7

By Harvard Nevill Hodgkins
(Written for the United Press)

HANCOCK POINT, ME., JAN. 2.—(UP)—
I guess it really was a snowstorm that helped me to capture those spies.

I went over to a dance at Ellsworth the night of Nov. 29th. It's about 17 miles from our home here, so I took Pa's car. We were having a lot of fun but it began snowing about 11 o'clock and I got worried because it was coming down real hard. I figured it might be getting pretty deep on the road toward home, so I passed up the last dance and started along.

It was pretty tough driving and I guess I'd traveled about four miles when I saw a couple of figures ahead of me in the road. They were coming towards me and as they got closer I could see they were men.

They seemed like young men, but the thing that struck me funny was the fact that they wore such light clothes. As near as I could see

This one, written or "ghosted" in an easy style, got the lowest score of any story tested on the day in question. The only mild surprise is that the score wasn't lower.

they had on topcoats. No one around here wears a topcoat in the winter and least of all on a night like that one. I pulled over some and went by slowly so I wouldn't hit them and I could see they were carrying some kind of bags.

Score 17 Plus

If Committee Chairman Watson really talks like this, there's small wonder about confusion in price and wage increases. It takes not only at least 17 years of education to get the sense of this one, but probably a divining rod, too.

YOUNGSTOWN, O., JAN. 2.—(UP)—The statement of the Office of Price Administration and Director of Economic Stabilization Fred Vinson that "for some time increases in the prices of certain steel products have been required by law" agrees with the position of the OPA's General Steel Products Advisory Committee, Committee Chairman Walter Watson said today.

"With that question now settled, the industry is keenly interested in having the respective amounts of the price increase determined and made effective as soon as possible," said Watson, who is first vice-president of the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. here.

"We are working with the OPA continuously to find the proper answer to the price question raised by past cost increases," he said. "We are also asking OPA to help find a solution for the effects of the new wage increase approved Dec. 30 on a retroactive basis by Mr. Vinson.

"At present, I cannot understand the statement of OPA that after price adjustment required by past cost increases are made, the proposed wage increase will not require any further net rise in the general level of iron and steel prices."

From Johnson's point of view—and presumably from the public's as well—his memoranda to the staff on these readability tests had a happy effect. Six or seven weeks after the first stories were surveyed, another set went to the researchers. And the

average score dropped from 16.6 to 11.7. Johnson still wasn't satisfied.

"Much of the news these days," he told his writers, "is of such vital importance that it deserves to be presented in terms that can be understood easily by the widest possible audience. *Let's have more periods and fewer complex words. Watch that lead sentence. Keep it short and simple. Then let the lead set the pace for the whole piece.*"

AP RADIO ADDS ITS VOICE

Still another indication in the trend of the times is a memorandum to staff writers of AP Radio. This was written by Oliver Gramling, assistant general manager, after he had interviewed a number of radio station news editors:

News editors today are digging for human interest items. They often are leading off their broadcasts with light feature stories and are sprinkling features of this kind throughout the news programs.

Recognizing radio as so important an entertainment medium, the thoughtful radio news editor today is re-evaluating news all along the line. He is putting a premium on anything that is new and refreshing. He is thinking, first and foremost, about listener appeal.

We must give sparkle and life to any story that contains elements of listener appeal. We must strive for new and picturesque ways of presenting the same thing. Even heavy stories may be lightened frequently by viewing or telling them through the eyes and ears of the personality involved. Wherever there is a human being, there should be human interest.

From all this evidence it seems clear that the five "W's" and the "H" are ripe for a slum clearance project. Living jumbled together in an opening sentence, they've had a crowded, miserable, and incestuous life.

2. SOME ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

A Comparison of Radio and Press

THE READER and the listener are the same man or woman. I consider it inevitable that written and oral journalism will tend to be uniform so far as the actual writing is concerned. But there are many differences between newspaper news and radio news, some of which react to the advantage of the former, some to the latter.

First off, there's the question of space. Even in days of newsprint restrictions and shortages the newspaper clearly has a marked advantage. It's true that type isn't made of rubber but neither is a clock. And whereas the printing of news is *the* primary function of a newspaper, it's only one of many functions of a broadcasting station which also, "in the public interest, convenience and necessity," as the Federal Communications Commission so charmingly puts it, feels itself called upon to supply drama, music, comedy, and educational and religious programs.

When a story of major importance breaks, the radio station can throw aside its normal schedules and can concentrate on news coverage almost to the exclusion of everything else. That, however, rarely happens, for day in and day out no news is carried except on regularly scheduled programs.

The newspaper, of course, has a tremendous advantage over radio in presenting large groups of figures. Stock tables, baseball box scores, detailed election results precinct by precinct, racing charts, itemized governmental budgets, nation-wide weather re-

ports of high, low and mean temperatures—none of these can be handled by radio. Any attempt to read them over the air probably would result in mass tuning out.

Radio, in fact, is generally helpless in regard to any story where the listener would like a point of reference. Let us assume that there has been some kind of major disaster in Iraq. The broadcaster can tell his audience where Iraq is, but can't hope even in as many as a thousand words to teach as good a geography lesson as one well-drawn map. If the disaster, such as a series of earthquakes, spreads over a wide area and affects towns and villages with unfamiliar names, the broadcaster is up against a tough hurdle. If he merely recites a list of place names, his audience will be completely baffled. Perhaps his best bet is to say something along these lines:

And now, if you have a good atlas, suppose you hunt it up while I give you some additional minor details on the disaster which is the worst of its kind since, etc., etc. (Then the minor details.) Now, if you have found the site of the earthquakes and have a map in front of you, we can tell you where the disturbances centered. In the northwest corner you will see the town of Golingkhar—that's spelled g-o-l-i-n-g-k-h-a-r—and first reports from there say at least 50 were killed and hundreds injured. About 50 miles to the south is a village—not shown on some maps. It's called Vercingetorix, named after the famous Gallic general. And an airplane pilot who flew over that village today reported that the quake and a subsequent fire had completely destroyed it. He saw no signs of life, and every building had been razed to the ground. Now, toward the center of the map, you will find, etc.

This type of news handling is awkward and so much mumbo-jumbo to those who don't have atlases or don't know how to use them, but at least it imparts to the listener a sense that the broadcaster is trying to be helpful. Television, of course, with the combination of both sight and sound, will deprive the newspaper of its superiority in presenting this type of news—with one exception. The newspaper map is permanent: it can be cut out and looked at again and again if the reader is exceptionally interested in the story. Television maps may be even more graphic

but they can be retained only in the memory, and most memories are notoriously untrustworthy.

NAMES DON'T ALWAYS MAKE NEWS

Let's admit newspaper leadership, too, in presenting a long series of personal names. Radio, for instance, has difficulty with casualty lists, society lists, contribution lists, court dockets, marriage license lists, committees, tennis pairings, golf tournaments, all types of vital statistics—anything of that kind which any newspaper can take in its stride. The mere recitation of a long list of names is excruciatingly dull to the ear, and attempts to break up the lists by use of descriptive phrases are generally not worth the effort.

Still another newspaper advantage is the relative freedom to report crimes, particularly sex crimes, in vivid detail. Later, I shall devote more attention to questions of good taste on the air, but for the moment it is enough to confess that radio is rather namby-pamby in regard to sex. Television probably will be even more so. The principal reason is easily apparent: newspaper reading is an individual experience. The reader is alone, and he selects the stories in which he is interested. If his taste lies in reading about sensational divorce actions, rape and dismemberment, then there's nothing except the newspaper editor's regard for the proprieties to prevent the reader from indulging himself to his mind's content. But radio is more often than not a family or group experience. That means news programs are listened to by father, mother, the children, and a neighbor who just dropped in for a small beer. There's simply no sense in embarrassing any member of that group by being overly explicit in crime or sex coverage. That accounts for considerable bowdlerization and overuse of such words, phrases, and sentences as "mutilation," "statutory offenses," "the defendant was accused of intimacy with Horace Wolfbane, a Long Island sportsman," and so on.

Sometimes "cleaning up" a story for radio goes to ridiculous extremes. Take these news wire and radio wire stories carried by one of the press services:

(For Newspapers)

ROCKPORT, INDIANA, OCT. 29—Technician Charles Williams of the Indiana state police said today that through finger prints the bodies of a man and a young woman found buried in a field near here yesterday had been identified as those of George E. Tyson, 33, and Ethel Sparks, 22, both of East St. Louis, Ill.

Williams said the finger prints had been furnished by the FBI which had obtained them in connection with an investigation of the wounding of Joe Callahan of East St. Louis.

The state police earlier today had found \$3,200 secreted in a brassiere on the girl's body.

Tyson, an ironworker, had been sought on a warrant charging assault with a deadly weapon following the shooting July 16 of Callahan, who was in an automobile parked outside a Madison, Ill., tavern.

(For Radio)

The bodies of a man and a young woman dug up in a wheat field near Rockport, Indiana, have been identified. Indiana state police said today finger prints revealed the woman was Ethel Sparks, aged 22, of East Saint Louis, Illinois. The man was George Tyson, aged 33, of the same city.

Earlier, the police had found three thousand two hundred dollars hidden in the woman's clothes.

You'll see that the radio story is the better story, for readability, but that for some reason the most interesting part of the story was left out. I am much more intrigued by \$3,200 hidden in a brassiere than in "clothes." I think most other listeners would feel the same way.

I've forecast that television will no doubt be even more restrictive, and some may wonder why I think so. You have only to consider the movies to find the answer. Whereas television may never have a Will Hays or an Eric Johnston to rule that sin should always be punished and virtue ever be triumphant, television faces a still more worrisome ogre than any industry-chosen "czar." The ogre is the Federal Communications Commission, which issues licenses and holds the threat of non-renewal over the head of every licensee. Let a television station become at all blatant in a sex drama or overly vigorous in its reconstruction of a crime, and letters of protest will flow to Washington in a tidal wave. There being no permanent record of what the station has actually televised, the station will have a tough time denying any adverse charges. And human imagination being what it is, the outraged citizen whose home has been invaded by what he considers depravity will very likely remember more than actually occurred.

Well, if newspapers have such an edge over radio in so many particulars—space, the publication of figures, maps and names, crime coverage—why has radio become so popular? What, in turn, are its advantages? There are many but I suspect that the three principal ones are radio's honesty, immediacy, and personalities.

THE BEST POLICY

To direct attention to radio's honesty is automatically to accuse newspapers of dishonesty. Let's not run away from that accusation, but add quickly that it doesn't apply to every newspaper. Many, however, find that the beliefs expressed in their editorial columns are borne out by the news that, not too coincidentally, appears on Page One. A single illustration should suffice. In the days of quota-butcherings, a West Coast city which had retained a great share of its swollen wartime population, was justly awarded an increase in meat slaughter. One newspaper, which had supported a Democratic Representative, gave all the Page One credit for the OPA-endorsed increase to that Congressman. The opposition newspaper, staunchly Republican, gave the Page

One credit to a Republican Senator. Presumably, one of the papers was right, or more accurately, both were half-right, but the public had no way of judging the facts.

There's still another type of newspaper dishonesty that may be even more reprehensible. Not in every case, but in too many cases, especially in afternoon newspapers, news stories are written to justify headlines which will make people want to buy newspapers. In radio, on the other hand, nothing can be done to gain more circulation once a program is actually on the air. The program costs nothing. It is "bought" merely by flicking a button and twirling a dial. Therefore, a good reputation rather than a flashy single product is apt to be radio's goal. It doesn't need to strain for headlines. It usually avoids "strong" leads unless the facts bear them out fully. If radio lets down the listener, if it tells him something sensational that turns out not to be true, it gains nothing, and in subsequent days it probably will lose that listener. Thus, neither in the writing nor in the tone of voice—about the only things comparable to fonts of type—does radio build up a story beyond its merit. An example:

What about the next day?

At one time during World War II, the British Prime Minister told Commons that German submarines and battle cruisers had crossed "to the American side of the Atlantic" and had sunk ships as far west as "the forty-second meridian of longitude." Afternoon newspapers throughout the United States, engaged in a highly competitive market for street sales, streamered this headline over eight columns: "U-Boats Sink Ships off U. S."

The fact that the forty-second meridian is some 15 hundred miles east of New York seldom appeared in any of the headline banks. A reader had to go to the third or fourth paragraph of the story itself to learn that "off U. S." was not exactly off the beach.

To reiterate: Radio has no immediate problem of capturing sales, no problem of attention-getting, and hence is under no compulsion to "scarehead" a news story. When a station goes on the air with a news program, it may have an audience of, let's say, a million persons. During the next few minutes there's nothing it can do to increase that audience to two million or three million. So it's simply good business for the station to

inform its million of what is known to be true or suspected to be true and achieve larger future audiences by creating a feeling of confidence and trust. It boils down to this axiom, which might well be posted in every radio newsroom: *You don't have to sell 'em; they're already there!*

FAST—AND FIRST

Now as to radio's immediacy, which is apparent. An on-the-spot broadcast of an event in progress is usually more thrilling than a written description of it. The radio listener to a skilled broadcaster at the scene of an event has the feeling that he, himself, is participating in living history. He is *there* and probably he has a much better idea of what is going on than the people who are physically attending the event.

The present tense is our most exciting tense. Most of us realize this unconsciously. When we are describing something dramatic that happened to us, we are apt to change tenses in midstream and to begin talking in the present.

"I got held up last night," a friend will say and when you ask him to tell you about it, he will forget about the past tense and go on this way:

Well, it's a little after midnight and I'm walking down Third Street near Elm and a fellow comes out of an alley and pokes a gun in my puss and says "Hands Up." So I put 'em up, but fast. Then he asks me how much money I got and I say, "Two or three bucks, in my right hand pants pocket." So he takes that and asks me if I got a watch. I tell him I got an old dollar Ingersoll in my vest and he looks at it, says "phooey" and hands it back. Then he tells me to go over and face the wall and not move for ten minutes or he'll drill me. I wait until I hear him running, then I go out and grab a cop and tell him my story. We go over to the station house and I have to tell it all over again to the desk sergeant. But the best part of the whole thing is this: I got 20 bucks folded up in the back of the watch—and I've still got the watch!

This conversational use of the present tense is natural to most of us. It is effective when telling about something which already

has occurred and even more so in describing something actually going on at the time.

The present tense can be used, often has been used successfully, by newspaper writers. But in giving a "spot" news story—one going on at the time—it obviously is inaccurate. Let us say that a spectacular fire has broken out in Medford, Oregon. The news announcer can say truthfully, "A major fire tonight is menacing the business district of Medford, Oregon. The fire already has consumed lumber yards and warehouses, and is spreading rapidly. All of the fire-fighting equipment in Medford has been called out, and additional equipment is racing to the scene from a half-dozen near-by towns."

But the newspaper writer can't make use of the present tense without the risk of inaccuracy. A reporter telephones the city desk, tells the story to the rewrite man who types it out. The copy goes to the city editor, then to the copy desk, then to the linotype machines. Proof is read, the type is locked up by the make-up man, a stereotype is made, put on the presses. They grind, the papers are distributed to drivers who take them to newsstands. By the time even the first newspaper has reached a reader the fire may be under control. By the time mail editions reach subscribers, the fire is definitely a thing of the past and use of the present tense would be ridiculous.

YOU LEARN MORE AT HOME

A listener doesn't need to know much about football to find his heartbeat disturbed as the announcer says, in describing the last play of the game:

The ball is snapped to Kelly, who fakes to Ogradowsky and then laterals to Spinelli who sprints around end. Spinelli avoids one tackler, two—boy, what blocking! Lund took out three men at once and Spinelli's in the clear except for Masterson. And "old swivel-hips" gets away! He's down to the twenty-five yard line . . . the twenty . . . the fifteen . . . the ten . . . the five . . . and he's over for a touchdown!

Most of the spectators at the game know only that someone has scored. A few know that Spinelli made the touchdown run.

Only the rabid fans know how the play was set up and executed. But the listener has had better than a front row seat: he has had the play described for him in elaborate detail by an expert.

Similarly, consider this familiar baseball description:

Williams gets hold of the next pitch and powers it out to right. Henrich goes back, back, back, but he can't get to it. The ball is going . . . going . . . it is gone.

The ears of the fan at his radio set are only a fraction of a second behind the eyes of the fan at the ball park. And because the announcer is trained to watch not only the flight of the ball but also the behavior of the defensive outfielder, the listener may even get the clue to a home run before the spectator actually sees the ball go into the stands.

ACTIONS SPEAK BETTER THAN WORDS

It's not only in sports that radio's immediacy (perhaps the better though more awkward word is instantaneoussness) has a decided edge over the newspaper. I was the director of news broadcasts at the Columbia Broadcasting System for 13 years, and the most moving thing I ever heard was a sound effect over another network. As the funeral cortege of Franklin D. Roosevelt wound its way up Washington's streets between the Union Station and the White House, I listened first to the CBS men on the scene, and was satisfied with the good job they were doing. Then I dialed in the broadcasts of the Mutual Broadcasting System, the American Broadcasting Company and finally the National Broadcasting Company. The NBC announcer at one point in the procession transferred the controls to another announcer whose microphone was at street level. At that precise moment the horse-drawn gun carriage bearing the coffin rolled by. The announcer had sense enough not to speak. The microphone picked up the clatter of the horses' hooves, the slowly turning wheels of the caisson. The sidewalk crowds were hushed. There was no other sound. It was an emotional experience not to be forgotten, and no words in type or on the air could have achieved the same impact.

A few seconds later I was on the private line telephone which links the New York and Washington offices of CBS, and I urged Bob Wood, our news manager in Washington at the time, to duplicate the broadcast before the cortege reached the White House. Unfortunately, however, we had no microphones at street level, and NBC escaped flattery-by-imitation. But a few minutes later we, too, though unwittingly, tugged at the hearts of our listeners. One of our announcers was Arthur Godfrey, a good friend of the late President over a long period of years. Godfrey described the cortege and the crowds in his inimitable homespun manner. He was extemporizing beautifully until the gun mount and the coffin came into his line of vision. Then something happened to his voice. He cleared his throat, started to talk again. But it was no use. He "broke," as they say in radio. Almost choking with emotion, tears streaming down his face, he managed to give the switching cue to Tris Coffin, the next announcer who was stationed in the White House grounds. Listeners the nation over wept with Godfrey.

THE MOST LIKED; AND THE MOST DISLIKED

Mention of Godfrey brings us to the part that personalities play in radio news. Godfrey isn't primarily a news announcer: he's an entertainer and a good one. When he first began an early morning period over WABC (now WCBS) he relinquished the air for five minutes every half hour so that another announcer could read a news summary prepared by a member of the CBS news staff.

Art Hayes, the manager of WCBS, got the idea that Godfrey's audience would increase if these interruptions were abolished and if Godfrey himself read the news. I objected on the ground that it was somehow cheapening the news to have an entertainer read it. I was overruled by company executives. Godfrey played records, told jokes, occasionally strummed a ukulele—and every half hour read the news. From the point of view of audiences, as was demonstrated by surveys made later, Hayes was right, and I was wrong. Those who liked Godfrey wanted more of him; those who didn't like him

wouldn't tune him in anyway. His ratings increased and everyone, except me, was satisfied.

There's some doubt, as I reread the above paragraph, whether I'm entirely accurate when I say, "Those who didn't like him wouldn't tune him in anyway." It has long been a thesis of those opposed to editorial policies of the Chicago *Tribune* that a large share of that newspaper's circulation is made up of people who hate the *Tribune* and who enjoy hating it so much that they read it every day. Obviously there's no way to prove or to disprove such a theory. But, if valid, it may also apply to certain news broadcasters. In the most intensive survey of its kind ever conducted, students of journalism at Iowa University attempted in 1946 to interview every citizen of an Iowa village as to radio likes and dislikes. The best liked news commentator was H. V. Kaltenborn. Oddly enough he was also voted the most disliked. It doesn't necessarily follow that he is listened to by those who dislike him, but the adverse opinions couldn't have been formed in a vacuum.

It seems logical to assume that they must have listened to Kaltenborn before they decided they didn't care for him, and only a little less logical to assume that thereafter they continued to listen to him, at least periodically, in order to nominate him as the least liked news broadcaster.

Regardless of likes and dislikes, the people invite radio news broadcasters into their homes regularly, and become so familiar with certain personalities that their visits become part of the way of life. Many of these personalities are almost unknown outside their immediate local or regional areas, but it doesn't matter to the listeners whether they are on networks or local stations. Few people outside of the territory served by WCCO in Minneapolis have ever heard of Cedric Adams, who gives the news blithely, even if he hasn't had a chance to read it before he goes on the air, and who has a sublime unconcern if he flubs, fumbles, or fouls up a word. But WCCO's surveys have established that he's by far the most popular news broadcaster in Minnesota and in portions of adjoining states.

So much for the differences between radio and newspapers.

Elmer Davis once disposed of these differences with his customary directness:

I think by now it is pretty generally agreed that the two do not compete so much as supplement each other. Radio has the advantage of immediacy, the newspaper of fullness; you hear the broadcast of the World Series but you are pretty likely to want to read about it, too, in the next day's paper.

Facts worth noting: Of the 1,553 radio stations licensed in the United States as of February, 1947, more than 320 were owned outright by newspapers; at least 300 others probably had some kind of a tie-up with the press. And as radio became more popular with its news programs, the newspapers piled up the largest circulations in their history.

3. GROWING PAINS

The Story of the Press-Radio War

IT HASN'T ALWAYS been possible to get most newspaper publishers and radio station operators to agree that the two media are supplementary and complementary. For a number of years they fought each other bitterly, and in the early nineteen thirties hostility had reached such a peak that there ensued what was universally called "The Press-Radio War." There are still some unreconstructed veterans on both sides, but for the most part press and radio learned to live together in an atmosphere of suspicious amity, their conduct being something like that of two nicely brought-up sisters trying to attract the same man.

Radio celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary in 1945. Although one of the first broadcasts was of a news event—the Harding-Cox election results of 1920 over KDKA, Pittsburgh—little emphasis was given to news during the early, formative years. A few stations carried occasional news bulletins or programs, but radio's plunges into the news field were largely on the spectacular side. In 1921 there was the broadcast of the Jack Dempsey-Georges Carpentier fight. Later in that year came the first broadcast bulletins on a World Series game. But it was in 1924 that there occurred an event which provided vigorous impetus to the purchase of radio sets and to the construction of homemade sets. That was the exhausting and prolonged Democratic national convention held in New York. In those days it was necessary for the winning candidate for the Democratic nomination to receive a vote of two-thirds of the delegates. The

leaders were Al Smith of New York and William G. McAdoo of California. Ballot after ballot was taken and an Alabaman, head of his state's delegation, became almost as nationally famous as Senator Claghorn, at a later date, by bawling the words in response to the first state called in each roll call: "Alabama casts 24 votes for Oscar W. Underwood."

The convention was exciting to listeners, and the number of receiving sets grew like a family of incontinent rabbits. By the time that Smith and McAdoo wore each other out and jointly retired in favor of John W. Davis, the dealers' shelves were almost bare. Radio's numerical gains in four years are depicted in this table:

	<i>U. S. Radio Homes</i>	<i>Sets in Use</i>	<i>Radio Stations</i>
1921	60,000	60,000	30
1925	4,500,000	4,750,000	571

Jumping ahead of the story, let's complete the table for the next 20 years.

	<i>U. S. Radio Homes</i>	<i>Sets in Use</i>	<i>Radio Stations</i>
1930	16,700,000	18,200,000	618
1935	22,900,000	30,500,000	605
1940	29,300,000	50,600,000	814
1945	34,000,000	56,000,000	924

BIRTHSTONES AND MILESTONES

In the late twenties and the early thirties almost everything that radio did was a "first." Important dates abounded with the frequency of Manville marriages. In 1925, 24 stations were linked together to provide coverage of Calvin Coolidge's inauguration. A year later the National Broadcasting Company was founded and in that year, too, it was estimated the greatest audience in history had gathered at loud-speakers for the first Dempsey-Tunney fight. In 1927 listeners followed the glorious exploit of a slim youngster named Lindbergh, and in the same year the Columbia Broadcasting System was organized. Now

there was competition a-plenty and the special events directors of networks fought each other with ingenuity, money, and tigerish ferocity.

This competition extended even to international broadcasting, and in 1930 and 1931 radio brought to American listeners the voices of five prominent foreign leaders—King George V, Premier Hamaguchi of Japan, Benito Mussolini, Mahatma Gandhi, and Pope Pius XI.

The Gandhi broadcast illustrates as well as anything the rollicking rivalry between networks. As Gandhi traveled from India to London, he made a commitment to James Mills of the Associated Press that he would make a radio broadcast. Mills informed NBC, and that network eagerly scheduled the broadcast as exclusive. CBS, of course, tried to persuade Gandhi to speak over both networks, but the Congress Party leader never answered, and indeed, probably never even read a series of anguished cables from CBS.

All seemed lost and NBC executives were chortling over their prospective "beat" almost to the very hour of the broadcast. But at the last moment, the incoming short-wave division of American Telephone and Telegraph Company telephoned CBS that on instruction from London the Gandhi broadcast would be available to both CBS and NBC. No one in New York knew how this miracle was accomplished until a cable was received from Cesar Saerchinger, then the London representative of CBS.

Hoping against hope that Gandhi would agree to a joint broadcast, Saerchinger had asked the British Broadcasting Corporation to install telephone lines to the hall where Gandhi was to speak. BBC complied with its accustomed courtesy, and later received a similar request from NBC. The logical British mind was disturbed. One set of facilities already had been arranged; there was no necessity for two. But, argued Fred Bate, NBC's London manager, Gandhi had agreed to talk only on NBC. Then NBC should have requested the installation earlier, BBC officials pointed out. These officials in a country where there's a monopoly in broadcasting, always had been amused anyway by the seriousness with which American networks battled each other

for programs. They sympathized with Bate but their decision was inflexible: NBC had the speaker, but CBS had the lines over which the speaker would speak. The only sensible thing to do, said BBC, was to combine these assets and to send the program to both networks. And, in the end, that was what was done.

THE CRIME WAS BEYOND DESCRIPTION

Strangely, in all of the competition for news events and news stunts there were relatively few news broadcasts or summaries. One press association—United Press—installed a printer circuit in network offices and from time to time would put an important bulletin on the teletype. Even these bulletins were not always used. Consider the Lindbergh baby kidnaping in 1932. First news of that atrocious crime reached New York radio stations in telephone calls from Newark newspapers which performed this courtesy for the sake of a credit line at the end of the bulletin. WOR in New York as well as CBS made hash out of regular schedules, sent broadcasters and technicians to state police headquarters at Trenton, to New Brunswick, to Hopewell, and even to the edge of the Lindbergh estate. They ordered overtime service to the network in order to give every possible detail on the crime. But that night NBC didn't carry the news at all. The story was considered "too sensational."

Later, of course, NBC changed its mind, and the kidnaping with its many false clues consumed a large part of the broadcasting day on all networks and stations. This had a none too happy effect upon newspaper publishers who steadily had been organizing against the young upstart, radio.

Curiously, newspapers had been among the first to nurse the infant broadcasting business. Manufacturers of sets and set parts were engaged in a wildly competitive market. Many newspapers, especially in metropolitan areas, issued weekly radio sections to carry advertising, technical and program news about broadcasting, and extravagantly detailed schedules. "The Cliquot Club Eskimos" were listed in just that way, and also listed were the musical numbers they were to sing. These special radio sec-

tions were profitable: one in a single issue of the New York *Evening World* achieved 96 pages.

BOULDERS IN THE PATH OF PROGRESS

But the bursting of the Wall Street bubble late in 1929 had its effect upon this delightful situation. Advertising dropped off, and radio sections soon were abandoned. Then publishers discovered that radio was getting a larger and larger share of the national advertising dollar. At every meeting of publishers' groups, resolutions were adopted urging newspapers to quit listing radio schedules altogether, or at least to reduce these schedules to a point where they would provide a minimum of information. To illustrate, let's look at NBC's "powerhouse" of Sunday evening programs as of 1946-47. The militant publishers would have listed the Jack Benny, Phil Harris and Alice Faye, Charlie McCarthy, and Fred Allen programs as follows:

7:00	Comedy
7:30	Music and comedy
8:00	Comedy
8:30	Comedy

At one time, the New York City Publishers Association actually instituted this type of listing. But the applecart was upset when the Scripps-Howard newspapers entered the field with its *World-Telegram*. Roy Howard was no great friend of radio—indeed to this day he seems unconvinced it's here to stay—but he was interested in circulation. So he restored informative program listings, added a column of radio news and gossip, and the public showed its appreciation by buying the paper. Reluctantly, the city's other publishers followed the Howard example.

Publishers then began to exert pressure against press associations not to give or sell their news to radio networks or stations not owned by newspapers. The spearhead in directing this pressure was the radio committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. The chairman of this committee was Ed Harris of the Richmond (Indiana) *Palladium*, and it seems

fantastic that this publisher of a small-town newspaper was able to obstruct radio news progress for so many years.

Harris's committee got its biggest boost in influence on Election Night of 1932 when the nation's voters decided that Franklin D. Roosevelt was to be preferred over Herbert Hoover regardless of how many cars were in every garage or how many chickens were in every pot.

Radio had carried election results ever since 1920 but mostly on a bulletin basis. This year, however, CBS decided to throw aside its normal schedules and to devote the entire evening to the election. The network dickered with United Press and finally emerged with a contract whereby UP would supply its service for what was almost a nominal sum—\$1,000.

But a few days before election, I received a telephone call from Karl A. Bickel, then president of UP, who told me the organization would have to abrogate the contract.

"I'll be right over," I yelled, and within a few minutes, argument in the Daily News Building, UP headquarters, reached seismic proportions. I threatened to sue, Bickel suggested that I do so, and asked me how I would prove any damages. Finally, realizing that a raised voice and a flushed face weren't going to accomplish anything constructive, I pleaded for mercy. But Bickel pointed out his organization's income was derived almost wholly from newspapers, and that the present temper of publishers was such that the UP would lose thousands of dollars if he permitted CBS to use the service. I retired defeated, both bloody and bowed.

Then came a windfall. Kent Cooper, general manager of Associated Press, had heard of the UP-CBS contract, did not know that it was canceled and reasoned that if AP failed to get its returns on the air it would be in effect subsidizing a competitor. Accordingly, he informed both NBC and CBS they could have the AP election service for nothing. Later, the UP also contributed its service in a more or less covert manner. The networks already had the UP printer machines over which bulletins were transmitted. On Election Night these machines were "mysteriously" switched to the main news trunk service of UP. And at the last moment, INS machines also were installed.

The INS copy could not be labeled as such, however; it had to be credited to "the New York *American* and other Hearst newspapers."

So, with AP, UP, and INS available in one form or another, radio went to town. Never before had it covered anything so fully. Newspaper "extras," long since doomed, that night became an anachronism.

But, if radio enjoyed that hour of triumph, it soon found the newspapers hadn't. Publishers, hitherto apathetic, suddenly began oiling their fowling pieces, and marched off to the war. Telegrams and letters of criticism poured down on Cooper's desk. I've always suspected that this canny AP executive had anticipated just such a reaction, had decided it was best to bring the entire matter to a head, and had calculated that the Election Night gift of AP service would have just that effect.

At any rate the AP board of directors, meeting in April, 1933, voted to withdraw any kind of service to networks and ruled that stations owned by AP member newspapers could use the service only upon payment of an additional assessment.

UP and INS were quick to follow suit and thus in the late spring of 1933 the networks and most stations couldn't buy or beg press association news. Radio was not as disconsolate as might have been expected, mainly because it had so few news programs. There may have been others, but the only network news broadcasters I remember now were Lowell Thomas and Walter Winchell on NBC, and H. V. Kaltenborn and Boake Carter on CBS.

Fearful of court action, since the press associations had a proprietary right in their news, the networks then went through a "verification" period. A. A. Schechter, Jr., the resourceful news director of NBC, and I decided we would have news as long as either of us could (1) read and (2) make telephone calls and send cables. So we read the newspapers, and checked up on stories by boosting the revenues of AT&T, RCA, Western Union, Postal Telegraph, and Mackay Radio. Thomas, Winchell, Carter, and Kaltenborn rarely went on the air without details of the biggest stories of the day.

Schechter, in the ebullient book he wrote with Ed Anthony,

The Story of the Press-Radio War

37

I Live on Air, has told lively stories of his telephone successes and also of what he called his Scissors-and-Paste-Pot Press Association. He once clipped from the London *Telegraph* a story datelined Calcutta which told of the efforts of Cawnpore police to arrest a monkey last seen heading for the jungle with a bag containing 10,000 rupees. The story was read on the air by Lowell Thomas and, although already days or months old, attracted so much attention that an American press association carried it two days later.

SCHECHTER TO BELL TO MICROPHONE

But the telephone was the Old Reliable. With Schechter's permission, here are several of his anecdotes that certainly left me none too happy at the time of their occurrence. The stories are revelatory of the methods we used in those early days, and they still point the way to first-rate radio journalism:

In the summer of 1933 a big steamer that made the run from the mainland to Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Island grounded off Naushon Island on a Sunday night shortly before nine o'clock. More than a thousand vacationists and excursionists were aboard. Newspaper and press service correspondents in southeastern Massachusetts were pressed for the story by their offices. None of them knew anything about it. Neither did the offices of the steamship company.

When Walter Winchell carried the story on his newscast that night, a lot of newspapermen were jumped on by their chiefs.

"Winchell gave the ship's position, name, number of passengers, and what-not ten minutes ago," was the common city-desk complaint. "Who is covering that area down there for us, you or Winchell?"

The correct answer would have been neither—just Schechter and that telephone again. He had picked up a tip on the story from Radiomarine, had grabbed the phone, and had checked full details with the radio operator at the RCA station in Chatham, Massachusetts, who was in direct wireless communication with the steamboat captain.

+

Early in 1934 the notorious John Dillinger escaped from the jail at Crown Point, Indiana, where he was being held. The story was

10971

improved by the fact that the sheriff was a woman, Lillian Holley.

I immediately telephoned Miss Holley. The old standby—"this is the office of Lowell Thomas in the National Broadcasting Company"—still worked, and I had no trouble reaching the lady sheriff. She answered questions freely and gave me her whole story. She was thrilled when I told her that a few hours later she would be able to hear Lowell Thomas tell the story she had just told me. . . .



When on Jan. 17, 1934, Lowell Thomas carried a detailed story about the great Peruvian floods, many people in the newspaper world were mystified. It was known that there was a disastrous flood in Peru—one of the worst in South American history—but details were lacking because it was impossible to contact Lima.

When I heard about the disaster, I tried unsuccessfully to telephone Lima. So I made a local call for a change. I telephoned Bill Van Dusen, publicity director for Pan American Airways.

Van Dusen knew about the floods but like everyone else had no additional information. I asked him if he could get in communication with the airport at Lima by short-wave radio and could find out what was happening.

Van Dusen said, "We ought to be able to get in touch with them unless something happened at the airport. We can effect a relay to Brownsville, Texas, and they can complete the relay to Lima."

Luck was with me, for within a few hours the airport manager radioed back a complete story of the Peruvian disaster.

PRICE TAG: \$1,500 A WEEK

Late in the summer of 1933 the advertising manager of General Mills came to CBS with a question and a proposition. Could we organize a radio news service of our own? If the weekly cost of such a service were \$3,000 or less, General Mills would pay half the freight.

Thus came into existence the Columbia News Service, which had its debut in late September of 1933. With less than a month to organize the service, it was remarkably comprehensive. We purchased the Dow-Jones ticker service which gave us a great deal of Washington news in addition to financial news. In London, we bought the report of Exchange Telegraph, a Brit-

ish news agency which had world-wide coverage. And we had bureaus in New York, Washington, Chicago, and Los Angeles. The managers of these bureaus soon lined up correspondents in every city in the United States of more than 20,000 population. We paid these correspondents higher space rates than those commonly paid by newspapers, and thus we had a willing group of "stringers." These are part-time correspondents and the word derives from the newspaper custom of paying by the column inch. Every week or month the correspondents would paste up their "strings" of copy used and send them in for measurement and payment. Then, too, we won a major victory when Postal Telegraph and affiliated companies gave us a press rate on telegrams and cables. Western Union and others soon fell into line. We were in business.

The Columbia News Service provided the material for Carter and Kaltenborn and, in addition, wrote three news broadcasts a day, two five-minute programs every weekday for General Mills at the noon hour and 4:30 P.M., and a fifteen-minute broadcast nightly at 11 o'clock. It was a fairly heavy news year. The New Deal in Washington was going full blast and the Hitler regime in Germany, just come to power, was beginning to write its vicious pages in world history. It was surprising that the regular and long-established news agencies beat us so infrequently. There was an earthquake in British Honduras and somehow or other we had no correspondent in Tegucigalpa. A report was made by consular officials to Washington, however, and thus we missed the story by only a few hours. But sometimes we were ahead. I remember how pleased we were at having the first news of a strike in the Ford plant at Camden, New Jersey, and of a forest fire in the Pacific Northwest. New York newspapers generally ignored this fire. On the other hand, we played it night after night. Within a few days the fire was front-page news in the newspapers.

But our biggest triumph, which caused us all to go around back-slapping for days, was the first interview with Doris Duke on the eve of her twenty-first birthday. A girl reporter named Florence Conley got the interview by the simple process of going to the Duke home, announcing that she had an appointment

with the so-called richest-girl-in-the-world, and talking with a somewhat baffled Miss Duke, who had no idea as to Miss Conley's identity but thought that she must have met her somewhere. The triumph came when the New York *Journal* called up, asked for a copy of the interview, and used it on Page One with full credit to the baby Columbia News Service.

THE HONEYMOON IS OVER

It wasn't long before we began to receive from low-budget newspapers, which found their press association costs onerous, queries as to whether they could transcribe our broadcasts and could use the material in print. At least three newspapers didn't even bother to ask. We found evidence that one newspaper in Pennsylvania, another in Florida, and another in Cuba were merely taking down the news and reprinting it with no credit to us whatever. We decided not to sell our service to papers, and we might have started legal action against those using it without permission, but the thunder had commenced, the dark clouds of publishers' wrath rolled over the horizon, and we had other things to think about. The ANPA radio committee was more active than ever. The committee began a new campaign to drop listings of program schedules, and worse yet from our point of view, to drop only the CBS listings. (NBC during this period merely continued the Schechter shears-and-telephone technique.) The campaign had some success—as I recall, newspapers in Washington, Oklahoma City, and Seattle, among others, were converts. Our time salesmen reported gloomily that NBC was informing prospective advertisers that they would be foolish to buy CBS facilities because soon there would be very few newspapers listing their programs. Whether we would have continued the Columbia News Service in the face of these developments is debatable; the question became academic when Frank Mason, a former Hearst executive and then a vice-president of NBC, arranged a series of peace conferences.

PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY

You could tell from the start that these were peace conferences because of the warlike attitude of all the participants. Nevertheless, after both sides had fired their most powerful verbal guns and found that there were no casualties, the design of a peace treaty began to emerge. It was about as satisfactory as Versailles, but at least it saved face all around and restored AP, UP, and INS reports to network news programs.

The instrument by which this was accomplished was the Press-Radio Bureau, with CBS and NBC paying most of the cost of operation and the three press associations donating their services to the Bureau. Columbia agreed to give up its own news service as of March 1, 1934, the date the Press-Radio Bureau was to start its operations. The Bureau agreed to supply two five-minute news summaries a day not to be broadcast until after 9:30 A.M. for the morning news and not until after 9 P.M. for the evening news.

The Press-Radio Bureau was located apart from its news contributors (the three press associations) and its two leading financial contributors (NBC and CBS). It had its own rewrite or processing staffs, its own editors, its own news judgments.

None of the Press-Radio Bureau news could be sponsored. In addition to the two summaries a day, the Bureau was to supply bulletins of news of "transcendental" importance. The final draft of the treaty contained this delightful double talk:

The object of the Press-Radio plan is to render a public service to radio listeners. It recognizes that the public is entitled to be advised promptly of the news of the day. It also recognizes that there are thousands of radio listeners, invalids, shut-ins, and the blind, who are unable to read the newspapers. It also recognizes the needs of large groups of listeners in remote places who get their newspapers long after the time of publication, and the areas where there are only weekly newspapers. The service also has a special value during vacation months when thousands of people are miles away from a newspaper, but still have access to radio.

So the nation's listeners, especially invalids, farmers, and vacationers, were to get the news "promptly," the definition of that word apparently being at an hour when morning and afternoon newspapers had made all of their street sales.

The Press-Radio War was over. It was difficult to say which side had won. In less than three months of operation, Columbia News Service had forced the publishers to lift their pressures brought against the press associations, and a supply of news to radio was assured. But radio in turn had given up income, some integrity, and a glorious opportunity. There was a question about the winner of this war, but no question at all about the loser. The loser was the American public.

*How did you feel about it?
What do think now? The loser was
the American public?*

4. WEATHER CLEAR, TRACK FAST

Radio News Makes Its Bid

THE ORIGINAL BLUEPRINTS for the Press-Radio Bureau were ignored almost from the start. The architects who had planned a simple little bungalow must have been surprised at the mansion that resulted.

The first thing that happened was an arbitrary decision by the networks that Winchell, Thomas, Carter, and Kaltenborn weren't news broadcasters but commentators. Hence they could be sponsored. It's hard to say how this specious idea was ever put across. Maybe publishers and press association executives, who might have objected, just liked to listen to those "commentators."

The next thing to go was the proscription in regard to the time of broadcast. Subscribers to the Bureau's service were able to put on the news as early as 8 A.M. and 6 P.M.—and later, even these hours were moved up. The reason was that the Bureau found it had competition.

A number of radio stations resented the restriction against sponsorship of news and became clients of radio news services hastily organized. The two most prominent were the Yankee Network's service with headquarters at WNAC, Boston, and Transradio Press headed by Herbert Moore, who had been one of the rewrite men in the New York office of Columbia News Service and thus had had practical experience in running a radio news service. It was noticeable that the Boston newspapers made no threats to remove the program listings of WNAC. A cynic might believe that was because John Shepard, who ran the

station, was also the owner of a department store which bought considerable advertising space in the Hub's newspapers.

At any rate the Press-Radio Bureau was liberalized to meet the competition. The phrase, transcendental importance, was interpreted to mean almost anything the networks wanted. James W. Barrett, former city editor of the New York *World*, which many people to this day consider the last good newspaper, was chosen editor-in-chief of the Press-Radio Bureau. He seemed to find delight in locking up the original specifications and throwing away the key.

The Bruno Hauptmann trial illustrated this. The Bureau carried thousands of words of "running" copy on the trial of the Bronx carpenter who was convicted of kidnaping the Lindbergh baby. Presumably this was of transcendental importance.

Nevertheless, Transradio Press continued to gain subscribers, and UP and INS, which are frankly in business for profit as opposed to the cooperative membership plan of the AP, began to get restive. They saw no reason why they should, in effect, build up a competitor by remaining aloof from a valuable market. Thus in 1935 UP and INS saw the light, or heard the voices, and began to sell their reports to radio with no restrictions as to sponsorship. (The AP didn't fall into line until 1941.)

THE RIGHT HAND SNUBS THE LEFT HAND

There followed a peculiar period in news broadcasting. UP and INS were in competition with themselves. They sold the news, and also gave it away. The Press-Radio Bureau was carrying so much news by 1938 that it was almost a full-time service. That was an important year in radio news history because of two events abroad—*Anschluss* in Austria and Crisis in Godesburg, Berchtesgaden, and Munich.

The networks, which had always reserved to themselves the right to cover news "on the spot"—originally such events as football games and horse races—were making giant strides in their foreign coverage. At the time of King Edward's abdication in 1936 they seemed to be originating as many programs from London as from New York or Hollywood.

Then came the Coronation of King George VI in 1937, undoubtedly the most elaborately covered event up to that time. The British Broadcasting Corporation installed for its coverage 58 microphones, of which 32 were in Westminster Abbey alone, and one of these—I'll take my oath on it—was under the throne.

There's an anecdote in connection with the Coronation broadcast which, to a certain extent, illustrates the emergence of radio as a first class power. When going over the plans with a BBC program official, I noticed that in the Coronation procession there were no mobile units, such as we use in this country to cover inaugural parades and other similar events. I told him it appeared that the route was some two miles long and that although there were observers at such points as Piccadilly Circus and the Marble Arch, there didn't seem to be any provision for a broadcasting car in the procession. "Suppose," I said, "some crackpot takes a shot at the King?" I was put quickly in my place. "In that unfortunate event, Mr. White," he said, "we would consider it a matter for Scotland Yard, not the BBC."

Compare that type of thinking with the enterprise and the ingenuity displayed by the BBC during the years of World War II, and you find that radio came of age very rapidly.

FRANKENSTEIN STARTS SOMETHING

It was in March of 1938, at the time when Hitler decided Austria could no longer get along without him, that an event occurred in radio which was to cause more gray hair and more unduly lined faces among radio news directors than anything else that ever happened. It was March 13 when Frankenstein created the monster, and at 8:00 P.M. of that date, Eastern Standard Time, the first multiple pickup news broadcast in history went on the air. "Multiple pickup" is a radio phrase meaning that Moscow's time is twenty seconds off and that of Athens, five minutes.

There's a story about this which perhaps deserves repetition. When the Germans came into Vienna, William L. Shirer was our correspondent there. The Germans closed the radio station, however, and I instructed him to go to London or to any other

place where he could get a broadcast through. At that time, our chief European correspondent, Edward R. Murrow, later vice-president in charge of public affairs, was in Warsaw arranging, of all things, a musical program for our "School of the Air." I don't know where Mr. Petrillo was at the time. At any rate, I cabled Murrow to go to Vienna as soon as possible because there was a chance that the Germans would reopen the radio station. This turned out to be the case, and so on the celebrated night of March 13, 1938, we had the peculiar experience of hearing Bill Shirer, whose job was in Vienna, speaking from London, and Ed Murrow, whose job was in London, speaking from Vienna. That's broadcasting—it couldn't happen in any other business.

On the same program we picked up newsmen from Berlin, Rome, and Paris, and also the late Ellen Wilkinson, Laborite M.P., from London. International roundups were now a part of radio.

The roundups became highly useful in September of 1938. That was when the Hitlerian threat of war against Czechoslovakia brought the world close to the disaster that finally overtook it a year later. The American public, long apathetic to events abroad, finally became aware that Germany alone of the big powers was playing for keeps.

If any one man contributed most to this awareness it was the redoubtable Kaltenborn. Before what was commonly called The Crisis, he had a schedule of only one or two programs a week at, I believe, the rate of a hundred dollars a broadcast. By the time The Crisis was temporarily resolved at Munich, Kaltenborn had been on the air so much and had captured such a following that income from broadcasting, lectures, and books reached thousands of dollars weekly.

The foreign correspondents would report and Kaltenborn would then analyze. He analyzed everything. The height of something or other was reached one afternoon when, in a fervor of commentation, he even analyzed a prayer by the Archbishop of Canterbury!

But the public loved it. We began to get so many telegrams, so much mail, that we had to hire three girls to handle the

influx. Incidentally, I have always believed that every letter, even the scurrilous ones, should be answered. My theory is that anyone who has taken the trouble to write, whether a "fan" letter or a "pan" letter, is entitled to a reply. In the long run I think this courtesy pays off in audience loyalty and respect.

The extent of public interest in The Crisis is well illustrated by the behavior of a family from Watch Hill, Rhode Island. On one late September day the eastern coast of the United States was lashed by a vicious hurricane. Despite wind and weather the Rhode Island family drove to Boston to visit friends. When they reached their destination, they entered a house in which the radio was broadcasting news about the hurricane, including the damage done at Watch Hill. But the newly arrived guests, outraging the so-called laws of human nature, paid no attention. "Let's dial around," they suggested to their host, "and find out what Kaltenborn has to say about Europe."

ALL'S WELL THAT "ENDS" WELLES

There was to be another display of odd behavior a month or so later in regard to the Orson Welles broadcast of an ancient H. G. Wells fantasy in which the Earth was invaded by Martians. Many people thought they actually had seen the invaders and in some places, notably New Jersey, home guards were hastily organized and deployed. It cannot be proved, of course, that the panic induced by the Welles program was tied up with the public suspense which had been created in the pre-Munich days before Chamberlain and Daladier yielded to Hitler and Mussolini and brought back "peace in our time."

Nevertheless, I'm convinced that the two were closely related. Radio listeners had had their emotions played upon for days, and they had come to realize that news was an increasingly important part of broadcasting schedules. Thus they believed the Welles production even though it was specifically stated that the whole thing was fiction.

That Sunday night I was summoned hastily to the office, and there bedlam reigned. The telephone switchboard, a vast sea of light, could handle only a fraction of incoming calls. The hag-

gard Welles sat alone and despondent. "I'm through," he lamented, "washed up." I didn't bother to reply to this highly inaccurate self-appraisal. I was too busy writing explanations to put on the air, reassuring the audience that it was safe. I also answered my share of the incessant telephone calls, many of them from as far away as the Pacific Coast. A bibulous gentleman from New Jersey wanted to know if it was true that Mars had declared war on us. I told him it wasn't. "That's too bad," he said. "My mother-in-law is out and I hoped she might get picked off by a stray bullet."

WE GET THE GREEN LIGHT

Late in 1938 the Press-Radio Bureau ceased to serve the networks. Provided with full service of UP and INS, they organized their own newsrooms in preparation for what appeared to be an inevitable World War II.

In the spring of 1939 the Germans, paying no attention to their pledges, marched into Czechoslovakia and proved that Chamberlain's hopes were less enduring than his umbrella. Early in June, I went to London and sat down with Murrow, Shirer, and our Paris correspondent at the time, Thomas Grandin. We didn't have any other staff men abroad and so the four of us plotted how we'd cover the war when it came.

Today it seems incredibly brash of us to have undertaken such elaborate plans. I recall that upon returning I sent a memorandum outlining these plans to our executive offices, and appended this note: "P.S. I don't think they'll work either."

It was a wrong guess, because the plans worked fine. Not as wrong a guess, though, as one we had on the air the night of August 31. On that night Kaltenborn came back from Europe, went on the air without script, and to my shock and horror, predicted that England would not fight for Poland, that some compromise would be worked out and that, in short, there would be no war. At that very moment airplane motors were revving up on German flying fields and the pilots were being briefed for the dawn assault on the helpless Poles.

But the start of World War II found us ready. Murrow,

Shirer, and Grandin, in the few weeks left to them before the memorable date of September 1, had interviewed—yes, bullied—foreign broadcasting directors, lined up prospective staff men and string men, and the result was that from the very outset of the blitzkrieg we were able to have out a sign, "Business as usual."

The rest of radio news history can be quickly telescoped because it is so recently a dramatic part of our memories. Even in our most harum-scarum dreams back there in 1939, I doubt if we could have imagined the extraordinary broadcasts to come in the next six years. Even now, it seems fantastic to recall such jobs as those turned in by Murrow during the blitz and after his bomber flight over Berlin, by Cecil Brown after the sinking of the *Repulse*, by George Hicks out in the Channel on D-Day, by Charles Collingwood in North Africa when he really poured it on both as to the military and political effects of the invasion, by Don Pryor in a B-29 actually over Tokyo at the time of the broadcast, by Bill Downs at the German surrender to Montgomery's forces, and by Webley Edwards and Merrill Mueller from aboard the *Missouri* when the Japs formally surrendered to General MacArthur. There were so many superb broadcasts that it's unfair even to list the few I've mentioned, unfair to a very gallant band of radio reporters whose courage and ability added so much to the annals of journalism.

*What was the news like when
we'd be fed?*

5. IT ISN'T DONE WITH MIRRORS

Some Notes on Personnel and Technical Operations

GETTING A NEWS PROGRAM on the receiving set at home is so easy the listener has no idea of the complexity of effort that has gone into preparation of that program. When I told a friend and former associate that I was writing a book on radio news and telling of some of my own activities in more than 15 years of radio, he quickly suggested a title—*Every Day Was Circus Day*.

But it wasn't all pink lemonade and blaring bands and clowns and trapeze acts and trained seals. There were many times when glamor was conspicuously absent, and often motley would have been willingly changed for cover-alls or blue jeans.

Putting news programs on the air can be done—and indeed has been done—with an absolute minimum of news-trained personnel. That is none at all. There are stations with no news service whatever except what they receive from a network, but these are few since most local stations, however small, find that news programs are among their most salable commodities. Thus I propose in this chapter to outline what I consider proper news personnel for stations of varying wattage and income.

Let us take first the 100-watter or 250-watter which in the argot of the trade is usually referred to as a "coffee pot." A station of this size should have a press association service and one trained newsman to act as editor, even if he doesn't go on the air himself. In fact, it probably is preferable that he not be

a broadcaster. One reason is that while he is talking, the mechanical news printer will still be typing out news, and if he is before the microphone with no assistant to watch the machine for him, he frequently will miss a late development that changes the entire news picture. He thus risks misinforming the public. If he says, "There's no late news on the coal strike," and the fact is that John L. Lewis has just given in to the operators (that would be news), then he hasn't kept faith with his listeners, who have the right to expect that every story is up-to-the-minute.

ERRORS, LIKE HISTORY, ARE REPEATERS

There are other reasons for having a news editor who isn't primarily a broadcaster. One of them is that an objective pair of eyes between the writing and the delivery of news frequently is able to avoid mistakes and duplication. It's a psychological fact that if anyone makes an error in preparing news copy, he's apt to repeat that error when reading it aloud. Still another reason is that a station will perform a greater public service if it carries a large amount of local news, and it's all but impossible in terms of time for a news editor to get this news, write it, combine it with press association news, familiarize himself with his material, and then go on the air. News editors, at least in their own judgment, are notoriously overworked, but there are or should be limits.

In more powerful (and more solvent) stations where there is larger personnel, some of these considerations do not apply, and on the whole it's probably better for the man who writes the copy to deliver it. Reading the copy aloud as he writes it, the writer-announcer becomes familiar with it right off the bat. He fits the words to his style of speaking. He sees and thus can avoid certain verbal hurdles that are apt to trip him. Even then, however, his copy should be looked at by someone else before he broadcasts.

I recall an incident in the 1944 presidential campaign that should serve as an example of the necessity for a fresh pair of eyes on news copy. There's no more responsible, painstaking,

and accurate reporter than Bill Henry. Nevertheless, for his program one night he wrote that "President Roosevelt will speak a half hour from now at 9:30, Eastern Daylight Time." The Roosevelt speech was actually scheduled for 9 P.M., and Henry's lapse was occasioned by the fact that a speech a night or two earlier had gone on the air at 9:30. But the copy was not properly checked and the damage was done. Many listeners by telegram, telephone, and letter accused Henry and his network of Republican bias and thought the whole thing was a calculated plot. CBS made an apology as soon as possible and Henry himself apologized the next night—but those apologies didn't recapture a section of the prospective Roosevelt audience which had been misled by the original error.

FOR BIGGER AND BETTER PAYROLLS

As a station's income expands its news staff should be increased. There are four natural news periods a day. First, the hour of arisal (I know there's no such word but there should be). Second, lunch time. Third, the homecoming and dinner hour. Fourth, ready-for-bed time. That long a broadcasting day obviously imposes too much of a strain upon one news editor, even upon two, and to stretch out the week at least three editors should be hired. Then, too, there should be an outside staff of the same number. A great deal of local news coverage can be handled on the telephone, but there's really no acceptable substitute for the reporter who can go out and dig.

Most laymen don't realize how much of their local news comes from so few places. If police headquarters, fire headquarters, city and county offices and courts, men's luncheon clubs, labor union headquarters, airports and railway stations, and sports arenas, stadia, and diamonds are well covered, then at least 90 per cent of any locality's news is at hand.

More and more local and regional news is being added, thus opening up more and more opportunities for college-trained journalists. There was always a marked predisposition on my part to hire recent graduates with little or no newspaper experience. They didn't have to unlearn much that they had learned.

Although, as I've pointed out, the actual styles of writing for eye and ear are becoming more uniform, there's still a necessity for compression in radio that doesn't exist to the same extent in newspapers. And once a newsman has developed an effective though wordy style in print, he finds it extremely difficult to boil down stories to their essentials.

To be fair, I must report that not all news directors feel so generously disposed toward the new journalism graduate. However, in visits to numerous radio newsrooms throughout the country, I've observed that the average age level seems to be much lower than in newspaper city rooms.

THE ONE-MAN SHOW

Let's take a look at the news set-ups of a number of stations that have specialized in that field and have established enviable reputations. We'll start with a five-thousand-watt station, KMA, in Shenandoah, Iowa, which has wide audiences in at least four states—Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas.

KMA takes the radio wires of both Associated Press and United Press. From these, it prepares locally seven fifteen-minute programs every weekday—at 7:00 and 7:45 A.M., noon, and 4:30, 6:30, 10:00, and 11:00 P.M.—all usually sponsored. In addition, it carries from its network, ABC, many news personalities.

There's other specialized news as well—roughly two hours of farm news a day and an hour and a quarter of women's programs devoted largely to homemaking helps, gardening, letters from listeners, and so on.

But aside from the specialized news there is—or was at the end of 1946—only one man on the station's news staff. That was Ralph Childs, who prepared and delivered no less than four fifteen-minute news programs a day—those at noon, 4:30, 6:30, and 10:00 P.M. His "only" other duty at KMA, he wrote me, was on Saturday nights when he made station break announcements from 8:00 until midnight.

For the benefit of three staff announcers who prepare and read the other fifteen-minute programs, Childs has written a

memorandum outlining the best way to use news from two news services. Here it is:

In editing news from the two machines, Associated Press and United Press, a simple and efficient procedure is to determine which machine is giving you the latest news in roundup form. Sometimes one service will be sending through bulletins killing previous roundups, while the other service is giving the complete story ready for broadcast as is. Considerable time can be saved by using the roundups of the latter.

Of course, individual preferences again can alter cases. This is submitted simply as a guide.

To blend the services, first it is necessary to separate the stories. Sometimes this can be done simply by cutting out dangling participles, connecting phrases, or wordiness that actually add nothing to the news.

Select the machine that seems to be giving the most useful material, and edit everything on it first. Separate the stories according to their categories and make a record in your memory of the facts therein.

Then tear off the news from the other machine. And as you read each story, compare it with the other service, looking for additional details that are pertinent to the story, interesting facts, or better writing. If necessary, discard the other story completely, or use details from either story to strengthen the other. Finish that section and move on to the next.

Do this to each section until you have your four main divisions. [Presumably foreign, national, regional, and features.] Perhaps you will have twice as much news as you can use. Then start editing. Balance facts against facts, details against details. Cut until you have all the important news without having sacrificed any section to oblivion. Cut and measure until you are within your limit.

You will have a well-balanced newscast, a well-rounded newscast, if you have seen to it that no complete section was thrown out; if you have moved from one section to the other, cutting and measuring until you have just the right number of lines for your newscast.

Now comes the simplest part of a newscast: "Here's the news from Washington"; "In Iowa . . ."; "In dispatches from overseas it's reported that . . ."; "Now for the latest on the labor situation." Scribble them in with a big black pencil.

Separate the stories first, line them up in logical order, and worry about the tie-ins later. They usually take care of themselves.

THE SPIRIT OF INDEPENDENTS

The independent station, so called because it isn't affiliated with a network, has a definite advantage in news handling because it can insert its news at any time it wants to. An independent will often have news every hour on the hour.

One of the best of these stations is WQXR, in New York, owned by the *New York Times*. It's noted not only for its hourly news summaries of five minutes between 7:00 A.M. and midnight (there's only one fifteen-minute news program a day, that at 9:00 P.M.) but also for its almost continuous programming of semi-classical and classical music.

The news staff necessary for eighteen news summaries a day consists of a news director, a night news editor, four full-time rewrite men, and one part-time man. The news is edited from the "A," or principal, news wire of the Associated Press and that service's radio wire.

A high proportion of the news is local; opening and closing stock market reports are carried at 11:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M., and sports scores at 6:00 P.M. All news broadcasts carry a two-line weather report.

A BIG VOICE IN THE TWIN CITIES

Let's go now to one of the biggest stations, the 50-kilowatt WCCO in Minneapolis, familiar to all listeners in Minnesota and far beyond into neighboring states and into Canada. You will see that as a station's power increases and its influence becomes greater, there's a sharp rise in needed news personnel.

WCCO, aside from the news programs received from its network, CBS, produces seven five-minute programs a day, five fifteen-minute broadcasts, a news analysis, a sports summary, and three farm service programs.

To handle this volume—written from both the news and the radio wires of AP and UP—the station has a news director, Sig

Mickelson, five full-time news writers, and one secretary. In addition, there are three news personalities, a farm service director, and a sports reporter. Staff announcers read the other programs not handled by these men.

Emphasis on certain types of news varies interestingly at certain times of the day. Mickelson writes me:

Our rule of thumb is that there should be a substantial amount of local and regional news on the 7:15 A.M. broadcast which immediately follows a fifteen-minute network foreign roundup.

At 8:30 A.M. we use only those local and regional stories that will stand on their own merit, and we emphasize national and international stories.

The 12:30 P.M. broadcast is designed to cover all of the news briefly, but completely enough so that the broadcast serves as a condensation of an afternoon newspaper. As a general rule, from one-third to one-half of the content could probably be classified as local and regional news.

At 5:30 P.M. we immediately precede a fifteen-minute network program of general news, so again we concentrate more on local and regional stories, along with agricultural news.

By 10 P.M. we assume that news has been pretty well hashed over for the day. Usually there is scant new news and so we throw in a little entertainment, looking for feature stories wherever we can find them.

COVERAGE THAT IS COVERAGE

Another station with an enviable news reputation is the 5,000-watt WMT in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Its particular specialty is regional news, although it is one of the few stations in the country, not serving as a network key station, that has three press services, AP, UP, and INS.

This is the way the extensive regional coverage was set up, and it's put forward in some detail because it could be—and in my opinion should be—copied by almost every other station of the same size:

Al Haugner, at one time the state news editor of WMT, selected part-time correspondents in 40 key cities and county seats within the

primary listening area of the station, roughly the whole of eastern Iowa. The correspondents report by telephone or telegraph and send a great deal of routine news by mail. They have been asked to be particularly vigilant on Sundays and holidays when radio stations have the news field to themselves. The station has a "country editor" program which, as the name implies, is a program of personal news from the communities.

Through this supplemental news service, WMT has been able to score many a notable beat on both newspapers and news services on important stories in its area. One outstanding example was a hotel fire in Dubuque in which 19 persons were killed.

The correspondents are paid a guaranteed minimum. If, in WMT's opinion, they have earned more due to unusual enterprise, fast coverage, a beat on the story, or through quantity of news, there's additional compensation. The whole idea makes for a great public service.

FROM V.P.'S TO OFFICE BOYS

Let's examine the personnel desirable for network operation. A network usually has in its New York office a director of news broadcasts, an assistant director, four editors—day, night, over-night, and week-end, who are able to cover the 168 hours in a week with occasional assistance from one of the other members of the staff—seven to ten rewrite men, from six to a dozen reporters and commentators, three office assistants (once known as office boys), a local news editor, three or four secretaries, and at least three linguists, who listen to foreign short-wave stations and translate news that's broadcast in foreign languages.

Fairly large staffs are necessary also in Washington, which, ever since 1933, has become an increasingly important news center, and in San Francisco, which is the radio-and-cable head for the Far East, just as New York is for Europe and South and Central America.

The size of the foreign staff varies considerably among networks. NBC and CBS have full-time men in London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Moscow, Tokyo, and a few other cities. ABC and MBS have fewer full-time correspondents abroad and depend

in large part on "stringers"; that is, men who work for some other news medium but are available for special assignments.

Also a part of network news operations are special events and sports broadcasts, although at times these divisions are autonomous and not under direct supervision of the news director. Actually, since on-the-spot coverage is just as much news as a summary of events, I've never seen any logical reason for not including special events and sports within the news department. But network executives sometimes move in mysterious ways their blunders to perform.

HOW A NETWORK WORKS

Although I've stressed—and should stress again—the desirability of local broadcasting, networks still supply a large proportion of a station's news schedules. This is because they've built up popular personalities, they're able to buy news from all press associations, they're able through their own staff men at home and abroad to sprinkle their broadcasts with news beats. Then, too, whenever hot news is breaking, they can make pick-ups direct from the scene or at least from the city in which the event is occurring.

Of the 1,553 stations licensed by the F. C. C. as of February 1, 1947, more than half—971—were affiliated with nationwide networks. The affiliations were as follows: MBS, 400; ABC, 243; CBS, 165; NBC, 163. But the point is not in percentages—it's in power and influence.

Nearly all of the big wattage stations with vast regional or concentrated metropolitan audiences are tied up with networks. Since V-J Day licenses have flowed like wine out of the F. C. C., but three-fifths of these licenses have been granted in towns of less than 25,000 people and in four out of five of those towns the newly licensed stations were the first ones to be installed in such localities. In other words, community radio is now going forward on a large scale.

But, in general, the networks still have the bulk of the nation's listeners and it might be profitable at this point to tell just how a network operates.

A network is a web of telephone lines, leased from the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The lines serving the four major networks spread a distance of close to a hundred thousand miles, most of them underground so as to be weatherproof.

A network broadcast usually originates in a studio insulated against outside sounds, is picked up by one or more microphones and "fed" to an adjacent control room, and from there to a master control room, where it is "patched" to the right segment of the network. From there it is delivered to the long-lines division of the AT&T and goes to the master control rooms of the network's affiliates. Each master control room "feeds" the program to the station's transmitter, again by telephone wire, and now it is broadcast from the tower or towers of each station.

Since certain sounds travel faster through telephone cables than other sounds, it's necessary for telephone company engineers to correct a situation called "getting out of phase." Then, too, "repeater" stations are set up at interval distances of about 50 or 100 miles. At these "repeater" stations, the programs are re-amplified so that the original microphone level is maintained over the entire network. Naturally, it's impossible to have such "repeater" points along the ocean floor and that's why trans-oceanic broadcasts are not feasible by cable. In these days when "telephoning London" is a commonplace among businessmen and government leaders, most people think of a transmission through cable wire. These "telephone" calls, however, are on short wave or long wave. The standard broadcast band for radio stations is medium wave.

THE LIMIT OF HUMAN ENDURANCE

For charting purposes, the Bell System linking the stations of the four networks has assigned a color for each—red for NBC, blue for ABC, purple for CBS, and gold for MBS. In order to make sure that the right program is going out in the right manner on each network, supervisors sit and listen—the radio word is "monitor" used both as noun and verb—constantly. These "monitors" hear everything from symphony to jive, from news to soap operas. They even, Lord help them, listen to singing

commercials. They work in four-hour shifts. They can't take it any longer than that.

Two other elements in network "traffic" which might be described are the "round-robin" and the "reversals." All network telephone lines are one-way streets but between New York and Chicago there are round-robin which permit instantaneous switches to some of the large cities of the industrial Middle-Atlantic states, the most populous section of the country. A network broadcast, for example, starts in New York, goes out to Chicago through Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, Louisville, and Indianapolis, and returns through Cleveland, Detroit, Buffalo, and Albany. Incidentally, sound carried over wires travels simply with the speed of sound, whereas radio carries the sound with the speed of light. If you stand before loud-speakers in a network master control room and hear a program before it goes to Chicago, and after it has returned, you will notice a "lag" of a fraction of a second. The words on their return are a syllable or so behind the originally spoken words.

With proper technical installations, any of these round-robin cities can be immediate originating points for programs on a direct "cue"—we take you now to Chicago, etc. The words keep going round and round the round-robin. But to switch to the Pacific Coast, which is connected to the round-robin by a one-way wire, unless a second telephone line is bought at a cost of roughly \$300 an hour, requires a brief period of time for reversal of the network. This time is from five to seven seconds and during the reversal stage there is "dead air" on the network. Radio people fear dead air more than almost anything else, but this dread probably is not shared by the public. Listeners, indeed, might occasionally welcome a fifteen-minute period of silence.

The network program goes out over telephone lines to local stations even when a local station is putting on another program. That makes it possible, and highly advisable, for the news editor in the local station to have the network program coming in on a receiving amplifier at low volume. Then, if the network has some spectacular news which hasn't reached the local station from its news service, the news editor can call master control and

break into the program in progress. At CBS, we originated the use of a series of "beeps," a word used to describe thousand-cycle tones put on to the network circuits, the number of beeps delineating the importance of a news program soon to be broadcast. This put the news editors of affiliated stations on notice that a bulletin, a news summary, or a broadcast was coming up and they then could speedily make up their minds whether to carry the network program instead of one originating locally.

Before using the "flash mike," one that can be used to by-pass the control room—it is ready for action the moment a button is pressed—it would be well for the editor to pause briefly and listen on his loud-speaker to find out just what he is interrupting. I give this warning from sad experience. I once broke into a dance-band program for announcement of the death of a prominent industrialist and philanthropist. Immediately after the bulletin the orchestra continued to play blatantly and with full vocal support, "I'll Be Glad When You're Dead, You Rascal, You!"

6. HOW TO AND HOW NOT TO

Advice on Radio News Writing

STYLE BOOKS have already dug too many a journalistic grave, but over the years certain things have been found out about radio writing, and the student may as well know what we've learned, or think we've learned. But none of the rules or suggestions now to be put forward is made of iron. Thus if I appear to be arbitrary and overuse the words "always" and "never," please realize that they may be construed to mean "almost always" and "hardly ever."

*How
do you
test
so you
write*

READ IT AS YOU WRITE IT

Too much emphasis can't be given the injunction to speak the words as you write them. Look in at a busy network newsroom in the early morning where perhaps as many as five writers are simultaneously preparing scripts. Their lips are moving soundlessly like a school of agitated goldfish. They are simply talking the words they have written to see if the sentences will come out all right. Some writers have never learned to do this except vocally and even vociferously. Ned Calmer, for instance, has always read his copy aloud—with full inflections—just as he intends to do it on the air. Mayhem has been avoided by the expedient of providing him with a private office. Other writers can then work in comparative quiet.

One thing that speaking your words will do is to help eliminate tongue-twisting alliteration. Nearly every announcer would

be thrown for a loss by phrases such as "the consensus of Schenectady's statisticians" or "his stalwart soldierly shoulders."

It might be inserted, by way of parenthesis, that most "flubbing" by announcers is not caused primarily by difficult words or phrases. The announcers school themselves for the hard ones, and then—possibly out of sheer relief—capsize on the words immediately following. The effect is somewhat like that of a steeplechase horse clearing a difficult jump magnificently and then stumbling on the flat. Another cause of "flubs" is the use, in one sentence, of two words spelled similarly but pronounced differently. Such a sentence as this, "He received a thorough grounding at the home office and then traveled through the South." The eye has a tendency to leap slightly ahead of the voice and an announcer may find to his dismay that he's reading the words after "through" instead of after "thorough."

One more advantage in reading your copy to find out how it will sound: you will be able to avoid unconscious rhyming which so beguiles the listener that he's apt to lose the sense of the story. An exaggerated example would be, "Georgette LeMay, star of the Broadway play, 'Hit the Hay,' lay unconscious today in County hospital at Broadway and Clay." This would simply sound like a bad lyric.

CURTAIL THE SHIRTTAIL

What do
you do
in / the
shirrtail

Qualifying words at the end of a sentence should never be used in radio. One of the first vows to be taken by a novitiate in broadcasting is to renounce the use of such phrases as "it was learned tonight," "according to well-informed sources in Belgrade," "it was reported by the United Press," etc.

That word, "report," has such a variety of meanings it should be used sparingly. As a noun, it can be an official document, an authentic message, or simply an unverified rumor. As a verb, its meaning is similarly loose. Let's take a look at this sentence:

The gang of bandits who staged the 300 thousand dollar bank robbery at Tucson last Thursday is hiding out in southern Arizona near the Mexican border, it was reported tonight from state police headquarters at Phoenix.

What does "reported" mean there? Did the state police issue a statement? Did some responsible citizen actually report the presence of the bandits in southern Arizona? Or is the whole thing merely a rumor? There's no way of telling. The fault lies with the correspondent who filed the story from Phoenix and the various editors who let the story "ride" without asking for explicit information.

Whenever there is any doubt as to the authenticity of a story, identify the suspect sources first rather than at the end of a sentence in what is termed a "shirrtail." To illustrate:

General de Gaulle is planning a political comeback and has told followers he expects to be the next premier, according to a news broadcaster on Radio Paris tonight.

This should have read:

A news broadcaster on a French radio station said tonight that General de Gaulle is planning a political comeback and has told followers he expects to be the next premier. There was no confirmation from any other source.

ACCENTUATE THE NEGATIVE

For some reason a prejudice against negative news has arisen in newspaper writing. Most reporters are taught never to begin their stories with the fact that there's a lack of new information. No news is not necessarily good news but it frequently *is* news. To get back to the bank robbery story on page 63, there's nothing wrong with this lead:

The gang of bandits who staged the 300 thousand dollar bank robbery at Tucson last Thursday has not yet been captured. State police headquarters at Phoenix says it has received information indicating the gang is hiding out in southern Arizona near the Mexican border.

Another example of an effective negative:

So far it's a safe-and-sane Fourth here in Central City. Up to 5 o'clock this afternoon hospitals had received no ambulance calls and the fire department had not had a single alarm.

REPEAT AND REPEAT AND REPEAT

This is the most frequently quoted description of radio news: "In radio news you tell the story three times. First, you tell 'em you're going to tell 'em; then, you tell 'em; finally you tell 'em you've told 'em."

The description applies to such a story as this one:

There's good news tonight for housewives who have been complaining of meat shortages. [You've now told 'em you're going to tell 'em.] The Department of Agriculture issued a forecast in which it said that the supply of meat was expected to increase by more than 50 per cent within the next six months. "By next April," the forecast said, "meat should be plentiful and lower prices should obtain for all beef, pork, and lamb cuts." [Now you've told 'em.] That was a direct quotation from the Agriculture Department which paints a rosy picture for future meat supplies. [You've told 'em you've told 'em.]

That type of treatment, although here exaggerated, is not bad radio usage, especially when a long quotation is used and a listener, tuning in in the middle of the broadcast, might think he was hearing the announcer's opinion rather than a quotation.

In using long quotations it's advisable to break them up occasionally with such phrases as "the President went on to say," "the presidential message continued," or "the President added."

On the general subject of repetition most young writers seem to feel that no word should be used twice in the same sentence—or even in the same story. This leads often to what Fowler has termed "elegant variation," which is more annoying than repetition of an obvious word. How many times have you heard an announcer say, "And there was big news in Washington today. Administration leaders in the nation's capital said"

I know of no reason why "the nation's capital" should be used in place of Washington, granting there's any justification for using either. It can be assumed fairly safely that if administration leaders said anything, they said it in Washington.

Another common fault of radio news writers is their search for

What is
the
reason
for
repetition?

synonyms for the word "said." Prominent people "declare," "assert," "express the belief," "observe," and "contend"—they do all of these things because writers don't want to have them continuously saying something. Actually, I doubt if anyone is ever conscious of repetition of the word "said." It's always read as though completely unaccented and doesn't protrude itself into a story no matter how often used.

There's one type of repetition, however, which does bother listeners—and that's unimaginative writing from one program to another in which the same story is used time and again with little or no variation. The radio wires of press associations are largely responsible for this. On the day of the settlement of the railroad strike of 1946, one news agency carried these three stories numbered consecutively, as follows:

170**BULLETIN**

Washington—An official of one of the striking railroad brotherhoods has predicted that the strikers will give in to government demands to call off the strike.

The official, who withheld use of his name, made the forecast as presidents of the striking engineers and trainmen conferred with carrier representatives in the headquarters of Federal Mediator John Steelman.

415P

171**SPOT SUMMARY**

An official of one of the striking railroad brotherhoods predicts that the striking railroad unions will yield to government demands to return to work. (60 words more)

417P

172**RAILS (SUBS PREVIOUS)**

Washington—An official of one of the striking railroad brotherhoods has predicted that the unions will accept the government's demands. This official, who declines to permit the use of his name, says he sees nothing else for the striking engineers and trainmen to do but end their strike. (150 words more)

424P

You will notice that the same story has been carried three times and, to me, this represents a scandalous waste of wire space. I don't doubt there were good reasons for this type of news handling—things have to be spelled out for small stations that haven't adequate personnel, but there should be an intensive study of ways to avoid such repetition.

In connection with that strike settlement story, the press association an hour later came up with a lead that was a good college try even if it missed a touchdown:

217**ELEVENTH FIVE MINUTE SUMMARY**

The iron horse is getting up steam to haul the nation off the side-track onto the main line.

The green light has flashed. The railroad strike is off.

The leaders of the striking engineers, etc., etc.

Here the writer was making a valiant effort to get away from a stereotyped lead, but it seems to me, he overshot the mark. I believe that the fancy stuff merely confused listeners. It would have been better if the sentences had been reversed as follows:

The railroad strike is off. The green light has flashed.

The iron horse is getting up steam to haul the nation off the side-track onto the main line.

The moral to be learned from the above is that originality is not, of itself, a virtue. It's okay to try to write something in a novel manner, but make sure you tell the story first.

BUT DON'T BE REDUNDANT

Repetition is excusable and often advisable. But redundancy is another thing. Avoid it as you would cholera. It wastes space and insults the intelligence of the listener. Herewith are some examples of the tautological, the unnecessary words being underlined:

He said he had seen the accident with his own eyes.

Consensus of opinion.

Present incumbent.

Funeral obsequies.

He was indicted by the grand jury.

The trial of Joe Doaks on a charge of murder began today in criminal court.

Still continues.

New departure.

He bowled a perfect 300 game without a single miss.

THOSE QUOTATION MARKS

In radio there's only one form of punctuation mark ordinarily used out loud. That's the quotation mark. Even its use should be sparing.

Your copy should be carefully punctuated for the simple reason that it will serve as a guide to the announcer reading it. Plenty of dashes or ellipses may be of particular help, since they will indicate the use of a parenthetical tone of voice or of a meaningful pause.

But of course the announcer can't make use of the words "period," "comma," "colon," "semicolon," "interrogation mark," or "exclamation point," except occasionally for a semi-humorous effect. He can only read the copy in such a way that the listener knows they are there. However, there are times when he must use "quote" or "quotation." That's for the sake of clarity, and because nothing so enlivens a broadcast as good, bright quotable material.

Here again there are difficulties in trying to draw up hard-and-fast rules. But, with the qualifying phrase "in general," here we go:

Don't use the word "quote" for short quotations in which it is perfectly obvious that the material is indeed quoted. For instance this would sound absurd: "The Argentine Government denounced the Washington report as quote false unquote." As would this: "Senator Boding pictured the United States as quote standing on the threshold unquote of quote the greatest catastrophe in the history of the world end of quote."

Remember that since the word "quote" is foreign to the ear

as far as ordinary conversation is concerned, it probably always is faintly disturbing to the listener. Accordingly, it should be used only when its absence might create confusion. In a long quotation, the listener might think that the views expressed were those of the announcer instead of the man being quoted.

Here are some other instances when oral quotation marks probably are advisable:

When a quotation involves use of the words "here," "in this city," "in our country," or the pronoun "I."

When the quotation is particularly arresting, such as the first report of Churchill's famous "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

But even when you have to say that a quotation is a quotation, rather than leave it to the announcer's voice, strive for some variety in saying it. Here are possibilities:

The Senator then turned to the subject of conscription and said, in just these words: "This bill is the most monstrous, etc., etc. . . ." That ends the direct quotation from Senator Fuss's speech attacking the conscription bill. He went on to say, etc., etc.

Here is a quotation from Senator Fuss's speech: ". . ." This quotation was part of a three-hour address, etc., etc.

To quote the Senator: ". . ." That's how Senator Fuss feels about the subject of conscription.

To sum it all up, try to use such words as "quote" and "quotation" as little as is consistent with clarity. And if you do have to use them, try to do so in a manner that *eases* them into the copy.

One thing more: please, please, don't use "unquote."

THE LONG AND SHORT OF IT

I've already emphasized the necessity for compression and hence for simplicity. But oversimplification has its dangers, too. A series of short sentences becomes monotonous and the staccato quality of that type of writing is annoying.

Ordinary rules of grammar, such as the rule that every sentence should have a subject and a predicate, may be ignored.

*why shouldn't
you have all
short sentences?*

Short

Some of the best writing for radio merely assumes a subject or a predicate. Examples:

It was a mixed crowd . . . Pushcart peddlers, brokers, uniformed soldiers, housewives, teachers, shoe clerks, touts, and bobby-soxers.

Flood . . . Incessant rain . . . Water inching over even the highest levees . . . Spilling into the fertile valleys . . . Drowning the ripening grain . . . Toppling over houses, barns, telephone poles . . . Sweeping away railroad tracks, ties, and even the roadbed itself.

Critics of radio have said there was too much "writing down" to the listener, have argued that radio news is written so that a twelve-year-old child could understand every word. But simplicity and clarity travel hand-in-hand. Take foreign words or phrases. Why say "per diem" instead of "a day," "chaise longue" instead of "couch," "esprit de corps" instead of "spirit" or "morale," "sub rosa" instead of "confidentially" or "covertly"? Similarly there are so-called "dictionary" words that have synonyms known by everyone and there's just no sense in using the uncommon words. Again a question. Why use "pellucid" instead of "clear," "recondite" instead of "secret" or "abstruse," "didactic" instead of "preceptive" or "instructive"?

On the other hand, if there's an unusual word with the precise shade of meaning you want, then by all means use it regardless of its length or rarity. Use it and, if necessary, define it. Always remember that self-improvement is an American passion and that the public likes learning something new. You may remember Senator Tobey's use of the phrase, "Macedonian cry," when he wrote President Truman pleading for more chicken feed for New Hampshire's poultry farmers. The phrase was probably meaningless to most listeners, but I believe they actually enjoyed the explanation; that it came from the ninth verse of the sixteenth chapter of *Acts*: "And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; there stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia and help us."

NO SAFETY IN NUMBERS

Numbers frequently pose a problem for announcers, just as they do for linotype operators. The latter frequently leave off three digits in a number, thus transforming billions to millions. Announcers, too, have difficulty in reading large numbers and are apt to stumble when faced with an array of ciphers.

There's also a considerable question as to just how much the mind can retain when complicated figures reach it only through the ear. Only an expert in mnemonics could long remember a number such as 1,674,935,468. Thus in radio, it would be better to say "more than one and a half billion." Herewith some style recommendations for all numbers:

Spell out numbers between one and nine.

Use numerals for numbers between 10 and 999.

Spell out thousand, million, and billion.

Spell out all fractions.

In giving election results, forget exact totals unless the results are exceptionally close. Don't say:

In the Senatorial race, with 1,465 of the state's 3,758 election districts reporting, John Smith is leading Henry Brown 22,375 to 16,799.

Instead, put it this way:

In the Senatorial race, with more than one-third of the state's election districts reporting, John Smith is leading Henry Brown by close to six thousand votes.

In regard to ages, it's not necessary to report them unless they are a particularly pertinent part of a story. If a 68-year-old woman marries a 19-year-old boy, there isn't any story unless you give the ages. Another age "must" is in death stories. People, particularly older people, always want to know how old a person was when he died.

Some radio newsrooms have a rule that writers should never use "a hundred," or "a thousand," or "a million" because the "a" might sound like "eight." I disagree with this theory be-

Handbook
radio
style
for
numbers
differ
from
newspaper
style?

cause the article "a" should be pronounced as though spelled "uh" instead of "ay." Further, in ordinary conversation, it's rare that a person says "one thousand." He's much more apt to say "uh thousand."

LANGUAGE AND SLANGUAGE

*What
is the
difference
between
good
conversational
style
and slang?*

Stress on use of colloquialisms usually occupies a large portion of the first chapter of a radio style book. For instance let's quote from Phil Newsom, manager of UP's radio service and author of that organization's radio news style book:

Radio news writing is more informal than newspaper writing, since people speak more informally than they write. In order to have listeners absorb what you're telling them you serve it on a familiar platter, using the same words they use in everyday conversation.

That is why generally accepted colloquialisms may be used to advantage in radio news writing—not "slanguage" or flippancies, but the smooth, simple, colloquial talk of the average man. And, since that is the way we speak, each sentence should try to cover one simple thought.

For instance, a news report on the bombing of Berlin might read:

"An estimated force of 300 RAF planes rained death and destruction on Berlin in a savage attack during the night, hitting railroad sidings, depots, warehouses, oil dumps and military installations."

The average man, telling of that same attack probably would say:

"We certainly gave Berlin a pasting last night."

Obviously, you can't use a lead of that type. But you could modify it this way:

"The RAF gave Berlin a terrific pounding during the night, Some 300 (note the easy 'some' instead of 'an estimated') British bombers dropped tons of explosives on the German capital, spreading death and destruction. Hits were scored, etc."

Simplicity is the essence of good radio news writing. A word or phrase which looks well on paper may sound silly or strained when it comes from a loud-speaker.

The border-line between colloquialism and slang isn't easily charted. Let's take this "brightener," carried by one press association at the time of the 1946 railroad strike:

OSSINING, N. Y.—A state law requires Sing Sing Prison to give railroad fare to released prisoners.

George Harris was released today when a train was as easy to find as a prairie schooner. So Harris finally hired a cab for New York—40 miles away. It was the first time in 97 years that anyone completed a Sing Sing sentence and had to shell out his own dough to get away from the joint.

To me, there's a question as to whether that's overly slangy. One reason for the question is the fact that press association copy is designed to be read by announcers of all types and ages and from the lips of some, particularly those of the pontifical persuasion, the story would sound ludicrous.

There's one type of story in which slang should be avoided. That's in connection with any tragedy. In fact, even the colloquial might turn out to be in bad taste. A good rule-of-thumb is for the writer to assume that some good friend or close relative is involved in the tragedy and then to write the story.

A recommended aspect of the conversational style is the use of contractions. Most people talk that way. Why not do so on the air? Say "it's not" or "it isn't" rather than the formal "it is not." Although purists and grammarians may writhe, I'm even in favor of "it's been" rather than "it has been."

BEG PARDON, PLEASE

If an error goes on the air, whether the fault of the writer or the announcer, never be afraid to apologize and to correct the error as soon as possible. Every newsroom should have on hand a supply of mimeographed pages as follows:

Earlier in this broadcast I mistakenly said What I meant
to say was
.....

Then, even if the error comes toward the end of the broadcast, the correction can be filled in quickly in the blank spaces and can be put on the air before "sign-off."

There are times when an admission of error can be made so

interesting it actually pleases listeners. Lowell Thomas once got a little mixed up in Canadian geography and misplaced Port Hope. Later, in a broadcast, he spoke as follows:

It would hardly do for me to broadcast from Canada without mentioning Port Hope. When I got on the train last night a brakeman came up to me and said: "Well, is Port Hope still up north of the Arctic Circle?" And all day here at the Mount Royal Hotel, friendly Canadians have been phoning me, volunteering to show me just where Port Hope is on the map.

In Toronto, one newspaper, the *Evening Telegram*, said: "Mussolini took Ethiopia; Hitler took the Sudeten; Japan took a slice of China; Franco took Barcelona; and Lowell Thomas took Port Hope—took it from its present site and planted it about three thousand miles away, on the shores of Great Bear Lake."

All this happened in a Movietone newsreel, recently, and I've been hearing about it ever since. So, in concluding tonight, here in the presence of a thousand people of Montreal, I want to move Port Hope back from the shores of Great Bear Lake to the shores of Lake Ontario where it belongs. As one Canadian paper put it: "Port Hope, the home port of a great hope, hopes that this sort of thing won't happen again."

Care and caution should always be exercised. But if you have to make a mistake, for heaven's sakes don't make it on a sports result. If you erroneously put the Pittsburgh Pirates in the American League or happen to give the score as Red Sox, 3, Yankees, 2, and add that the game was won when Ted Williams cracked a homer with the bases full (the score would then obviously be at least 4 to 2) you have undermined the entire institution of radio in the opinion of the most critical audience of all, the nation's sports fans.

NO RUNS, NO HITS, SEVERAL ERRORS

Sometimes, by the arrangement of words in a sentence, you inspire false rumors and unwittingly give misinformation. I learned my own lesson in this regard when I put on a bulletin reading as follows:

"William N. Doak, Secretary of Labor under President Hoover, died today in Charleston, West Virginia."

Within a half hour newspaper offices were swamped with telephone calls asking if it were true that President Hoover had died. These calls were traceable to inattention or to the fact that at any given second there are a certain number of sets tuned in in the middle of a sentence, and all that certain listeners heard were the words "President Hoover died today in Charleston, West Virginia."

Tom O'Neil, news director for AP's radio service and author of a booklet, "For Reading Out Loud," points out the necessity for avoiding that type of error:

Particularly confusing is separation of subject and predicate when more than one person is involved. Take a very commonplace type of newspaper item.

WASHINGTON—W. Norman
Thompson, 56 years old, administrative assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, died last night from the effects of a stroke suffered two days ago.

The listener would think that Morgenthau had died. Suppose the item were phrased as follows: "One of Secretary Morgenthau's administrative assistants, W. Norman Thompson, died last night. Mr. Thompson suffered a stroke two days ago. He was 56 years old."

O'Neil also tells of more complicated misunderstandings:

A few years back I was deluged late one night with inquiries to the effect that the radio said General Pershing was dead in Constantinople. It happened that the General at the time was in Washington. Prolonged research developed that some radio station had read verbatim a newspaper dispatch somewhat as follows:

"Constantinople—A great fire today destroyed a famous mosque, 15 persons perishing."

Over the country there were many inquiries upon two different occasions about New York and Chicago being bombed.

The rumor about New York being bombed was due to newscasts about an anti-aircraft gun being fired accidentally or in practice, and shrapnel hitting a building in the Wall Street area. The rumor about

Chicago being bombed started from a newscast about Jap planes bombing the cruiser *Chicago*.

SOME COLORS FADE

Colorful and vivid writing is unfortunately rare in radio news, and welcome signs are out for those who can provide these qualities. One of the best means of imparting color to a story is the use of an apt metaphor, but unfortunately this sometimes leads to a confusing mixed metaphor. The championship in this department, as far as I am concerned, was once reached by a Navy public relations officer, speaking of saboteurs. Said the good captain:

"These creatures are festering sores. Let us stamp them out by the roots, let the chips fall where they may."

There are some overworked verbs which have been used so frequently that writers have forgotten they're metaphorical. Such words as "swept," "beclouded," "loomed," "nose-dived," and "tripped"—metaphorical in themselves—may unwittingly form mixed metaphors.

You have to be careful of similes in radio. If it's a good one you may so amuse or bemuse the listener that he doesn't pay attention to the rest of the sentence. "As out of place as a pick-pocket at a nudist colony," "the team's pass defense was as ineffective as a 'stop' sign in a whirlpool," "as dangerous as an atom bomb scientist with delirium tremens"—these may or may not be all right in print, but in radio they're much too intrusive.

Renounce the clichés, the so-called "fancy writing" of other years. "Arms of Morpheus," "tripped the light fantastic toe," "on the horns of a dilemma"—these and a thousand like them have no place in broadcasting.

WHO THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY ARE

One of the problems facing the radio writer is where to put a descriptive phrase regarding people who have made news. If a man's name isn't widely known to the general public, the best rule is probably to put the apposition first, as follows:

"The state director of fisheries, Robert K. Roberts, said today that, etc."

When a person's name is well known, however, it's a different proposition. On one afternoon I noticed that a press association carried three stories on a golf tournament:

SPORTS

St. Louis—The Hershey, Pennsylvania, stylist, Little Ben Hogan, forged into a tie for the early lead today at the halfway mark in the Western Open Championship Golf Tournament.

SPOT SPORTS SUMMARY

The little Texan with the long drive, Bantam Ben Hogan, shot a six-under-par 66 today to tie big Jim Ferrier for the second round lead in the Western Open Golf Tournament.

SPORTS

St. Louis—The Bantam Texan, Ben Hogan, beat par by six strokes today with a 66 to tie big Jim Ferrier of Chicago for the lead in the Western Open Golf Tournament.

These descriptions of Hogan, before giving his name, bothered me. I doubt that descriptions should come first. To the listener, the name of Ben Hogan *means* golf, and he's thus oriented on the story right away.

In the case of extremely well-known people it's unnecessary to waste words in description or in first names or in initials. There's only one President Truman and it would be absurd to write, "Harry S. Truman, President of the United States." Similarly, "Foreign Minister Molotov" is enough, rather than "Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov of the Soviet Union."

That brings us to the question of "mister." I have always argued that its use should be restricted to elected heads of state in English-speaking countries, such as "Mr. Truman, Mr. Attlee, Mr. MacKenzie-King." A possible exception, however, might be in obituary material following the death of a prominent and respected citizen. Then, too, "Mr." probably should be preferred for clergymen after the first mention of the name. "The Reverend Mr. Jones," for example, is better than "the Reverend Jones," which is simply inaccurate.

ABOUT SOME PARTS OF SPEECH

Verbs.—As Phil Newsom has written, "No adjective has ever been invented that will take the place of a good, active verb." He cites "roared" and "thundered" as good but overworked examples. It's true that the right verb creates a striking mental picture, and writers should be on constant lookout for such a verb. A man can become verb-happy, however. There's the story told of a football announcer who had been describing a game in which one halfback picked up a lot of yardage every time he carried the ball. At half-time, when the "air" was returned to the studio for a news summary, the announcer said to his assistant, "What do I say about Whoozis now? I've said he dove, twisted, sped, rifled, pierced, battered, powered, streaked, sprinted, drove, smacked, crashed, whirled, whipped, smashed—everything I can think of." The assistant meditated and was struck by lightning. "How about this?" he suggested. "Why don't you just say that Whoozis *ran*?"

Pronouns.—These are the trickiest of words for radio. If there's the slightest doubt about the antecedent, don't use a pronoun. Take this example:

Senator McWilliams said he had talked with Representative Jasmine, co-author of the bill, and he had urged speedy action on the measure.

There's no way of telling to whom the word "he" applies, although presumably it was Jasmine, since no pronoun at all would be used if McWilliams had done the urging. Again, to quote O'Neil:

Over the air, a pronoun should never be used unless the antecedent precedes it by a few words. And if the news item is about one person, it is well for the sake of clarity to mention the proper name, time and again.

In fact, it's a close question as to whether O'Neil is more perturbed by misuse of pronouns or separation of subject and predicate. Either is apt to send his blood pressure dangerously high.

SWEEEPING UP

There are any number of miscellaneous suggestions as to how to write—and how not to write—radio news. Many of these suggestions come from my own experience. Others come from Newsom, O'Neil, Seymour Berkson, general manager of INS; Richard L. Tobin, at one time director of news for ABC; and from a group of former associates at CBS including Henry Wefing, Matt Gordon, and John Edwards. Here, then, is unclassifiable though important miscellany:

How do
you
make
use of
split
sentences

When writing network programs, don't use such phrases as "out in Wyoming" and "down in North Carolina." To California listeners, Wyoming isn't "out"; to Mississippi listeners, North Carolina isn't "down."

"Above" is a much misused word. Don't use it in the sense of "preceding" or "foregoing" because the listener has no way of looking back to what has been said before. Then, too, it should not be used as a synonym for "more than."

Take full advantage of radio's timeliness. Write "the first alarm sounded a half hour ago," "the statement was released at the exact minute this program began," "a radio and press conference has been scheduled for 4 P.M.—that's 17 minutes from now."

Boost your own medium. Don't say "gave an interview to the press," but "gave an interview to radio and press." Don't say "readers throughout the nation were stunned by news of the President's death." Say "listeners." With any big event most people get the news first by radio anyway.

Don't get into a rut on transitions. Particularly to be avoided are "meanwhile," "by the way," "in the meantime," and "incidentally," unless they're irreplaceable. Don't begin too many sentences with "and," "but," "also," "however," "moreover," and "on the other hand."

Frequent use of the word "well" is just too, too folksy.

Don't worry about the old bugaboo of a preposition at the end of a sentence. It's sometimes vigorous writing as in "let's see

what it amounts to," "the animal was too vicious to be trifled with."

There are a number of other "must nots" learned in freshman grammar classes that no longer need obtain. One is the rule forbidding the word "alternative" when more than two choices are open. As far as I'm concerned it's all right to say that a man faces several alternatives. Another is the distinction between "between" and "among." I'm not at all unhappy when I hear there's been an exchange of views between the United States, Britain, France, and Russia. "Among" may be correct, but "between" has come into such common usage that we may as well accept the fact of language's growth.

Don't worry too much about split infinitives. Sometimes that device becomes effective writing.

Don't use the word "thrusts" if you can avoid it. This word usually ties up an announcer's tongue worse than any other.

Don't take the easy way out by using such fairly meaningless words and phrases as "know-how," "showdown," "cracked down on," "brewing," "flare-up," and "crisis."

I go along with Newsom in this list of suggestions as to choices of words:

HURRY or GO—don't always 'rush.'

SEND something—don't always 'transmit' or 'dispatch' it.

CALL a person, or persons, or a meeting—don't always 'summon' them.

BUY something—don't always 'purchase' it.

LEAVE some place—don't always 'depart' or 'evacuate.'

ACT—don't always 'take action.'

TRY—don't always 'attempt.'

WILL—not always 'is going to.'

ARREST or SEIZE—not 'take into custody.'

SHOW—not always 'display' or 'exhibit.'

GET—don't always 'obtain.'

NEED—don't always 'require.'

SEE—don't always 'witness.'

CAN—not always 'is able to.'

HELP—not always 'aid' or 'assist.'

HURT—not always 'injured.'

BREAK—not always ‘fracture.’

BUILD and BUILDING—not always ‘construct,’ ‘erect,’ ‘construction.’

MEET—not always ‘confer,’ ‘convene,’ or ‘hold a conference.’

DOCTOR—not always ‘physician.’ ”

7. READIN', 'RITIN', AND 'RITHMETIC

Preparing a News Program

THE FIRST THING to do when you sit down to write a news program is to decide what you're going to write. In other words, get your material organized and write down, or have well in mind, the amount of space you're going to devote to each item.

As press association copy comes tapping in over the automatic printer it should be cut up and distributed in front of you under various headings. First, read the news and then cut off the various items and file them in folded sheets of copy under appropriate headings such as "Palestine," "Air Crash," "Congress," "Heat Wave," "U.N.," "Features," etc. If you are covering local news—and I hope you are—do the same thing with that copy. "Lumberyard Fire," "City Council," "Wampum Traded," etc. The last-named item would need explanation to an outsider but not to you. The story, telephoned in by one of your reporters, is that Cedric "Chief" Wampum, catcher for the home-town ball club, has been traded to Terre Haute for a left-handed pitcher and a bundle of cash.

Once you have sorted your copy, you then decide on the "play" to be accorded each story. Most radio rewrite men apportion this space by typewritten lines rather than by words. Reading speed varies rather widely among individuals but on the average 15 lines of pica type $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide will consume one minute.

Writing for radio involves a smattering of elementary arith-

*How many
lines of type
make
one minute?
Is reading matter?*

Has many
minutes
of news
for a
5" program
or 15" one?

~~How do~~

In what
order to

You
write
your
stories
I put
the last
together:

What is
a good
way to
be sure
the
announcer
has enough
copy?

metic. In the first place, if a program is sponsored—and it usually is—a five-minute news program may consist of only three and a half minutes of news; a fifteen-minute broadcast may have only twelve minutes of news. The remaining time is taken up in commercials and station identification.

Let's assume that you are writing a so-called five-minute news program with opening and closing commercials. These already have been written, and should be timed by the man who is going to read them on the air. He tells you they run a total of one minute and five seconds. You're already aware that the "station break," in which the station identifies itself and incidentally puts in another recorded commercial so that no possible revenue will be lost, takes 30 seconds. You are now ready to figure:

Total	300 seconds
Less	95 seconds
Left for news	205 seconds, or 3 minutes, 25 seconds, or a little over 51 lines.

Oddly enough, the first item you write will be the last one broadcast—an inconsequential feature, usually with a humorous or "light" twist. The theory behind the use of such a story at the end of a news broadcast is simple—that it pays to leave the listener with a smile or a half-smile. He's in a better mood to listen to the closing commercial, he's well disposed toward the announcer, and he will listen to him again. It has often been pointed out that since news so largely consists of deviation from the norm it's laden with disaster and strife. If you leave home in the morning, do your job, eat lunch, work again all afternoon, and then drive home at the accustomed time, the chances are you haven't made much news. But if you crack up your car, stab a fellow worker, or throw the boss out of his office, you are newsworthy. All the more reason to try to end each broadcast with "h.i." the journalist's abbreviation for "human interest."

At any rate, you select a feature and write it first so that the announcer can time backwards. He will then know at what exact second he must start to read that story so as to conclude it in time

for the closing commercial. This, then, is the feature: (All examples herein are fictional and there is no intended reference to any person or corporation.)

In Benton Harbor, Michigan, today a husband got a raise in his personal allowance and kept a wife. Carson Fremont, a mill worker, had sued for divorce, charging that his wife gave him only two dollars a week spending money out of his pay check and that he had to agree not to smoke a pipe to get even that much. But the divorce court judge called Fremont and his wife into chambers and worked out a compromise. From now on Fremont will get four dollars a week and the ban on pipe-smoking is removed. "It will be a second honeymoon," said Fremont, puffing happily for the first time in three years.

On the typewriter, this story will make nine lines, and you will have 42 lines left for the rest of the news. You weigh its importance and interest and get up a tentative outline, something as follows:

Heat wave	6
Congress	8
Palestine	8
UN	6
Air crash	7
Lumberyard fire	5
City council	4
Wampum	3
	<hr/>
	47

This adds up to more than you will need but it's always better to over-write than to under-write.

The next stories to write are those which probably will not have new leads before the time of the scheduled broadcast. You look through your list and decide that the only running stories—that is, stories which may have additional details coming in later—are the heat wave and Palestine stories. You then write the others, preferably one to a page. And in writing them you put in transitions so that, to as great an extent as possible, your entire broadcast will have a flow to it. There are still some news programs using the dateline technique—that is, first giving the

name of the city where the event took place—and then telling the story. I have long opposed this technique for two reasons. First, it isn't natural and conversational in telling a story; second, in these days of rapid communication the entire world is interconnected so that what happens in Asia Minor, for example, immediately has its effect upon London, Washington, and Moscow. The use of a single dateline in such cases is patently ridiculous.

But let's get on with our five-minute news program.

Incidentally, this isn't given you as an ideally written radio news program. It's fairly wooden. It represents, let's say, an average radio news writer's effort after only a couple of years in the business. But it shows the way to more original writing, and to the virtue of local angles to a national story. It also illustrates the value of short sentences (some of them are too long) and the necessity of using "wire" copy with very little editing when occasion requires.

The intense heat in Washington, where the thermometer climbed to 95 degrees, didn't slow down the national legislators who are anxious to dispose of all pending bills and get home for summer vacations. The Senate passed the Whopper general appropriations bill and it now goes to the White House. The House, without a record vote, adopted the Blathers amendment to the National Parks bill, providing five gallons of free gasoline for every motorist who visits the parks.

Echoes of the Palestine disorders were heard at a brief session of the United Nations Security Council. Urtletay Ecknay, the Scythian delegate, introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the latest disorders and proposing that the entire Arab-Jewish dispute go before the next meeting of the General Assembly. The resolution will be debated at the next meeting on Friday of this week.

There was another major airplane crash early this morning, the third since the first of June. A Colorado and Eastern plane, en route from Denver to Kansas City, plummeted to earth near Hoisington, Kansas. Three crew members and eight passengers were killed. There were no survivors. Cause of the accident was unknown although a farmer near the scene of the crash said he had heard one

of the plane's motors sputtering and that the pilot had dropped flares before the craft piled into a stone fence.

Here in Central City there was a fire just before noon in the Wharton Lumber Yard at 30th and Chestnut. The blaze apparently was started by a cigarette, and damage was estimated at more than five thousand dollars. The fire was confined to the northwest corner of the yard and was kept under control by the firemen.

The City Council has met and approved the purchase of ten thousand dollars' worth of new playground equipment for Laurel Park. The new slides and swings—fun for all the kids—will be installed by next spring.

And here's a local sports item. The Central City Crackers have announced the trading of Cedric "Chief" Wampum, second-string catcher, to the Terre Haute club of the Three-Eye League. The Crackers will get pitcher Homer Boswell, a southpaw, with a season's record thus far of seven victories, four defeats, and also an undisclosed sum in cash.

By now it lacks only 20 minutes or so "before air" and it's time to write the two stories that have been left so that all late details could be included. You decide to lead with the weather story:

Three-fourths of the nation is sweltering in a heat wave that has broken records for the season all the way from Montana to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Rockies to the Atlantic. The hottest spot in the country was Concordia, Kansas, where the mercury hit 110 degrees. And temperatures of more than 100 were registered in cities as far apart as Dallas and Detroit. Twenty deaths from heat prostration have been reported. Here in Central City the maximum temperature was 95, registered at 3:30 this afternoon and the prediction for tomorrow is "fair and warmer."

Now the Palestine story and you're through:

The biggest news from abroad told of more riots in Palestine. Refusal by British authorities to permit the landing of 500 Jewish immigrants from Central Europe touched off the riots, in which three soldiers were wounded. Troops and police began a house-to-house search for terrorist leaders who are believed to have incited demonstrations. By midnight ten men had been arrested, charged with illegal possession of firearms.

You hastily count up your lines, find you have over-written considerably, find you have about 50 lines instead of the 42 you had planned. You look over your copy and decide to combine the Palestine and UN stories, saving some six of these lines:

Renewed Jewish riots in Palestine today in which three British soldiers were wounded brought echoes at a brief session of the United Nations Security Council. Urtletay Ecknay, the Scythian delegate, introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the latest disorders and proposing that the entire Arab-Jewish dispute go before the next meeting of the General Assembly. The resolution will be debated at the next meeting on Friday of this week.

Next you indicate other possible cuts such as the last sentence of the plane crash story and the last sentence in the lumberyard fire. (The way to indicate these cuts is merely to put them in brackets. If the announcer finds the broadcast too long in his pre-timing, he will simply cross out these sentences before going on the air.)

You have left fairly large margins, perhaps as much as two inches, at the top of the page. Then you have numbered the pages in pencil in numerals at least a half inch tall, with circles around them. The reason for this is that you want to be able to find the right page quickly in case the pages get mixed up—and also, as an announcer comes to a new page, you don't want him to read the number aloud.

Now the clock ticks toward the hour of broadcast. The announcer, stop-watch in hand, touches his nose with his forefinger. The program has timed out exactly "on the nose," or exactly to the second. Two minutes to go. A minute and a half. Then the teletype stutters for a moment and five bells ring out. You dash to the machine; you know the sounding of five bells means a bulletin. And you read:

174**BULLETIN**

Hollywood, July X—(WNP)—Penelope Menace, 48-year-old film actress noted for her "vampire" roles in the days of silent movies, was shot and killed at her home here today. No revolver

was found near the body. Police said they were notified of the former star's death by her fifth husband, Carlos Caracas, wealthy Peruvian importer.

(more) 3:59 P.M.

You have less than a minute to go. You realize this story may develop into the biggest news of the day. You take off the date-line, write in the word "Hollywood" in front of the word "home," cross out the word "here" and rush to the studio. You mark that story "1" and the heat wave story "I-A." The opening commercial is read and the announcer begins the news with the news of Miss Menace's death. But that means that five lines have to be cut from somewhere else in the news. Well, the public will just have to get along without the story about "Chief" Wampum. So you toss page 7 on the floor—you don't crumple it up because that sound would get into the microphone—and you go back to the newsroom to see if there's anything further regarding the assassination of Miss Menace. There isn't, but the WNP has put out a new lead on the heat wave. Deaths from heat prostration now total 25 instead of 20. You hasten back to the studio and barely have time to write in the new figure before the announcer comes to it.

Now back to the newsroom and a wait for any further news. WNP starts sending an "Add Menace, Hollywood," but it's all biographical material that will have to wait for a later, longer program. The loud-speaker in the newsroom booms on to the end of the broadcast. Incidentally this loud-speaker is equipped with an automatic cut-off so that it ceases to work when the door to the news studio is opened. That way you can avoid "feedback," a sad mishap in which the announcer's voice is fed both directly and from afar into the microphone, causing squeals, echoes, and other annoyances.

The program is finished. All that remains is to collect the copy, make sure that the date, time, and name of announcer are properly listed on the first page, and then staple the pages together and file them for the station's records and for the benefit of other staff members who will be writing later programs.

All in all, this broadcast should have taken about two hours to prepare. In its final form as it went on the air it looked like this:

OUTSTANDING BROADCASTING SYSTEM
JULY ?, 194?
4:00 - 4:05 P.M., EDST

TOPPS' TOFFEE NEWS

ANNOUNCERS: Dale Widgett (commercials); Roger Roister (news).

OPENING COMMERCIAL

WIDGETT: 4 o'clock Eastern Daylight Saving Time and here is Roger Roister with the news brought to you by Topps' Toffee, the Candy with a Future. Want quick energy? Want a between-meals treat that peps you up and gives you much-needed vitamins? Then remember...if it's Toffee you want, it's Topps'. Now here is Roger Roister.

~~WNP 174~~

~~BULLETIN~~

①

HOLLYWOOD, JULY X ~~(WNP)~~ -- PENELOPE MENACE, 48-YEAR-OLD FILM ACTRESS NOTED FOR HER "VAMPIRE" ROLES IN THE DAYS OF SILENT MOVIES, ~~(HOLLYWOOD)~~ WAS SHOT AND KILLED AT HER ~~HOME HERE~~ TODAY. NO REVOLVER WAS FOUND NEAR THE BODY. POLICE SAID THEY WERE NOTIFIED OF THE FORMER STAR'S DEATH BY HER FIFTH HUSBAND, CARLOS CARACAS, WEALTHY PERUVIAN IMPORTER.

(MORE)

53

8:59

(1) A

Three-fourths of the nation is sweltering in a heat wave that has broken records for the season all the way from Montana to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Rockies to the Atlantic. The hottest spot in the country was Concordia, Kansas, where the mercury hit 110 degrees. And temperatures of more than 100 were registered in cities as far apart as Dallas and Detroit. ~~Twenty~~²⁵ deaths from heat prostration have been reported. Here in Central City the maximum temperature was 95, registered at 3:30 this afternoon and the prediction for tomorrow is "fair and warmer."

(2)

The intense heat in Washington, where the thermometer climbed to 95 degrees, didn't slow down the national legislators, who are anxious to dispose of all pending bills and get home for summer vacations. The Senate passed the Whopper General Appropriations Bill and it now goes to the White House. The House, without a record vote, adopted the Blathers amendment to the National Parks Bill, providing five gallons of free gasoline for every motorist who visits the parks.

(3)

Renewed Jewish riots in Palestine today in which three British soldiers were wounded brought echoes at a brief session of the United Nations Security Council. Urtletay Ecknay, the Scythian delegate, introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the latest disorders and proposing that the entire Arab-Jewish dispute go before the next meeting of the General Assembly. The resolution will be debated at the next meeting on Friday of this week.

(82) (4)

There was another major airplane crash early this morning, the third since the first of June. A Colorado and Eastern plane, en route from Denver to Kansas City, plummeted to earth near Hoisington, Kansas. Three crew members and eight passengers were killed. There were no survivors. Cause of the accident was unknown [although a farmer near the scene of the crash said that he had heard one of the plane's motors sputtering and that the pilot had dropped flares before the craft piled into a stone fence.]

(83) (5)

Here in Central City there was a fire just before noon in the Wharton Lumber Yard at 30th and Chestnut. The blaze apparently was started by a cigarette and damage was estimated at more than five thousand dollars. [The fire was confined to the northwest corner of the yard and was kept under control by firemen of the Sycamore Street Station.]

(61)

(6)

The City Council has met and approved the purchase of ten thousand dollars worth of new playground equipment for Laurel Park. The new slides and swings - fun for all the kids - will be installed by next spring.

(37)

~~(8)~~ (7)

In Benton Harbor, Michigan, today a husband got a raise in his personal allowance and kept a wife. Carson Fremont, a mill worker, had sued for divorce, charging that his wife gave him only two dollars a week spending money out of his pay check and that he had to agree not to smoke a pipe to get even that much. But the divorce court judge called Fremont and his wife into chambers and worked out a compromise. From now on Fremont will get four dollars a week and the ban on pipe-smoking is removed. "It will be a second honeymoon," said Fremont, puffing happily for the first time in three years.

(113)

JULY ?, 194?
4:00 - 4:05 P.M., EDST

TOPPS' TOFFEE NEWS

ANNOUNCERS: Dale Widgett (commercials); Roger Roister (news).

ROISTER: (cue) And now a word from Dale Widgett:

CLOSING COMMERCIAL

WIDGETT: Going on a vacation this summer? Going to a lake, the mountains, or the seashore? Or just staying home, doing a lot of the things you've put off throughout the year? Well, whatever you do, make sure you have an abundant supply of Topps' Toffee. Its locked-in, mellow goodness will provide you with plenty of quick energy. One or two pieces of vitaminized Topps' Toffee and you find you have more pep, more zest. You lead the crowd, not follow it! Topps' Toffee is available at almost all drug, stationery and candy stores, ten delicious pieces for only ten cents. Or try the big economy size - thirty pieces for a quarter. And always remember that if it's Toffee you want...it's Topps'.

Listen tomorrow and every day, Monday through Friday at this time, for Roger Roister and Topps' Toffee News. (Cue) This is O B S, the Outstanding Broadcasting System.

--station break--

Although the example of a five-minute program just given provides a workable pattern for the radio journeyman, it must not be thought that all such programs are prepared in this manner. Bill Henry uses a technique dissimilar from the one that I've outlined. He comes into the office, reads the newspapers and the teletype printer wires, here and there writing down a few notes. He continues his note-taking up to an hour or so before the broadcast, then sits down and writes his program. One advantage of this method is that the news is presented more wholly—various news items are interconnected more easily and more stories are given. Further, he knows almost to the fraction of a line just how much copy he has to write and mentally does his cutting as he goes along.

The longer a news program is, the longer the amount of time necessary to prepare it properly. A ten-minute news summary may need as much as four hours of work; a fifteen-minute program as much as six. There can be no rule-of-thumb in the matter. Sometimes a story of major importance will develop just a half hour before air time, and nearly everything previously written will have to be junked. But the fact is that most of the leading newsmen in the broadcasting business take their jobs seriously, devote minutes to thinking of just the right word or phrase—and usually wind up with a lot more copy than they can use. But there's one truism that's well worth remembering: "There never was a script that couldn't be improved by cutting."

8. HOW THE PRO'S DO IT

Examples of Press Association Copy and Scripts

YOU'VE SEEN how a theoretical news broadcast would be prepared and you've been given certain suggestions on what to write and what not to write, in Chapters 6 and 7. It's time now to take a look at what, on one big news day, actually went on the air and what was supplied the broadcasters by the chief source of their news—the press associations.

It would be impossible, of course, within the limits of a book such as this, to reproduce *all* the news made available even in a single day. But, through the courtesy of AP, UP, and INS, we can show how these three services covered one major story at the moment it was breaking—and how that story was used on various news broadcasts in relation to other news of the day.

I selected a happening of historical significance—the sentencing of the war criminals at Nuernberg, Germany, on Oct. 1, 1946. The sentencing took only a little over 40 minutes, but for adequate sampling of how the story was handled by the press associations it's probably best to include everything that came over the wires from approximately 8:00 A.M. until noon (EST) or a little later. The story was then "wrapped up." Later there were a few fresh developments, but none of much consequence.

You'll notice that this isn't "radio wire" copy. All of it is from the leading trunk wires of the three press associations. The reasons for not including radio wire copy are twofold; first, there was little difference in the style of writing; second, if the student of radio news is to have an opportunity to find out what he would write from the combined products of the three great

services, he should have original material and not news that has already been processed with radio in mind.

First off, we should have the day's background. The International Military Tribunal some four or five hours earlier had meted out verdicts of guilty to 19 of the 22 former leaders of Hitler's Nazi regime. Those acquitted were Franz von Papen, an important German diplomat in World Wars I and II, Hjalmar H. G. Schacht, the former finance minister, and Hans Fritzsche, a little-known tool in the Goebbels propaganda ministry. Of the 19 convicted some had been found guilty on all four counts of the indictment; others on only one, two, or three. It was the breakfast hour in New York and in farm homes of the Middle West as the world waited to hear what was to happen to 19 men who had helped to cause it so much misery.

Now for the copy. In the presence of witnesses I drew straws to decide in what order it would be presented. The drawing came out UP, INS, AP.

I'm reproducing the material almost exactly as typed for me by the three services. I say "almost" because I've eliminated certain typographical errors, rearranged the numbering of "leads" for clarity's sake, and omitted the initials of teletype operators and other code symbols that might be confusing. Timing on the various "takes" of the story is as the services gave them to me. Where no time was given, I have used the symbol (U) for (untimed). You'll notice as you examine the press association copy that the services can't get together on spelling of the names of some of the defendants. For example, they're variously *Walter* and *Walther* Funk, *Hans Fritzsche* and *Fritzsche*, *Eric* and *Erich* Raeder, *Constantin* and *Konstantin* von Neurath, and *Rudolf* and *Rudolph* Hess. I see no reason to act as umpire, so the spellings have been reproduced as sent over the wires.

THE UNITED PRESS

The UP, alone of the three services, used the "flash" technique in handling each sentence. A "flash" is always followed by

a bulletin. That will explain what may seem to be a great deal of duplication.

Actually all press association copy is sent in capitalized type-written letters, such as is illustrated in the first two flashes and the first bulletin below. For ease in reading, however, the remainder of the examples will be put in regular book type form.

FLASH

NUERNBERG — GOERING SENTENCED TO DEATH. BY HANGING.

759A

111

BULLETIN

NUERNBERG, OCT. 1 — (UP) THE WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL TODAY SENTENCED HERMANN GOERING, ADOLF HITLER'S RIGHT HAND MAN, TO DEATH BY HANGING.

759A

FLASH

NUERNBERG — HESS SENTENCED TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT.

800A

112

BULLETIN

LEAD TRIAL

By Edward W. Beattie
United Press Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The International Military Tribunal today imposed a sentence of death by hanging upon Hermann Goering who with 18 other top flight Nazis were convicted before the bar of world justice for criminal complicity in Adolf Hitler's assault upon peace and humanity. (more) 802A

113

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HUMANITY.

Three of the 22 defendants, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Hans Fritzsche and Franz von Papen, were acquitted unexpectedly at

the climax of the trial of those charged with guilt in plunging the world into the most devastating war it had ever seen.

Goering, stripped of his famous medals and now slack and drab where once he had strutted paunchy and arrogant

FLASH

Nuernberg—Von Ribbentrop sentenced to death.

804A

Goering, stripped of his famous medals and now slack and drab where once he had strutted paunchy and arrogant, was summoned before the judges of Britain, France, Russia, and the United States to hear his fate at 2:53 P.M. (7:53 A.M. EST).

804A

114

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX EST.

Goering was sentenced to be hanged until dead. He received the

FLASH

Nuernberg—Keitel sentenced to death by hanging.

806A

114

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX EST.

Goering was sentenced to be hanged until dead. He received the verdict without emotion.

The defendants have four days within which to appeal to the Allied Control Commission in Berlin. The sentence must be carried out within 15 days.

Rudolf Hess, 50, No. 2 Nazi was sentenced to a life term of imprisonment. He received the sentence impassively not bothering to listen to the verdict over the translator's earphone.

Joachim von Ribbentrop, Nazi Foreign Minister, was sentenced to death by hanging.

Field Marshal Wilhelm von Keitel, chief of the German high co

FLASH

Nuernberg—Ernst Kaltenbrunner sentenced to death by hanging.

808A

115

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Field Marshal Wilhelm von Keitel, chief of the German high command, was sentenced to death by hanging.

The sentence of death by hanging to Keitel rebuffed a hope by Nazi militarists that the court would allow them to die by the military proceed

FLASH

Nuernberg—Rosenberg sentenced to death by hanging.

810A

116

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX XXX BY THE XXX
MILITARY PROCEDURE OF A SHOOTING SQUAD.

Dr. Ernst Kaltenbrunner, chief of the Nazi security police, was sentenced to death by hanging.

Dr. Alfred Rosenberg, Nazi philosopher, was sentenced to death by hanging. (more) 813A

FLASH

Nuernberg—Hans Frank sentenced to death by hanging.

814A

117

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Hans Frank, Nazi governor of Poland, was sentenced to be hanged. (more) 814A

118

WITH TRIAL (BEATTIE)

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) Franz von Papen was described by the International Tribunal as a bully and intriguer, but was acquitted because evidence was lacking that he engaged in overall aggressive plans.

Haggard but still aristocratic looking, he heard the Tribunal free him without a show of emotion. (u)

FLASH

Wilhelm Frick sentenced to death by hanging.

816A

FLASH

Streicher sentenced to death by hanging.

818A

119

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGED.

Wilhelm Frick, "protector" of Bohemia Moravia, was sentenced to death by hanging.

100

How the Pro's Do It

Julius Streicher, Nazi Jew baiter, was sentenced to death by hanging.
(more) 818A

FLASH

Walter Funk sentenced to life imprisonment.

820A

120

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Walter Funk, Nazi economics minister, was sentenced to life imprisonment.
(more) 821A

FLASH

Doenitz was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment.

822A

121

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX IMPRISONMENT.

Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, commander in chief of the Reich Navy, was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

(more) 824A

FLASH

Eric Raeder sentenced to life imprisonment.

825A

122

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX IN PRISON.

Grand Admiral Eric Raeder was sentenced to life imprisonment.

(more) 825A

123

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX IMPRISONMENT.

Raeder gave the court a military salute as he left the courtroom.
(more) 826A

FLASH

Von Schirach sentenced to 20 years in prison.

828A

124

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX COURTROOM.

Baldur von Schirach, Nazi youth leader, was sentenced to 20 years in prison.
(more) 828A

FLASH

Saukel sentenced to death by hanging.

830A

125

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX PRISON.

Fritz Sauckel, director of Nazi slave labor, was sentenced to death by hanging. (more) 830A

FLASH

Jodl sentenced to death by hanging.

832A

126

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, chief of the Wehrmacht general staff, was sentenced to death by hanging.

(more) 833A

FLASH

Seyss-Inquart sentenced to death by hanging.

835A

127

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Nazi chancellor of Austria, was sentenced to death by hanging.

835A

FLASH

Speer sentenced to 20 years in prison.

838A

128

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX HANGING.

Albert Speer, Nazi construction chief, was sentenced to 20 years in prison.

(more) 839A

FLASH

Von Neurath sentenced to 15 years in prison.

840A

FLASH

Bormann sentenced to death by hanging.

840A

129

ADD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX PRISON.

Konstantin von Neurath, Hitler's first foreign minister, was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

Martin Bormann, Nazi leader tried in absentia, was sentenced to death by hanging. (u)

102

How the Pro's Do It

130

2ND LEAD TRIAL (BEATTIE)

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The International Military Tribunal today sentenced Hermann Goering and 12 of Adolf Hitler's top leaders to death by hanging, imposed life prison terms on three, terms of 10 to 20 years on four others, and acquitted three in the world trial of the Nazi regime.

(more) 845A

131

ADD 2ND LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX REGIME.

Those sentenced to be hanged were: Goering, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Wilhelm von Keitel, Dr. Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Julius Streicher, Fritz Sauckel, Alfred Jodl, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Martin Bormann, in absentia.

Those sentenced to life in prison were: Rudolf Hess, Walter Funk, and Eric Raeder.

Those receiving prison terms were: Karl Doenitz, 10 years, Baldur von Schirach, 20 years, Konstantin von Neurath, 15 years, and Albert Speer, 20 years.

Those acquitted were: Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche.

The defendants have four days in which to appeal to the Allied Military Council in Berlin. The sentences are to be carried out within 15 days.

The court announced that the Soviet judge, I. T. Nikitchenko, dissented from the acquittal of Schacht, Von Papen, and Fritzsche. He also dissented from the life sentence imposed upon Hess, believing the sentence should have been death by hanging.

A third Soviet dissent was entered to the acquittal of the Reich cabinet and German general staff and high command from the general charge of conspiracy against the peace of the world and aggression.

(more) (u)

132

ADD 2ND LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX AGGRESSION.

Chief Justice Geoffrey Lawrence of Britain read the sentence to the 21 Nazi leaders. Each entered the solemn courtroom singly, escorted by a guard. Each stood stiffly before the justices of France, Britain, Russia, and the United States and heard his fate.

Few of the Nazis displayed any emotion as they were led in

through a small door at the courtroom rear, stood a moment or two at the bar of world justice, heard their sentences, and then were led silently back to their cells. (more) 855A

133

ADD 2ND LEAD NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX CELLS.

Goering was the first to stand before the tribunal. He was led in at 2:53 (7:53 EST). There was a moment of trouble when the earphones over which he was to hear the German translation of Lawrence's words failed. A guard fussed futilely with the headset, then Lawrence impatiently motioned him away. Goering heard the verdict—in the Russian translation—but he was obviously certain what his fate was to be.

Hess, the No. 2 Nazi whose conduct throughout the trial has been erratic, brushed off the earphones and declined to listen to the translation. He was led away with no show of emotion.

Grand Admiral Eric Raeder gave the court a stiff military salute after hearing himself condemned to spend the rest of his days in prison. (more) 859A

134

BULLETIN

In 2nd lead trial Nuernberg (Beattie) please make 1st pgh read
xxx Goering and 11 of Adolf xxx (instead 12).

UP NEW YORK 9A

135

ADD VON PAPEN NUERNBERG XXX EMOTION.

"The evidence leaves no doubt that Von Papen's primary purpose as Minister to Austria was to undermine the Schuschnigg regime and strengthen the Austrian Nazis for the purpose of bringing about Anschluss," the Tribunal said.

"To carry through this plan he engaged in both intrigue and bullying. But the charter does not make criminal such offenses against political morality."

He still may not go free because the Austrian Government has demanded that he stand trial in that country.

903A

137

ADD 2ND LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX IN PRISON.

The sentences were imposed swiftly, each requiring only a minute or two with the guards shuttling steadily between the prison cells,

bringing the defendants up by elevator and into the courtroom for what for many was their last appearance in public.

Less than an hour after Lawrence read the first verdict to Goering the ceremony was completed at 3:41 P.M. (8:41 A.M. EST) with the announcement by Lawrence of Russia's dissent from three of the verdicts.

The nature of the sentences had been foreshadowed clearly by the court in its morning session when it found 19 of the 22 defendants guilty and reviewed the charges against each. There was one surprise—the order that the death sentences against all 12 men be carried out by hanging. The Nazi military leaders had hoped that this indignity would be spared them and that they might face a military firing squad rather than the hangman's noose.

(more) 905A

139

WITH TRIAL (BEATTIE)

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The International Tribunal rejected outright the contention that military leaders can escape guilt for war crimes by pleading that they were only obeying orders.

It found both Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel and Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl guilty on all counts and sentenced them to be hanged.

"Participation in such crimes as these never has been required of any soldier," it said of Jodl. "He cannot now shield himself behind the mythical requirement of soldierly obedience at all costs."

Of Keitel it said, "Superior orders even to a soldier cannot be considered in mitigation here. Crimes as shocking and extensive have been committed consciously, ruthlessly, and without military excuse or justification."

910A

141

ADD 2ND LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX NOOSE.

Not a word was spoken by any of the defendants during their final courtroom appearance although Hess mumbled inarticulately.

The Nazis appeared to sense the solemnity of the hour. Julius Streicher, notorious Jew baiter who has industriously chewed gum for the last two days of the trial, apparently parked it outside before entering to hear Lawrence tell him that his sentence was to hang until dead.

Lawrence disdained the ordinary black cap which a British judge dons before handing down a sentence of death. To each defendant

he gave the verdict in these words, changing only to fit the various sentences:

"Defendant Hermann Wilhelm Goering, on the counts of the indictment by which you have been convicted, the Tribunal sentences you to death by hanging."

The sentences will be carried out by the Allied Military Council in Berlin. All except Schacht, Von Papen, and Fritzsche will be turned over immediately to the Four Power Council. It was assumed that all the convicted defendants will make pro forma appeals to the Council but no change in the court's verdict was expected.

There was a possibility that Schacht, Von Papen, and Fritzsche will be free men before nightfall. Arrangements for their release from the Nuernberg prison already were underway. However, Von Papen is wanted by Austria for trial as a war criminal there.

(more) 915A

148

ADD 2ND LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX THERE.

The brief Soviet dissent as read by Lawrence said:

"The Soviet member of the International Tribunal desires to record his dissent in the cases of the defendants Schacht, Von Papen, and Fritzsche. He is of the opinion they should be convicted and not acquitted. He also dissents in the decision with respect to the Reich cabinet and general staff and high command being of the opinion that they should have been declared criminal organizations.

"He also dissents of the sentence of the defendant Hess and is of the opinion that the sentence should have been death not life imprisonment."

Pick up lead at 3rd pgh Goering, etc.

924A

156

3RD LEAD TRIAL

By Edward W. Beattie

United Press Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The International Military Tribunal in measured judicial tones today wrote an end to Adolf Hitler's schemes to dominate the world by sentencing Hermann Goering and 11 other Nazi leaders to be hanged until dead within 15 days and committing to prison for terms ranging up to life eight other leaders of the Third Reich.

Three Nazis, the wily financier, Hjalmar Schacht, the minor propagandist Hans Fritzsche, and the scheming diplomat, Franz

von Papen, were acquitted. One of those condemned to death, Martin Bormann, has not been seen since the final battles around the Reich Chancellory in Berlin, in May, 1945, and probably was already dead.

The sentences imposed today will be appealed to the Allied Military Council in Berlin within four days but no change in the court's verdict is anticipated.

(more) 944A

157

ADD 3RD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX ANTICIPATED.

There was little arrogance left in the high Nazis when they finally filed in, one by one, to hear their fate after watching for 10 months and 10 days the ever-growing mountain of evidence against them.

The Allied prosecutors who had indicted the Nazi elite on charges of conspiracy or a common plan of aggression, crimes against the peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity expressed some disappointment that not all the defendants had been convicted.

But they were gratified that the doctrine that "Aggressive warfare is a crime for which individual statesmen may be punished" has now been written into the body of the law of nations.

Pick up 2nd lead at 2nd pgh those sentenced to be, etc.

947A

164

ADD 3RD LEAD TRIAL NUERNBERG (BEATTIE) XXX NATIONS.

The statement by the American prosecutor, Robert H. Jackson, expressed disappointment at the acquittal of Schacht, Von Papen, and the high command organization and said that the acquittals would have a definite effect on plans for further prosecution of German industrialists and military figures. However, he declined to elaborate pending full study of the court's opinion.

958A

168

By Clinton Conger
United Press Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The Nuernberg defendants, who deliberately brought suffering to so many millions, tried mightily to hide their own emotions today when the time came for them to squirm.

Some of them succeeded. But not all.

(more) 1009A

169

BULLETIN

1ST LEAD RELEASES

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche, acquitted Nuernberg defendants, were freed today. (more) 1010A

170

MORE DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX ALL.

As the War Crimes Tribunal announced its verdicts and then the sentences, the German military and naval defendants held up well, but some of the politicians seemed stunned, bewildered.

This is how they took their sentences.

Hermann Goering, commander of the German Air Force, sentenced to death, flushed slightly.

Rudolf Hess, No. 2 Nazi, looked depressed, mumbled and fumbled. He held his earphones at his side while the court announced he must spend the rest of his life in prison. Hess remained standing, and had to be led from the dock. (more) 1012A

171

ADD 1ST LEAD RELEASES NUERNBERG XXX TODAY.

The trio were released from their prison cells about an hour after the International Military Tribunal completed returning its verdicts.

It was not yet certain whether Austria would succeed in its effort to force Von Papen to go to Vienna for trial there on war crimes charges. (more) 1013A

172

ADD DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX DOCK.

Field Marshal Wilhelm von Keitel, chief of the German high command, stood expressionless with straight military bearing while he received his death sentence. He left the dock smartly.

Ernst Kaltenbrunner, chief of the Nazi secret police, bowed stiffly from the waist, heard his death sentence, bowed again, and left the dock.

Alfred Rosenberg, anti-Jewish Nazi philosopher, angrily threw down his earphones when they crackled out his punishment—death.

Hans Frank, the Nazi Governor of Poland, apparently did not know what to do when he entered the dock. He smiled weakly at his lawyer just before he received his death sentence.

Julius Streicher, the world's most vicious Jew baiter, stopped chewing gum for the first time in two days. When he heard his death sentence, he grimaced, nodded slightly, and left.

(u)

173

ADD 1ST LEAD RELEASES NUERNBERG XXX CHARGES.

The trio met with correspondents shortly after being given their freedom by Col. Burton C. Andrus, Nuernberg prison chief.

Schacht, his hands locked behind his back, his head bowed and a rather dazed expression on his face, walked into the Nuernberg press room, a free man for the first time in a year and a half.

He said that his own desire now was to be reunited with his wife and two children. He expressed hope that he would "never see the press again."

Von Papen was equally eager to leave the spotlight and Fritzche had little to say.

1018A

175

ADD DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX LEFT.

Walter Funk, economics minister and Reich bank director, seemingly stood in a fog after he received a life term. A guard had to nudge him to get him out of the dock.

Admiral Karl Doenitz, commander in chief of the German Navy, stood gravely as he learned he must serve 10 years in prison. He banged down his earphones and walked quickly from the court.

Admiral Eric Raeder, 70-year-old Navy commander, appeared almost unmoved by his life sentence. A guard, however, had to tell him to remove his earphones. He grimaced toward the bench as he disappeared from the courtroom for the last time.

(more) 1020A

180

ADD DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX TIME.

Baldur von Schirach, youngest of the defendants, stood with his hands crossed over his waist. The 30-year-old leader of the Hitler youth movement glared angrily at the bench until he received his 20-year sentence, then left the room without further display.

(more) 1027A

184

ADD DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX DISPLAY.

Fritz Sauckel, who conscripted forced labor from Nazi-occupied countries, gulped when he learned he must hang. His tiny, tooth-

brush mustache worked up and down in front of a frowning face. He had to be told to remove the headset.

Gen. Alfred Jodl, Army chief of staff, continued to stand stiffly for a moment after receiving his death sentence. Small red spots appeared on his brightly flushed cheeks, but that was the only sign of emotion.

Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Nazi Chancellor of Austria, gripped the bench with a grave face, and swayed forward when the judge said "Death."

Konstantin von Neurath, Hitler's first foreign minister, took his 15-year sentence with a wooden face. The 73-year-old diplomat merely nodded, and departed.

Martin Bormann, Hitler's deputy at the end of the war, was sentenced to hang, but the announcement was made to an empty dock. Bormann disappeared in the last confusing hours of the collapse of Berlin, and was being tried in absentia.

(more) 1036A

186

2ND LEAD RELEASES

By Dudley Ann Harmon

United Press Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) The three free men of Nuernberg, Hjalmar Schacht, Hans Fritzsche, and Franz von Papen told correspondents today that they want "Rest, oblivion, and plenty of space."

This was their comment when they visited the Nuernberg newsroom a few minutes after being released from prison after their acquittal on war crimes charges by the International Military Tribunal.

There seemed to be no further bar to the future freedom of Schacht and Fritzsche, but Von Papen still is sought by Austria for trial as a war criminal in Vienna.

Schacht told correspondents: "I plan to join my wife and my two little girls and then disappear in some quiet place and never see anything of the press again."

Asked where he would be tonight, he snapped, "That's what I would like to know, too." 1040A

188

ADD DEFENDANTS NUERNBERG (CONGER) XXX ABSENTIA.

Each defendant was in the dock only about 30 seconds while his sentence was read.

Earlier, all had been seated while the Tribunal announced the guilty verdicts and the three acquittals.

1043A

198

ADD 2ND LEAD RELEASES NUERNBERG (HARMON) XXX TOO."

The newsroom was like a tower of Babel as Schacht, Von Papen, and Fritzsche were questioned in a variety of languages, and themselves frequently answered in French or English in addition to German.

Schacht swung his head around sharply to face numerous questioners. He still looked peevish and quarrelsome. He wore a thick fur-collared coat.

Fritzsche, in a light gray pinstriped suit was smiling and dapper. He grinned and joked continuously. Once he shook hands with a volunteer interpreter.

Von Papen, in an Oxford gray double-breasted suit, looked as though he had stepped out of one of the embassies he had frequented at intervals throughout his adult life. He was the quietest of the three.

Fritzsche shouted "No" to a question whether he would like to broadcast tonight.

(more) 1103A

199

ADD 2ND LEAD RELEASES NUERNBERG (HARMON) XXX TONIGHT.

"I hope they give me a few weeks of freedom to get over my dizziness at being free at last and not having before me the gray walls and barred windows of a prison cell," Fritzsche said.

"But I desire, now that I have been acquitted before the military tribunal here, to appear as soon as possible before a German court.

"I already have said I feel completely guiltless of the accusations brought against me here. Now I would like to render an account before a German court as to why I spoke as I did on the radio."

1105A

213

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) Justice Robert H. Jackson said today that the war crimes prosecutors were disappointed in the acquittal of Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen, and the German high command as an organization.

In a statement written for the combined prosecution and issued after the final adjournment of the court, Jackson said the acquittals would have a definite effect on the further prosecution of industrialists and militarists. He did not amplify, pending further study of the opinion.

Sir Hartley Shawcross, British chief prosecutor, said he had no comment on the verdict.

"On behalf of all nations," Jackson's statement said, "we prosecutors asked the conscientious and independent judgment of the members of the Tribunal as to the guilt of these men and organizations.

"This we have now received. In sustaining and applying the principle that aggressive war is a crime for which statesmen may be individually punished, the judgment is highly gratifying.

"The effect of the acquittals on the further prosecution of industrialists and militarists which have been planned will have to be studied from the text of the opinion.

"However, I personally regard the conviction or sentence of individuals as of secondary importance compared with the significance of the commitment by the four nations to the proposition that wars of aggression are criminal and that the persecution of conquered minorities on racial, religious, or political grounds is likewise criminal.

"The principles of law will influence future events long after the fate of the particular individuals is forgotten."

1140A

215

FOLLOW TRIAL, NUERNBERG.

Washington, Oct. 1—(UP) Members of Congress and newspaper editorial writers today hailed the outcome of the German war crimes trial as a landmark in international law and a strong factor in keeping the peace.

Senate President Kenneth McKellar, D., Tenn., said the trial was "discriminating" since not all the defendants were found guilty.

"The decision ought to have a good effect in keeping the peace," McKellar said. "If men in high places in government know that they will be dealt with after a war, they will not be so anxious to start wars in the future."

The Washington *Evening Star* said the judgment of the International Tribunal "now passes into history as a precedent whose potentialities are such that future generations may come to celebrate it as a shining landmark in the moral development of mankind and in mankind's desperate striving for good and enduring peace."

1144A

229

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(UP) An apparent attempt by unidentified persons to seize copies of the Nuernberg verdict last Sunday night was reported today.

Capt. Joachim von Jastrow of the U. S. Army, who had direct charge of the final translations, made the report. He said an automobile with important trial documents was followed from the courthouse Sunday, and later the same day an attempt was made to halt it when it returned to the courthouse with documents.

"The car was definitely being followed, and they tried to throw up a road block," Jastrow said.

The car was not stopped.

1215P

INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE

You will notice that INS used a running lead technique more than the UP, and did not concern itself with "flashing" the individual verdicts. The writing is somewhat more colorful than the UP's. And there was no such obvious error as occurred in UP's #130.

48

BULLETIN PRECEDE

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Former Marshal Hermann Wilhelm Goering of Nazi Germany today was sentenced to die on the gallows by the International Military Tribunal for war crimes and offenses against humanity.

802A

49

BUN ADD PRECEDE VERDICTS. NUERNBERG XXX HUMANITY.

Rudolph Hess, scheduled as number two successor to Adolf Hitler as leader of the Nazi Reich, received a verdict of life imprisonment.

806A

51

BULLETIN LEAD

By Pierre J. Huss
International News Service Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Hermann Wilhelm Goering will die on the gallows for the "supreme crime" of waging aggressive war and for a vast catalogue of sins against humanity.

Rudolph Hess will spend the natural life that remains to him behind the bars of a cell or at hard labor on a rock-pile.

The International Military Tribunal of the United Nations meted

out these fates today to the two still surviving principal leaders of Adolf Hitler's Germany after acquitting Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Baron Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche, the latter a minion of the Nazi propaganda ministry.

Thus eighteen of the defendants at the Nuernberg war trial were found guilty on one or more counts.

A nineteenth, the missing and believed dead Martin Bormann, deputy to Hitler, was convicted also and condemned to execution in absentia.

Ernst Kaltenbrunner, chief of the Nazi security police, and by virtue of his job the Lord High Executioner of Germany under Hitlerism was sentenced to death by hanging.

(more) 816A

52

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX HANGING.

Former Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, who engineered all of Hitler's aggressive foreign policies, was assigned to the gallows.

So was Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, dynamo of the German war machine, and a like fate was handed to Alfred Rosenberg, the Latvian-born minister of culture in the Nazi regime, appointed by Hitler to become some day the new "Aryan" czar of a defeated Russia.

(more) 821A

53

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX RUSSIA.

Hans Frank, the suave murderer selected personally by Hitler to exact the last possible toll of cruelty from German-occupied Poland, was sent to the gallows tree.

So was Wilhelm Frick, the original Nazi master of Bohemia and Moravia, sent into the raped and slaughtered territories of Czechoslovakia in the first surge of Nazi aggression in 1938.

Walther Funk, minister of economics during many long years of Hitler's power, was sentenced to imprisonment for life.

Death by hanging with a rope around his unwashed neck was decreed for Julius Streicher, arch-priest of Hitler's war against the Jews.

(more) 828A

54

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX JEWS.

Admiral Karl Doenitz, spark plug of Germany's amazingly successful U-boat warfare in the early stages of the second world conflict, got off easily with only ten years in jail.

But his naval counterpart in the historic trial, Grand Admiral Erich Raeder, was sentenced to life imprisonment. He had been accused of building and drilling the German Navy for aggressive warfare against the world.

Count Baldur von Schirach, one of the few "high-born" Germans to throw in their lot with the Nazis and who was entrusted with the complete Nazification of German youth, was sent to jail for twenty years.

He will be 57 when released from captivity.

(more) 835A

55

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX CAPTIVITY.

Lord Presiding Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence intoned the verdicts upon one of the sorry-faced defendants after the other.

In the case of each he used the same unchanging formula, saying:

"On the counts of the indictment of which you have been convicted, the International Tribunal sentences you to . . ."

Then followed the capital punishment or period of years to be spent in jail.

(more) 839A

56

INSERT LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG AFTER 16TH PARA XXX CAPTIVITY.

Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, chief of staff to Hitler during the war years, was told that he must die by the hangman's noose, as was Fritz Sauckel, whose job it was to mobilize, exploit, and kill when advisable the millions of slave laborers brought into Germany from conquered nations.

(end insert) 843A

57

ADD INSERT LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX NATIONS.

The noose was decreed for Arthur Seyss-Inquart, be-spectacled former gymnasium teacher who was appointed in turn by Hitler as gauleiter for Holland and his native Austria.

Albert Speer, whose organizing genius won him the post of minister of production and munitions for the Nazis, was told he will have to spend the next twenty years of his life behind bars.

848A

58

ADD INSERT LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX BARS.

Fifteen years in prison was the punishment decreed for tall, gray-haired Baron Constantin von Neurath, once a foreign minister of

Germany and later the perpetrator of Hitler's infamies in Bohemia and Moravia.

851A

59

BULLETIN DIVISIONAL

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Presiding Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence disclosed today that the Soviets dissented from the decision of the International Military Tribunal to sentence Rudolph Hess to life imprisonment.

The Soviets insisted that the former Hitler deputy be sentenced to the gallows.

The Russians opposed also the decision to acquit the German cabinet, general staff and high command, and defendants Hjalmar H. G. Schacht, Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche.

914A

60

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX JAIL.

The various defendants accepted the news of their fate with varying reactions.

As Presiding Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence read out the news that Goering must die—by hanging and not with the military courtesy of the firing squad as he had asked—the once-powerful Grand Marshal ran into difficulties with adjustment of his earphones.

The proceedings were delayed for a full minute until the apparatus could be put into shape.

Then Goering stood rigid, his thumbs at the seams of his trousers in full military attention, while the verdict was read out.

He left the dock to return to his jail cell with a gait that was the full step of military precision.

(more) 917A

61

DIVISIONAL

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—This is what the International Military Tribunal of the Allied Nations handed down today as punishment for 22 former Nazi leaders accused of aggressive warfare and crimes against humanity.

Death on the gallows for:

Hermann Wilhelm Goering, Martin Bormann (missing and believed already dead), Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, Alfred

Rosenberg, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Julius Streicher, and Fritz Sauckel.

Imprisonment for life:

Rudolph Hess, Walther Funk, and Grand Admiral Erich Raeder.

Imprisonment for twenty years:

Armaments Minister Albert Speer and Count Baldur von Schirach, Nazi youth leader.

Imprisonment for fifteen years:

Baron Constantin von Neurath.

Imprisonment for ten years:

Admiral Karl Doenitz.

Acquitted:

Baron Franz von Papen, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, and Hans Fritzsche.

924A

62

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX PRECISION.

Hess angrily pulled the headset from his ears, looked around the courtroom, stared for a moment at the ceiling, and then strode out.

Von Ribbentrop heard the verdict with his hands folded in front of him, apparently in half a daze. Keitel clicked his heels and accepted his notice of execution at the stance of full Prussian attention.

Rosenberg was an immovable, emotionless figure when he heard the court tell him he must die.

Streicher tossed his head arrogantly and refrained for a moment or so from chewing gum or munching on his diet of biscuits. He seemed pleased when Lord Lawrence absolved him from a common Nazi plan of conspiracy, but scowled when the justice convicted him of crimes against humanity.

Raeder and Schirach heard their verdicts with German stolidity. Frank nodded his head in anticipation of the sentence and politely thanked the white-helmeted American military guards for the use of his earphones as he made his way back to the elevator leading to the jail cells.

(more) 927A

63

ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX CELLS.

Frick seemed to sway slightly as the sentence was handed down. Doenitz took his punishment with what appeared to be an impatient gesture. Kaltenbrunner, who stood erect during the reading of the verdict, bowed to the judges as he left.

Funk let his baggy jaw drop completely open when he was told he must go to jail for life, abandoning the luxuries and pleasures he knew as a prime figure in the Nazi Reich.

Raeder took his sentence without batting an eyelid, Sauckel glowered and stared, and Jodl gazed wonderingly at the Tribunal as though he could not believe his own ears.

The three acquitted prisoners, Von Papen, Schacht, and Fritzsche, immediately made positive demands that they be shielded against interviews and photographers. Their attitude was that acquittal meant they should be liberated in a quiet manner and not followed by curious crowds.

931A

65

BULLETIN DIVISIONAL

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—United States Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief American prosecutor at the Nuernberg trials, today expressed unanimous regret of himself and his colleagues that the Tribunal absolved some Nazi organizations and individuals from guilt.

His statement said:

"We regard the conviction of individuals and organizations, however, as secondary in importance to the significance of a commitment by four nations to the proposition that wars of aggression are criminal, and that persecution of conquered minorities on racial, religious and political grounds is likewise criminal."

(more) 946A

66

ADD JACKSON DIVISIONAL NUERNBERG XXX CRIMINAL."

Jackson continued:

"On behalf of all nations we prosecutors asked for conscientious, independent judgment by members of the Tribunal as to guilt of these men and organizations. This we have now received.

"In sustaining that application of the principle that aggressive war is a crime, for which statesmen and soldiers may be punished individually, the judgment is highly gratifying.

"It is a sign for the peace of the world that representatives of the great powers all agree on this principle of law and are committed to it by this judgment. Other aspects of the opinion are too intricate to be appraised without study, for which there has been no time.

"We regret that the Tribunal felt constrained to acquit Schacht

and Von Papen and declined to declare the German general staff a criminal organization.

"Our arguments for their conviction, which seemed so convincing to all us prosecutors, seemed not to have accomplished a similar effect on the Tribunal.

"The effect of these acquittals on further prosecution of industrialists and militarists which have been planned will have to be studied from the text of the opinion."

1005A

67**BULLETIN BOX**

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht, German financial wizard who was acquitted by the International Military Tribunal at Nuernberg today, said:

"I want to join my wife and children in a quiet place."

1006A

69**BULLETIN SECOND LEAD**

By Pierre J. Huss

International News Service Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Twelve of Nazi Germany's top leaders—one of them missing and believed dead—were sentenced to hang by the neck today for their crimes against humanity, and Hermann Wilhelm Goering headed the list.

Three of the defendants named in the original indictment of the International Military Tribunal were acquitted, along with the roster of the German high command and this led immediately to a storm of protest from the Soviet Russian judges who participated.

They filed a sharp dissent, holding that all of the twenty-one visible defendants plus the ghost of missing Martin Bormann, should have been convicted of all charges and of every count in the indictment.

But despite this opposition, three men went free—Former President of the Reichsbank Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Baron Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche, the obscure figure who ran the radio station chain of Propaganda Minister Paul Joseph Goebbels' regime.

(more) 1015A

70

BUN ADD SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX
REGIME.

Prison terms, ranging from only ten years to life, were meted out to the other seven defendants.

It took only forty-four minutes for Lord Presiding Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence to deal with the convicted persons.

Each of them stood for about only one minute in the dock—alone for the first time instead of being ranked into the double-barreled row of once-mighty leaders whose positions in the dock were made familiar to the world by countless thousands of photographs and newsreels.

Goering was stolid and at strict military attention when informed by Lawrence that he will die on the gallows for the “supreme crime” of waging aggressive war and for a vast catalogue of sins against humanity.

(Pickup second para xxx Rudolph Hess, etc.)

1019A

71

BULLETIN DIVISIONAL

By Lowell Bennett

International News Service Staff Correspondent

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(INS)—Three white-faced, shrunken Nazis, seemingly surprised at their recently acquired freedom, today told the world what they hoped to do in the future.

The three men in question were Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, former president of the Reichsbank; Franz von Papen, veteran Nazi diplomat; and Hans Fritzsche, assistant to Paul Josef Goebbels in the propaganda ministry.

All three were acquitted by the International Military Tribunal in a verdict which threw a veritable bombshell into the crowded Nuernberg courtroom.

Schacht was bundled to the ears in a voluminous fur coat as he faced reporters. He was pale and nervous as he said:

“I want to go far away from here and forget.”

“I want to have some food and eat.”

“I want some quiet.”

“Most of all, I never want to see a reporter again.”

“The verdicts were partly too just and too hard.”

Schacht did not explain what he meant by saying that the verdicts were “too just” but reporters did not believe that he referred to his own case.

Franz von Papen, veteran diplomat and former German ambassador to Turkey, said with tight-lipped emphasis:

“My public life has come to a definite close.”

1030A

73

BUN ADD SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES (HUSS) NUERNBERG XXX HUMANITY.

Unless any of the death sentences are commuted, the eleven now-living Nazi leaders are likely to die before the 16th of this month.

Allied authorities had agreed that all those condemned would be disposed of within fifteen days of sentence.

(Pickup second para xxx Rudolph Hess, etc.)

1041A

76

ADD DIVISIONAL (BENNETT) NUERNBERG XXX CLOSE."

Fritzsche said:

"I want a few free weeks to get away from prison life and re-acquaint myself with freedom, then I will try to obtain some sort of vindication and de-Nazification before my own people.

"I want to appear before a German court as soon as possible to prove my innocence and explain why I spoke over the German radio under the Hitler regime."

So far as can be learned, Schacht and Von Papen are free men and can go when they wish, but there is some doubt regarding Fritzsche who is wanted badly by the Russians.

Schacht said that his home in the Russian-occupied sector of Berlin had been pillaged by German Communists and that his wife had to walk forty kilometers to find a new one.

Von Papen said he would go either to the British Zone to join his wife, or to the French Zone to join his daughter, adding:

"I will go home, if I have one."

All three men showed clearly the great strain they have been under but they reflected the great relief they have felt since the Tribunal set them free.

Schacht started to speak in English but soon switched into German.

1056A

77

ADD DIVISIONAL (BENNETT) NUERNBERG XXX GERMAN.

Schacht said he didn't know where he would spend the night.

All three men said they had no fear that they would be attacked by anti-Nazi Germans.

At the conclusion of the interview, they received clearance certificates. Then Schacht, ever the businessman, said:

"I have two small children and I would like to have some chocolate candy donated."

At this point, an angry American colonel, trying to shunt away autograph hunters, shouted:

"You people write Schacht and ask him for his autograph.

"Send him some chocolate for his kids."

IIOIA

81

UNDATED

By J. C. Oestreicher

International News Service Foreign Editor

The sentences were handed down at Nuernberg today—the various degrees and burdens of punishment to be exacted from the men who made possible Adolf Hitler's war against humanity.

And they contained their full measure of surprises.

As expected, Hermann Wilhelm Goering was sentenced to die on the gallows, deprived of the firing squad he had asked for or of the right to shoot himself with a Lueger pistol in keeping with tradition of the Prussian military.

The hangman's noose was decreed also for ten other one-time leaders who have sat with Goering in the dock of the Nuernberg Palace of Justice since last November.

And the similar fate was intoned for Martin Bormann, deputy leader of the Nazi party, who is generally believed to have been killed in the explosion of a tank, while trying to get away from Berlin in the dying days of Hitlerite Germany.

But there were three acquittals, vigorously protested by the two Soviet justices who composed the Russian segment of the eight-man military tribunals.

Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht, a financial wizard of the German banking system dating back to the days when Hitler was shoveling snow from the streets before the Hotel Bristol in Vienna, was one of them.

Another was Franz von Papen, diplomat and intrigist whose unsavory reputation survived two world wars.

(more) I135A

82

ADD OESTREICHER UNDATED XXX WARS.

The third was Hans Fritzsche, little-known and little-rewarded even in the heyday of Nazism. He was merely the man who put Propaganda Minister Paul Joseph Goebbels' radio shows on the air.

These sentences, setting a precedent in enactment and administration of international law, set in motion a whole new landslide of

international discussion as to the manner in which the Allied Nations have chosen to deal with their conquered enemies.

It was inevitable from the mere dissents voiced by the Russian judges at Nuernberg that the whole propaganda machine of the Soviet Union soon would be set in motion to accuse the western Allies of appeasement and toadying to reaction not only in Germany but in the rest of the world.

But there were observers in Nuernberg and elsewhere who expressed themselves as satisfied that the Tribunal had dealt with the cases in a manner that was the epitome of fairness and justice.

In its final summations, verdicts, and sentences, the Tribunal stigmatized all men who in the past and in the future have or will regard military aggression and brutality to fellow-creatures as proper and accepted means of behavior.

It released three defendants but handed out heavy penalties to the vast majority. So the groundwork at least has been laid for a world precept that no government or group of men can assault civilization and escape unpunished.

1143A

ASSOCIATED PRESS

As will be seen, there were few differences in AP's handling of the story. It didn't seem to "lead" the story as quickly as the other services but had a great deal of interesting "side-bar" or supplementary material.

101

BULLETIN

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Hermann Goering was sentenced to death by hanging. 801A

102

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—FIRST ADD SENTENCES XXX HANGING.

Rudolf Hess was sentenced to imprisonment for life.

802A

103

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—SECOND ADD SENTENCES XXX FOR LIFE.

Joachim von Ribbentrop was sentenced to death.

(u)

104

The former Nazi foreign minister also will hang unless the Allied Control Council grants him clemency in an appeal. The defendants have four days in which to file appeals. Unless appeals are granted, sentences are expected to be executed Oct. 16.

Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel was sentenced to hang.

(u)

105

Ernst Kaltenbunner was sentenced to die by hanging.

(u)

106

Alfred Rosenberg was sentenced to death by hanging.

814A

107

BULLETIN

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Death by hanging was ordered today for Hermann Goering, Joachim von Ribbentrop, and other high leaders of the Nazi war machine.

815A

108

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—THIRD ADD SENTENCES XXX BY HANGING.

Hans Frank was sentenced to die by hanging.

(u)

109

Wilhelm Frick was sentenced to death by hanging.

817A

110

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—FOURTH ADD SENTENCES XXX BY HANGING.

Julius Streicher was sentenced to death by hanging.

819A

111

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—FIFTH ADD SENTENCES XXX BY HANGING.

Walther Funk was sentenced to imprisonment for life.

823A

112

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—SIXTH ADD SENTENCES XXX FOR LIFE.

Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz was sentenced to ten years in prison.

825A

124

How the Pro's Do It

113

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—SEVENTH ADD SENTENCES XXX PRISON.

Grand Adm. Erich Raeder was sentenced to life imprisonment.

827A

114

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—EIGHTH ADD SENTENCES XXX IMPRISONMENT.

Hitler Youth Leader Baldur von Schirach was sentenced to 20 years.

830A

115

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—NINTH ADD SENTENCES XXX 20 YEARS.

Labor Boss Fritz Sauckel was sentenced to death by hanging.

832A

116

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—TENTH ADD SENTENCES XXX HANGING.

Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl was sentenced to death by hanging.

834A

117

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—ELEVENTH ADD SENTENCES XXX HANGING.

Arthur Seyss-Inquart was sentenced to death by hanging.

837A

118

BULLETIN MATTER

TWELFTH ADD SENTENCES XXX HANGING.

Munitions Minister Albert Speer was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment.

839A

119

BULLETIN MATTER

THIRTEENTH ADD SENTENCES XXX IMPRISONMENT.

Former Foreign Minister Constantin von Neurath was sentenced to 15 years.

842A

120

BULLETIN

LEAD WAR CRIMES

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—The International Military Tribunal today ordered death on the gallows for Hermann Goering, Joachim

von Ribbentrop, and 10 other leaders of the Adolf Hitler gang which ravaged humanity with the most dreadful war in history.

844A

121

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—FIRST ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES (BY WES GALLAGHER) XXX IN HISTORY.

The court acquitted three defendants.

Others sentenced to death were Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Julius Streicher, Fritz Sauckel, Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, and Martin Bormann (in absentia).

Rudolf Hess, third ranking German until his strange wartime flight to Scotland, was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Also sentenced to life were Walther Funk and Grand Adm. Erich Raeder.

Those acquitted were Franz von Papen, the old gray diplomat who led intrigues in both World Wars; Hjalmar Schacht, the German finance wizard; and Hans Fritzsche, deputy propaganda minister for Paul Joseph Goebbels, a suicide.

Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz, who surrendered Germany and was Fuehrer in the last few days of the war, received a ten-year sentence.

(u)

122

Baldur von Schirach, Hitler youth leader, and Albert Speer, German munitions minister, both were sentenced to 20 years in prison.

Constantin von Neurath, former German foreign minister and later "protector of Bohemia and Moravia," was given 15 years.

849A

123

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—14TH ADD SENTENCES XXX YEARS.

Martin Bormann, tried in absentia, was sentenced to death.

850A

125

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Some members of the Allied prosecution staffs made it plain unofficially today that they were not too happy about some of the verdicts in the War Crimes Trial.

The acquittal of Franz von Papen, smooth diplomat who led German intrigue in two wars, rankled most of them. One prosecutor, who may not be named, said on behalf of his delegation:

"Frankly, we are a little pained about Von Papen."

Several prosecutors expressed no opinion and brushed questions aside brusquely.

Rudolf Dix, German lawyer for Hjalmar Schacht, said the acquittal of his client was what he expected all along and "It followed what I have been contending throughout the trial."

Franz von Papen, Jr., smiled broadly at the verdict. Counsel for Hans Fritzsche did not comment.

854A

126**BULLETIN MATTER****NUERNBERG—SECOND ADD LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX 15 YEARS.**

The Russians did not support the three acquittals, it was announced. Lord Justice Geoffrey Lawrence, presiding justice, announced that the Soviet member of the Tribunal "desires to record his dissent" from the decisions in the cases of Schacht, Fritzsche, and Von Papen.

"He is of the opinion that they should have been convicted and not acquitted," Lawrence said. "He also dissents from the decision in respect to the Reich's cabinet and general staff and the high command (acquitted yesterday).

"He is of the opinion they should have been declared criminal organizations. He also dissents in the case of the defendant Hess, and is of the opinion his sentence should have been death."

(u)

127

Lawrence announced the dissenting opinion of the Soviet member would be attached to the record and published as soon as possible. The Soviet judge is Maj. Gen. I. T. Nikitchenko.

The defendants have four days in which to appeal to the Allied Control Council, their court of last resort. This council, representing the United States, Britain, Russia, and France in the government of Germany, has authority over the executions, which are expected Oct. 16 unless an appeal for clemency is granted, and there seemed little chance of that. All defense attorneys had announced they would appeal in the event of death sentences against their clients.

859A

128**BULLETIN****SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES**

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—The International War Crimes Tribunal today decreed death on the gallows for 12 leaders of the Adolf

Hitler gang, sentenced seven to prison, and—with Russia dissenting—
acquitted three defendants. 9A

129

BULLETIN MATTER

NUERNBERG—FIRST ADD SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX DEFENDANTS.

The court, after sentencing to death Hermann Goering, Joachim von Ribbentrop, and 10 other Nazi henchmen, announced that Russia had protested against the Tribunal's acquittal of Franz von Papen, Hjalmar Schacht, and Hans Fritzsche. The Soviet judge, Maj. Gen. I. T. Nikitchenko, also protested that Rudolf Hess should have been hanged instead of receiving the life imprisonment sentence the court handed him, and objected to yesterday's acquittal of the general staff and high command. (u)

130

Judges of Britain, the United States, and France joined in the majority opinion, which now will be carried out by the Allied Control Council, representing all four Allies.

Legal officials of the American Military Government said that if any of the three Nazi leaders acquitted were returned to the U. S. Zone of occupation they probably would be tried by Germans under the Zone's de-Nazification law. (u)

131

The officials said because Schacht and Von Papen owned property in more than one zone it was conjectural to which they might be returned. Legal experts in Berlin expressed belief the Russians might get custody of Fritzsche, whom they arrested in Berlin and delivered to Nuernberg for trial.

Others sentenced to death xxx third graf lead.

908A

137

NUERNBERG—SECOND ADD SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX FOR TRIAL.

Justice Robert H. Jackson, Chief U. S. prosecutor, expressed regret that "the Tribunal has felt constrained to acquit Schacht and Von Papen and to decline to declare the criminality of the general staff." He said in a formal statement that "the effect of these ac-

quittals on the further prosecution of industrialists and militarists which have been planned will have to be studied from the text of the opinion."

932A

139

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Despite protests which poured in from American and British newspapers, the International Military Tribunal refused to relent today in its decision to bar photographers from the Nuernberg courtroom during the reading of sentences.

The Tribunal's attitude was that it wanted nothing to impair the dignity of the court during the historic session. A committee representing the international press contended without avail there had been no complaint during the 10 months of the trial against the photographers.

942A

140

By Thomas A. Reedy

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief U. S. prosecutor, said today he regretted the International Military Tribunal had acquitted Hjalmar Schacht and Franz von Papen, and expressed doubt how the acquittals would affect future trials of German militarists and industrialists.

Jackson also expressed regret that the four-power Tribunal had declined "to declare the criminality of the general staff." Jackson praised, however, the general terms of the Tribunal's history-making judgment.

The text of Jackson's statement:

"On behalf of all the nations we prosecutors asked the conscientious and independent judgment of the members of the Tribunal as to the guilt of these men and organizations. This we have now received.

"In sustaining and applying the principle that aggressive war is a crime for which statesmen may be individually punished, the judgment is highly gratifying.

"It is a hopeful sign for the peace of the world that representatives of the great powers all agree on this principle of law and are committed to that position by this judgment. Other aspects of the opinion are too intricate to be appraised without study of the text, for which there has been no time.

"I regret that the Tribunal has felt constrained to acquit Schacht and Von Papen and to decline to declare the criminality of the general staff.

"Our arguments for their conviction, which seemed so convincing to all of us prosecutors, seem not to have made a similar impression on the Tribunal. The effect of these acquittals on the further prosecution of industrialists and militarists which have been planned will have to be studied from the text of the opinion.

"However, I personally regard the conviction and sentence of individuals as of secondary importance compared with the significance of the commitments by the four nations to the proposition that wars of aggression are criminal and that persecution of conquered minorities on racial, religious, or political grounds is likewise criminal.

"These principles of law will influence future events long after the fate of particular individuals is forgotten."

949A

141

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—How the Germans fared in the War Crimes Trial:

Hermann Goering, sentenced to death by hanging. Convicted of conspiracy; crimes against the peace, namely: planning, preparing, initiating or waging aggressive war; war crimes, namely: violations of the laws or customs of war; and crimes against humanity, namely: murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation or other inhumane acts against any civilian population, before or during the war; or persecutions, political, racial, or religious.

Rudolf Hess, life imprisonment. Convicted of conspiracy and crimes against the peace. Acquitted of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Martin Bormann, death (in absentia). Convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Joachim von Ribbentrop, death on the gallows. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, death on the gallows. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Ernst Kaltenbrunner, death on the gallows. Convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Alfred Rosenberg, death on the gallows. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Hans Frank, death on the gallows. Convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Wilhelm Frick, death on the gallows. Convicted of crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Julius Streicher, death on the gallows. Convicted of crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Walther Funk, life imprisonment. Convicted of crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Hjalmar Schacht, acquitted. Held not guilty of conspiracy and crimes against the peace.

Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz, 10 years in prison. Convicted of crimes against the peace and war crimes. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Grand Adm. Erich Raeder, life imprisonment. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, and war crimes.

Baldur von Schirach, 20 years in prison. Convicted of crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Fritz Sauckel, death on the gallows. Convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy and crimes against the peace.

Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, death on the gallows. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Franz von Papen, acquitted. Held not guilty of conspiracy and crimes against the peace.

Arthur Seyss-Inquart, death on the gallows. Convicted of crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy.

Albert Speer, 20 years in prison. Convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Acquitted of conspiracy and crimes against the peace.

Constantin von Neurath, 15 years in prison. Convicted of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Hans Fritzsche, acquitted. Held not guilty of conspiracy, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

143

NUERNBERG—THIRD ADD SECOND LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX THE OPINION.

Each defendant was sentenced individually.

Goering was first. He strode into the courtroom flanked by military policemen. His gray suit hung limply about his once ample figure. Chief Justice Lawrence looked sternly down from the bench and sentenced the Number 2 Nazi to death by hanging. Under the glare of lights, Goering's face was immobile.

Gray and sickly, Von Ribbentrop stood stunned as the death sentence was pronounced. He had to be helped out by military policemen.

1001A

145

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, minister-president of Bavaria, told the German people tonight that Franz von Papen faces trial by a de-Nazification board if he remains in the American Zone.

Hoegner, broadcasting soon after Von Papen was acquitted by the International Military Tribunal, said the former diplomat would be brought before German authorities and "That means he will be condemned for several years at hard labor."

Hoegner later told reporters that he gave orders to German authorities that similar de-Nazification action would be taken against Hjalmar Schacht, former president of the Reichsbank, and Hans Fritsche, ex-Nazi propagandist, if they remained within his jurisdiction. They also were acquitted by the military Tribunal.

Dr. Hoegner continued:

"I consider the acquittal of Von Papen a most astonishing thing. I consider him the real instigator of the Third Reich."

Von Papen was German chancellor before Adolf Hitler and urged old President Paul von Hindenburg to appoint Hitler his successor.

Hoegner said he "supposed" the British, Russian, and French Zones also would institute de-Nazification action against the three acquitted defendants, depending on where they decide to establish residence.

Fritsche was a prisoner of war in the Russian Zone before being taken to Nuernberg. Austrian authorities have asked custody of Von Papen, who was German ambassador to that country at the time Hitler absorbed it in Anschluss.

1011A

SENTENCING DESCRIPTIVE

By Wes Gallagher

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Rudolf Hess, to the end the posturing crackpot of the War Crimes Trial, brushed aside earphones that would have told him whether he was to live or die, and stared blankly ahead of him as a stern judge sentenced him to 20 years imprisonment.

One by one, 21 once haughty Nazi leaders were marched before the bar of the International Military Tribunal to hear their fate.

Goering retained his fierce reserve. Gone were his flamboyant trappings—his medals, his glittering uniform, his field marshal's baton—as he strode into the courtroom between two stalwart military policemen. His shabby gray suit hung limply about him.

Presiding Lord Justice Geoffrey Lawrence, cold and impersonal, gazed sternly at the No. 2 Nazi chieftain and sentenced him to die on the gallows. Under the pitiless glare of the kleig lights, not a muscle of Goering's face moved.

Joachim von Ribbentrop, the dandy of the Nazi cabinet who as foreign minister once strutted proudly across Europe's diplomatic stage, was stunned when he heard his death sentence. Gray and sickly, he had to be helped from the room by military police.

Aging Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Hitler's military yes-man, heard his doom silently. When the court pronounced the death sentence, he turned silently and went back through the small door in the dock.

Tall, hulking Ernst Kaltenbrunner, once chief of the dread Gestapo, still looked easily the fiercest of the defendants. He bowed ironically when the court sentenced him to hang.

(Eds—in first graf above correct to read xxx judge sentenced him to life imprisonment. (Not 20 years.)

1016A

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Defense attorneys told newsmen a month ago that 12 of the 21 Nazi leaders on trial expected to be hanged, that three expected clemency and that six still had "hopes."

Here is how the expectations compared with the court judgment:

<i>Defendant</i>	<i>Expected</i>	<i>Sentenced to</i>
Hermann Goering	hanging	hanging
Rudolf Hess	hanging	life
Joachim von Ribbentrop	hanging	hanging
Wilhelm Keitel	hanging	hanging
Ernst Kaltenbrunner	hanging	hanging
Alfred Rosenberg	hanging	hanging
Hans Frank	hanging	hanging
Wilhelm Frick	hanging	hanging
Julius Streicher	to live	hanging
Walther Funk	hanging	life
Hjalmar Schacht	clemency	acquitted
Karl Doenitz	to live	10 years
Erich Raeder	to live	life
Baldur von Schirach	to live	20 years
Fritz Sauckel	hanging	hanging
Alfred Jodl	to live	hanging
Franz von Papen	clemency	acquitted
Arthur Seyss-Inquart	hanging	hanging
Albert Speer	hanging	20 years
Constantin von Neurath	clemency	15 years
Hans Fritzsche	to live	acquitted
		1025A

149

NUERNBERG—FIRST ADD SENTENCING DESCRIPTIVE XXX TO HANG.

The man who scourged occupied Russia, Nazi philosopher Alfred Rosenberg, straightened his coat, folded his hands and waited impassively until his sentence of death was read.

Stocky Hans Frank, killer of thousands of Jews, nodded curtly when the judge sentenced him to the gallows.

The most hated man in the dock—hated by the defendants themselves—was Jew baiter Julius Streicher, the screaming fanatic of the Nazi press. He was immobile when he was condemned. Because he had been found guilty on only one count, it was thought for a time he might escape death.

Wilhelm Frick, one-time Nazi street fighter who became the “protector of Bohemia and Moravia” under Hitler, looked haggard as sentence of death was pronounced. But like Kaltenbrunner, he bowed to the court.

Grand Adm. Erich Raeder, who planned the Nazi domination of

the sea and the attacks on Norway and Denmark, remained as impassive as he had been throughout the trial as the court doomed him.

1028A

151

NUERNBERG—SECOND ADD SENTENCING DESCRIPTIVE XXX DOOMED HIM.

His successor, Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz, who became Fuehrer of Germany in the last days of the war, without emotion heard himself sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. The lightness of the sentence imposed on the Nazi submarine chief surprised many spectators.

Shabby Walther Funk, one-time economics minister, looked more like a comic strip character than a once powerful cog in a grim war machine. He shot a disgusted look at the court as he heard himself sentenced to life in prison.

Baldur von Schirach, chief of the Hitler youth, was hustled off quickly by his two military police guards when the Tribunal sentenced him to 20 years. He looked angry.

Next into the hot courtroom came the tough Nazi labor boss and enslaver of millions, Fritz Sauckel. He greeted his death sentence with an ostentatious sneer.

Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, whose ample diary of his association with Hitler helped convict himself and his co-conspirators, stared languidly as Lord Justice Lawrence sent him to the gallows in the same dispassionate monotone. The presiding judge, as he did with all the others, looked the prisoner squarely in the eye.

1034A

154

95

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Hjalmar Schacht, freed of war crimes charges by the International Military Tribunal, told reporters tonight there appeared to be "neither laws nor free opinion" in occupied Germany today.

Schacht appeared with the other two acquitted German leaders, Hans Fritsche and Franz von Papen, at a turbulent news conference, and was asked whether he now expected to be tried by a German court.

The belligerent Nazi finance wizard replied that in the days before Hitler "There were laws and free opinion," but that "there appeared to be neither laws nor free opinion now."

1047A

155

NUERNBERG—THIRD ADD SENTENCING DESCRIPTIVE XXX IN THE EYE.

Arthur Seyss-Inquart clung tensely with both hands to the railing of the dock as he heard his death sentence. With a palpable effort the former gauleiter of the Netherlands and Austria controlled his emotions.

Old and worn, former Foreign Minister Constantin von Neurath looked limp in his dark clothing, as he heard himself sentenced to 15 years—virtually life imprisonment, considering his age.

When the last pair of military policemen departed, Von Neurath between them, Justice Lawrence passed the sentence of death upon the absent deputy fuehrer, Martin Bormann, and ended the historic 10 months session by announcing the dissenting Russian opinion, which will have no effect on the present judgments.

1050A

158

THIRD LEAD WAR CRIMES

By Wes Gallagher

Nuernberg, Oct. 1—(AP)—Hermann Goering and 10 co-conspirators of the Hitler gang will die on the gallows for their war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The International Military Tribunal sentenced them today, at the same time sending Rudolf Hess to prison for life and, over Russian objections, acquitting Franz von Papen, Hjalmar Schacht, and Hans Fritsche.

The death sentences, the Allies' retribution for the death and misery that Hitler and his leaders visited upon humanity, are expected to be invoked in 15 days, or on Oct. 16. The defendants have four days to appeal to the Allied Control Council, their court of last resort, but no one looks for their sentences to be changed.

Sentenced to death with Goering were Joachim von Ribbentrop, Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Julius Streicher, Fritz Sauckel, Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, and Martin Bormann. The court tried Bormann in absentia, and there was no indication he could be found before the execution date. Many believe him already dead.

Russian judges on the four-power Tribunal, besides objecting to the three acquittals, dissented that death also should be decreed for

Rudolf Hess and objected against yesterday's acquittal of the general staff and high command.

While Von Papen, Schacht, and Fritzsche left the Nuernberg court-room as free men, there were plentiful signs that they still would face charges. Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, minister-president of Bavaria, said Von Papen faced trial before a de-Nazification board if he remained in the American Zone of occupation. Maj. Gen. C. L. Adcock, representing the American Military Government, said all three might be tried under the Control Council's de-Nazification statute.

Schacht, arrogant as ever, offered to sell his autograph for candy bars and left the court declaring Germany today lacked both laws and free opinion.

(u)

159

All the defendants received their sentences silently—some with sneers and other ironical gestures, some as if stunned. Goering was immobile. Ribbentrop, shrunken from the days of his triumphs as Adolf Hitler's foreign minister, had to be helped from the courtroom.

Russia still may carry to the Control Council her objections to the acquittals and the prison sentence for Hess. This council is made up of the ranking representatives in Germany of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and France, and has the final say over all the defendants.

Even as the Hitler gangsters were shuffling back to their Nuernberg courthouse cells, Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, representing the Control Council, was in the courthouse making execution arrangements.

Besides Hess, the four-power Tribunal gave life sentences to Walther Funk and Grand Adm. Erich Raeder. Sentences of 10 to 20 years were ordered for Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz, Baldur von Schirach, Albert Speer, and Constantin von Neurath.

Justice Robert H. Jackson, who was the chief American prosecutor, expressed regret at the three acquittals, and said the action threw doubt upon possible legal action against other Nazi industrialists who helped build the German war machine. One of these, Gustav Krupp von Bohlen Und Haldach, was indicted here, but was not brought to trial because of senile softening of the brain. Robert Ley, the 24th of the defendants originally indicted here, hanged himself before the trial got underway.

Legal officials xxx fourth graf second lead.

179

NUERNBERG—1ST ADD THIRD LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX UNDERWAY.

The hanging will take place in the jail of the Nuernberg Palace of Justice.

Legal officials xxx as before.

1216P

195

NUERNEBERG SECOND ADD THIRD LEAD WAR CRIMES XXX PALACE OF JUSTICE.

A spokesman for the Allied Control Council said the seven men sentenced to prison would be confined in a four-power jail in Berlin. For security reasons, it was not disclosed when the group would be moved to Berlin.

Legal officials etc. xxx as before.

1254P

WHAT WAS DONE WITH IT

It seems useless to show how this material was used by radio stations during that hectic hour or two as the bulletins and leads were rolling in. It was read pretty much as received.

But as the day wore on some interesting differences in handling emerged. I asked a number of the leading "names" in broadcast news to send me their scripts for that day. All complied readily, although it must be remembered that none had been notified in advance, and probably would have worked a little differently on his script had he known it was ever to take a permanent place between covers. It's noteworthy that some broadcasters say "Nuernberg" and others "Nuremberg"—but that's of small consequence.

Let's look first at coverage in the morning and the early afternoon.

And now for a little analysis plus the news.

CECIL BROWN

MBS

11:00 A.M.

The world has now decided that waging aggressive war is a crime, punishable by death, and decreed by a court.

That is the great meaning of the verdicts handed down today at the Nuremberg war trials against 22 top ranking German criminals.

By setting up that court at Nuremberg and holding the trial against the Germans, the nations of the world have given up a

certain amount of their sovereignty. They have subjected their national decision on making war to an international verdict.

By now, you may have heard 19 of the top German gangsters were convicted, and three were acquitted.

The surprising part of the verdict was that only 12 of the criminals were sentenced to die. It came as no surprise that among them was Hermann Goering, the one-time fat, dope-taking right-hand man of Hitler. He will be hanged. The same fate for Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, chief of the German High Command, and Colonel General Alfred Jodl, one of Hitler's top military brains.

Death sentences went out also to Ernst Kaltenbrunner, chief of Himmler's secret police, and Hans Frank, the brutal, sadistic governor of occupied Poland.

Also waiting for the rope now are Julius Streicher, the notorious persecutor of the Jews, and Arthur Seyss-Inquart, the one-time chancellor of Austria.

But there were shocking surprises in the verdicts. For instance, Rudolf Hess, the one-time heir of Hitler, was given life imprisonment. Hess, you recall, hopped off for England during the war to cook up a deal with Britain to turn on Russia. Also sentenced to spend the rest of their days in prison are these specimens of German culture: Grand Admiral Erich Raeder, chief of the German Navy; and Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, the chief of German U-boat warfare, and the man who took over after Hitler died and surrendered to the Allies, was given 10 years in prison.

Baldur von Schirach, the head of the German youth movement, the man who directed German youngsters in the art of being proficient murderers and supermen, was sentenced to 20 years in prison.

Altogether seven of the defendants were given prison terms.

But the shocking surprise was the acquittal of three of the notorious criminals of Germany. They are Hjalmar Schacht, the man who waged the Nazi financial war and economic penetration against other countries. Also Hans Fritzsche, attorney and radio chief of Goebbels' propaganda machine.

And here's the payoff on the acquittals. The tribunal freed Franz von Papen, the notorious instigator of wars, the master intriguer in both the first and second world wars.

It is unbelievable that some of these men received only prison sentences. But it is beyond all comprehension that such men as Schacht and von Papen should be able to walk out of the international court as free men.

Schacht and von Papen were key figures in paving the way for aggression against other countries, in softening up these countries, in engaging in the promotion of aggressive warfare.

But they were acquitted. Even so, it has now been established that wars of aggression are criminal, as judged by a tribunal made up of other nations. And that is a great step forward.

G. C. PUTNAM

MBS

12:00 NOON

First—news all of us are waiting to hear—the sentences that the International Military Tribunal passed today on Hitler's 22 leaders. Hermann Goering and 11 others will be hanged until dead, within 15 days. The others have been sentenced to prison terms ranging up to life!

And three of the Nazis were acquitted!

The three free men are Hjalmar Schacht, the wily financier; Hans Fritzsche, the minor propagandist; and Franz von Papen, the scheming diplomat. These three told correspondents this morning they want "rest, oblivion, and plenty of space."

Although there seems to be no further bar to the freedom of Schacht and Fritzsche, von Papen still is sought by Austria for trial as a war criminal in Vienna.

The sentences imposed today on the 22 Nazi leaders will be appealed to the Allied Military Council in Berlin within four days, but no change in the court's verdict is anticipated!

Justice Robert Jackson, Chief U. S. Prosecutor, says he regrets the International Military Tribunal's acquittal of Schacht and von Papen. He expresses doubt as to how the acquittals will affect future trials of German militarists and industrialists. Jackson also expresses regret that the four-power tribunal has declined to declare the criminality of the general staff. However, Jackson praises the general terms of the tribunal's history-making judgment!

The Russians are also *against* the three acquittals. And here's a brief once-over on the momentous sentencing of these Nazis.

Sentenced to hang are: Goering, von Ribbentrop, von Keitel, Kaltenbrunner, Rosenberg, Frank, Frick, Streicher, Sauckel, Jodl, Seyss-Inquart, and Martin Bormann, in *absentia*.

Those sentenced to life imprisonment: Rudolf Hess, Walther Funk, and Eric Raeder.

Those receiving prison terms are: Doenitz, 10 years; von Schirach, 20 years; von Neurath, 15 years; and Albert Speer, 20 years.

Those acquitted are: Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen, and Hans Fritzsche, as I said before.

Chief Justice Geoffrey Lawrence, of Britain, read the sentences to the 21 Nazi leaders. Each entered the solemn courtroom singly, escorted by a guard. Each stood stiffly before the justices of France, Britain, Russia, and the United States and heard his fate.

The sentences will be carried out by the Allied Military Council in Berlin.

And now for more analysis.

CEDRIC FOSTER

MBS

2:00 P.M.

The international war crimes tribunal, sitting in Nuernberg, today sentenced to death by hanging 12 leaders of the Third German Reich of Adolph Hitler. Seven others were given terms in prison and three were acquitted. The Soviet Union also objected to the tacit acquittal of the German general staff and high command on charges of criminality as a unit . . . and it likewise protested against the imposition of a sentence of life imprisonment upon Rudolph Hess. It was the opinion of the Russians that Hess should have been sentenced to death on the gallows.

Those who will end their infamous careers with a hangman's noose around their necks (unless the Allied Control Council should heed their pleas for mercy or order that they be shot to death instead of hanged) those who will go to the gallows include the following:

Field Marshal Hermann Goering; Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop; Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel; Ernst Kaltenbrunner; Alfred Rosenberg; Hans Frank; Wilhelm Frick; Julius Streicher, the Jew baiter of Nuernberg; Fritz Sauckel, the labor boss; Colonel General Alfred Jodl; Arthur Seyss-Inquart; and Martin Bormann. Bormann was tried and sentenced in absentia. Seyss-Inquart was the ruthless National Socialist Party leader who rode in the saddle over the prostrate Netherlands after having served in a similar capacity in Austria following Anschluss.

Rudolph Hess, who was the third ranking member of the National Socialist Party (with Hitler number 1 and Goering number 2) was sentenced to life imprisonment. Walther Funk, who succeeded Hjalmar Schacht as head of the Reichsbank, was also sentenced to life imprisonment, as was Grand Admiral Erich Raeder, head of the German fleet. Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, who surrendered Germany to the Allies in the waning moments of the war, and who,

for a time, was the German fuehrer, was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

Baron von Schirach, who was head of the Hitler Jugend, and Albert Speer, who was minister of munitions for Adolph Hitler, were both sentenced to 20 years in prison. A term of 15 years in prison was given to Constantin von Neurath, former foreign minister of Germany.

Those who were acquitted were Franz von Papen, Hjalmar Schacht, and Hans Fritzsche. Von Papen, of course, is the German diplomat whose intrigues and machinations go back through both world wars. Schacht was the former head of the Reichsbank and a man, as I reported to you yesterday, who was as much responsible for Hitler's rise to power as any individual in the Third Reich. Hans Fritzsche was the deputy propaganda minister who was tried instead of Paul Joseph Goebbels, who went to a suicide's death in the flaming ruins of Berlin.

Lord Justice Geoffrey Lawrence, who was the presiding jurist at the Nuernberg trials, announced today that the dissenting opinions of the Russian judge would be attached to the record. These opinions were given by the Soviet Major General I. T. Nikitchenko. It was also revealed that the defendants have a period of four days in which to appeal their sentence to the allied control council of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. Unless this control council should upset the verdict and the sentences of the trial court (and it is difficult to see how any such action should or would be taken) the sentences will be carried out on the 16th of October. Nevertheless, it is certain that an appeal will be made in each instance from the death sentences imposed, as defense attorneys have already announced that they will follow that course.

The Russians, it should be pointed out today, were not alone in their objection to the three acquittals and to the refusal of the court to find as guilty as a unit, the German general staff and the German high command. Justice Robert H. Jackson of the United States Supreme Court, who was the chief United States prosecutor, issued a statement today in which he said: "On behalf of all of the nations, we prosecutors asked the conscientious and independent judgment of the members of the tribunal as to the guilt of these men and organizations. This we now have received. In sustaining and applying the principle that aggressive war is a crime for which statesmen may be individually punished the judgment is highly gratifying.

"It is a hopeful sign for the peace of the world that representatives of the great powers all agree on this principle of law and are committed to that position by this judgment. Other aspects of the opinion are too intricate to be appraised without study of the text, for which there has been no time.

"I regret that the tribunal has felt constrained to acquit Schacht and von Papen and to decline to declare the criminality of the German general staff. Our arguments for their conviction, which seemed so overwhelming and convincing to all of us prosecutors, seem not to have made a similar impression on the tribunal. The effect of these acquittals on further prosecution of industrialists and militarists which have been planned will have to be studied from the text of the opinion. However, I personally regard the conviction and sentence of individuals as of secondary importance compared with the significance of the commitments by the four nations to the proposition that wars of aggression are criminal and that persecution of conquered minorities on racial, religious, or political grounds is likewise criminal. These principles of law will influence future events long after the fate of particular individuals is forgotten." That is the end of the statement by Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief prosecutor for the United States at the Nuernberg trials.

From Wes Gallagher of the Associated Press we learn the manner in which the defendants received their sentences today. Goering appeared between two military policemen. Gone were his medals and trappings and field marshal's baton. His shabby gray suit hung limply around him. As Justice Lawrence sentenced him to death by hanging, not a muscle on Goering's face moved under the pitiless glare of the kleig lights. Rudolph Hess stared blankly ahead of him, and he brushed aside the earphones which would have told him whether he would live or die. Joachim von Ribbentrop was stunned when he heard the sentence of the court. Gray and sickly, he had to be helped from the courtroom by the MP's. Field Marshal Keitel heard his sentence without emotion. After the sentence he turned silently to go back into the dock. Ernst Kaltenbrunner, the brutal head of the even more brutal Gestapo, still appeared to be the fiercest of the defendants. He bowed ironically to the court when he was told he must hang. Alfred Rosenberg straightened his coat, folded his hands to stand impassively as the verdict was read. Hans Frank, who killed thousands of Jews, nodded curtly to the judge. Julius Streicher, the Jew baiter, and easily the most hated and detested man in the courtroom, was found guilty on only one count, that of crimes against

humanity but he was, nonetheless, sentenced to hang. He was immobile when sentence was read. Wilhelm Frick, who was a street fighter under Hitler, and later became protector of Bohemia and Moravia, appeared haggard but just as Kaltenbrunner did, he bowed to the court. The two German naval officers, Raeder and Doenitz, were impassive. Walter Funk shot a disgusted look at the court as he heard himself sentenced to life imprisonment. Baldur von Schirach, head of the Hitler Jugend, appeared angry while Fritz Sauckel, labor boss and enslaver of millions, greeted his death sentence with an ostentatious sneer. Colonel General Jodl stared languidly at the judge as he heard his doom. Arthur Seyss-Inquart gripped the railing tensely and with a supreme effort controlled his emotions. Von Neurath appeared limp in his dark clothing. Thus the ruling clique from the remnants of Hitler's regime heard the decisions and sentences of the court.

The three German leaders who were acquitted by the Nuernberg tribunal today appeared headed for de-Nazification trials if they elected to take up residence in the American zone of Germany. It is also reasonable to assume that they will face the same situation in either the British or Russian zones but it hardly is conceivable that any of them will elect to place themselves within the jurisdiction of the Soviet Union.

Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, minister-president of Bavaria, said today that von Papen would be tried if he stays in the American zone, and he added that he considered the acquittal of the German diplomat a most astonishing thing because he believed that von Papen was the real instigator of the Third Reich.

Hjalmar Schacht, who was also acquitted, held a press conference after he was freed by the court. Von Papen and Hans Fritzsche were also present. When he was asked whether he expected to be tried by a German court, the former head of the Reichsbank said there were "neither laws nor free opinion in Germany today." He said that in the days before Hitler there were laws and free opinion, but these now have vanished. When Schacht made this remark, the news conference broke into an uproar with the French and Belgian correspondents shouting and yelling into the press rooms. Von Papen and Fritzsche said they had always been confident of acquittal and Fritzsche, who was Goebbels' deputy propaganda minister, said he now hoped to be tried by a German court to vindicate himself in the eyes of the German people. That started an uproar. Von Papen then declared he didn't see why he should be tried by a de-Nazifica-

tion court as he had already been freed by the highest international tribunal. The fact remains that they are free, however, but for how long remains to be seen.

It is impossible to bring any discussion of the Nuernberg trial to a close without reiterating the statement made on this broadcast yesterday . . . one in which Justice Jackson concurred today . . . that it is regrettable that the court failed to rule on the criminal status of the German general staff. No more fearful or diabolical instrument for aggressive war was ever organized. The German general staff and high command wrote its orders in the blood of millions. The acquittal of Franz von Papen is no less amazing. He bears a charmed life and the only hope that humanity has of escaping from his future deviltry lies in the de-Nazification court. As long as he lives, von Papen may be expected to plot and conspire against free men. As long as he lives, von Papen may be expected to continue his involvements and machinations. He knows no other life, and the only safe place to keep him is behind steel bars. Even this the Nuernberg court refused to do. It is not to be wondered at that the Russians protested the verdict which freed von Papen, nor is it surprising that the Russians dissented on the question of the German general staff. In these instances the Russian government is absolutely on sound ground.

EMPHASIS BEGINS TO CHANGE . . .

By 6 o'clock some radio writers were restive. The five-minute news on WJZ (ABC) at that hour gave prominence to two other stories first—one a ball game between the St. Louis Cardinals and Brooklyn Dodgers, and the other a report of a New York meat investigation. This was all that was said about Nuremberg.

FIVE-MINUTE NEWS

WJZ-ABC

6:00 P.M.

Berlin—The Allied Control Council says the 12 Nazi leaders condemned to death by the War Crimes Tribunal will be hanged in the courtyard of Nuernberg Prison. The exact date is being kept secret for security reasons. But highly reliable sources say the executions will take place on October 16th.

Nuernberg Prison—The chief psychiatrist at Nuernberg Prison says the convicted Nazis have dropped the false air of bravado which they displayed in court today, and now are shaking in their cells.

"They're all cowards," says Doctor Gustave Gilbert, "every one of them."

Nuernberg—American Prosecutor Robert Jackson says he is disappointed in the acquittal of three Nazi defendants, because it will have a definite effect on future trials of lesser war criminals. However, the Supreme Court Justice adds that the fate of individuals is of secondary importance compared with the significant fact that four great Nations have agreed on a principle—"The principle that wars of aggression are criminal, and that persecution of conquered minorities on racial, religious, or political grounds is likewise criminal."

Vienna—The Austrian Government has asked the Allies to hand over Franz von Papen, acquitted at Nuernberg, for a new war crimes trial in Austria.

. . . BUT NOT FOR TROUT AND THOMAS

On this particular date Robert Trout and Lowell Thomas were broadcasting at the same time—6:45 P.M. Since both are excellent broadcasters, that situation always provided a tough problem for listeners. It's interesting to note that, although both continued to "play" the same story, their styles were quite different. Trout—featurizing little; Thomas of the choppy sentence—or no sentence at all, for that matter, school-leaning heavily on human interest.

ROBERT TROUT

CBS

6:45 P.M.

They're shivering in their cells tonight—11 German war criminals, sentenced to death; three to life imprisonment; four to shorter prison terms. Death on the gallows for Hermann Goering; Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop; Field Marshal Keitel, Chief of the German High Command; Alfred Rosenberg, the philosopher of the Nazi Party; Colonel General Jodl, Chief of the German Army Staff; Gestapo Chief Kaltenbrunner; Hans Frank, Governor-General of Poland; Wilhelm Frick, protector of Bohemia and Moravia; Austria's betrayer, Seyss-Inquart; Labor boss Sauckel; Anti-Semitic specialist Streicher; and Martin Bormann, Hitler's deputy, sentenced to death in his absence—he may already be dead. Three of the criminals will spend the rest of their lives in jail: Rudolf Hess, once Hitler's deputy, before his flight to Scotland; Walter Funk, once President of the German State Bank; and Grand Admiral Raeder, the Navy Chief. The

Hitler Youth Chief, von Schirach, and Munitions Minister Speer were given 20 years. Former Foreign Minister von Neurath got 15 years, and the U-boat Chief, Grand Admiral Doenitz, got 10 years. Tonight they're shaking in their cells, separated into three groups: the condemned, the lifers, and the comparatively short-termers.

There's a fourth group, too. It consists of the three men who were acquitted. They're spending the night in jail just because it's a place to sleep. The Army, like most everyone else, was surprised by the verdict of "not guilty" and was unable to make quick travel arrangements for the three who were set free: von Papen, Schacht, and Fritzsche. They may not be free long. Fritzsche, the propagandist, may be handed back to the Russians who had captured him and delivered him to the International Court. Von Papen, the international plotter of two world wars, is wanted in several places, including Austria. Schacht, the money wizard, faces trial by a de-Nazification board if he tries to stay in the American zone. But all three were jubilant at the end of the historic ten-month trial. They faced a room full of Allied reporters with arrogance, and in a few minutes turned the interview into pandemonium with everyone shouting at everyone else and no one hearing anything.

The three judged not guilty were as belligerent as ever, but the 18 sentenced to death or prison are quaking, so says the prison psychiatrist Dr. Gustave Gilbert. This morning, in the final act in the courtroom, the convicts heard their fate with varying reactions. Hermann Goering stood motionless before the court that had just declared his guilt to be unique in its enormity. He held himself stiffly like a soldier as Lord Justice, Sir Geoffrey Lawrence, told him he will die on the gallows. A minute later, in his cell, Goering said to the psychiatrist: "I got the best sentence of all!" But his face was gray and his hands shook.

The end is near for the men who led Germany into Germany's second World War. Appeals can be made until Saturday to the Allied Control Council, but, if the Council rejects the appeals, the death sentences will be executed in Nuernberg, probably October 16, two weeks from tomorrow.

LOWELL THOMAS

NBC

6:45 P.M.

Tonight at Nuernberg three men, Messers Schacht, von Papen, and Fritzsche are back in the same old place. They're back in prison. Today in the War Criminal Trial they were declared not guilty. They were set free. They were given passes to go wherever they

pleased. But tonight there they are, back again in the War Criminal prison. The reason—they're afraid. Afraid that some of their fellow Germans may try to kill them now. After their exoneration today, Schacht, von Papen, and Fritzsche had their first taste of freedom. Appeared before a press conference. They walked around a bit. Then they asked the Allied authorities could they go back to the jail for the night. That privilege was granted them. So now, they're occupying not cells, but just rooms in the prison where they were locked up for 10 months during the trials. Von Papen's lawyer has asked for a military escort to guard him on his way home, which is in the British zone. Schacht's lawyer tomorrow will put in the same request for his client. And it's thought that Fritzsche, too, may ask for protection on his way home.

This comes as rather a surprise just as the verdicts of not guilty were a surprise in the cases of Schacht, wizard of Nazi financial scheming; von Papen, arch villain of Hitler diplomacy; and Fritzsche, the propaganda chief under Goebbels. The Soviet member of the tribunal voted for their conviction. Took exception to their acquittal; entered a dissenting opinion. However, a majority of the Court ruled that according to the evidence, those three did not take part in the conspiracy to make war or in the crimes of Nazi atrocity.

There's no surprise in the death sentences imposed on Goering, von Ribbentrop, Rosenberg, Streicher, and the other higher artists of Nazism. They were arch conspirators in the world crimes of Hitler. They themselves were not astonished, if we can judge from their bearing in the courtroom today, as they were brought in, one after another, to face the verdicts pronounced by the British Chief Justice. They were stolid, phlegmatic with a sneer or two. When Goering came in, the first to hear sentence, he had trouble adjusting the earphones. The Chief Justice spoke in English. The earphones brought translations in other languages. Goering's earphones were to have been adjusted so he could listen to the German version. But something was wrong. Apparently what he heard was Russian. A language he doesn't understand. So it would seem that the former number 2 man to Hitler never heard the sentence at all. That is, in a way that he could understand. He acted as if it didn't matter anyhow. He knew exactly what it would be. He was sure of it. So Goering, who once rode the tide of pride, splendor, and tyranny, didn't go to any trouble to hear the verdict against him. Wasn't sufficiently curious; wasn't in any doubt.

NUERNBERG FAILS TO COME THROUGH

NBC's world news roundup scheduled for 7:15 P.M. intended to make a pickup direct from Nuernberg, with Roy Porter reporting. But atmospherics prevented, and Morgan Beatty read copy prepared in Washington. It was preceded by no less than six stories—the illness of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a record-breaking flight by a Navy plane, "The Truculent Turtle," some minor news from the State, Agriculture and Justice Departments, and a paragraph about Henry Wallace's plans. Then:

MORGAN BEATTY**NBC****7:15 P.M.**

In Nuernberg, Germany, today came the penultimate climax in the lives of 21 Nazi war lords. They heard the verdict of a four-power military court. Impassive Hermann Goering and 11 of his fellow henchmen drew death by hanging, others life, a few were acquitted. Nobody seems quite happy with the decision including the prosecuting attorneys. We had intended taking you to Nuernberg, but atmospherics have prevented it, so we'll give you our Nuernberg dispatches from Washington here.

Seven other defendants, including Rudolf Hess, were sent to prison today and three were acquitted by the four-power military tribunal in the first international war crimes trial.

The death sentences will be carried out in the Nuernberg jail, probably October 16. The prison term will be served in a four-power jail in Berlin. That is a jail controlled by the four powers who have these men in custody.

The trial lasted 10 months. The International Court announced the sentencing after completing the reading of a 100,000-word history-making judgment ruling that aggressive warfare "is the supreme crime."

Hans Fritsche, Franz von Papen, and Hjalmar Schacht were acquitted, with Russia dissenting.

The freedom of these three men, however, may be short-lived. They face possible trial before de-Nazification boards in Germany. The German minister-president of Bavaria said today that any of the three who remained in the American zone would be haled promptly before such courts and he added, "This certainly means several years of hard labor."

The Russian member of the tribunal dissented on the acquittal of

these three men. He also declared that Hess should have been sentenced to death instead of life imprisonment.

The Soviet justice also asserted that the court erred in not declaring the Reich Cabinet and General Staff and High Command guilty.

Justice Robert H. Jackson said that he regretted the Tribunal had acquitted Schacht and von Papen and had "declined to declare the criminality of the General Staff." Here's how the principals acted when they were sentenced today:

Goering, whose guilt was declared by the court to be "unique in its enormity," put his head in his hands and appeared lost in thought, but his expression remained immobile as chief justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence read his fate.

Hess brushed the earphones from his head. He did not hear sentence pronounced.

Keitel gulped, lowered his sharp Prussian chin, and stared blankly into space.

The pudgy Walter Funk alone appeared physically affected. His knees sagged as he walked out of the courtroom.

MOST OF THE 15 MINUTES

The illness of Secretary Hull was the "lead" story for most of the remainder of the evening, but not, of course, for Elmer Davis. Most of his 15-minute commentary was devoted to Nuernberg:

ELMER DAVIS

ABC

7:15 P.M.

Now that the great trial at Nuernberg is ended, the grandstand managers and Monday morning quarterbacks the world over are offering their observations on the outcome. The opinion has been expressed in this country that the fairness of the trial is proved by the fact that three of the 23 defendants were acquitted; but there will probably be general regret that the verdict could not have been unanimous on all of them, as it was on most. And a good many people in all countries may agree with the Russian judge that they should all have been found guilty—a view which was expressed today by some Germans. Perhaps an exception might be made for Hans Fritzsche, chief of radio propaganda under Goebbels. In the days when Hitler was going strong, Fritzsche looked like quite a figure in Berlin; but the court found that he had no control over the formulation of the

propaganda policies which he executed, and never amounted to enough to attend the big conferences that planned aggressive war.

The acquittal of Schacht and von Papen is another matter. Justice Jackson spoke for the entire prosecution staff in expressing regret over this decision, which may lead a good many Europeans to believe that slipperiness pays better than candor. The court noted that in July, 1944, Schacht was sent to a concentration camp for complicity in the plot against Hitler; but the Russian judge observed that he got into such activities pretty late and never did much about them. Meanwhile he had worked for Hitler for years, building up the economic and financial basis for Hitler's military machine; and it seemed to the Russian that he shouldn't be let off merely because he saw that the ship was sinking and dived overboard in time.

As for von Papen, the Russian judge pointed out that he helped Hitler into power and faithfully served the Nazi government with his diplomatic skill up to the very end—though there were suspicions that he might have double-crossed Hitler if he had thought it would pay. The court called him a bully and intriguer but observed that such activities, though deplorable, were not criminal; von Papen built up the Nazi party in Austria while he was ambassador to that country, but they found no evidence that he favored its seizure by force. Nor did the court's jurisdiction extend to the intrigues by which von Papen managed to get Hitler appointed in the first place as German chancellor, with himself as vice-chancellor, in the innocent confidence that under that arrangement Hitler would be the front and von Papen the works. Which was only one of von Papen's many mistakes. He used to be carelessly described as Hitler's ace diplomat; actually he was a deuce diplomat, whose activities were usually unsuccessful—dating clear back to 1915, when as German military attaché in Washington, he was caught promoting sabotage in American factories, and was sent back home in consequence. But all his life long he has had extraordinary luck in escaping the consequences not only of his misdeeds but of his mistakes.

The new Austrian republic, however, is said to want to try von Papen for what he did there; it also wants von Schirach, the youth leader, whom the Nuernberg court sentenced to 20 years in jail. Whether these requests will be granted is doubtful; at any rate the men acquitted must still go through the de-Nazification courts in occupied Germany, and could be sentenced to reconstruction labor, though they probably won't be.

Surprise may also be felt at the sentencing of the high military officers, Field Marshal Keitel and Colonel-General Jodl, to hanging. But the court found that Keitel not only actively participated in the planning of aggressive wars but ordered or permitted reprisals on prisoners, both military and civilian; and of Jodl's activities as chief of Hitler's personal military staff, it said that participation in such crimes as these has never been *required* of any soldier.

Admiral Doenitz, however, was let off with 10 years, having been most of the time a line officer performing strictly tactical duties. On Goering, the court remarked that the record discloses no excuse for this man; which just about says it all. The 11 men sentenced to death will be hanged two weeks from tomorrow, unless the court should yield to some of their appeals for clemency, which seems very improbable; the rest will start serving their sentences in the Nuernberg jail.

Justice Jackson, whose opening address did much to define the principles of international law on which the trial was conducted, thinks that its most important result was the commitment of the four great powers—America, Britain, France, and Russia—to the doctrine that wars of aggression are criminal and so is persecution of conquered minorities. These principles, he says, will influence future events long after the fate of individuals is forgotten. So they will; and already some people in this country have expressed disquiet about the way they may influence them. In part this is a purely legalistic argument; the heads of the German government, or so many of them as survived, were tried by a court which had no precedent jurisdiction over them and for offenses which, however abhorrent to the conscience of the world, were in some cases—the making of aggressive war, for instance—not crimes at law. Justice Jackson's opening, however, cited so many treaties in which the German government had solemnly promised *not* to do what it later did that a considerable legal basis for trial was established.

But, it is argued, no nation ever admits that it is waging aggressive war; Hitler always claimed that his neighbors either had attacked him or were getting ready to attack him; and if he had won, the history of the world would thereafter have been written by Dr. Goebbels, and his story might have stuck. So, it is maintained—and this argument has been advanced by some very respectable citizens, as well as by some copperheads—the Nuernberg trials merely amount to saying hereafter that the winners have a right to try the heads of the losing government, and put them to death if it seems advisable.

In wars of the old-fashioned type, that would certainly have been a new and dangerous implication; but it seems likely that we may never have any more wars of the old-fashioned type—wars of one nation against another, for limited objectives, such as for instance our war with Spain in 1898. The charter of the United Nations forbids aggressive war, and if it works, any future violator of its provisions could be punished under them. It may not work; but if it did not, it seems at least probable that any wars of the future would be world wars; with an aggressor or group of aggressors trying for domination, and the other nations banded together in self-defense. If the aggressor won, heads of the governments that tried to defend their liberties would probably be put to death. It is true that Hitler did not put to death the leaders of the countries he overran, but most of them got away; he had the heads of the French government tried by French courts, and when those courts failed to convict them, the war was still going on. Hitler had to consider public opinion in France and the world at large and could not take drastic measures at once—though he did keep the defeated French leaders in jail, where some of them died. If he had won, he could have done anything with them that he wanted to. So, in the future, if an aggressor should conquer the world, men who had led the fight for freedom would probably pay for it with their lives. To make sure that an aggressor, if he lost, would pay with his life might help to discourage aggression.

MUCH IN LITTLE

Bill Henry's ability to condense and to tell the story of the day in his five-minute news summaries (really only three minutes and a half when the commercials are counted) is the envy of many of his fellows. Here is how he told the story that night:

BILL HENRY

CBS

8:55 P.M.

Today's verdicts in the Nuremberg war crimes trials did not do much to emphasize unity among the big powers. Shortly after the announcement that 12 of the defendants, including Hermann Goering, had been sentenced to death, three others, including Rudolf Hess, to life imprisonment, four more to varying prison sentences, and that three had been acquitted, criticism was voiced in many quarters. The Russian judge issued a lengthy statement officially dissenting. He wanted *no* leniency. American prosecutor, Justice Robert Jackson,

regretted that any of the 22 had been cleared. Since then, numerous groups and individuals have protested the verdict. Justice Jackson hailed the action of the court in outlawing aggressive warfare, but many jurors found fault with this business of finding people guilty of transgressing law not in existence at the time of their offense. In any event, the dozen due to be hanged will have their sentences carried out in Nuremberg by October 16, and it is very likely that von Papen, Schacht, and Fritzsche, who were cleared of war guilt charges, will be tried by lower courts and will not get off completely free.

"THERE'S GOOD NEWS TONIGHT"

Gabriel Heatter didn't use his familiar phrase at the opening of his program that night—naturally because his first news was about Hull's illness and his second about meat shortages. This is what he had to say about the sentencing:

GABRIEL HEATTER

ABC

9:00 P.M.

Well, I said last night there was one place anyway where the Allies did achieve unity, where they were in complete agreement. And that place was Nuremberg Courtroom. But I was wrong. For there, too, there was a disagreement. With the Russian judge opposed to life imprisonment for Rudolph Hess. He wanted him to hang. He was opposed to exoneration of Schacht and von Papen and Goebbel's lieutenant Fritzsche. He was opposed to exoneration for the German General Staff. The big surprise was, of course, Dr. Schacht, although there were probably many people who felt he might never hang. A good many thought he would draw some punishment. For in the record of the trial it was shown that he not only called for a *heil* or two for Hitler, but he said a triple *Sieg heil* every time he attended a public ceremony for Hitler. Not only that, he was proud, he said, to put the German Reichsbank to work for Hitler and the Nazis. And he meant to keep it there.

There's something uncanny about the ability of everyday people to anticipate events, for a great many had the feeling Dr. Schacht would somehow get away. The chances are von Papen's exoneration was an even greater surprise. Twice now, after two world wars, von Papen has turned up on his feet. He not only was never bothered after his work in World War One, he even became Germany's real

power behind the scenes. As much as any man in all Germany, as much as any man in all Europe, it was von Papen who made Hitler. If all the unrevealed and invisible industrial and financial powers in Germany had a front man who carried the ball for the real war makers in Germany it was Franz von Papen. He worked so cleverly they called him Satan in a top hat. But once again he got away without a scratch.

There's some talk tonight of Schacht and von Papen being tried again inside Germany and Austria before a lower court. Well, if it goes before a German court a great many people are going to remember the trials in German courts following World War One when the Germans were not only acquitted but hailed by bands and children waiting outside with garlands of flowers. And out they came—conquering heroes.

No man in all Europe can dig up money for war better than Hjalmar Schacht. No man in all Europe knows his way around diplomatic chancellories better than Franz von Papen. No man in all Germany, not even Goebbels himself, could do as good a job on the German people as Fritzsche, Goebbels' lieutenant who went free today. And there was never a time when they had more to work with, more in fear, tension and the diplomatic checkerboard where they're all old hands.

During the war, in the grim days of war, there were people who said this man Heatter is a wishful thinker. Foolish enough to believe that Hitler would never get to England when he was only 18 miles away. Foolish enough to believe that Stalingrad would hold out when there were only two thousand yards left. When so many people were sure Hitler would conquer all Russia in eight weeks. Well, I know some real wishful thinkers tonight. They're the people who really believe shooting Goering and a handful of Nazis will end the chapter and spare the children a war in their time. They're the wishful thinkers. Those men whose names were called today, they were the rabble, the window dressing, the real masters of Germany were never in that courtroom.

We're setting up a new German government. We're turning Germany back into German hands. She'll have goods and probably credit and perhaps in time a fat loan. Better look carefully at the hands into which we turn it back. Better look carefully for marks on those hands lest our children pay for it as our sons paid and their fathers before them.

They say the last trace of humanity left the Nazis' faces today when they heard the verdict guilty. Well, the old people of Europe,

they knew it would come. The day of judgment, the day of retribution. But the Nazi leaders had no time for the nonsense prattled by old men and women.

In a village in Greece a boy climbed up to haul down a Nazi flag and they shot him dead. In another village in Czechoslovakia a boy tried not to tell where his father was hiding. They shot him dead. The old men wept and cried out God's judgment will fall on your heads. But the Nazis were too busy to bother to listen.

They're no longer too busy tonight. It was retribution day for the man Hitler called my right arm—Keitel, the Field Marshal. Retribution day for Jodl who was probably Hitler's left arm.

Well, people all over the world have certainly made a real march on the road to peace when men who wear the military uniforms of Prussian Germany are condemned to hang. The wrath of honest men has smashed a tower of evil when a German Field Marshal dies for the crime of making war against humanity. Children all over the world are that much better off tonight. The chances are even King Solomon would say there is nothing new under the sun tonight. For centuries men made wars, killed millions, and the only punishment was defeat, humiliation, reparations, but never a personal crime. A man would steal a bag of potatoes or a hog, and he would be held personally responsible. But the man who ordered men to burn a city, he became a hero or came home in defeat. But he came home. And the men who never came back were the people ruined by the war . . . too bad . . . war was war. But not any more. And that's the biggest thing that I have known to happen in all my lifetime.

AND THE END OF THE DAY

An effective method of tying together the two big stories—Hull and Nuernberg—was found by Charles Collingwood. Although in this chapter we've been considering only the Nuernberg story, Collingwood's skill is so interesting to watch, let's examine all of his lead:

CHARLES COLLINGWOOD

CBS

11:00 P.M.

In the Naval Hospital, outside of Washington, D. C., an old man, rich in years and fame and wisdom, lies critically ill tonight, perhaps dying. The old man is Cordell Hull, the Tennessee judge who became Secretary of State at one of the most crucial moments in American history. From his hospital bed tonight, the man whom President

Roosevelt called "the Father of the United Nations" issued a plea to the nations of the world, which may be his last political testament. He did not mention the dispute over Henry Wallace's views, but this is what he said: "The great common interests of nations cannot be attained except by the practice of justice and fair dealing toward each other and through mutual confidence and mutual respect. Not since the darkest days of the war," said Mr. Hull, "has it been so necessary as now for the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and France to work together. Only thus," said one of the elder statesmen of the world, "can we have a world order, ruled by enlightened reason and just law, rather than by stark terror and by brute force."

An example of that enlightened reason and just law, for which Cordell Hull was pleading, was handed down today in Nuremberg, Germany. This was the day they had been waiting for in Nuremberg. The twenty-one men chiefly responsible for the planning and carrying out of Germany's part in the war heard the sentences which a court of four nations handed down on the basis of long, dragging, tedious legal process. As much as could be, this was a trial of law and reason and not of revenge. Solemnly and on the basis of law, twelve, including Goering and von Ribbentrop, were sentenced to death. Rudolf Hess and seven others were sent to prison, and three, Hjalmar Schacht, the surly financier, Franz von Papen, the diplomat, and Hans Fritzsche, the radio propagandist, were acquitted.

The Russian judge entered a long dissenting opinion, objecting to the acquittal of the three who were freed. Supreme Court Justice Jackson, who was not a judge but acted as the chief American prosecutor, also expressed his regret that the tribunal had acquitted Schacht and von Papen. However, Justice Jackson praised the court for sustaining and applying the principle that aggressive war is a crime for which statesmen may be individually punished.

It is indeed a great principle which the court laid down in Nuremberg today. But the men who received their sentences seemed hardly worthy characters in so great a drama. Although once they shook the world, most of them seemed contemptible in the courtroom. An army psychologist says they're shaking in their cells tonight. And when Hjalmar Schacht, the great financial wizard, the man whose currency manipulations governed the economics of half a continent, was released, he rushed out to hold a news conference. It ended with Schacht trying to sell his autograph for chocolate bars. Maybe Goering was right when he said his death sentence was the best.

9. GO AHEAD AND TALK

A Few Notes for the News Announcers

THERE ARE ANNOUNCERS with years of experience who say quite honestly that they never feel completely at ease before the microphone. Thus the first rule about delivering radio news, "take it easy," should be followed with the words, "if you possibly can."

A stock sentence in greeting a newcomer to the microphone is, "Go ahead, it won't bite you." And it won't. But it will magnify every speech defect you have, will expose your learning or lack of learning, will often amplify a slight hoarseness to the point where it will seem you are playing the death scene from *Camille*.

Oddly enough, there aren't many so-called "good" voices that have reached the forefront of radio news. Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, H. V. Kaltenborn, Gabriel Heatter, the late Boake Carter, William L. Shirer, W. W. Chaplin, Baukhage, Raymond Swing, Elmer Davis, Quincy Howe, Cecil Brown—I think that any of these men would be quick to admit that his voice is not an elocutionist's delight and that he's more interested in what he has to say than in what he has to say it with. So you are apt to find, in high audience appeal, there are factors other than excellent diction. One of these is intensity. Another is a sincere desire to inform. A third is community of interest with the listener, and that's something almost impossible to define.

I suppose I've listened to hundreds of prospective news an-

nouncers, most of whom had become attracted to radio as a prospective career because their friends told them they had "good" voices. But in sad case after sad case there was simply no sincerity in the voice; the man auditioning was merely reading, not talking. My reaction was apathy. I found my attention wandering.

But let no one think that this is a fault only among the beginners and aspirants for jobs as announcers. I've talked with many veterans who confess that often they find themselves reading almost meaningless words. One man who has been on the air five times a week for years told me that there's always one point near the middle of his script where he has to force himself to pay close attention and realize he's imparting knowledge. Otherwise, his voice just goes on and on without conviction.

This chapter doesn't pretend to be even a basic outline of radio speaking. There's some doubt as to whether there could be any teacher of the subject except experience. But there are a few tricks of the trade useful to some, and the student may benefit from several suggestions.

THE FIRST READER

Remember that, as far as the public is concerned, you are the first reader of news copy. Someone else may have written it, may have read it to himself as he wrote it, but when it goes out over the air the listeners are unaware that anyone but you has ever read the copy. So the first rule is to familiarize yourself with every word, every sentence, every paragraph.

That means looking out for booby traps in sentence construction. There may be the words, "a series of reminiscences." All of these sibilants together might come over the air like a steam calliope in full cry. If you yourself have written the phrase, change it to something more readable; if someone else has written it, ask him for permission to make the change.

Always have at hand a good, unabridged dictionary. Look up any word that's unfamiliar to you for both meaning and pro-

nunciation. Even fairly common words, such as "fulsome" and "shambles," may not have the meaning you intend. You may be erroneously using certain words interchangeably such as "infer" and "imply," "further" and "farther," "intense" and "intensive," "apt," "likely," and "liable."

There's no sense being overly pedantic in looking out for the niceties of language, which fortunately is always growing anyway, but every radio announcer is a teacher whether he wants to be or not, and he might as well teach what authorities consider the best current English. One of the most conscientious news announcers I've ever known is Douglas Edwards. He looks up every unfamiliar word and practices pronunciations until he has them letter-perfect. Announcers throughout the country are quick to recognize talents of their colleagues, and Edwards, unwittingly, has become a guide to pronunciation. I've been in small stations and heard broadcasters talking shop. "I know it's 'in-ex'pli-ca-ble,'" one will state categorically. "That's the way Doug Edwards says it."

As for foreign place names and unusual personal names, the best thing to do is to write them out phonetically so that you won't trip over them as you go past. A valuable book in that connection is Cabell Greet's *World Words*, published by the Columbia University Press. Here are Greet-recommended pronunciations of some of the most contentious place and personal names, as well as of some common words:

archipelago, ahr'ki-pel'uh-goh

auspices, os pi-siz

Bayreuth (Germany), bai'roйт'

Beirut (Syria), bay'root'

Belgrade (Yugoslavia), bel'grayd'

Caribbean, kehr'i-bee'uhn

Cugat, Xavier (American), koo'gaht', ek-say'vi-ehr

Dachau (Germany), Dah'k(h)au

Debussy (French composer), duh-bü-see'

ensemble, ahn-som'buhl (English), ahN-sahN'bl (French)

Fiume (Italy), fyoo'meh

Garand, John C. (inventor of the rifle), gehr'uhnd
Hacha, Emil (Czechoslovakian leader), hah'hah, eh'mil
Haiti, hay'ti
Haitian, hay'shuhn
Ibn Saud, ib'uhn sah-ood'
Jehol (Manchuria), juh-hol'
Khabarovsk (Russia), hah-bah'rofsk
Kossuth, Lajos (Hungarian hero), ko'shut, lo'yosh
Le Havre, luh hahvr' (English), luh ahvr' (French)
Lehman, Herbert H. (American), lee'muhn
Lewes (Delaware), loo'is
Lie, Trygve, lee, trüg'veuh
Lwow (Poland), lvoof'
Maori (New Zealand), mau'ri or mah'o-ree
Newfoundland, nyoo'fuhnd-land'
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., oh-ma'huh-ni
Peenemuende or *Peenemünde* (Germany), pay'nuh-mün'duh
pianist, pi-an'ist (preferred for American usage) or pee'uh-nist
quay, kee' (English), keh' (French)
ration and *route*, two words on which authorities disagree. Greet notices that most Americans prefer *ration* as though to rhyme with *fashion* and *route* as though to rhyme with *bout*. Dictionaries and purists, however, disagree with those pronunciations.
Sakhalin (Russia), sah-hah-leen'
Split (Yugoslavia), spleet'
Trieste (Italy), tri-est' (English), tree-es'teh (Italian)
Uruguay, yoo'ru-gway (English), oo-roo-gwai' (Spanish)
Vladivostok (Russia), vlah'di-vos-tok'
Willamette (Oregon, river), wi-lam'it

SO YOU'RE A MUSICIAN YET

Assuming that you now have in mind what you want to say, there's still a major problem—that of emphasis. Some announcers therefore “score” their copy. A single underline denotes minor emphasis, with double and triple lines calling for more and more emphasis. The announcers also write in ellipses and sometimes even the words, “long pause,” in parentheses, as a guide to the flow of sentences.

One thing you will notice if you listen attentively to the conversation of your friends is that they seldom follow the normal rules of punctuation, especially if they are telling a dramatic story. It's difficult to illustrate this habit in written form but perhaps this will serve:

I'm walking down Main toward Elm . . . youknowaboutablock-fromtheviaduct . . . an' I see this big black car tearinalong about . . . oh . . . sayabout sixty . . . an' allofasudden . . . wham! . . . he smacks right into the front fender of a jalopy that's justpoking-along. . . . Well, the guyinthebigcar putson his brakes, looks back, throws sump'n utothecar and startsupagain just 'sif nothinhad happened. Well I trytoget the license number when allofasudden I hear the fella in the jalopy sayin', "Well, I'll be . . ." So I look around and guesswhathe's holdin' . . . Uh hundred dollar bill . . . uh hundred, nokiddin'. All Icansayis he sure mustabeen in onehelluva-hurry.

Again I protest that I don't urge this type of language for broadcasting, but I think a newsman often gains by ignoring periods, commas, and other forms of punctuation for the sake of emphasis. Edward R. Murrow is a past master at this type of personal punctuation, and his decision to abandon the microphone for executive work was a distinct loss to spoken radio. But there are others, such as John W. Vandercook and Charles Collingwood, who effectively take their pauses where they feel them, rather than where little dots and dots-with-tails-on-them say the pauses should be.

Sometimes an individual's scoring of his copy is so esoteric as to be beyond understanding to the layman. For what it may be worth, to the uninitiate, on the following pages you will find an example of copy as scored by George Putnam:

"Years-hence" -- the men who write the "history books" are going to
look back and say that on one-certain-date -- the tide of battle
changed. On that one-date -- the fate of Hitler was finally sealed --
and all that happened thereafter was merely "anti-climax." And it may
be -- it may just be that today was that-date.

For today -- (on the field of battle) -- (and in the realm of di-
plomacy) -- Hitler suffered "real-defeats" -- (reverses which may even-
tually spell the decline and fall of his tottering-empire.)

Today -- (March the 13th) -- is the day in which the Red Army
startled the world by sudden capture of the Black sea port -- (the Ger-
man defense bastion of Kherson.) Today -- two nations -- (recently
enemies) -- renewed the "ties-of-friendship" -- (the government of Russia
and the Italian-Regime of Marshal Bagdolio.) Today too -- the Allies
showed that they mean business -- (that stricter-measures are in the off-
ing to prevent vital-information from leaking to the enemy through Eire.)

All-these-things today -- and many-more-too.

But before I present the full-details of Hitler's-reverses --

here's the front-line-dispatch from General MacArthur's-headquarters --

(an apt-reminder that while we turn the full weight of our power toward
knocking Germany out-of-the-war -- we are by no means neglecting the
Japs.

General MacArthur -- (in his night communique) -- reveals that Ameri-
can-forces -- (at the Allied bridgehead at Empress Augusta Bay on New
Guinea) -- turned back a strong Japanese attack. More than that -- a
"third of the three or four thousand Japs who made the assault have been
killed. This American victory is especially heartening -- because even
as this official word came from the Southwest Pacific -- NBC monitors
(here in New York) heard Radio-Tokyo make another in its series of fan-
tastic claims -- (a claim that the enemy had recaptured two of the three
airdromes in that Empress Augusta area.)

But General MacArthur has even more to report. American cavalry-
men have two more small-islands (in the Admiralties) -- (to the west of
Los Negros -- where we had established our first outpost bases, in that
region.) The landings were made after the enemy had been bombarded by
long-range artillery (from Los-Negros.) →

DOES SOMEBODY LOVE YOU?

Once you know your copy thoroughly you still have the barrier of establishing a unity with the listener. Naturally this is a matter for each individual to solve for himself, but a great many announcers say they talk as though to only one person, usually to someone who loves them—wife, mother, or sweetheart. I don't mean to imply that this leads or should lead to a caressing tone of voice; it merely invites sympathetic understanding, helps the announcer stay interested in his copy, and adds to his sincerity.

On the other hand, one announcer, an excellent broadcaster, told me he always imagined his audience as consisting entirely of a woman he had detested for years—a teacher who had flunked him in Freshman English. He said he strove constantly for her attention, and whenever he turned in what he thought was a particularly good job, he had the feeling she actually had been listening. Her name long since forgotten, she was still as vivid as in the days when Beowulf proved too much of a mystery.

Here are several "do's" and "don'ts" that might be useful:

Practice with recordings. There's scarcely any city of any size that doesn't have a recording company, and if you are serious about an announcing career, a home-recording device may not prove too expensive. Even the most professional newsmen occasionally check on themselves by having recordings made. One, to his horror, found he was beginning to say "Long Guyland" for "Long Island." Another discovered he had slipped into a singsong cadence which was so monotonous it was practically a sure-fire cure for insomnia.

Keep the voice flexible. It's about the only counterpart of printing type you have, and if you were getting out a newspaper, you wouldn't put every story under the same size headline. I don't mean, of course, that you should deliver every news broadcast with the nuances and shadings, the shoutings and whisperings of a Shakespearean soliloquist—but strive for variation in speed, pitch, and tone. There's probably a little bit of ham in every radio newsmen—and ham's a popular American dish.

Here is what Paul H. Wagner, author of *Radio Journalism*, has to say about the desirability of a flexible voice:

Flexibility of voice means, perhaps, versatility in control of the voice so that desired tone, pitch, volume, force, and enunciation can be achieved. In other words, adequate range. Flexibility of voice can be obtained through practice.

The student should practice speaking with full use of his lips, tongue, and larynx so that he does not, as most of us do in conversation, "swallow" his words or talk in a lazy monotone. The correct qualities of voice are obtained through control of the muscles which regulate the lips, tongue, and larynx, and the muscles of the diaphragm which control the breathing.

The best radio voice is a well-modulated one with a deep rather than a "thin" tone.

Variation in pitch is essential in radio speaking because of the necessity of proper emphasis. Little or no variation in pitch invariably results in a "dull," uncommunicative voice.

The student should distinguish between volume and force. Volume is depth, bigness, and fullness in the vocal tones. Force is intensity of tone. Generally speaking, it is better to use force than volume. The volume should be moderate, always under control, or the speaker will be given to "blasting" the microphone. Blasting occurs when great volume is used, causing the sensitive microphone to distort the sound. Intensity, or force in speaking, gives meaning and weight to words without distorting their natural sound.

Sit or stand, whichever is more comfortable. Lie down, for that matter. I know of a man who had to make a recording of only a hundred words once a week and he faced this chore with the attitude of a man about to walk the Last Mile. He came out of each recording session with his hands clammy, his face bathed in sweat, his clothing soaked. When he told me his nervousness was caused, he thought, by the fact that he couldn't keep his script from shaking in his hand as he talked, I suggested he insist that the engineer install a table microphone, that he lay the script on the table, and just keep his hands folded. This worked fine, with the dry cleaning industry the only loser.

Don't move around. Once your technician and you have decided on a proper level, stay where you are. Raise or lower your

voice if you want to, but don't act as though you were taking a fencing lesson.

If you're nervous—and don't think that nervousness is a sign of bad broadcasting—try to develop some soundless physical mannerism that may help you to work off that nervousness. Some men constantly swing a leg or cross and recross their feet. Others gesture with hands just as if they were in front of a crowd. I repeat that the mannerism should be soundless. Edwin C. Hill, as a beginner in radio, is reported to have pounded the table to a point where a program executive hastily had to find a pillow and put it in front of his hammering fists.

If you have to cough, go ahead and cough. It's less irritating to a listener than the croaking of a frog in the throat. Some announcers have a cut-off switch, enabling them to cut themselves off the air whenever they have to clear their throats. Others use a hand signal—the forefinger extended in a cutting motion across the throat—to ask control room engineers to cut them off the air momentarily. If you find that you're in a paroxysm of coughing, try to turn your copy over to anyone else in the studio, face away from the microphone and get it over with . . . hoping that the unwitting substitute is getting along all right. Sneezing and hiccuping in front of the microphone are rare, so rare in fact that I cannot recall having heard either, but coughing is a problem, and the best thing to do is to decide in advance how you will take care of it . . . the very knowledge you've solved the problem may avert it.

If you "muff" or "flub" a word, don't belabor it. I once wrote into a script by Larry Lesueur the phrase, "teapot tempest," instead of the more familiar "tempest in a teapot." When he came to the phrase on the air he stopped, stared, started with "tempot," repeated "tempot" two or three times, and finally got it out "teapest tempot." The next cable from Murrow in London who had been listening while Lesueur struggled in New York asked if he could be sent a "tempot" to install in Westminster Abbey or would we be fearful of starting another "tempot dome" scandal.

But it's unfair to single out Lesueur and merely one slip-of-the-tongue. Helen Sioussat, director of talks at CBS, has com-

piled some "howlers" in her book, *Mikes Don't Bite*. Among them:

TED HUSING. I returned to New York from Miami with a dirty linen suit and no trunks.

DAVID ROSS. We now present H. V. Kaltenborn, who has been on the lecher platform for 25 years.

ANONYMOUS. I'll leave no turn unstoned.

PHIL LORD. Now we will all lift our voices in singing a chorus of "Iceland's Greasy Mountains."

ANONYMOUS. Distasteful as it is, we must bring this program to a close.

EVANS PLUMMER (to a guest). Now, if you'll just say good-bye to the folks, I know they'll appreciate it.

Miss Sioussat has prepared a list of "do's" and "don'ts" in regard to preparing radio talks. Since nearly everyone in the news business occasionally has to make a talk on the air outside of his professional duties, this list may be a useful guide:

DO

Select subject that is timely, interesting and important.

Speak from prepared script.

Carefully time script in advance of broadcast.

Write as you talk.

Use vivid, meaty phrases.

Make talk alive with things of homely interest.

Use simple, readily understood vocabulary.

Use short sentences and concise statements.

Speak in conversational tones.

Believe in what you say.

Sustain interest.

Stop before they want you to.

DON'T

Extemporize.

Run over into the other fellow's time.

Use formal, literary speech.

Use statistics or abstractions.

Make direct statement that you're going to prove something.

Digress from subject.

Make long, pedantic speeches.

Try to be funny if you're not a natural humorist.

Be breathless.

Poke along.

Change normal pitch of voice.

Make your first meeting with the "mike" a blind date.

A SENSE OF TWUTCH

Completely off the point, you may be mildly amused by a story which Miss Sioussat tells on herself. She writes of a time when she was a guest lecturer in the radio journalism class that I taught at Columbia University. She assigned the students to write ten-minute talks on subjects of their own choosing. One of the "talks" began as follows:

Phundra is a fascinating game once played in Egypt. It was known only to the priests and played outdoors on a sort of tennis court called a "tutman," which in the Egyptian language means hard surface or sand that is smooth and packed solid. A curtain of papyrus, very much like a tennis net, was stretched across the tutman. This smulka held three yabish, and it was the aim of the two contestants to see which one could throw the greatest number of gulbs into each yabish. Each contestant was blindfolded and allowed three gulbs for each receptacle.

The game of Phundra was played either with large nuts or oranges. It was no easy task to walk onto the tutman, arrange the smulka, and start throwing your gulbs into the yabish—considering you were blindfolded and had the twufts in your hand. Those who have studied the origin of games are of the belief that Phundra may very well have been the forerunner of our own game of tennis.

However, any game, whether ancient or modern, develops in man a sense of fairness and makes for the building of strong mental flitem and a sense of twutch.

Miss Sioussat brought the manuscript in to me.

"If you need a new man to write sports," she said, "I think I've found a prospect among your students."

I read about Phundra. I looked up at Miss Sioussat. She was utterly serious, the joy of discovering new talent in her eye.

"Helen," I said, "you have been victimized. This is nothing but the damnedest, most meaningless double-talk I've ever seen."

GRIN AND BEAR IT

Many announcers acquire warmth in their voices by grinning while broadcasting. Wearing an inane grin on one's face while talking doesn't make the speaker sound as if he were amused. It somehow or other relaxes constricted throat muscles, and merely makes him sound more friendly—perhaps helpful is a better word.

Of one thing I'm certain, but I've spent many futile years in attempting to persuade some news broadcasters to my point of view. I think it's bad broadcasting to put a laugh, or slight chuckle, into the voice when telling a funny story. If the story is funny, the public will know it. If it isn't, then an announcer's laugh kills the "punch line" and makes him sound silly.

During World War II millions of young Americans were exposed to British Broadcasting Corporation news for the first time. On the whole, they liked it—particularly the slower reading pace that permitted greater comprehension of the news. But I've frequently heard one criticism—that the BBC news readers all sound alike. If this criticism be valid—and from my own short wave listening I think it is—then I think there should be an effort made toward getting a greater variety of voices.

Let's not make a pattern. Let's have some of our announcers eager, others staid; some of them middle-aged and pontifical, others young and engaging. Let's have announcers speaking with a clipped New England accent, others using the broad, soft speech of the South, others the nasal twang of the Midwest. There should be room on American air for all types.

10. TEACHING THE UNTEACHABLE

News Judgment and Good Taste

THIS CHAPTER is devoted to discussion of two subjects that have been debated as long as there has been any journalism at all—news judgment and good taste. Admit at the outset that both are unteachable and you've made a certain gain. But that doesn't relieve teacher and student from the desirability of inquiring into questions of judgment and taste, and trying their best to figure out some answers.

In the first place, of course, you need a definition of news. Is it the happening or the account of a happening? If you should find in your attic trunk a million dollars in negotiable currency—and if, contrary to the probabilities of human nature, you told no one about it—would it be news? Some say it wouldn't be news even to you. It would be a fact, yes; but not news. And of course it couldn't be news to anyone else because no one else would know about it. But if you didn't hoard your newly found treasure, and your standard of living began suddenly and inexplicably to change upward, you would start making news—not to the general public, but to your friends and neighbors. There would be gossip: "I see Charlie has a new car; wonder where he got the money?" "Charlie must be playing the stock market. They say he's going to build a twenty-room house." "I heard today that Charlie's going to fly to Europe; funny he seems to have so much dough ever since he quit his job."

Before long the gossip might spread to the point where it was accepted that you were wealthy. Then, your activities would

become news almost in direct proportion to the number of people they affected or interested.

Or take another example. If there should be a giant convulsion of the earth that caused an entire island in the Antarctic to disappear, but if no one knew it had happened or even knew there was such an island in the first place, would it be news? The only news would be in the violent recordings etched by the world's seismographs and in the interpretations scientists drew therefrom.

LET'S TRY TO DEFINE IT

We've come now to a point where it's almost mandatory to give a working definition of news and here it is: "News is the statement of freshly ascertained facts about something of interest that has happened, is happening, is about to happen or that, contrary to expectation, hasn't happened, isn't happening, and probably won't happen."

The flaw in that definition, of course, is in the phrase, "of interest." What does "of interest" mean? It can be both general and specific. Presumably almost everyone would be interested if scientists found out and announced that, after all, there *was* a defense against the atomic bomb. But there would be only a few hundred people, at most, interested in the outcome of a baseball game between the married men and the single men of the Odd Fellows' Lodge in Iola, Kansas. Yet a definition of news must be sufficiently elastic to cover the bomb defense and the baseball stories.

Dowling Leatherwood in his *Journalism on the Air* met this issue head-on with his definition:

News is an accurate and timely report of some event, situation, condition or opinion—a report which will interest the particular persons for whom it is intended.

Had Leatherwood written "which will, might, or should" instead of merely "which will," he might have been more on the target. But we'll discuss the "should" aspect later. Leatherwood himself seemed most troubled that his definition did not limit

news to the "significant." He thought there was "a strong, practical, utilitarian argument" in favor of presenting significant news, an argument that would appeal only to believers in democracy. He summed up the argument as follows:

Freedom of press and freedom of radio depend for their continuance on the stability of a democratic society. A democratic society depends on the soundness of public opinion. Sound public opinion depends on the public's getting significant, truthful information about society's problems. The press and the radio are probably the best agencies for disseminating such information. Therefore, the press and the radio can help materially to preserve their freedom by publishing that significant and truthful information which is necessary to the formation of sound public opinion, which is necessary to continuance of democratic society, which in turn is essential for maintenance of freedom of press and radio.

And so . . . the first principle of news selection for radio journalists is: include as much significant news as possible.

It's curious that the controlled press and radio of Spain and Russia, operating at opposite ends of the ideological pole, follow this principle more than do American editors. In this country our newspapers and news broadcasts are always ready to subordinate a significant story to a trivial one, if the latter has the right amount of human interest and heart-tug value. And perhaps, just perhaps, editorial freedom to play up the trivial and play down the significant is living, breathing evidence of "the stability of a democratic society."

A QUESTION AS TO "THE RIGHTNESS OF THINGS"

Let's turn to a definition of journalism given by Eric Hodgins as editorial vice-president of Time, Inc.

If I were to undertake a copybook definition of this profession, I think I would try to say something like this: "Journalism is the conveyance of information from here to there, with accuracy, insight and dispatch." But then I would be bound to add—"and in such a manner that the truth is served, and the rightness of things is made slowly, even if not immediately, more evident."

Readers of *Time*, which calls itself "the weekly newsmagazine" and which has advertised itself as "curt, clear, complete," are well aware that the Hodgins definition is far from academic. Let's examine a "story" in the issue of *Time* for Sept. 30, 1946:

One measure of an administrator is the lieutenants he appoints. As of this week, Harry Truman's Cabinet looked no worse than the Cabinet he had inherited from Roosevelt. In some respects it looked better:

State—James F. Byrnes for Edward Stettinius (gain).

Treasury—John Snyder for Fred Vinson, who had succeeded F.D.R.'s Henry Morgenthau (the gain that was Vinson was lost).

War—Robert P. Patterson for Henry Stimson (little change).

Navy—James Forrestal, only F.D.R. holdover left (and a good one).

Attorney General—Tom C. Clark for Francis Biddle (slight gain).

Postmaster General—Robert Hannegan for Frank Walker (no worse).

Interior—Julius Krug for Harold Ickes (gain).

Agriculture—Clinton P. Anderson for Claude Wickard (gain).

Commerce—W. Averell Harriman for Henry Wallace (gain).

Labor—Lewis Schwellenbach for Frances Perkins (loss).

That "story" falls well within the Hodgins hope that "the truth is served and the rightness of things . . . is made more evident." But there's a serious doubt as to whether it's journalism in the sense that it's "the conveyance of information from here to there." Opinion, yes; information, no. I would withdraw any objection if the weekly newsmagazine had preceded its opinion by some such locution as "*Time's* editors have decided" or "*Time's* Washington staff polled itself this week and came to the conclusion that, etc." But here we have an editorial—really 20 editorials in one because it contains that many evaluations—presented as though it were news instead of opinion. In other words, it's curt, clear, complete—but what is it?

SELECTING THE 1 PER CENT

But even if you could get all people in the news business to agree on a definition of news, you soon would find them far apart in gauging the importance of individual stories. In the course of a single day, close to a quarter of a million words will flow into a network newsroom. Since even a 15-minute broadcast has a maximum of 25 hundred words, how do you decide upon the one per cent of the daily total you use in that broadcast? The answer is "news judgment," but trying to find a precise meaning for that phrase is a quicksilver task.

Offhand, you might think the stories selected would be the ones affecting the most people. But that just isn't the case. If the price of wheat goes up or down a cent a bushel, it affects practically everyone in the country, but that small a variation could happen every day and never be included in a general news broadcast. Even an increase or decrease of a half dollar a bushel would take second place to a story about a fatal duel between Frank Sinatra and Van Johnson, or a story that living sextuplets had been born in Dubuque.

As a matter of fact, few editors have ever been brave enough to try to provide a yardstick for news evaluation. An exception was James W. Barrett, head of the Press-Radio Bureau, who courageously wrote a letter to Dowling Leatherwood. Here is an excerpt from Barrett's letter:

The decision as to the "play" to be given each item was made by the editor in charge of each report, subject to my personal approval. The selection of the news, and the amount of space given it, was based:

First, on its intrinsic importance.

Second, on its general appeal.

Third, on its human values.

Fourth, on its suitability for radio broadcast.

Fifth, on its constructive value. (That is, we would prefer to broadcast items which have a permanent value rather than those of ephemeral interest, such as murders, suicides, fires, etc.)

Sixth, on its importance from the standpoint of public welfare. In this category we include crime stories, such as the escape and capture

of Dillinger, and the capture and trial of Hauptmann, because these have a bearing upon the problem of public safety.

Lastly, and most important, the editor is usually guided by his instinctive news sense, which is rather difficult to define.

I suspect that Barrett himself, upon reading over his list, would probably settle for throwing out his first six considerations, retaining only the last paragraph.

The tough part about trying to dissect the various terms used by Barrett in those other six paragraphs is that you soon run into a forest of semantics and get so thoroughly lost that the chances are you can't get safely back to camp—camp being the "instinctive news sense, which is rather difficult to define."

For instance, how does anyone define "intrinsic importance," "general appeal," "human values," "suitability," "constructive value," and "importance from the standpoint of public welfare"? They are all fine-sounding words or phrases, but what do they mean? If you wanted to—and I for one don't want to—you could spend hours in an attempt to define each of the terms Barrett has used and then spend days defining the definitions.

JUDGMENT ON JUDGMENT

But it boils down to this:

In the main, an editor uses the stories on a news broadcast he thinks will be the most interesting to the most people. I say, "in the main," because any competent editor must have a social conscience, and he will use some stories which he believes will not interest people but which, in his opinion, *should* interest them. On the other hand, there are stories he knows will be extremely interesting, but which he won't use because he doesn't want to violate laws of libel, and doesn't want to broadcast obscenities or other offenses against what is called good taste.

"Boils down" is right. There it all is in a hundred words. And the operational formula of news judgment is quite clear—at least it is to me. But if it were elaborated to 10 thousand or a hundred thousand words, I'm afraid I would confuse myself as much as any reader.

Nevertheless, to stop at that point would be to beg the subject. What stories are "the most interesting to the most people"? Well, not in the order of their importance, they are stories about love, money, the weather, animals, immorality, competition (including sports and election results), crookedness (particularly in high places), war and threats of war, prices of things, taxes, industrial and legislative strife, scientific discoveries (especially if they promise to prolong life or make it more enjoyable), children doing cute things, inexplicable phenomena (whether or not of a religious nature), and births, deaths, marriages, and divorces among the prominent. There's no such thing as a complete list. But working in a mass medium of information you have to consider whether any individual story would be of interest to a housewife in Texarkana, a Wall Street broker, an aircraft worker in San Diego, a college wrestler at Oklahoma A. & M., a sponge diver at Tarpon Springs, Florida, a stenographer in St. Paul, and yes, even a quiz kid. If the story would interest all the members of that group, you ought to use it. If it would interest only the college wrestler and the quiz kid, throw it out.

But I've written of the necessity for an editorial conscience, and here we encounter shoals for which no charts are available. The fact is simply that the public in general is apathetic about a great many things that it should be eager to know more about, and so an editor uses stories about these things either as a prod to public interest or so that he can continue to live with himself. Examples? Let's take peace and good government.

Nearly everyone wants peace, or at least says he does. But he is usually profoundly disinterested in the mechanics of peace. Similarly, nearly everyone wants good government, or says he does. But, for the most part, he would rather complain about incompetent officials than applaud those who are demonstrably doing a good job.

Every worth-while editor realizes all this, consciously or unconsciously, and thinks he should do something about it. That's why he carries stories about United Nations sub-committees, the increased number of visitors to National Parks, incidents reflecting improvements in racial tolerance, and figures on improved

public health in Peru. He carries these stories even though he may be positive not one listener in a hundred is interested in them.

It mustn't be thought that all news judgments are alike, although the operations of press associations tend to make for similarity. Within a few minutes after one news agency has furnished its clients or members with an exclusive story, every other news agency has had a message informing it of the "beat." After 20 years I can still recall, with shudders, days at the United Press when, on the "desk," I would get frantic messages from bureau points which had access to other services. "Jits (that was the code-word for INS) says 20 killed in Utah train crash. How?" Or "Rocks (that was the code-word for AP) says big bootleg ring rounded up in Chi. How?"

This constant effort of every press association to keep up with its competitors usually results in all of them supplying the same stories before the end of the news day. That accounts for the similarity of front pages from one end of the country to the other and for the fact that any news broadcast at 11 o'clock at night has just about the same stories as every other news broadcast at that hour.

Nearly every editor has a sublime faith in his own judgments, but there are many times when that faith is shaken. I shall never forget the morning in August, 1945, when an assistant came into my office with the news that the War Department had announced the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Japan.

"Play the very dickens out of it," I said. (The account of my conversation probably attains a new high in bowdlerization.)

"I thought I'd hold it up till the next station-break," he said.

"Oh, fudge!" I exclaimed. "To the deuce with that. Put it on right away and keep putting on every consarned detail."

So we dumped over schedules and played the story, probably the most important one in modern times, as hard as we could. We lined up programs for later in the day, and when this was done, we decided to check on our competitors to see if they had beaten us with the story. For some reason, even a "beat" of five

seconds in radio is considered a great triumph by those who have scored it.

Much to my surprise no other network had yet touched the story, except for one which had used it in a matter-of-fact manner buried in a regularly scheduled news broadcast. I sat at my desk utterly incredulous—and frankly worried. My decision to interrupt programs and to discard other ones had been costly to the network—thousands of dollars had been tossed out the window because of a judgment that didn't seem to be shared with anyone else. Not until later in the day, when everyone "climbed aboard" the story could I relax and grin a little. The whole thing had taken some sweating out.

NOBODY HOME THAT DAY

On the debit side of the judgment ledger there was the story of the airplane that crashed into the Empire State Building in New York. To me this was interesting but not terribly important. I had gotten so used to thinking in global terms that I forgot almost everyone had said to himself at one time or another: "I wonder what would happen if a plane crashed into one of those big skyscrapers."

Here was the answer to such wonderings, a convincing, tragic answer. And I did little or nothing about it. This time the news directors of other networks were tossing programs overboard to make way for bulletins and eye-witness stories of the crash. I handled it in the most routine manner possible that Saturday morning until I was brought up sharp with a wire from the news editor of one of our affiliated stations.

"What's the matter?" he asked. "Doesn't anyone in your news department work on Saturdays?"

These anecdotes have been included to illustrate that news judgment is a variable. Sometimes you are going to guess wrong; sometimes right. And always remember that an average of .400 will win the batting championship in any league.

YOU'VE GOT IT, BUT WHAT IS IT?

Now as to the news that any editor knows is news but won't use. I'm not referring to stories whose publication is forbidden by law in statutes prohibiting libel, obscenity, and blasphemy. The offenses against law deserve—and will receive—a separate chapter. Here we will discuss only offenses against good taste. And again you have come upon a phrase all but impossible to define. An extraordinary factor in trying to define it is that, although no two people will agree on just what good taste is, nearly everybody is perfectly certain he has it.

SOME TASTEFUL DON'TS

The standards of good taste are forever changing and it may be some of the suggestions I am going to list will not long be valid. Nevertheless, it's suggested that you:

Don't use words offensive to peoples of various races and nationalities, such words as "white trash," "nigger," "dinge," "coon," "wop," "dago," "mick," "harp," "Hebe," "sheeny," and "Polack."

Don't mention physical infirmities unless they are essential to the story. There isn't anything funny about stuttering to people who stutter. And those who are cross-eyed probably don't regard their affliction as unduly hilarious. Paul Wagner tells of one commentator who received a letter from an irate listener who had been embarrassed while dining with his fiancée. The commentator had been discussing the beauties of American girlhood but had added, "You rarely find one with thick ankles, which, of course, are always a catastrophe." Unfortunately the fiancée had thick ankles.

The most difficult job of avoiding mention of an infirmity probably was done by Robert Trout at the Philadelphia Municipal Stadium in 1936, when President Roosevelt spoke there after having been nominated for his second term. It had been raining and the field was muddy. At the rear of the speakers' platform, out of sight of the crowd, the President's braces slipped and he

fell down. A copy of his speech scattered in the mud. Aides got the President to his feet and adjusted the heavy apparatus which enabled him to walk. Others dashed about and recovered the manuscript. Trout, who was on the air at the time and describing the scene, was an eye-witness to this and yet did not once refer to the mishap. He ad-libbed at length about the people who were in the Presidential party, about the weather, about the waiting crowd—about everything else except what had happened to the President and his manuscript. Nor was there any rule about not mentioning Mr. Roosevelt's infirmity. Trout merely felt that good taste required him to ignore the episode.

Don't broadcast any stories that might tend to interfere with constituted authority in the performance of its duties. I refer to such stories as major fires and race riots. If a fire is going on at the time, you may find yourself covering it so sensationaly that people will drive to the scene and menace lives and property by getting in the way of fire-fighting equipment. Once in connection with a race riot in Harlem, several stations covered the unfortunate event much as they would a football game. The result was that thousands of New York listeners rushed to the scene, making it more and more difficult for police to restore order.

Don't be unduly graphic in connection with crime and sex stories. On the other hand, if public good should result, I see no reason for not being completely realistic. A case in point was the horror of Dachau and other German camps. Radio reporters were permitted free rein, this in the hope that the American public would realize the enormity of enemy offenses against mankind.

Avoid so-called comic stories whose humor depends upon mention of diapers, the affinity of dogs for trees and telephone poles, Chic Sale construction, and feminine sweaters.

Be careful not to use "hell," "damn," and other profanity too freely. Such words are offensive to a great many people, especially fathers and mothers who write bitterly to radio stations that their children heard the words in news programs, and then adopted them in juvenile conversation. On the other hand if a "hell" or a "damn" is used in an effective quotation and is a legitimate part of the news of the day, don't be afraid of it.

General Stilwell's comment that "I claim we got a hell of a beating . . . and it is humiliating as hell" is to the point. So would have been Farragut's "damn the torpedoes."

It isn't even necessary that the quotation be in an important and significant story. For instance, I consider it perfectly all right to use this "h.i." (human interest) item from a U.P. wire:

In Long Beach, California, judges are only human, the following transcript from municipal court records seems to show.

QUESTION. Doctor, in language as nearly popular as the subject will permit, will you please tell the jury just what was the cause of the man's death?

ANSWER. Do you mean the proxima causa mortis?

QUESTION. I don't know, doctor. I will have to leave that to you.

ANSWER. Well, in plain language, he died of an edema of the brain that followed cerebral thrombosis, or possibly embolism that followed in turn arteriosclerosis, combined with the effects of a gangrenous cholecystitis.

JUROR. Well, I'll be damned!

THE COURT. Ordinarily, I would fine a juror for saying anything like that in court, but I cannot in this case justly impose a penalty on you, sir, because the court was thinking exactly the same thing.

There are signs that the public is acquiring a little more tolerance, but radio executives are still wary. When the U.S.S. *South Dakota*, which earned the affectionate sobriquet of "the Big Bastard" in its Pacific exploits, returned to the United States and we interviewed one of its officers, I was worried about use of the phrase. It was used, however, and as far as I know there were never any letters of protest.

TASTE—EVEN IN COMMERCIALS

From time to time voices have arisen in the land decrying commercial sponsorship of news programs. Personally, I've never seen any valid reason for not permitting such sponsorship. A valid reason, to my way of thinking, would be a situation in which the sponsor chose what news was to be presented and could omit news he regarded as injurious to his interests, or could give

elaborate emphasis to news he regarded as favorable. But stations and networks have retained the right of editing and, as far as I know, there has been no actual sponsor interference in news content. If any provable instance of that should ever arise I've no doubt that the Federal Communications Commission would consider it a grave offense, and would pursue the matter vigorously at the next application for a renewal of station license.

There have also been suggestions that no middle commercials be permitted in news broadcasts, and NBC adopted such a rule in 1945. However, the rule is subject to ambiguous interpretation. The sponsor may identify his product and then, after a brief résumé of the news, give his opening commercial. Therefore, in effect, a middle commercial is provided after all.

Herewith are the CBS standards for sponsored news programs. They were drawn up in wartime by Paul W. Kesten, then the network's executive vice-president, but they've been carried over into peacetime operation, and to a certain extent they've become industry-wide in application. To the development of these standards, major contributions were made over the years by William S. Paley, chairman of the board, and Edward Klauber, long executive vice-president. Klauber, in fact, may well be regarded as the godfather of radio news, he having brought to the broadcasting business his years of experience as an editor on the *New York Times*, and I am glad to acknowledge my own debt to him for his enlightened counsel.

But here are Kesten's standards:

Persons tuning in who have lacked recent prior access to news are exceedingly eager to know what has happened, particularly if the news situation is exciting, or changing, or both. Therefore, opening commercials should be as short as possible, and every news broadcast should get into the news as rapidly as possible. Forty seconds is to be the limit on opening commercials for 15- and 10-minute news broadcasts, and 25 seconds for the opening of a five-minute program.

Opening commercials must be given in such a way as not to lead the listener to believe that he is listening to news rather than to a commercial.

Neither opening commercial nor any other commercial is to be in

the form of a jingle or any other device manifesting undue gaiety, humor, or excitement.

The technique of giving mere sponsor identification, then a few headlines, and then going into a commercial is to be avoided because it tends to the use of a few bulletins as a kind of "teaser" copy, confuses the listener, and compels him to listen to a commercial before he really finds out what the news is all about.

Middle commercials shall at the option of the network be permitted only in news programs of 10 minutes or more. They are inappropriate in a five-minute news broadcast because they compel interruption of such a brief period of news.

One middle commercial is to be permitted when its inclusion is technically feasible, and this shall be preceded by a minimum of three minutes of news in order that a reasonably leisurely and comprehensible review of outstanding developments may reach the audience before the program is diverted to a commercial message.

If the middle commercial is normally permitted, the network reserves to itself the right on any appropriate occasion to refuse a middle commercial, or to insist upon its coming later in the program, when its use earlier interrupts a continuing description of a single situation. For example, if 10 minutes of a 15-minute news broadcast were devoted to the Roberts (Pearl Harbor) report, the news of that report should not be interrupted by a commercial. Similarly, if some transcendental item takes up the entire news period, the sponsor's middle message should be omitted.

All commercials, except opening commercials which are obviously a sponsor's message, must be set apart from the news content in one of two ways.

It is preferable that a different voice be used. If this is not done, the news broadcaster is permitted to give the sponsor's message provided he invariably separates it, not solely by a pause but by some appropriate phrase, such as—"now a few words from our sponsor . . . now let me tell you something about our product, and so forth.

The sponsor's message shall not be presented as a news item. This of course bars the use of words like "flash" and "bulletin" to introduce a commercial, and bars such phrases as, "now news about Blank's product." Such phrases as, "now here is something new and interesting about the product," however, should not be barred. The objection is application of a specific news label to a commercial.

Over-all limits on the amount of commercial message in a news

broadcast are to be 20 per cent below those allowed for other types of sponsored programs.

Commercials on all news programs must be temperate and restrained and appropriate to the spirit of the program. Too rapid-fire delivery or an over-emphatic type of selling should not be permitted on any news broadcast.

FROM THE MAN WHO PAYS THE BILLS

Before leaving the subject of good taste in commercials, let's consider the matter from the point of view of the sponsor and his advertising agency. A popular misconception of the agency man's role in the radio news picture is that he sits about dreaming of longer and louder commercials, and plotting the most annoying possible places in which to insert them. Nothing could be further from the truth. An agency's very existence, as well as the sponsor's, depends upon pleasing the public. It would be absurd, then, for either agency or sponsor to write or to introduce commercials in such a way as to create widespread public disapproval.

One of the leading agencies in the news field is Platt-Forbes, Inc., which originates several hundred news programs a week on most of the nation's top stations, in behalf of its client, Peter Paul, maker of candy and gum. After V-J Day, when some unseasoned news sponsors fled to the hills, Platt-Forbes quietly picked up dozens of the choicest programs that others had dropped.

"I look at it this way," Bill Forbes told me. "The biggest show on earth is the news. Every day two billion people are doing things, making news. Today it's Secretary Marshall who gets top billing—tomorrow it's Harry (the Cat) Brecheen. Every day it's a different cast. And every day more people listen to the radio for the news than for any other type of program."

Forbes reports that in all of his dealings with individual stations and news broadcasters, neither he nor any of his staff has ever suggested the inclusion or deletion of a news story. On the other hand, he has vigorously opposed the insertion of opinion in the guise of news.

Smart stations, he says, are constantly trying to improve their news technique. "In the old days, a radio newsroom often consisted of a man with scissors and paste who took the material off the newswire. Now the big stations employ expert rewrite men. Every individual newscast sparkles with originality. A warmed-up rehash won't do."

As for the commercials, Forbes says they should be just as interesting as the news itself. "Each one must paint a word picture—appetizing, informative. Properly done, commercials are welcomed by the listeners. This is indicated by the fact that the ratings of our programs show constantly increasing audience."

Platt-Forbes has found that the public responds best to short, pictorial selling messages at the opening, middle, and close.

Audience surveys seem to bear out these theories. But perhaps the most persuasive answer lies in the Peter Paul sales curve. For nine years the company has employed radio news as its only advertising medium. In that time, it has grown and grown until its products are household words in every home and in demand at every candy counter.

MORE ON THAT MIDDLE COMMERCIAL

But station managements don't seem to be in unanimous agreement with Forbes in regard to the middle commercial. *Broadcasting Magazine* sponsored a poll of stations as to what changes in program policy had been adopted in 1946, and found that 25 per cent had eliminated middle commercials in locally produced news programs. Another 10 per cent planned to take that step "in the near future."

Those figures don't take into consideration the stations which had adopted an anti-middle commercial news policy before 1946, but no record is available as to their number. A few stations such as KSD in St. Louis and WJR in Detroit have enforced such a policy, and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* has conducted an editorial campaign against breaking into news programs with advertising. The *Post-Dispatch*, however, continues to run display advertising next to the news matter in the paper, and sees no inconsistency in that.

11. MUSTN'T, MUSTN'T

Legal Restrictions

NOW TO CONSIDER those things a radio newsman is forbidden to do—not through choice but by law. The first of these in importance is to commit libel.

The courts still have not established a thoroughgoing, precise distinction between libel and slander. The general definition is that the first is written and the second is spoken. But since there nearly always is a record kept of anything broadcast, then that written record may become the basis of an action for libel. The point is somewhat academic anyway and, although of interest to the legal profession, need not unduly concern the radio news writer. The main thing is that he should avoid defamation, regardless of whether it is libel in some states and slander in others. As to what constitutes defamation, the American and English Encyclopedia of Law defines it as the unjustifiable publication of any statement which might tend “to blacken the memory of one who is dead, or to impeach the honesty, integrity, virtue or reputation, or to publish the natural or alleged defects of one who is alive, and thereby expose him to public hatred, contempt, ridicule, or obloquy; or to cause him to be shunned or avoided, or to injure him in his office, business, or occupation.”

Offhand that explanation of defamation looks so comprehensive as to make it appear that you ought not to write anything about anyone unless to say that he's a great fellow and a big help around the house. But, as you know, in the day's news there are plenty of publishable stories that certainly tend to impeach a man's reputation; in fact, these stories make it pretty clear that

he's a low dog, indeed. This represents a seeming paradox, and whenever you are presented with a legal paradox, the only thing to do is to call in a lawyer. That I'm going to do now. He is Fred S. Siebert, a member of the Illinois bar, and director of the University of Illinois School of Journalism.

Siebert had received numerous requests for a concise summary of radio law as it applies to news, and wrote an excellent article, which appeared originally in the *Journalism Quarterly* (June, 1946), and has been amplified for this book:

The following is an attempt to put into brief and concrete form the various legal rights and duties of the managers and employees of radio newsrooms. Legal problems arising from gathering, writing, and broadcasting news programs may be classified under the following headings:

1. Defamation
2. Right of Privacy
3. Censorship
4. Obscenity
5. Protection for news programs, including
 - a. Literary property
 - b. Copyright
 - c. Unfair competition
6. Lotteries

No attempt will be made to treat these branches of the law except as they apply to the problems of radio news.

DEFAMATION

Slander or libel? As your author has pointed out, the greatest single legal hazard confronting the radio newsman is defamation. Defamation consists of libel and slander. Slander is oral defamation. Libel is written defamation. The problem of whether defamation in news broadcasts is slander or libel has not been finally determined in all jurisdictions. The trend of judicial decisions and legislative enactments appears to be in the direction of libel rather than slander. The leading case on this subject is *Sorenson v. Wood* in 123 Neb. 348 (1932).

Criminal liability for defamation by radio. Criminal libel is based on enactments of the state legislatures, and therefore the question of whether the criminal libel statute covers defamation by radio must

be determined in the light of the wording of a particular statute. Most criminal libel statutes do not cover defamation by radio. Some states, including Illinois, have enacted special statutes covering criminal liability for libel by radio. In the absence of a special statute, it is safe to assume that statutes on criminal libel do not apply to radio. In case of doubt, check your state statutes or consult your state Attorney-General.

Civil liability for defamation by radio. Whereas criminal liability for defamation by radio is strictly limited to the wording of the statute of the particular state in which the broadcast is received, civil liability (a suit for damages for injury to reputation) is a product of the common law and therefore more flexible in its definition. It is also the more common form in use today; for every criminal prosecution for defamation in the United States today, there are at least ten civil suits for damage to reputation. Civil libel is also the more dangerous of the two forms since there is practically no limit to the amount of money damages which may be recovered, while in criminal libel the fine and the term of imprisonment are specifically defined by the state statute. Thirty days in jail is sometimes to be preferred to paying a \$25,000 judgment.

Extent of liability for damage for defamation by radio. The safest rule to follow is that the *civil* liability of the radio station for defamation contained in a news program is absolute. This is the rule which is now applied to newspapers.

A radio station is liable for defamation committed in a news program in the following manner:

1. Reading from news script—full liability.
2. Ad-lib programs—full liability.
3. Piped-in programs—full liability on the individual station.
4. Deviations from script—generally liable when committed by station employee or agent. However, station is not liable for unauthorized insertions by a person not its employee or agent. The leading case is *Summit Hotel Co. v. NBC*, 336 Pa. 182 (1939) in which it was held that NBC was not liable for a defamatory remark by Al Jolson which was not included in the script.

How to identify defamation. To be libelous, a statement made over the radio must

1. Be defamatory—it must injure someone's reputation.
2. The person defamed must be identifiable. Ordinarily identification is by name, but it can be accomplished in other ways, such as by description.

3. If factors No. 1 and No. 2 are present, the statement is not libelous if the station can establish *any one* of the following defenses:

a. That the statement is true.

b. That the statement is privileged, i.e., it is a fair and accurate report of a judicial or legislative proceeding.

c. That the statement is a comment on a matter or person in the news who for some reason or another is seeking public approval.

d. That the statement is a comment on a public officer or a candidate for public office.

Practically every five-minute news broadcast will contain at least one item which is defamatory, and in which the person is identified (No. 1 and 2 above), but an analysis of these items will show that one or more of the excuses or justifications listed under No. 3 are present, thus eliminating all liability for defamation on the part of the broadcaster.

Let's look more closely at each of the points listed above.

1. *What is defamatory?* In the last analysis any statement is defamatory which a group of twelve men, good and true in the form of a jury, consider an injury to reputation. What is defamatory in one section of the country may not be defamatory in another. To call a man a "greaser" would probably be considered defamatory in Texas but innocuous in Maine.

Practically any news story can be defamatory depending on the circumstances. To broadcast that Miss X was escorted to a country club dance by Mr. Y can be defamatory of Miss X if Mr. Y is already married. To say that a local lawyer has left town can be defamatory when the fact is he has gone on a two-week vacation. Not all libel appears on the face of the copy—and these are the dangerous cases.

2. The person defamed must be identifiable. A person does not have to be named to be identified with the defamatory broadcast. The listening public may know the man's name from other sources and be able to connect your story with him.

A lot of trouble has arisen over identical names. Stories like—"John Jones was arrested this morning for drunken driving"—can cause a particularly virulent form of occupational headache. Although true of one John Jones, it is not true of another residing in the same city. To avoid this kind of mix-up, always give additional data of identification such as street addresses, especially when dealing with common names.

Let me interrupt Siebert here with a story which goes back to a pleasant book of fiction written by Elmer Davis at the time of prohibition and speakeasies, a book entitled *Friends of Mr. Sweeney*. The title was derived from the idea that entrance to the town's gin mills could be gained by saying that you were one of Sweeney's pals.

As producer of the program, "Report to the Nation," I sent wires to a number of affiliate stations asking for details of local black-market operations, and received from one Midwestern city an interesting story of dealings in "hot" tires. You went to a certain place, established that you were bona fide, paid over the exorbitant sum demanded per tire, and then drove away to a dark street corner and waited. Pretty soon a truck would draw alongside, and a tire would be put in the back seat of your car.

This story was dramatized on the program, but unfortunately, as the method of establishing good faith, I had a prospective customer say, "I'm a friend of Mr. Sweeney." What I didn't realize was that in this community there actually was a Mr. Sweeney who conducted an entirely legitimate automobile business. When a letter arrived from his lawyer, it was necessary to send an apology and explanation to the affiliate station which put it on the air and also published it in local newspapers. Retractions and apologies, by the way, don't remove the threat of libel actions; they're advisable, however, in order to prove your good intent and lack of malice, and so tend to lessen damages assessed.

And now, back to Siebert:

3. Now let us look at the reasons why all defamatory stories in which a person is identified (and every news broadcast contains some of these stories) are *not* libelous. The courts and legislatures long ago came to the conclusion that it was in the public interest to have published certain kinds of defamatory stories even though someone's reputation might get injured in the process. In four general types of stories the public interest in the information is considered to outweigh the damage which an individual might suffer. They are:

a. Stories that are true. No broadcaster need fear a libel suit even though the story injures someone's reputation, if he can prove that the facts are true. It is not enough that he believe the story to be true; he must be able to prove it true.

Truth in most cases depends on accuracy. One station discovered to its surprise that a story broadcast about a local citizen to the effect that he had been charged with embezzlement was not true. The suit as filed against him was for "conversion of funds." The station paid.

The best basis for proof of the truth of a story is documentary evidence. After that the testimony of reliable witnesses. Reporters have learned to their sorrow that many so-called reliable witnesses change their minds when they appear in court.

b. Stories that are privileged. No liability attaches to a defamatory story which is a fair and accurate report of a judicial or legislative proceeding. Thus all stories based on court proceedings, on legislative hearings, or sessions, and in most cases on documents filed with either type of body cannot be made the basis for a libel suit.

When the Senator, who is chairman of the ways and means committee in the state legislature, gets up on the floor of the Senate and castigates the political boss of the neighboring metropolis, the story if accurately reported is privileged—and this in spite of the fact that the Senator may accuse the boss of benefiting from a \$10,000 monthly take from the slot-machine racket.

The prosecuting attorney in a criminal case may give a highly damaging, and slightly erroneous, biography of the accused as part of his presentation in court, but the broadcaster is not liable even though the defense may later prove that some of the statements are inaccurate.

In some states the privilege attaching to reports of judicial proceedings does not extend to preliminary documents filed with the clerk of the court in advance of a public hearing. In all cases, however, the fact that a suit has been filed, together with the charge, can be published without fear of liability.

The immunity from liability discussed above applies to news items based on proceedings of all types of judicial and legislative bodies such as Justice of the Peace courts, school boards, county boards, municipal councils, and their committees, as well as to the more well-known governmental bodies such as Congress and state legislatures.

It should be noted that the privilege does not extend to stories emanating from executive or administrative officers. A judge or senator may turn the air blue with his denunciation of an individual in the courtroom or on the floor in the Congress, and the story can be broadcast without fear of liability, but when the Governor of a state or the Secretary of Commerce issues a press release of equal violence, the news reporter to avoid liability must be able to prove the truth of the

charges, which administrative officers sometimes so glibly release for political purposes. That a general of the Army made the charge is no defense in a libel suit; that an ex-corporal made the charge in an open meeting of the city council is a defense.

c. Comments on a matter or person seeking public approval. A third defense for a libel suit is that the defamatory statements are comments on a person who is in the news, and who for some reason or another is seeking public approval. This defense applies to those parts of the story which are not statements of fact (which must be proved to be true or privileged) but to those parts of the broadcast which can be construed as "comments." What is a comment as distinguished from a statement of fact is not always so clear either in the minds of the newsman or of the court.

It is perfectly clear that appraisals of the performance of all types of artists and pseudo-artists are not libelous even though damaging to their professional reputations. A performance by the current Edwin Booth of the movies can be criticized as "lousy" without incurring liability. This defense is available in reference to all types of performers whether they are amateur or professional, so long as they make public appearances.

The same defense is available in connection with comments on public institutions or on private organizations which are seeking public support. The teaching in the primary grades in the local schools can be called "antiquated" without fear of a libel suit from either the superintendent of schools or the local association of primary teachers.

A station can express the opinion that too high a percentage of the money collected by the local community chest drive is being spent on administrative expenses. The local committee may descend on the station, may even threaten suit, but it can't collect.

d. Comments on political officers and candidates for political office. Ordinarily individuals falling within the above classification are pretty thick-skinned, and are likely to use other methods than a libel suit to even the score. Nevertheless, threats of suits and occasionally a court action may follow an attack on a current officeholder. Although not entirely unanimous on this matter, the courts generally have concluded that it is in the public interest to permit a wide latitude of criticism of public officers even though individual reputations may fall by the wayside. In fact some courts go so far as to say that there is no liability for any attack on a public officer or on a candidate so long as it is part of legitimate news enterprise.

Most radio stations, following a decision of the FCC, have avoided

taking a stand on political issues, and very infrequently have come out for or against a public officer or candidate for public office. There is nothing in the law aside from the Federal Communications Act of 1934 which prohibits a radio station from commenting on or even attacking public servants, and it is not clear that even the communications act restricts such activities.

A newscast which reports a scathing denunciation of the mayor of the town, who is running for reelection, by his opponent in a public meeting cannot be the basis for a libel suit, so long as the denunciation is in the form of comment based on stated and provable facts. To say that the mayor is "crooked" is libelous, but to report that his opponent charged him with failure to take the lowest bid on the paving contract and allotting it to his brother-in-law's uncle, and concluding that such "crooked dealings must stop" is not libelous.

Now to apply the paradox of libel to an actual situation. The following piece of copy comes to the radio news desk:

"Miss Jane Doe, 1216 Ontario Street, jumped or fell from the fourth floor window of the Standard Hotel this morning. Police are questioning John Roe who was alleged to have been her companion in the room a few moments before she was discovered on the sidewalk."

The story is obviously defamatory of Miss Doe. However, she is dead and cannot recover damages for civil libel. In some states this would come under the definition of criminal libel, but a prosecution, which is unlikely to be undertaken in a case like this, would fail on the basis that the statement about Miss Doe was true. Now take her boy friend. His reputation is obviously damaged. The fact that the police are investigating his connection with the death is no defense, since the police are neither legislative nor judicial officers. The use of the term "alleged" in this case would not eliminate liability. The station is stuck.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY

The Right of Privacy is still a new and undeveloped area of the law. At present it is not of universal or uniform application throughout the United States, and is based on a few statutes and a few court decisions. At least seven states have established this branch of the law in their jurisdictions by court decision; five states have rejected it; and in others the issue has not been raised. At least two states have established the right of privacy through legislation. The New York

statute prohibits the use of a person's name or picture "for advertising" or "purposes of trade."

The following is submitted as an analysis of the law of privacy as applied to news broadcasts:

1. All states permit the use of a name in news. This rule applies whether the news is sponsored or sustaining; whether the item is strictly news or in a news commentary.

2. New York, Virginia, and a few other states prohibit the use of a name in advertising without permission of the person whose name is used.

3. News and features about persons are permitted in all states so long as there is legitimate news or human interest in the person. When news and features degenerate into mere gossip, there is a possibility that the right of privacy may be involved, but the courts have not yet set out any rule for distinguishing between the two.

4. There is trouble ahead for the broadcaster who uses a fictitious name and it later turns out that there is someone by that name in the community. Better call him John Doe.

Although cases involving privacy are rare, here is an instance. Howard Mau, a chauffeur, was held up by a robber and shot, suffering severe injuries. Seventeen months later the Rio Grande Oil Company produced an advertising program entitled "Calling All Cars" which was broadcast by a San Francisco station. This broadcast presented a dramatization of the Mau holdup. The federal court held that since California had recognized certain aspects of privacy under its constitutional guaranty of the "inalienable right to pursue and obtain happiness," Mau could recover damages. *Mau v. Rio Grande Oil, Inc.* 28 Fed. Supp. 845 (N.D. Cal. 1939). It should be noted that this was not a news broadcast but a dramatization produced seventeen months afterwards.

CENSORSHIP OF NEWS

As far as censorship of news is concerned, radio has the same standing as newspapers or magazines. All are protected by the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Section 326 of the Communications Act specifically restrains the Federal Communications Commission from exercising any form of censorship over radio programs, including news programs.

OBSCENE, INDECENT, OR PROFANE LANGUAGE

Section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934 prohibits the use of obscene, indecent, and profane language over the air. A number of states have criminal statutes prohibiting the dissemination or circulation of blasphemous statements.

PROTECTION FOR NEWS PROGRAMS

Legal rights to ownership of news programs are capable of protection under three branches of the law—literary property, copyright, and unfair competition.

Literary property. The owner of a news script or of news copy may protect his rights to exclusive ownership under the law of literary property. This right is not lost after the initial broadcast, and in this respect, a radio news script differs from a news story published in a newspaper. When a news item is published in a newspaper, the owner loses all exclusive rights to republication. The broadcast of a news script, however, does not deprive the owner of the script of exclusive rights for rebroadcast. This right of ownership in copy applies to all types of radio news scripts, including straight news, commentary, and human interest copy.

Copyright. In addition to the above right, further exclusive rights can be created by securing a copyright on the script. This copyright is available for all scripts prepared for oral delivery. To copyright a script, the owner must comply with the requirements of the Copyright Act, register two copies, and pay the registration fee.

Copyrighting affords protection against unauthorized rebroadcasting or republication of the literary form of the script but does not give the owner exclusive right either to the news or to the ideas presented in the script. Copyrighted news matter can be rewritten and then broadcast without violation of the copyright law.

Unfair competition. The law of unfair competition as developed by the courts prohibits the unauthorized appropriation of news copy by a competitor. One radio station may not make a transcription of a competing station's news program and then rebroadcast it. Sec. 325 (a) of the Radio Act of 1934 prohibits a station from rebroadcasting the program or any part thereof of another station without express permission.

It has also been held that in this branch of the law, radio and newspapers are competitors, and unauthorized appropriation by one from

the other is prohibited. This applies both to the news itself and to the literary form in which it is written, but does not apply to news tips. A newspaper may publish a news story based on a tip from a radio news program and developed by the newspaper staff without violating the rights of the radio.

NEWS OF LOTTERIES

Section 316 of the Communications Act of 1934 prohibits the broadcast by radio of "any advertisement of or information concerning" a lottery. This prohibition applies both to advertising and to news programs. Although the lottery provisions of the postal regulations which apply to newspapers and magazines are quite similar, there is a slight difference in wording and a significant difference in enforcement. Under the postal law, newspapers may not publish the "results" of lotteries, but there is no definite restriction against publishing advance notices of lotteries so long as these notices do not take the form of "advertising." The radio law prohibits all "information" concerning lotteries, including advance stories and follow-ups giving results. On the matter of enforcement, the post office department has in the past been very lenient in applying the ban against publication of the results of lotteries. Most newspapers carried stories of the American winners in the pre-war Irish sweepstakes. It does not appear that the Federal Communications Commission is likely to follow the post office department in this matter.

The problem of what constitutes a lottery is particularly confused. Three elements must be present—consideration, prize, and chance. Bingo games, as well as bank nights, are lotteries, but neither horse racing nor the stock market is considered to be a lottery.

In conclusion, the most effective method of avoiding legal difficulties arising from news broadcasts is to employ a competent newsman. Adherence to the principles of good taste and of accurate reporting as practiced by trained and experienced newsmen is the safest guarantee against legal liability.

This summary should give the radio newsman a sufficient guide for general use. I'm certain, however, that Siebert himself would be the first to say that it doesn't pretend to cover all of the matters that may arise and that the safe thing to do, in case of any doubt, is to check with counsel before risking libel.

One other red flag before leaving the subject of libel. The

warning is to make absolutely certain that privilege is involved before you ever impute unchastity to a woman. A sentence such as "Amber Lovely has had six *official* husbands" will have you quickly over a legal barrel. Decisions of juries are difficult to predict at any time but it's a safe bet that they will always rally around the precious flower of womanhood.

12. NO ONE KNOWS THAT MUCH

How Much Scope for Commentators?

I'VE DISCUSSED limiting factors in the handling of radio news, both from the standpoint of good taste and from the purely legal point of view, in the two preceding chapters. There's still another question involving self-censorship, and that involves the latitude to be given news commentators. Should they be permitted to harangue, to plead, to urge courses of action, to set themselves up as authorities on every conceivable subject?

Offhand, the entire question seems to go right to the heart of the First Amendment which guarantees freedom of speech. However, as has been often pointed out, the authors of that amendment had in mind freedom of *responsible* speech. They didn't intend that anyone should have the right to cry "fire!" in a crowded theater, or that the pastor of any church should be required to share his pulpit with an atheist, so that the congregation could be exposed to two points of view.

In September of 1943, I became involved in a public controversy on the subject of news commentators, and was soundly berated by such writers and broadcasters as Walter Winchell, H. V. Kaltenborn, and Dorothy Thompson. A wag who referred to them and their colleagues as having a "vested interest in irresponsibility" came very wide of the mark. To me there was no doubt whatever as to their sincerity.

WHERE IT ALL BEGAN

A peculiar aspect of the controversy is the fact that it ever arose at all. In 1939 there was issued a memorandum to the staff of CBS on war coverage. The following are excerpts:

Columbia's announced policy of having no editorial views of its own and not seeking to maintain or advance the views of others will be rigidly continued.

In being fair and factual, those who present the news for Columbia must not only refrain from personal opinions, but must refrain from microphone manner designed to cast doubt, suspicion, sarcasm, ridicule, or anything of that sort on the matter they are presenting.

What news analysts are entitled to do and should do is to elucidate and illuminate the news out of common knowledge, or special knowledge possessed by them or made available to them by this organization through its news sources. They should point out the facts on both sides, show contradictions with the known record, and so on. They should bear in mind that in a democracy it is important that people not only should know but should understand, and it is the analyst's function to help the listener to understand, to weigh, and to judge, but not to do the judging for him.

It is impossible, within any reasonable limits, to define completely this last-mentioned aspect of news analysis. Fairness and temperateness are of its essence.

CAME THE BROWN DELUGE

That memorandum, written by Edward Klauber, issued two years prior to Pearl Harbor and widely published in the trade press, evoked no criticism, but rather praise. It was construed correctly as merely formalizing and amplifying earlier instructions to the staff, and it certainly represented no basic change in the company's news philosophy. But as the years went by and as America got into the war, we found there were occasional instances in which news analysts were straying off base. Accordingly, I wrote a new memorandum and this, too, might have gone unnoticed except for two things. One was the fact that the company's executives published it in New York newspapers as

a full-page advertisement under the heading "News, Not Opinions." The other was the fact that a criticism I had made of a broadcast delivered by Cecil Brown led to the latter's resignation and his raising of the cry of censorship.

First, to consider the Brown episode. He had just completed a whirlwind, nation-wide tour in which he had attempted to interview as many people as possible on the state of the union. I received letters from various cities which caused me to suspect pre-judgment, that his questioning had invited the answers he wanted. This may or may not be unfair; obviously there's no way of proving it. At any rate, upon his return to New York, Brown made a broadcast in which he said, in effect, that the American people had lost interest in the war. With bond drives oversubscribed and with production reaching new highs, I thought there was plenty of evidence to the contrary. It seemed to me that Brown, in his brief trip, could not possibly have seen and talked with enough people to provide a scientific sampling of public opinion.

It would have been all right, I told Brown, for him to say, "I have just talked with Americans all over the country and *from information I received in those interviews*, I gathered the impression that Americans are losing interest in the war." That, I said, would be reporting. But to say something incapable of proof and to say it flatly was out-and-out editorializing and as such contrary to CBS policies.

At that point, Brown resigned. He gave a "press conference" in which he declared he had been the victim of censorship.

WHY THE LID BLEW OFF

All of that focused attention on the newspaper advertisement in which my memorandum had been printed. Since it represented my views on the entire problem at that time, and still does, here it is in its entirety:

This is a restatement of Columbia's policies in regard to news analysis, an explanation of their reasons for being, and a declaration of our intention to enforce them rigidly to the end that the American listening public will be best served.

Please do not expect anything new in this memorandum. No innovations are involved. It is sent you at this time merely because there have been occasional instances recently in which there seemed to be a lack of clear understanding of our policies both on the part of news analysts and of our editors. I trust this will clear up any confusion which may have existed, especially among newer members of our staff. If not, then I shall be all too happy to discuss these matters with you personally at greater length and supply you with fresh copies of previous material dealing with our policies.

First off, let it be emphasized that Columbia has no editorial views except in regard to radio itself. By extension, those men selected by us to interpret or analyze the news must also refrain from expression of editorial opinion or our non-editorial position becomes an empty shell.

Each of you has been chosen by us because of your background and knowledge, insight, clarity of thought, and special ability to make yourselves understood by vast audiences. We feel we have faced and met a considerable responsibility in your selection. We now feel that you must meet and face much the same responsibility in writing your analyses. For we have said to ourselves, "We will not choose men who will tell the public what they themselves think and what the public should think." And we ask that you say to yourselves, "We are not privileged to crusade, to harangue the people, or to attempt to sway public opinion."

In our view, then, the function of the news analyst is to marshal the facts on any specific subject and out of his common or special knowledge, to present these facts so as to inform his listeners rather than persuade them. The analyst should attempt to clear up any contradictions within the known record, should fairly present both sides of controversial questions and, in short, should give the best available information upon which listeners can make up their own minds. Ideally, in the case of controversial issues, the audience should be left with no impression as to which side the analyst himself actually favors.

The news analyst, so restricted in the expression of his personal beliefs, may argue that he is being denied freedom of speech, that if he were employed by a newspaper or a magazine, he would have much greater latitude in speaking his mind. This argument brings us to the reasons for the policies I have just enunciated and the best way to deal with those reasons is to declare at once that there is a very considerable difference between the radio station or network and a newspaper or magazine.

The essential contrast is supplied by the available opportunities for publication and for broadcasting. Nothing except lack of funds or unwillingness to risk them prevents anyone anywhere from starting a newspaper, a magazine, or a publishing house. Within the laws of libel, obscenity, and sedition, the publisher is then able to say editorially anything he wishes to say, or to hire men to say it for him. But in the case of broadcasting, there are only a certain number of frequencies available for broadcasting stations and by the same token, only a limited number of networks can be created and maintained on a national basis. It is this limitation which makes for the basic difference between broadcasting and the press, from which stems our non-editorial policy. Without such a policy it is easy to see that a powerful and one-sided position on serious issues could be created for a small group of broadcasters locally, regionally, or nationally.

The threat of such unbalanced power is inimical to a democratic and free radio and to democracy itself.

As for those radio news analysts who cry out that the limitations which our policies impose on them threaten freedom of speech, I think the opposite is true. For we have set aside regular broadcasting periods in which controversial issues of the day can be and are discussed first by one side, then by the other. We have declined repeatedly to sell time for the discussion of these issues, so that the greater amount of time (and with it the effective control of public opinion) would not be at the disposal of the side prepared to spend the most money.

Actually freedom of speech on the radio *would* be menaced if a small group of men, some thirty or forty news analysts who have nation-wide audiences and have regular broadcasting periods in which to build loyal listeners, take advantage of their "preferred position" and become pulpitiess. To permit these men to preach their own views would be to create a super-editorial page, instead of no editorial page at all. Then freedom of the air, within the genuine spirit of democracy, would be merely a hollow phrase. There is no sense to the idea of erecting a barricade that will protect public opinion from one-sided assault, and then drilling holes in that defense whereby men in our own employ are permitted just such assault.

Our policies are meaningless unless strictly enforced and every news editor is held accountable for their enforcement. We are quite aware that other networks and individual stations may not as yet have similar policies. We hope that in the interest of furthering a free and democratic radio, all of them will come to agree with us. But

whether or not they do, we want to continue to set the highest possible standards of news objectivity and to retain leadership in public confidence.

As I have said, that memorandum touched off a minor explosion within and without the industry, and both on the air and in innumerable newspaper columns, I was roundly attacked.

PATRICK HENRY . . . NEWS

Walter Winchell was particularly antagonistic and fought what he considered unreasonable censorship as violently as he for many years has effectively decried American Fascism. Typical was his stinging query:

“Aren’t we all lucky that Patrick Henry’s message didn’t have to be reported by the Columbia Broadcasting System?”

Well, there may be an answer to that.

By Patrick Henry’s message, Winchell probably meant either of the two speeches including the much-quoted “If this be treason make the most of it,” or “I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!” Going back more than 170 years and imagining that radio was then in existence, I’m certain that the Virginia legislator’s words would have been carried in network news programs, that news analysts would have mentioned them in their proper perspective to the background of the news, that Patrick Henry would have been invited to expound his views, and that he might have participated in a radio forum. Whether the orator himself should have been selected as a news analyst, however, is another thing. It shouldn’t be forgotten that he was his state’s leader in opposition to ratification of the American Constitution and that his views, presented with the advantages which accrue to radio analysts having regular periods week after week, might well have been put so persuasively as to change for the worse the course of our national history.

Another opponent was, and probably still is, H. V. Kaltenborn. He made a speech in which he pleaded against what he, perhaps intuitively, called “ham-stringing”—a speech in which

he said: "The radio news analyst cannot and should not function night after night as preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself the medium for passionate expression of personal or minority opinions." The key to Kaltenborn's argument would thus seem to concern only the frequency with which the news analyst becomes a pulpитеer. In other words, he apparently agreed with me in the main, but felt that if a radio analyst wanted to get passionate about something occasionally, then a network should throw its policies out the studio window and dust off the soap-box.

THE GOLDEN RULE

On the other hand, Kaltenborn raised one quite serious point. Here is the way he put it:

No news analyst worth his salt could or would be completely neutral or objective. He shows his editorial bias by every act of selection or rejection from the vast mass of news material placed before him. He often expresses his opinion by the mere matter of shading and emphasis. He selects from a speech, or interview, or public statement the particular sentences or paragraphs that appeal to him. Every exercise of his editorial judgment constitutes an expression of opinion.

Here is involved, it seems to me, merely a matter of definition of words such as "opinion" and "editorial." Certainly all journalism is human. "Editorial bias," in the sense that all men do not see and read and think alike, doesn't start with the news analyst. It starts with the police beat reporter or the correspondent in the field or anywhere else a man or woman sees something, hears something, and then reports it. Complete journalistic objectivity is only an ideal, but the fact that it is difficult if not impossible to attain does not seem to me to impair the ideal itself, or excuse the broadcaster from a constant and vigilant effort to try for it.

The Golden Rule is unattainable, too; but it has been the cornerstone of Christianity for close to two thousand years—and who would discard it as a precept even if mankind is so frail it can't live by it?

THE OPPOSITE SIDE—IN FULL

It's probably unfair to select a phrase or two from context of opponents' remarks and try to refute them. The best thing to do is to report an opposing argument in full. I once had a public radio discussion on the subject over the CBS network with John W. Vandercook, who had been selected for the assignment by the Association of Radio News Analysts. This was Vandercook's thesis:

Perhaps the kindest interpretation of the policy of prohibiting news analysts from expressing their opinion over the air is that CBS desires to air only the truth, and that, as I see it, is the basic fallacy. Columbia infers that it is competent to judge what is fact and what is opinion. That's an extraordinary assertion. Man has been seeking to distinguish between truth and untruth ever since he began to walk. Only self-appointed censors and only those of a dictatorial trend of mind have ever been so vain as even to claim that they could make that fine distinction.

I will not deny that CBS has an entirely benevolent intention, but, since history began, all those who have sought to impose their will or their definitions of truth upon other minds have always begun at least by asserting that their purpose was benevolent. They are merely taking upon themselves, they say, the high duty of deciding for the good of the people what the people shall read or hear. Invariably, that program, whether it's imposed by a government, by an organized group of private interests, or a single corporation, has ended in failure and disaster.

We who are members of the Association of Radio News Analysts agree with CBS on just one thing—we, too, seek to tell the truth. But this is the great difference: each of us, out of his experience, out of his personal knowledge and out of his constant study of all available opinion, out of all available so-called facts, seeks to tell you, his listeners, that truth as he sees it in his own way. I don't have to tell the radio listeners of the United States that we don't all agree among ourselves; you know that we don't. It would be very dangerous if we did, for, in that unthinkable event, you would be listening to the organized opinion of a group, just as Columbia, if it insists upon carrying to its logical conclusion its present policy, would have you listening to the collective judgment of five of its executives who con-

trol the news policies of the corporation. We news analysts insist upon our right to speak as individuals to the American people as individuals. In short, we trust our fellow Americans, as they've always been trusted, as they must always be trusted if the democratic system is to endure. We don't believe, as does Mr. White, in measuring or selecting the doses of opinions and points of view which we present. We think it's for the listener to decide what he shall choose to hear. We think that choice can only be made at the point of outlet in radio and not at the point of origin. We believe in each citizen's liberty to agree with us or not to agree with us, in his right to listen or tune us off. We don't think that the decision of what and whom you can hear can be made by anyone but by the individual himself.

In the short code of ethics of the Association of Radio News Analysts, which I was one of those who helped draw up, we've imposed this degree of censorship upon ourselves. I quote—"The association expects and requires of the radio news analyst the exercise of sound judgment and good taste, the avoidance of sensationalism in both the substance of his broadcast material and the manner of its presentation." To sum up, we as citizens of the American Democracy, believe in self-control. We do not believe in corporate control, and it's our conviction, a conviction supported by the whole tradition of freedom in this country, that the American people will agree with us.

A HAZARD AT THE FUTURE

The controversy died down, as usually happens with any argument on abstractions, and the situation into early 1947 was that two networks, NBC and CBS, did their best to prevent the self-designated Messiahs from spreading their messages in the guise of news analyses. ABC and MBS, on the other hand, felt they had resolved the question by selecting analysts with opposing political philosophies, thereby achieving a reasonable balance in points of view.

From time to time several Congressmen have advocated laws which would delimit commentators but—if anything, this would seem to me to prove that Winchell has a great deal in his favor—these legislators are usually of the type of Senator Bilbo and Representatives Rankin and Hoffman.

In respect to the future, the imminence of frequency modula-

tion, which will mean a vast increase in the number of licensed radio stations, may make invalid some of the arguments I've advanced. If, let's say, any given community can have an f.m. station which is pro-labor and another one pro-management, one pro-internationalist and another pro-nationalist, then maybe all points of view can be adequately represented and there'll be no necessity for the caution I've advocated.

Until that happy day arrives, however, I think American radio should be careful lest a small group of men indulge in bias to a point where they exert a dominant power over public opinion. Such power in the hands of a few would destroy all fairness on the air—and in a democracy there's no freedom without fairness.

13. THE ABSTRACT SET IN CONCRETE

Propaganda—at Home and Abroad

I FIND THAT in the preceding chapter I referred to controversy over the place of the commentator in radio as an argument in abstractions. I'm not particularly sure that was a happy phrase. Actually, it's possible to give substance, by example, to the various means by which commentators attempt to sway public opinion. Some of these means are obvious, some subtle. They all add up to propaganda.

As to what constitutes propaganda in contrast to authentic news there's a sharp division of opinion. To show that they're probably intertwined, let's quote again from Elmer Davis—from an article he wrote for the *Journalism Quarterly* of June, 1946—with his usual straight-line thinking:

What is propaganda? The late A. E. Housman once said that he could not define poetry any more than a terrier could define a rat, but that the terrier knew a rat when he saw one. That is about the way I feel about propaganda; so long as the material you send out is true, whether it is propaganda or information depends on the intention, and still more on the effect, rather than on the actual content of the material. [Here is] an instance. The blue book issued by our State Department on the pro-Nazi activities of the Argentine Government [in 1946] was news; it was factual information. But, if the Argentine voters accepted it as true, and if they were permitted to express their feelings in the election, it would probably influence their votes. Was the State Department radio guilty of propaganda, then, in sending a report of the contents of this American official document to Argentina? If so, the AP and UP were equally guilty of propaganda, for they sent long news stories about it, too.

All those agencies, governmental and private, were reporting news; but it was news which would have a propagandistic effect. The truth is that a fact—an incontrovertible, undisputed fact—is often the most powerful propaganda. . . .

Certainly false information may be propaganda, but propaganda, as I have suggested, is not always or even often false. Falsehood is too easy to detect; and when it is exposed, your propaganda backfires. During the war the Office of War Information did make propaganda against our enemies—both to their home publics, to the inhabitants of occupied countries, and where necessary to neutral countries; but we stuck to the truth. Luckily the truth was on our side. We could stick to the truth and tell an effective story; but we told the truth to advance the interest of the United States at war, and we told it to the enemy, to occupied countries, and on occasion to neutrals, with such selection and emphasis as best to advance that interest. That was propaganda and I am not ashamed of it.

Despite Davis's earnest reasoning we must realize that to most Americans the term "propaganda" has a sinister connotation. And for purposes of explaining how propaganda may be used unfairly in creating attitudes, we will adopt the man-in-the-street's definition of the word.

Most students of public opinion are familiar with the list of propaganda devices drawn up by Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee in their book, *The Fine Art of Propaganda*. To show how propaganda enters the home, often disguised, let's invent a fictional commentator by the name of Joe Blow who is anti-Russian, anti-British, anti-Semitic, anti-union, anti-capitalist, anti-vivisectionist—in fact, just about everything except anti-Blow. He speaks endlessly on behalf of the common man whom he must know only from a distance—you encounter very few common men when you live in a penthouse apartment in New York and leave there only once a day to go to a radio studio. But Blow sees no inconsistency between his preachments and his mode of living. His four-figure weekly salary is his due—and the only flaw is that a vacillating and vicious government taxes away so much of it. But here are the propaganda devices and explanations of them as prepared by the Lees—plus my own illustrations from hypothetical commentaries to show how Blow spreads his poison:

NAME CALLING

"Name calling is a device for giving an idea a label. It's used to make us reject and condemn the idea without examining the evidence." This and the following quotations are reproduced by permission from *The Fine Art of Propaganda* edited by Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee, copyright, 1939, by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.

BLOW [*on the subject of military conscription*]. It is becoming increasingly evident that those who want this bill passed are Fascists on whose shoulders is draped the mantle of Hitler and Mussolini. These American-style Fascists are supported by the armament makers, most of whom have been proved to be war profiteers. Compulsory military training would simply be an invitation to warfare and that's why greedy warmongers favor it.

GLITTERING GENERALITIES

"A glittering generality associates something with a 'virtue word.' It's used to make us accept and approve the thing without examining the evidence."

BLOW. [*He has decided it's absurd to send food to Europe's starving.*] We're told that we should follow the injunction to "love thy neighbor." Of course we should. But I ask you: is it love when you reduce your neighbor to the point where he is merely a contemptible beggar? No, if you really loved your neighbor, if you really had in your heart the ideal of brotherhood that is so essential to universal peace, you would ask him to shun charity and work out his own destiny. Only in that way can he ever acquire the glorious feeling of independence that is the greatest freedom of all.

TRANSFER

"Transfer carries the authority, sanction, and prestige of something respected and revered over to something else in order to make the latter acceptable; or it carries authority, sanction, and disapproval to cause us to reject and disapprove something the propagandist would have us reject and disapprove."

BLOW [*in opposition to the suggestion that we should share our atomic bomb discoveries with other nations*]. And so the scientists propose

that we turn over the product of our skills and inventive minds, the things that have made America the greatest nation in the world, to other nations without the wit or talent to develop the atomic bomb. I wonder if these scientists have ever left their cloistered laboratories long enough to talk with American mothers. Take the mother in her happy home looking lovingly at the latest photograph of her children. Does she want her home destroyed, her loved ones killed because we have been so foolish as to put the bomb in the hands of possible future enemies? No, you men of science, go to the mothers in every American home and find out for yourselves what *they* think. You'll discover how wrong, how sinfully wrong, *you* have been.

TESTIMONIAL

“Testimonial consists in having some respected or hated person say that a given idea is good or bad.”

BLOW. [*Miraculously, he's defending an action of the State Department, probably because it appeared to him to be anti-British.*] Tonight we find many so-called liberals criticizing our country's attitude in the matter. They forget the glorious words of George Washington, who said, “Our country! May she always be right, but our country, right or wrong.” [*Blow isn't bothered that this is a misquotation and that Stephen Decatur said it, not Washington.*] Well, if those sentiments were good enough for the Father of our Country, they should be good enough for the children. Now let me tell you something. A writer named G. K. Chesterfield [*sic*] once said he didn't think this slogan was patriotic. It was like saying, “My mother, may she always be right, but my mother, drunk or sober!” And do you know who this Chesterfield was—an Englishman! Can you imagine an American saying his mother was drunk?

PLAIN FOLKS

“Plain Folks is the method by which a speaker attempts to convince his audience that he and his ideas are good because they are ‘of the people.’”

BLOW [*opposing a Treasury Department recommendation for continued high taxes.*] Now the Treasury Department says these taxes

are necessary to the national economy. I don't claim to be any expert in economy but where I come from they say a person is economical if he lives within his budget. But that's something the Government never has heard of. So it's up to you and me to tell those fellows down in Washington there's no sense in beating a horse that's too tired. Give him a little rest and he'll pull his share of the load. Use the whip and he'll just lie down on you. *You* know that; *I* know it. The thing is for us common, everyday folks to tell it to Congress.

CARD STACKING

"Card Stacking involves the selection and the use of facts or falsehoods, illustrations or distractions, and logical or illogical statements in order to give the best or the worst possible case for an idea, program, person, or product."

BLOW. [*He has convinced himself America should stay out of the Palestine issue.*] And so it is becoming more and more apparent daily that the United States has no stake in the political affairs of the Middle East, except to make sure that its oil holdings are protected. We cannot afford to become involved in the arguments between the Jews and Arabs because if we did we would have to send our Army over there, and then you would be reading about how the Jewish extremists had blown up the headquarters of the American military staff. Why should Americans lay down their lives just to help provide a new homeland for people who are better off where they already are?

BAND WAGON

"Band Wagon has as its theme 'Everybody—at least all of *us*—is doing it.' With it, the propagandist attempts to convince us that all members of a group to which we belong are accepting his program and that we *must therefore* follow our crowd and 'jump on the band wagon.'"

BLOW. [*He's whooping it up for his favorite Presidential candidate, Tantamount Tyrant.*] The crowds that are turning out to greet Tyrant's campaign train all over the country show that he probably

will be elected with the greatest plurality any candidate has received since 1936. The betting is now so one-sided that his backers can't find anybody to bet against him. I receive thousands of letters every day from people who say they haven't bothered to vote before but they are going to the polls this time to make sure that Tyrant is elected almost unanimously. That will show the Russians and the British we are really a United States.

CAN IT HAPPEN HERE?

By this time, I trust you're as sick of Joe Blow as I am. You may believe that it's impossible for such a man to flourish in this country. With all my heart, I hope you're right. But from time to time there have arisen radio personalities (Senator Long and Father Coughlin come immediately to mind) who have acquired great influence and have attracted many followers in inverse proportion to their regard for the democratic processes. I hold it quite possible for a news commentator—shrewd, biased, sometimes purposefully ignorant, skilled in deception and trickery—to appear to many as a Man-on-Horseback. Let's never forget that little Austrian with the funny mustache.

SHORT WAVES HAVE LONG EFFECTS

Although the tricks described above—name calling, glittering generalities, transfer, testimonial, plain folks, card stacking, and band wagon—have been illustrated in connection with the domestic scene, they are all in use every hour of every day by foreign broadcasters. This was expected during wartime; it may be news to many Americans that the assault against people's minds still goes on. Words can be as deadly as overexposure to radio-active waves. Some may argue that they never listen to short-wave broadcasts and thus couldn't possibly be affected. But, upon even a cursory examination, this argument falls flat.

The fact is that nationals of other countries residing in the United States *do* listen to their own short-wave programs, and derive therefrom the "line" of their countries. They repeat this "line," and sometimes it's accepted as truth, and becomes a part

of our own national thinking. Then, too, we are all affected in one way or another by what other nations think about us. If Radio Madrid succeeds in furthering South American antipathy toward the United States, then our foreign trade suffers, and a drop in foreign trade disturbs the economy of our own country, thus indirectly producing an effect upon our standard of living.

THE NEIGHBORS ARE TALKING

Two articles published in the *Journalism Quarterly* for June, 1946, tell the story of peacetime short-wave broadcasting. One is "International Broadcasting: Still a Jangle of Nerves," by John W. Gerber, who was wartime director of the CBS listening station. The other is "Short Wave Broadcasting and the News," by William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State. First, some salient paragraphs from Gerber's study of what is going on abroad:

It has become a habit to regard international radio as a psychological weapon, rather than as a medium for information, education, and entertainment. The emphasis is on establishing among the audience a desired effect, for which purpose it is necessary to "tailor" programs to fit each section of the audience. . . .

Let's take a look at what we know of the international broadcasting programs of a few countries, to see what America has to compete with—if America is to compete.

The British Broadcasting Corporation presents a splendid example of the complex requirements of a really big-scale international broadcasting outfit designed to do a job of convincing. The BBC operates, roughly, seven "transmissions" a day . . . many of them running simultaneously. (A "transmission" is a period during which one set of short-wave transmitters is directed to a specific area.) . . .

The one feature that all these transmissions have in common is news. Observing only from the loud-speaker end of the business, it may be said that the BBC gives the impression of trying to be objective about its domestic news. When there was a debate in Commons on the question of nationalizing transport, for example, the BBC conscientiously reported both sides of the debate; and if one side came out on top, it seemed to be because it had the better argument. But on some questions of foreign policy it is impossible to give the BBC such

a clean bill of health. When President Truman abruptly ended lend-lease, the BBC reported extensively the pained comments of sundry leading Britons. Since there was no apparent effort to counter-balance with American comment, most listeners could only get the impression that America was being manifestly arbitrary and unfair. Again, during the recent disturbances in India [1946], the BBC consistently used such prejudicial phrases as "orgy of destruction," and the listener could only get the impression that this was a spontaneous outburst of violence for its own sake. I hope that an objective American reporter would have inquired at length into the reasons for the violence. The sins of the BBC are largely sins of omission of one side of the story.

The operation of Moscow Radio is comparable in size to that of the BBC, and in many of its transmissions Moscow also concentrates on news and talks. There the comparison ends. News, to the Soviets, has a completely different meaning from what it has to us. It is reporting with a mission. It consists, to a great extent, in "playing" official statements, communiqués and reports, or reports of officially-sanctioned activities. Moscow's news broadcasts generally sound as if each item is broadcast, not simply because it is an informative account of something important that happened, but because it will produce a specific effect at the time.

Take, for example, the demand of Soviet Georgia for the return of certain territory now part of Turkey. Every day Moscow broadcasts excerpts from such leading newspapers as *Pravda* and *Izvestia*. The Georgian demand was quoted from an editorial in a relatively obscure provincial newspaper which had never before, to my knowledge, been quoted on Moscow Radio's international transmissions. It became big news, in our terms, only when Moscow Radio picked it up. . . .

No report on international radio, however brief, could be complete without mentioning the great current anachronism: Radio Madrid. It is the last remaining example of Goebbels-type propaganda in its purest form.

Madrid is constantly railing at democracies. Here are a couple of sentences from a recent comment on freedom of the press. "We have more freedom of the press than the limited papers of the Anglo-Saxons. . . . Home censorship is negligible. . . . Moreover, we have extenuating circumstances. No new regime can establish itself with absolute freedom of the press." . . .

This competition of jagged nerves presents America with a superb opportunity—an opportunity to set an example in using this poten-

tially great medium, which can circle the globe within the space of a second, for building international friendship and understanding.

And how is America facing this opportunity? In his article, William Benton cites several examples of the job American short-wave radio is doing. Here is one that's typical.

When the State Department announced on Dec. 22, 1945, that it had decided to recognize Yugoslavia's newly proclaimed republican government, there was a kicker to it. Our ambassador was asked to make it clear that this recognition "should not be interpreted as implying approval of the policies of the regime, its methods of assuming control, or its failure to implement the guarantees of personal freedom promised its people." The Yugoslav press didn't carry the story until three days later, and then ignored the American government's reservations about the newly recognized regime.

But three times a day American radio stations on the east coast of the United States, with the help of relay stations in North Africa and England, broadcast in the Yugoslav languages full accounts of what had happened. Here let Benton take up the story:

Yugoslavs who heard the broadcasts told others; word spread quickly that there was more to the story than the newspapers revealed.

In Belgrade crowds descended on the offices of the United States Information Service, which is maintained by the American Embassy. They wanted authoritative information about the recognition. They swarmed around the USIS bulletin-board, where two copies of the full text of the State Department's announcement had been posted. The small building became so crowded that normal operation of the library reading room became impossible, so the persons in charge began mimeographing copies to give to those who asked for them. By noon of the next day, 3,400 copies were gone and still the people came. The congestion grew so serious that the USIS office had to be closed temporarily in order to avoid police intervention.

It was less than a year later that the USIS office in Belgrade was closed again—but this time not temporarily. The Tito government might not have been able to stop short-wave listening,

but it was able to stop internal activities it considered inimical to the Yugoslav republic. And of course the number of short-wave receivers in most countries—Russia might serve as a good example—is piddling. Nevertheless, Benton has faith that the truth will out:

Short-wave broadcasts carry the Voice of America wherever we want it to be heard—without exposing it to censorship, distortion, suppression, or delay.

The ability of short wave to penetrate to the far corners of the earth without regard to national boundaries or other man-made obstacles makes it a potent weapon in the campaign for world-wide freedom of the press. Half the power of a controlled press to do evil is lost whenever the people who read it learn that it is controlled. If it does not jibe with foreign news broadcasts that are truthful and are believed, it cannot completely deceive or corrupt any people. Bad money may drive out good, but corrupt “news” cannot stand against true news if there is a chance for comparison.

American short-wave newscasts are especially effective in this respect, for two reasons. Most of the world knows that in America the collection and dissemination of news is free and untrammeled, and that American newspapers, news agencies, and radio networks record and report world events on an unparalleled scale and with unsurpassed freedom. The second reason is that general respect for the integrity of the American Government carries conviction to Voice of America listeners overseas. . . .

In a world no longer at war, but not yet at peace, America's radio voice must not be silenced. For it is a powerful and irreplaceable advocate of American principles, not least among which is freedom of the press, freedom to know.

Benton surely doesn't regard us as so naive we will believe that “the Voice of America” isn't “exposed to censorship.” What would happen, for example, if some nuclear scientist submitted a broadcast script which seemed to tell more about atom bombs than the War Department thought proper?

No, censorship is still with us in varying degrees in various nations. Like hunger and wretched poverty, it's one of the pounding, nauseous hangovers of war.

14. THE POPULI HAVE A VOX

A Study of Surveys and Fan Mail

THUS FAR I'VE CONCERNED myself mostly with what goes out *to* the listener. There has been little consideration of what comes back *from* him. Yet it mustn't be thought that radio newsmen are insensitive to what the public likes or what the public wants.

The fight for a share of the national advertising dollar is a hard scrap. The newspapers bite and gouge. Magazines claw their way into the tussle. Radio slashes away for its life. And car-cards, billboards, and other media are in there, too.

In one respect newspapers and magazines have an edge. The Audit Bureau of Circulation at least can tell the advertiser how many purchasers are exposed to his sales story: not total readership, but purchasers. Radio, as we will see, has to demonstrate its listenership in other ways.

And radio continuously tries to better the size of its audiences. That's called "promotion." Sometimes radio stations use competing media. They've bought space in newspapers, magazines, on car and subway cards, on billboards; they've put up elaborate neon signs near their studios and transmitters. But the best news promotion, as far as I'm concerned, is within the radio medium itself.

Not only should every news program be followed by a brief sentence to tell the listener when the next one will be on, but there should be cross-references. Let's assume that a station has three news announcers, John Smith, Bob Brown, and Joe Jones.

Brown at noon should say: "There hasn't been any news on the coal strike since John Smith broadcast for you at 10 o'clock this morning. In his program, heard every day at that time, Smith said . . ." If the President is holding a news conference later that day, Brown should say so and add: "And you'll hear all of the details of that conference when Joe Jones broadcasts over this station tonight at 6 o'clock."

This should be done throughout the news schedule. Every announcer should plug the other announcers. Audiences are built up day after day with that common sense approach. I say common sense because if a listener has a favorite broadcaster, he will learn the names (and times of broadcast) of others. Then, too, it becomes part of a sort of "one big happy family" pattern. And that's all to the good.

RADIO USES ITS OWN EARS

There are three principal ways of ascertaining the number and the attitudes of listeners. The first—and most important—is through surveys. Radio is more partial to surveys than any other medium of information. It conducts them at the drop of a kilocycle. A reason for this is that newspapers, magazines, and—to a certain extent—even newsreels, can prove their circulation. Radio can only guess at its circulation, and then attempt to establish the accuracy of the guess by surveys. A second way of finding out about listeners is to study fan mail. The third way is for the broadcaster to talk with his friends and acquaintances.

This third method is so haphazard and reveals so little it can be discounted almost at once. As a matter of fact, it probably does more harm than good. If you happen to know a newsman, the chances are you will not speak to him disparagingly about his work unless you're a very good friend indeed; and all too often the friendship will not withstand criticism. The broadcaster who says, "Now tell me honestly what you think about my work," probably thinks he means it. But the chances are that what he really means is, "Now please tell me you think I'm pretty hot stuff."

I've gone on the air infrequently. I know that I'm not a good broadcaster, and as a matter of fact am not interested in becoming one. But in nearly every case, I've heard a hundred words of praise to one of criticism. People either think they're being nice or else they want something. If that be cynicism, the thing for the broadcaster to do is to make the least of it.

THEY ALSO SURVEY

No, surveys are much more revelatory. The science of collecting data about public opinion is by no means an exact science, any more than is political science or economics. But the public opinion specialists have been conscientious and have tried increasingly to avoid the charge that they prove what they want to prove. They now phrase their questions so that no particular answer is invited. To illustrate, they no longer ask a question such as this:

Now that it is winter time and radio reception has improved, do you find yourself listening more to the radio than you did last summer?

Such a question undoubtedly would bring a chorus of "yeses" and would be meaningless. The affirmative response has been invited; more than that, it has been almost demanded.

Survey groups not only have made their questions more fair but they have done a noble job of apportioning the group to be surveyed along the lines of a national average. By that I mean that the recipients of questionnaires are fairly well divided according to their age, income, and education.

There are four general methods of conducting surveys. One is by sending out questionnaires or asking listeners to keep a "diary" on their radio habits. A second is by making telephone calls. (This second method is used by C. E. Hooper; its defect is that telephones are usually owned by people who have more money and more education than other people.) A third is by personal interviews. And a fourth is by mechanical devices.

THE MECHANICAL AGE

The first three of these survey methods are easily understood. The fourth probably requires some explanation. One mechanical device is that used by the Nielsen Radio Index. A graph is installed in radio sets in a certain number of homes in a certain number of cities. Every time the radio is turned on, that fact is registered on the graph, as well as every time it's turned off. At stated intervals these graphs are taken from the receiving sets and new ones are substituted. The graphs show how many hours a day the sets have been in use, what programs have been listened to, and—perhaps more important—the exact time at which the listener has either turned off his receiver or switched to a different station.

Another mechanical device is that developed by Frank Stanton and Paul Lazarsfeld. A selected group is assembled to listen to a program, either "live" or recorded. Members of the group, by pressing a button, can express pleasure or displeasure. Electrical impulses from these buttons are registered on a master chart, and the universality of public likes and dislikes has been amazing.

HOOPERS—AND DISPOSITIONS

Out of the multiplicity of surveys let us now consider some of the results. The "Hooper," issued every two weeks, is supposed to give a popularity rating for all sponsored programs, including news programs. Find a news analyst draped over a bar, glaring at the bottom of his glass, and the chances are that his recent "Hooper" showed that he dropped a point. Find the same man walking jauntily to work, a smile on his face, his eyes sparkling with warm regard for his fellow man—you know that his "Hooper" has just jumped 1.8 points. In conversation it's the custom of news broadcasters to decry surveys—"I care nothing of what the mob thinks of my work"—but the issuance of a new survey is a signal for them to come a-running and a-looking.

For what it may be worth here is a Hooper survey showing how the public regarded the leading network news personalities over a twelve-month period ending in August, 1946:

HOOPER RATING: SEPTEMBER, 1945-AUGUST, 1946

Walter Winchell	18.9	Gabriel Heatter	6.1
Lowell Thomas	11.0	William L. Shirer	4.9
Bill Henry	9.7	Fulton Lewis, Jr.	4.9
H. V. Kaltenborn	9.3	Arthur Hale	3.8
Drew Pearson	8.3	Robert Trout	3.0
John W. Vandercook	6.9	Raymond Swing	2.6

THE CHANGE IN SIX YEARS

In Chapter 1, I mention the public regard for radio news and the job radio did during World War II. It might be interesting to show how rapidly, within a six-year period, the public switched its reliance. Two cross-section surveys, one by the widely known public opinion analyst, Elmo Roper, in 1939; the other by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver, late in 1945, tell the story clearly:

Roper question. From which one source do you get most of your news of what is going on—the newspapers or the radio?

NORC question. From which one source do you get most of your daily news about what is going on—newspapers or radio?

	<i>Survey by Roper, 1939 per cent</i>	<i>Survey by NORC, 1945 per cent</i>
Newspapers	64	35
Radio	25	61
No choice	11	4

It might be thought that the public turned to radio only during the war because of its anxiety concerning the nation's sons. But in the months following V-J Day there was little variation in listening. The Nielsen Radio Index supplied this analysis of

listening to sponsored network news between June and December of 1945:

NIELSEN RADIO INDEX

1945	Average Audience Rating for Period	Average Minutes Listened per Day
June	5.7	11.3
July	4.5	7.8
August	5.7	9.6
September	5.3	8.6
October	6.1	9.5
November	6.5	10.1
December	7.3	9.9

WANTED: MORE LOCAL NEWS

The University of Denver group has interested itself in a series of questions regarding radio listening which would tend to reflect the type of news wanted by the public, and its attitudes on everything from commentators to commercials. Following are some of the questions and the results:

As far as your own listening is concerned, is the radio giving too much time or not enough time to:

- A. Foreign news, that is, news about other countries?
- B. National news, that is, news about this country?
- C. Local news, that is, news about things around here?

NEWS SURVEY BY NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

	Too Much	About Right	Not Enough	Don't Know
A	17%	56%	14%	13%
B	4%	64%	23%	9%
C	3%	54%	31%	12%

WHAT ABOUT COMMENTATORS?

As you know, there are two different types of news broadcasts. In one type, the broadcaster simply reads you straight news reports. In the other type, a commentator includes his own personal opinions when he gives you the news. In general, which one of these do you like best—straight news or commentators?

	<i>per cent</i>
Straight news	46
Commentators	37
No preference	17

In general, do you think it a good idea or a bad idea for news commentators to take sides in any important issues of the day?

	<i>per cent</i>
Good idea	33
Bad idea	46
No opinion	21

Which one gives you the fairest, most unbiased news—the newspapers or the radio?

	<i>per cent</i>
Newspapers	24
Radio	48
No opinion	28

- A. Who do you think mainly decides what opinions a news commentator expresses over the air—the commentator himself, the radio station, or the company that sponsors the program?
- B. Who do you think should decide? (The commentator himself, the station, or the company that sponsors the program?)

	<i>Does</i>	<i>Should</i>
Commentator himself	43%	63%
Radio station	7%	7%
Sponsor of program	27%	15%
No opinion	23%	15%

The above is an appalling statistic. It is bad enough that more than a quarter of the people think the sponsor controls the commentator's opinions but even more disconcerting to find that 15 per cent think this proper. From time to time there have been unsubstantiated rumors concerning the lack of integrity of certain news analysts, but in my professional experience I've never known of a case in which the sponsor was able to tell the newsman what to put in and what to keep out. If radio journalism ever falls to that low an estate, it will face inevitable disaster.

The chief public complaint seems to be that from time to time

"liberal" or "conservative" commentators are dropped by sponsors or networks or both. Cases in point are those of William L. Shirer over CBS and Upton Close over NBC, although as far as I know both men made up their own minds to depart from those networks.

On the whole, it may merely prove that analysis is analysis and that ideology is something else again. If a man brings neither too sharp nor too dull an ax to the microphone, he can't do too much harm swinging it or make too much noise grinding it.

But to resume the questions and answers of the University of Denver survey:

- A. In general, do you think radio news programs should be paid for by advertisers or by the radio stations themselves?
- B. How about entertainment programs in general, should they be paid for by advertisers or by the radio stations themselves?

	News	Entertainment
Advertisers	53%	73%
Radio stations	24%	9%
No opinion	23%	18%

Here are some criticisms of the way news is handled on the radio. Would you tell me which ones, if any, you feel strongly about?

	<i>per cent</i>
Interrupted by advertising	40
Same news over and over again	32
Incomplete, not enough details	13
Too many one-sided personal opinions	12
Hard to follow—news given too quickly	10
Broadcaster's voice too dramatic	10
Too much news on one subject	9
Too much sensational news	7
News often inaccurate	7
Broadcaster's voice dull or tiresome	6
News often dragged out to fill up time	6
It's never on when I want it	4
Don't feel strongly about any	32

[Percentages add to more than 100 per cent because more than one answer per person was possible.]

It's always interesting to see the way an expert interprets statistics. This is the way that Elmo C. Wilson, director of research at CBS, sums up the results of the surveys just cited:

It seems clear that radio news, in something approximating its present expanded volume, is here to stay.

Whether because of war-born habit, or because the news of the peace is more exciting than had been anticipated, millions of Americans are continuing to listen to the news to approximately the same degree as they did during World War II. There seems to be a tendency for less reliance on the commentator and a preference for straight news reporting, although there is little feeling that even the news presented by commentators has been biased in the past. Advertising on radio news programs is objected to by a minority, and there is considerably more opposition to commercial sponsorship of news programs than entertainment programs. It is possible, however, that some of this feeling about commercials is directed at their placement rather than at their existence.

By all odds, one of the most interesting surveys ever conducted was that undertaken by the Iowa School of Journalism in March of 1946 in a typical Iowa village whose exact identity was hidden under the name "Middleville." Graduate students of the school attempted to interview every inhabitant of this village—510 persons. Actually, 94 per cent of the people of Middleville were reached, the remaining 6 per cent being either ill or uncooperative. About one-fourth of the interviewees were found not to be listeners to radio news, in most cases because they were too young, in a few cases because they had no radios. But the remaining 360 were asked some 40 questions by the students, the interviews lasting from 20 minutes to an hour each.

In reporting the results of all of these interviews, Wilbur Schramm, director of the Iowa School of Journalism, and Ray Huffer, a graduate student who supervised the field work, emphasized that no attempt was made to equate Middleville to the entire nation. To me, however, it's doubtful if the tastes and judgments of a farming community in east central Iowa vary widely from those of Brooklyn's Flatbush, the Gold Coast of Chicago, the Texas Panhandle, or an Oregon fruit-growing

county. I suspect, but can't prove, that Middleville gives many a clue to national listening habits and preferences.

THEY LISTEN IN BED

Here, taken from an article by Schramm and Huffer in the *Journalism Quarterly* of June, 1946, are some of the things ascertained in Middleville:

Middleville's 158 radios begin to flicker on shortly after 6 A.M. Eighty-eight per cent of the homes have radios and 43 per cent of the business places. The average radio plays 4.2 hours a day. By 7:30 A.M., one-fifth of the people have tuned in a newscast.

The high peak of news listening during the day is between noon and 1 P.M., but there is another peak between 6 and 7, and still another between 10 and 11 P.M. A number of persons who hear newscasts at 10 or 10:15 hear them in bed. After 10:30 there is very little news listening.

The average citizen of Middleville who listens at all to radio news can name, by station and time, two newscasts which he hears regularly. Housewives hear most (3.1 per day), farmers least among adults (2.2), and students still less (1.08). Women average 2.3 newscasts per day; men, 1.7. Of the persons who hear any newscasts, 74 per cent hear at least two, 35 per cent at least three, 18 per cent at least four, and 6 per cent at least five. One Middleville woman named 10 broadcasts, by time and station, which she makes it a point to hear every day. By their own testimony, checked against two auxiliary studies, the people of Middleville spend between 20 and 30 minutes a day listening to radio news, between 30 and 40 minutes reading newspapers and news magazines.

Newspaper reading is heavy in Middleville—about 1.65 papers an average person a day. Yet almost two-thirds of those readers, if faced with a choice between conflicting radio and newspaper news, say they would prefer to believe the radio. Age makes a considerable difference in this attitude. The younger people who grew up with radio voted for the newer medium, 70 to 26 per cent, 4 uncertain; the older people by a margin of only 40 to 25, 35 uncertain. . . . There is no serious opposition to commercials on news programs, but 60 per cent said they would prefer not to have a middle commercial. Fifty-nine per cent of adults say gruesome details bother them more on the

radio than in the newspaper, and 34 per cent object to crime news on radio.

FROM THE AGE OF 10

Young people in Middleville start to listen to radio news in the third grade, about the age of 8. None of them "make a point" of listening, however, until they are about 10. After that the curve of listening goes steadily up through high school.

A strong trend in favor of local and regional news is apparent in Middleville. Asked what change in radio news they would like, 62 per cent said more local news. Asked for a preference among types, they voted for local news over state, national, and foreign.

Finally, Middleville's great dependence on radio news, so evident throughout the survey, was underlined by 87 per cent of the listeners, who said they depended on radio for their weather forecasts, and by 88 per cent of the farmers, who said they depended on it for crop reports and market prices.

Seventy-four per cent of the men, 57 per cent of the women, said that when they were in a group, and a newscast started, they stopped talking to listen.

Seventy-nine per cent said they were usually tuned in at the beginning of a newscast.

Sixty per cent said they were often uncertain, after the program, as to certain things the newscaster had said. Names caused the greatest trouble, followed by small details, then by names of cities and towns.

Seventeen per cent said they usually read a morning newspaper before their first morning newscast; 64 per cent usually read an evening paper before their first evening newscast.

THE YOUNG LIKE CRIME

Fifty-eight per cent of adults, 51 per cent of students, said gruesome details bother them more when heard on the radio than when read.

Thirty-four per cent of adults, 12 per cent of students, said they objected to crime news on the air.

Forty-five per cent said that a one-day-a-week substitution for the usual newscaster on a program bothered them.

Only 31 per cent said they objected to any of the commercials on the news programs they heard, but 60 per cent said they would prefer not to have a middle commercial in a newscast.

Sponsor identification in connection with newscasts was about what

it is with non-news programs, but a check showed that the names of sponsors of the most-heard programs were very well known, although the interviewees did not always connect them with the particular program—indicating that the advertising is doing its work.

THE NEW GENERATION

There are signs that a generation with a somewhat different attitude toward radio may be growing up. Persons 30 or under have been exposed to radio for most of their educational life. When some of the statistics from Middleville are broken down in terms of people under 30 and people over 30, the results are extremely interesting. For example, persons under 30 are significantly less opposed to crime stories on the air, less disturbed by gruesome details on the air. Does this indicate that material of this kind is developing scar tissue in its hearers, and that a different kind of listener is beginning to appear? Furthermore, there is a significant difference in the attitude of Middleville people under 30 toward the newspaper. Seventy per cent of those persons under 30 say that, in the case of conflicting news, they would be inclined rather to believe radio than newspaper; only 40 per cent of persons over 30 felt that way. Sixty-nine per cent of persons under 30 indicated that they could more easily give up newspaper than radio news; only 56 per cent of persons over 30. . . . The suggestions of a new radio-mindedness developing in the younger generation have implications far beyond Middleville.

STAMPED APPLAUSE

The average news broadcaster may be mildly interested in results of surveys, whether conducted in Middleville or on a nation-wide basis, but he's much more interested in his fan mail. That isn't so important as his pay check, of course, but a source of satisfaction nevertheless. Fan mail is a kind of delayed applause and sometimes seems to be a figurative hickory smoke bringing out the full flavor of the ham.

There are two types of fan letter writers: the regulars and the occasionals or first-timers. Some regulars all but make a career of it. I know of a Washington broadcaster who receives a letter every day from a woman he has never met. She apparently listens to all of his broadcasts, by now considers they are addressed to her, and writes him long and lovingly about his work.

To vary the routine from time to time, she sends him cakes, cookies, ties, and socks. If he seems to have a cold, she sends him instructions on how to care for it. In short, the maternal instinct is rampant.

Even a news director not often heard on the air has his regulars. One of my most frequent correspondents over the years was Fred Kelly of Peninsula, Ohio. In some manner mysterious to me, except for the possibility that a friend who owned a print shop sent him copies of his work, Kelly had amassed a tremendous collection of varied letterheads. One day he would write on the stationery of a cemetery in Arkansas, the next day on the stationery of a quick lunch resort in Idaho. The letters themselves were brief and pointedly critical. One day he would object to the use of the phrase "and now for news of Washington, *we take you to the nation's capital.*" Another day he would complain that none of our broadcasters could properly pronounce the French syllable "en." A third day he would quarrel with an announcer who had said "Veen," instead of "Vienna," and inquire caustically whether the announcers would now speak of "Paree" and "Behr-leen." I dare say the publication of this book will bring forth some letter from Kelly, probably written on the letterhead of the Denver Department of Sanitation, Street-Sweeping Division.

Another pair of regulars wrote from a Texas city. Man and wife had all but adopted the group of foreign correspondents whose work I directed, called them "our boys," collected their autographs and photographs, and were quick to write in praise of any outstanding broadcast. I was immensely flattered when asked to become a sort of honorary "our boy" even though I wasn't a reporter abroad.

The friends one makes and keeps by mail are valuable. Their importance is that they assure the broadcaster that he isn't talking into a void, that he has a living and appreciative audience. From time to time Congressmen have deplored the fact they get so few letters from their constituents, except for the obvious letters inspired by minority groups, and the letters asking for favors. They say it would help their work if enough civic leaders would write them of conditions at home, of current public opinion

on pending legislation, and of other major matters. To a certain extent, the same thing applies to the broadcaster. He, too, would like to hear from his audience.

Nor is only praise desired. Criticism has its uses. By that, I don't mean a postcard such as was received by one of the better-known broadcasters, a card that said simply:

Dear Sir:

You are a louse.

An American.

Much more constructive would have been a signed letter stating the thought processes through which the state and degree of lousiness were decided.

A SIMPLE REQUEST

I don't know why so many listeners seem to think there's a certain virtue in writing, "This is the first time I have ever written a letter to anyone in radio, but . . ." That sentence, however, is the most common one in all fan mail. If there is any particular type of letter that is anathema to the broadcaster it is one such as this:

DEAR MR. BLANK:

This is the first time I have ever written a letter to anyone in radio, but I know you can help me out. I am scheduled to speak at the next meeting of our club on "The Progress of Mankind Since the Birth of Christ." Will you please send me all the information you have on the subject?

There simply isn't any effective reply to such a letter. If the broadcaster suggests he's too busy, refers the correspondent to public libraries or replies that he hasn't any information on the subject, he is thought "snooty" and extremely uncooperative.

If minority groups ever realized how unavailing were organized campaigns of letter writing, I'm certain that the campaigns would be eliminated. If a broadcaster suddenly begins to receive a flood of mail on a single topic, such as the cause of prohibition or the unionization of foremen, it instantly becomes clear that these letters are inspired, even if all of them are dif-

ferently worded. That realization completely destroys the effectiveness of the campaign and, indeed, is apt to have an effect opposite from that intended. A man's sense of innate fairness suggests that a minority is trying to put something over, and that the other side isn't being adequately represented.

THE SALOON-KEEPER'S LAMENT

No, the fan mail that makes the deepest impression is that from the "occasional" or "first-timer" who obviously has a sincere personal grievance. There's one letter I've saved for a couple of years that is out of the ordinary, and occasionally I've reread it to make sure my sense of humor was on straight. The letter requires a bit of explanation.

In the first place there are a number of news analysts who have what are called cooperative programs. These programs are not sponsored by one company over an entire network but by a different company in each city. The Town Hall of the Air, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Elmer Davis programs are examples. Davis, for instance, might be sponsored by a used-car lot in Chicago, a ball club in Cleveland, and presented merely as a public service with no commercial aspect at all by a station in Phoenix.

The letter I've treasured refers to a commentator whom we shall call Henry Hardhead and who, let's say, is sponsored in the mythical town of Charlesburg by an equally mythical Hopalong Brewing Company. The letter was addressed to the President of Hopalong, and a copy was sent to me under the mistaken impression that Hardhead had broadcast under my direction. Here it is:

SIR:

I admit that I'm writing this boiling mad. Listen why.

Ten minutes ago my head bartender at a spot I own called me on the phone to ask me if I wanted the cops on a mill man who tried to get at the radio when Henry Hardhead was laying out the OPA. Some damage was caused, but I told my fellows not to say anything but to hush it up all possible and that I'll stand the damage.

This mill man has known me for 20 years, and he and I used to be in ward politics together. Now he is a union man and has changed

his party registration because of the lies and half lies over the air. If I had trouble with him and his friends, I might just as well go out of business because they are maybe fifty or sixty per of it. Naturally I should rush right down to my place and see what happened and what it will cost, but this guy and his friends are still there and it seems that everyone agrees with what they say. Maybe they will be cooled off by the time they see me again.

My half brother does not have a radio in his place in another part of Charlesburg but he says that a lot of fellows like ballplayers—big timers, I mean—and students and a few doctors even have mentioned that Hopalong Beer should know better than to have a one-sided man like Hardhead on the air. Some of these students told my half brother that Hardhead seldom tells direct lies but messes his words around to damn everything the country is doing. After hearing this I began to listen to Hardhead and by God they're right about him. My half brother says that from now on there will be no Hopalong Beer in his place and he don't care if he never sells another bottle of it. I feel the same way and after the present shortage I will not try to sell your stuff and will not push it at all. If anyone asks for some he gets it but not too pleasantly.

I am not a smart man but I did take some typing & shorthand at night school and it's enough to tell you straight what the boys are thinking. In my place tonight they started *doing*. No doubt you would pay my damages or your agent would but I want the whole thing kept quiet and have told my fellows to fix up quick and tell no one of the events, not the wagon drivers even nor the distribs.

But I'm telling you and telling it straight. There should not be room on the air for half-track guys like your man. They are going to fool around till nobody believes anything and the whole thing blows up. If I was you I would get out from under.

P.S. It is now one hour later and I have blown off a lot of steam and feel better but I have read all the above over again and it still goes *double*.

I don't know whether the Hopalong Brewing Company still sponsors Hardhead. But I like to think that the company's advertising manager was a little jarred by this letter. After listening to many of the sanctimonious, self-assured, evangelical and ignorant "half-track guys," I, too, often have the feeling that "they are going to fool around till nobody believes anything and the whole thing blows up."

15. THE AGE OF SPECIALIZATION

For Women, Children, Sports Fans, Farmers

OUR STUDIES of radio news thus far have been devoted to general news. But there are vast fields of specialized news, and I suspect that many of the new jobs to be opened up in radio, if frequency modulation greatly increases the number of stations, will have to do with these specialties. They include programs about home-making, movies, sports, farming, children, women's activities, biographies of the great and near-great, humorous incidents, and Washington "behind the scenes."

Some idea of the audience for such programs comes from a study of the radio wires of United Press and Associated Press. Although space is at a premium, both services regularly grind out feature copy on most of these specialized subjects, some designed for five minutes, others for fifteen minutes; some sent over the wires daily, and some only weekly.

The networks, too, carry such specialized programs and find that they are widely accepted. For years one of the most popular NBC features has been "The National Farm and Home Hour." Nearly always in the first ten "Hooper ratings" of the daytime programs, and often at the top, is the Kate Smith program at noontime in New York, a program that contains some general news read by Ted Collins, but which concentrates on Miss Smith's reading of feature stories and her engaging homilies.

SUFFER, LITTLE CHILDREN

From the point of view of the individual station operator, each of these specialized programs constitutes a problem of deliberately inviting a part of the audience to tune out. Radio as a mass medium tries to appeal to everyone. Whenever a portion of the day's schedules is set aside for a program that is written especially for housewives, farmers, or sports addicts, a certain percentage of audience is obviously shunted aside. Only if the feature is so well liked among the group to which it appeals that it attracts a loyal, consistent following, is the sacrifice of mass audience considered worth while.

A single example should suffice. The most popular sport in America from the standpoint of the number of participants is probably bowling. But persons who don't bowl and who never intend to bowl would be bored beyond measure by a program about the sport. So the local station operator would have to weigh this against the possible popularity of such a program for bowling enthusiasts. Actually, although the game is fun to play and often is fun to watch, it isn't very much fun to hear about. That's why there are few, if any, popular programs devoted to bowling.

To a certain extent, the same considerations apply to children's news programs. In the first place, is the news to be *about* children or *for* them or both? In my years at CBS, I never was able to find a satisfactory formula for this type of news, although the idea of such a program was by all odds the one most often submitted by people outside the industry. I believe that I always told everyone who had such an idea that I accepted it in principle, but would like to see a script. And most of the scripts, if designed for children, gave me a very bearish view of the nation's youngsters. We have already seen in the Middleville study that in one community, at least, children begin listening to general news at about the age of eight and begin selecting news programs at ten. How many children would listen to this script submitted in all seriousness by an educator who felt that

only by proper guidance of the juvenile mind could the nation achieve its manifest destiny?

[*Sound. Bell ringing.*]

ANNOUNCER. Calling all children! Calling all children! It's time now for your lesson in the news brought to you by [station or sponsor]. Remember, children, that as you grow up you will become the leaders in the world of tomorrow and it's very important for you to know what is happening. Now here is [name of commentator] to tell you what is happening.

COMMENTATOR. Today we will take up the news about the United Nations. That is a group to bring us peace instead of war. Let me tell you what it is like. Suppose you and your friends were always fighting. Some of the boys and girls would get hurt and have to go to bed and not have any fun. So then you might decide to get together and say that you were tired of fighting and from now on you wouldn't do it again and what's more you would form a kind of club and if anyone started fighting, all the rest of you would jump on the bully and give him a good licking. . . .

I didn't read any further than that. I don't know how it would affect children but I think they would, as Dorothy Parker delicately put it, "fwoow up." That type of oversimplification would be an insult to most ten-year-olds; it's even doubtful that it would appeal to younger children.

Or take the other extreme. Once I had submitted a children's news script which began:

COMMENTATOR. In a case analogous to that of a typical Horatio Alger hero, Fleetwood Mutch of Meridian, Mississippi, today found himself accorded honor, fame, and fortune because of a display of redoubtable courage. All of us are constrained to derive inspiration from Fleetwood's . . .

Here again I quit. I don't know what child (or adult, for that matter) would be interested in hearing further about Fleetwood's bravery and its sequels. No, I'm afraid that the perfect news program for children is still to be written. And I have a growing suspicion that they understand a great deal more of the general news than most people think they understand. A scooter

doesn't run so fast as a motor car, but it gets the child where he wants to go.

Which is not to say there are no good programs written especially for children. One of the most successful is heard over WOSU, operated by Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio. It is written and broadcast weekly by C. W. "Wib" Pettegrew. Here is an excerpt from a program which has a big audience among the Ohio small fry. (The material is dated now, with General Marshall's duties lying elsewhere, but the sincerity of approach to juvenile minds is still apparent.)

Hi there, boys and girls . . .

If you have a calendar hanging in your room, take a look at it. Under tomorrow, Friday, you'll see a big number SEVEN. December 7th is the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, the day the Japs attacked us and drew us into a war. That was back in 1941—four years ago. The war is now over. The Japs started the fight, and we finished it.

This year, on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, we're not thinking much about the war. It is true that, in Washington, a committee of Senators is investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster—to see why we were so completely unprepared when the Japs struck. And we still like to read stories about some of the secrets of the war which are being told—now that the war is over.

No, on this fourth anniversary of Pearl Harbor, we are thinking mostly about peace—and how to gain peace. But, strangely enough, one of the reasons why we're thinking so much about peace is that the war caused a lot of new headaches. And many of the old headaches we had before the war have popped up again.

There's China, for example. We talked about China just a few weeks ago, didn't we? We talked about the Nationalist Government, headed by *Chiang Kai-shek*, and the Communist Government, headed by *Mao Tse-tung*. In this country, about 80 years ago, we had two different governments: The Federal Government in the North, and the Confederate Government in the South. You know what happened then, don't you? We had a Civil War. And people are afraid that China may have a Civil War. Today, the news from China isn't any better than it was when we talked about it four weeks ago. And, to top it off, the United States Ambassador to China, General Patrick A. Hurley, resigned—quit his job—about a week ago because he didn't like the way the United States was acting in China.

General Hurley, you see, thinks that we should give all our aid to the Nationalist Government—the government of General Chiang Kai-shek. Other people who work in China for the United States Government disagree. These people say that there's much to be said in favor of the Communist Government of Mao Tse-tung, and that we should be extremely careful about how much help we give the Nationalist Government. Many of these people say that Mao Tse-tung's government has done much more for the people than the Nationalist Government. They believe that the Communist Government is not nearly as "Communistic" as others think it is . . . that the Communist Government is really much more democratic than that of Chiang Kai-shek.

But General Hurley said that we were trying to help spread Communism in China.

Anyway, President Truman accepted General Hurley's resignation. Immediately, he appointed General Marshall to the job of Ambassador to China. As you know, General Marshall was our Army Chief of Staff during the war. In the eyes of the Chinese, he ranks second only to President Truman. So the Chinese will feel honored that General Marshall is our Ambassador there. And they will know how important the Chinese problem is to us. If it wasn't important, we wouldn't be sending a man like General Marshall to China.

It will take wisdom and patience to help China work out its problems. General Marshall has plenty of both. It will be interesting to see whether China can become a *unified* nation—one nation—without having a Civil War.

SPORTS WHEN THERE AREN'T ANY

One of the toughest jobs for the sports broadcasters is to fill up their allotted time on days and in seasons when there are practically no sports events worth mentioning. All during the baseball season it's possible to take the performance of a player or a club and, with the extravagance traditionally permitted sports writers of all types, compose a program that is fairly topical. If the Phillies should happen to win six out of seven games, it's quite all right to devote 15 minutes to the causes of this "resurgence." Fortunately, sports fans don't seem to have

long memories about such things, and if the Phillies lose the next six out of seven games, nothing is said about it.

But it's in the dreary late winter, when only a few indoor track and field meets, a hockey game or two, and a basketball tournament are on the sports agenda that the sports broadcaster is up against a tough proposition. The United Press Radio Wire is aware of this and to take care of the dull days and to provide a store of chestnuts for the long, hard winter, it carries a feature, "Great Moments in Sports." Here is a typical and, on the whole, excellent example:

The world of sports harbors a million memories. Great moments at the race track . . . in the boxing ring . . . on the golf course and on the football field.

This is [*announcer's name*] with another thrilling sports story of the past, prepared by Joe Drury of the United Press Radio Sports Staff.

You've heard of football games in which one player was a thorn in the side of the entire opposing team. But on a 1933 afternoon at the Yankee Stadium—there was one Tulane back who became a whole cactus bush in the Colgate team's flanks. And even in the game's very last second—but let's take this story from the start. . . .

Colgate's Red Raiders went into that game with a mighty impressive record. Andy Kerr's boys were unbeaten, untied, and unscored on during the previous season's schedule. And in 1933, they remained unbeaten, were tied only once, and had nothing more than a single safety scored against them. All that added up to a 17-game unbeaten streak and made Tulane's Green Wave a definite underdog.

Well, the Red Raiders got rolling true to form, baffling the Tulane defense with their double wing back attack. Colgate smashed 48 yards to the Big Green's 25-yard line in the first few plays of the game.

Then Tulane dug in hard, putting brutal impact behind every tackle. Sure enough—two plays later Jack Fritts was dumped so hard that he fumbled the ball. And when the officials blew the whistle on the scramble, Joe Loftin had recovered the ball for Tulane.

The Southerners held a fast huddle and then fell into formation—anxious to make the most of a break that might not come their way again. Back snapped the ball to Captain Floyd Roberts, Tulane's 176-pound back and field general. Roberts bulled off tackle, stumbled crazily twice, and then knifed back in front of the Colgate secondary.

The ball-carrier's sharp reverse caught defending backs off balance,

and one by one they fell away from the play, as Roberts raced straight for the side line. There he swung around, picked up his interference and streaked down inside the white stripe. By the time he reached Colgate's 25-yard marker, his blockers were gone and Fritts was moving in fast to trap him.

But Roberts worked a perfect feint. He stepped up his sprint for a half-dozen strides until Fritts was certain he'd try to squeeze past him on the side line. Then Roberts slowed abruptly, lunged away toward midfield, and jogged across the goal line ahead of the out-tricked Colgate back.

Roberts' kick for the extra point was good, and the score at the end of the first period was 7-to-nothing, favor Tulane.

In the second and third periods, Colgate took to the air, completing 60 per cent of its passes and threatening the Green Wave's goal time after time. But Tulane's hard-charging line—with an upset victory in sight—wrecked every scoring thrust the Red Raiders could throw at them. Neither team could get inside the other's 25-yard line in the final quarter, and it began to look mighty bad for Colgate's long unbeaten streak.

But, late in the last period, McDonough took Simons' punt on the Colgate 37, and ran it all the way back to Tulane's 48. Two quick passes picked up eight yards for the Raiders. Then—with two yards to go on the fourth down—Kern passed to Captain Anerson, who was standing on Tulane's 24.

Time was running out now, only seconds remained on the big clock over the stadium bleachers. On the next play, the ball went to Kern, who faded far back as he looked desperately for a receiver. Then he made a wild fling downfield just before he was slammed to the ground by Tulane tacklers.

Bogdanski, the Colgate left end, caught the ball on Tulane's 17-yard line and slipped past tackler after tackler as the Big Red fans went wild. It looked as if Colgate would keep that unbeaten record after all—and despite Floyd Roberts' great run.

Tulane fans watched Bogdanski toe-dancing toward that goal line and feared that Roberts' great run would get them nothing better than a tie.

But Bogdanski wasn't over yet. One lone Tulane back came racing across the field to intercept him. The ball-carrier tried frantically to bull his way through. The tackler met his charge head-on. As the final whistle blew, the pair hit the ground on the two-yard line—with grinning Floyd Roberts on top.

ANYTHING FOR A SMILE

I've already spoken of the desire to end most news broadcasts with a "brightener." But in addition to requests for these endings, there's a steady demand for entire programs devoted to little slices of life—the unusual, the humorous, the trivial. Proper writing of these tidbits of news is difficult, and anyone who acquires the knack has almost an assured income for life. In the first radio journalism courses that I taught, I started the students out on these "brighteners," but unfortunately the results weren't too happy—whether the fault of teacher or of students is moot.

The fact is that it takes considerable practice and skill to keep a listener interested in these little stories, and to hold back and phrase the punch-line so as to get a smile. Of course, a great deal depends upon the delivery of the line as well as the writing of it, but at least the primary responsibility is that of the writer. Here are some examples of "brighteners" that I consider above average:

A man entered a coin shop in Detroit this morning and asked the dealer to appraise a coin he said he'd found in the street. The dealer found it was a rare Ecuadorian sucre worth at least a hundred dollars. But when he returned to the front of the shop to tell the stranger of his good fortune, the dealer found his cash drawer open—and empty. The stranger had made off with its contents—seven dollars and forty-three cents. The moral? Never be a sucker for a sucre.



A London black marketer was fined eighty dollars today for selling a negligee without ration coupons. The Board of Trade investigator who made the arrest was a Mr. Buyer. The prosecutor was a Mr. Purchase. And—yes, you're right. The transaction took place in Petticoat Lane.



In Tampa, Florida, today a motorist named Andrew Higgins complained that a big dog had run into Higgins' small car, had caused him to dent two fenders, and lose a front wheel. The dog, apparently unhurt, had run off and Higgins complained he didn't even have a hair of the dog that hit him.

To satisfy the demand for this type of thing, AP Radio has adopted a pseudo-dramatic technique including the use of music and more than one voice in a weekly feature, "Side Street, America." The entire program is designed for 15 minutes, but to acquaint the student with the unusual format, here is merely a portion of a single broadcast:

NARRATOR. "Side Street, America!"

[MUSIC: *In . . . and fade under*]

NARRATOR. Once again (station or sponsor) takes you down that unique street that wanders through every town and hamlet in our land . . . down where the lights are sometimes kerosene lanterns and sometimes big-city neon lights . . . down where the little events happen to just plain people . . . the humorous things, the ironic and the fantastic things that reveal the warmth and the flavor of life in our land . . . the incidents of "Side Street, America" . . . But first, here's a message from our sponsor.

[MUSIC: *Fades out*] [Commercial]

NARRATOR. And now . . . "Side Street, America!"

[MUSIC: *In . . . and fade under*]

NARRATOR. Nature saves a marriage . . .

A woman gets a seal out of a jam . . .

A pig makes an unholy show of himself . . .

A cop confesses he's confused . . .

And our outstanding American of the week . . . a miner who became a hero.

[MUSIC: *Up . . . and out*]

NARRATOR. Orange, New Jersey. While the war was still being fought, Sam J. Nasralla of Orange was held prisoner for months by the Germans. It was raining one day. And he was cold and wet and miserable. He was also tired. And he was hungry. He turned to another G.I.

VOICE. So help me, Mac, I'm gonna name my next son for the general who gets us outta this firetrap.

NARRATOR. Mac thought it over. And then he said, "You're takin' an awful chance, aren't you, Sam?" Sam didn't get it.

VOICE. Whaddaya mean, takin' a chance?

NARRATOR. Mac thought it was obvious. He said, "Well, who do you think is gonna liberate this burg anyway?" Then Sam saw what he meant.

VOICE. You mean I'll probably have to name the kid for a Russki, huh?

NARRATOR. Mac nodded.

VOICE. Yeah. I guess you're right. We're pretty far east.

NARRATOR. Then he shrugged.

VOICE. Oh, well. So I said I'd name the kid for the general who liberates us, so I'll name him for the general. I don't care if he is a Russki. The guy that gets us away from these squares deserves some kinda special honor.

NARRATOR. But Mac had a point. A few months later Sam Nasralla was liberated by Red Army troops. And a few months after that Sam was back in New Jersey and in the dog-house. His wife was going to have a baby. And she didn't think much of naming him Georgi Zhukov Nasralla. Sam pleaded with her.

VOICE. Look, Hon, I promised myself, see? You don't want me to go around breakin' promises, do you?

NARRATOR. In this case, she thought it was a good idea. Sam argued.

VOICE. Well, look. You've never been a P.O.W., but I can tell you it ain't fun. And what's the matter with the guy who got me outta there anyway? I coulda done a lot worse.

NARRATOR. She said maybe he should've thought of that before. And then she said, "What if Malinovsky had liberated you? I suppose we'd have to name the baby Rodion Y. Malinovsky Nasralla! And heaven only knows what that 'Y' stands for!" Sam's face got a little red.

VOICE. Yeah. Kinda long handle, all right.

NARRATOR. She pressed her point. She said, "And did it ever occur to you that you might be saved by Timoshenko? How would you like that?"

VOICE. Why? What's his first name?

NARRATOR. She snarled it. "Semyon Konstantinovitch!" Then Sam bristled.

VOICE. Well, Semyon Konstantinovitch Timoshenko didn't liberate me! Georgi Zhukov did. And in comparison with the rest, I think Georgi Zhukov is kinda cute!

NARRATOR. This week, Sam paced the floor of the Newark Presbyterian Hospital waiting for the news. The doctor came towards him.

VOICE. What is it, Doc? And how's my wife?

NARRATOR. The doctor said, "The mother's doing fine, and so's the kid. A baby girl. Your wife named her Dolores Marie."

[MUSIC: To tag . . . and fade out under]

"Side Street, America" then goes on to recite the stories of the seal, the pig, the cop, and the miner-hero. Human interest has been served.

THE WOMEN, BLESS 'EM

Most emphasis in special feature programs is placed on women's news. This consists of news not only about women but the things that are supposed to interest them—marketing, cooking, movie gossip and so on. You can quickly get the general idea by reading a few paragraphs from several examples of features carried by the radio wires of the news services:

I. GOOD EATING

It's always been a bit insulting to call a person "hard-boiled" . . . and nowadays it's insulting to call an egg that too! For the best eggs definitely aren't boiled. They're simmered . . . gently . . . over a low heat. And the delicious result after 25 minutes is a "hard-cooked" egg . . . not a "hard-boiled" one.

Fast cooking ruins eggs, according to nutritionists of the United States Department of Agriculture. Because they're a protein food, heat that's too intense makes them tough and leathery. So turn down the heat and you'll have "hard-cooked" eggs that are tasty and tender . . . worthy of the stellar role on any menu.

2. IN MOVIELAND

The script calls for Susan Hayward to become a victim of drink. To degenerate rapidly, but in prettier surroundings you couldn't imagine.

A pent-house dipsomaniac, is Susan. With her favorite cocktail one called the "stone fence."

No one knows who first concocted it, or gave it the name. But the "stone fence" plays quite a part in Miss Hayward's downfall. She doesn't fall clear down—she just skids a bit. And no wonder, after such drinks.

Script girl Dorothy Hughes has the recipe. She said a good, sturdy "stone fence" should contain a jigger of brandy, one of Cointreau (kwan-tro), three of rye, dashes of orange bitters and absinthe, and a twist of lemon peel.

The picture in which Miss Hayward is supposed to be addicted to this mixture is entitled "Smashup," with the name indicative of the feminine star's moral decay.

3. WOMEN IN THE NEWS

On a bus in England not long ago the dowager Marchioness of Reading was tapped on the shoulder by a dust man—in America, a garbage collector. She was wearing, at the time, the simple dark green uniform of the Women's Voluntary Services for Civilian Defense—which she heads.

The garbage man remarked—rather belligerently—"You're all dolled up in a uniform. But my old woman's got one, and I'll bet she's just as good as you are."

To which her ladyship replied heartily—"I'll bet she is too!"

This ought to give you a good idea of what has happened to England's class distinctions during the war.

Lady Reading is probably England's greatest woman leader. She was responsible for the wartime activities of a million and a quarter women.

4. LISTEN, LADIES

June is just around the corner. So let's talk about weddings—of rice and rings and many things. But most of all of the June bride.

I think there's something about June brides that just gets everyone misty-eyed and romantic. The lucky young lady who's going to march down the aisle to Lohengrin's strains is on a pink cloud herself. But there's more to making a wedding than meets the eye.

Weddings aren't made by the wave of a fairy godmother's wand. There are an infinite number of details—an infinite number of pains that go into making that big day a star-studded and seemingly effortless affair.

5. STARS ON THE HORIZON

Some stars consider themselves fortunate when they reach stardom quickly—by scoring overnight successes. But Phyllis Calvert, an English blond beauty, is glad she reached stardom slowly, by working her way up step by step. She started playing bit roles at Shepherd's Bush Studio in Britain. Twice she was injured so seriously that her theatrical career was almost cancelled altogether. Yet today she's one of the principal players in England's ever growing film industry.

Looking back and down from the top of the cinema ladder where she stands now, Phyllis Calvert is thankful that the climb was long and hard.

6. WOMEN TODAY

For a gal who says she never had any education whatsoever, Mildred McNaughton is doing all right for herself. She has earned a reputation for being a brilliant intellectual woman. She has made friends with some of the outstanding literary figures of our times. And she has just had her first novel published.

True, she never went to school at any time. She had governesses and tutors. And before getting down to writing, she never did anything professional. But she has travelled more in her 38 years than 10 people might travel in all their lives. For 15 years she lived in France, Italy, the Balkans, Holland, Germany, and even spent some time in Constantinople.

If it's cosmopolitan background you're looking for you'll find it in Miss McNaughton. She was born in South Africa. Her father's people were of Scottish descent and they settled there in 1840. Her mother's kin were English and she spent about half of her childhood in Shropshire with the maternal side of her family. Their name is De la Warre and in her novel, *Four Great Oaks*, Miss McNaughton gives them a role.

[Note that it's taken 200 words to give the name of the novel, publication of which was apparently the reason for this story. News should be treated as news, even when it's women's news.]

Reading those examples—which were run-of-the-mine and not specially chosen for their deplorable dullness—you can sympathize with a woman feature writer who always begins her day's work by typing out the words "Trite Tripe." To me it passeth understanding, and I'm glad to say that I personally don't know any women who would think of listening to such stuff. But the programs seem to have wide audiences and certainly vary the monotony of soap operas.

FARE FOR THE FARMER

One of the chief opportunities to improve public service by radio is for stations to better their farm programs. Many stations, as the easy way out, merely carry network programs or the special scripts supplied daily by press associations. But it's obvious that a Wisconsin dairy farmer is not going to be interested

in many of the things that are of paramount importance to a peach grower in South Carolina or to a sheep herder in Wyoming.

The press associations, to give them full credit, try their best to sectionalize farm news by a device known as "splits." At intervals throughout the day the main trunk wires of the news agencies are split apart so that Albany, for instance, can "feed" state news to New York stations, Denver to Colorado stations, etc. During these "splits," a great deal of state farm news and market data can be carried.

But the fact remains that no station can do a wholly satisfactory job for its farm listeners, if it has to depend upon outside sources for its farm news. The stations supplying the best service have organized county-by-county reports in primary listening areas and are well rewarded through the number of listeners they gather, and the consequent salability of the programs.

One other suggestion: By all means, be sure that your farm editor knows something about farming. Don't hand over the job of preparing a farm program to just any staff member who happens to be around and not busy. Charles B. Driscoll, by birth a Kansan like myself, brooded in his syndicated column one time:

Recently a New York radio news analyst told his vast audience that wheat was being piled on the ground in Kansas because there are not enough silos to hold it.

Undoubtedly this Rockefeller Center agriculturist had seen cylindrical grain storage tanks in large elevators, from car windows, and had been told that these held wheat. Somewhere he had seen a silo, and heard it called silo, but never stopped to inquire as to its uses. It looked like an elevator to him.

In a quiz contest I overheard the master of ceremonies ask for the proper word for the young of various animals. A sheep? Lamb, of course. Deer? Fawn wasn't too difficult.

Then this amazing animal husbandryman asked for the word for the young of a pig!

When the contestant became understandably confused, the wise man counted her out, and announced that a pig's baby is a shoat!

One often wonders why somebody doesn't edit these people—or are they too smart to be edited?

Driscoll should be told that these people aren't too smart to be edited. Chances are the editors are just not smart enough to do the editing.

AND "THE NATION'S CAPITAL"

Another improvement in news service for the local station would be the hiring of special correspondents in Washington. Most of the big newspapers have their special correspondents there, but very few radio stations do.

No matter how good a job is turned in by the networks and the news agencies, the individual station without a Washington correspondent will often miss the biggest local and regional stories. How did your local Congressman and your State's Senators vote on a contentious measure? What is the status of a proposed appropriation for some new improvement of vital interest to your community? Has the Department of Commerce or the Department of Agriculture any new survey material on manufacture and farming affecting your listening area? The way to find out these things is to have a special correspondent of your own in Washington with instructions to telegraph or air-mail his copy (or to make recordings and air-express them if it's decided to create a radio personality for the correspondent and if the cost of special line charges is excessive).

The cost of maintaining a Washington correspondent may be too large for most stations. But there's no reason why three or four stations in non-competitive areas could not team up to hire one man to work for all of them. The expense would thus be minimized, and in my opinion the station would profit in prestige and listener interest, in addition to the possibility of a direct sale of the special correspondent's reports.

Many have said that the average American's indifference to politics and government is a national disgrace. Perhaps radio can improve coverage at the seat of our government to a point where a real and vigorous public interest is aroused.

16. SOUND AND FURY, SIGNIFYING HEADACHES

The Dramatization of Radio News

PRESENTATION of unembellished straight news on the air, as we have seen, poses enough problems in writing, editing, timing, and delivery. But if we dramatize the news, if we add music, sound, and actors, we multiply the difficulties astronomically and we multiply the sales of aspirin, too.

The principal reason for the headaches is that newsy news is not always dramatic. A second reason is that occasionally it becomes so dramatic that to embroider it with sound and music is lily-gilding of the most flagrant sort. There are third, fourth, fifth, sixth and many other reasons, but they'll emerge as we study the technique of news dramatization and documentary programs.

No one knows exactly when the first news program was dramatized but the "March of Time," a series which captured public fancy and which has had more imitators than John Barrymore, was first produced in 1931. Some idea of the complexity of this half-hour program, which unfortunately is not always on the air, has been given by Max Wylie, one of the more literate and lucid students of radio drama, and author of the valuable textbook, *Radio Writing*. (A revised edition is to be published by Rinehart in 1947.) Wylie says that it has taken an average of 72 people to prepare and produce the "March of Time" each week. He adds that it has taken one thousand man-hours of labor, more than 33 hours for each minute of broadcast time.

These thousand hours were made up as follows: news research, writing, and rewriting, 500 hours; cast and sound crew rehearsal, 400 hours; music rehearsal, 60 hours; clerical work, 40 hours.

For several years I produced a program, "Report to the Nation," certainly not dissimilar to the "March of Time," and Wylie's figures seem somewhat low. There were times when I thought that I myself had put in a thousand man-hours of labor a week, except for the probability that the mathematicians are right and that the maximum can't rise above 168 for any individual.

DEUS EX MACHINA

The most important single person in your dramatized news script is the narrator. It is he who sets every scene, supplies the transitions when music and sound will not in themselves suffice, and generally is to radio drama what the subtitle was to the old silent movies. The fact that radio drama is necessarily one-dimensional, that it must appeal solely to the ear, calls for someone to interpret and to place the action. (Actually, of course, there can be two or more narrators. I have used the singular merely for purposes of clarity.)

To begin the study of news dramatization, let's take an old nursery rhyme. It has several variations, but one of the most familiar is this:

Simple Simon met a pieman,
Going to the fair.
Said Simple Simon to the pieman:
"Let me taste your ware."
Said the pieman to Simple Simon:
"Show me first your penny."
Said Simple Simon to the pieman:
"Indeed I have not any."

It may be objected that although this is a pleasant enough scene, with reasonably metrical dialogue, it isn't very newsworthy. We'll correct that in a moment. We'll also have to de-

cide for all time whether it's Simple Simon who is going to the fair, or whether it's the pieman. We'll be arbitrary and say that it's Simon; that the pieman has his pie stand—no, better bring it up to date and make it a hot dog concession—right at the edge of the grounds of a traveling carnival.

And to make the story usable in news dramatization, we have to go beyond the point where Simple Simon told the pieman—that is, the hot dog concessionaire—that he didn't have any money. By this time Simon has bitten into the frankfurter, the hot dog merchant is enraged, and a scuffle ensues. A crowd gathers, and we have to introduce a third character, a policeman. The cop searches Simon, finds vast rolls of bills in every pocket, totaling more than a hundred thousand dollars. It turns out that the man who has been living as a hermit and who has been known as Simple Simon, is in reality Bertram Gouger, a missing witness in the Congressional investigation into illegal war profits. And now we have a news story.

For the moment we will dispense with music and sound and concentrate on what the narrator says in introducing the scene. One possibility is this:

NARRATOR. A sequel to the Congressional investigation into illegal war profits came this week on the grounds of a traveling street carnival in Danville, Illinois. A man who had been living a hermit-like existence near that town, a man the neighbors had known as "Simple Simon," approached a hot dog stand.

But that won't do. The narrator has given away the point of the story in his first few words. True, most listeners may already know the story, may have heard it in news broadcasts or read it in the papers, but for purposes of dramatization it's best to keep suspense to the end. So we'll try it again.

NARRATOR. It's all right to be a hermit if you're not a miser, too. The failure of a man to part with less than one-millionth of his money led this week to the biggest surprise the town of Danville, Illinois, ever had. A street carnival was playing there and a man who had been living as a hermit near Danville, a man the neighbors had known as Simple Simon, approached a hot dog stand.

That's better. You've got a "teaser" lead which, theoretically at least, keeps the listener wondering what's going to happen. And you've set the scene.

NOW ADD MUSIC

But it's probably not advisable for the narrator to open the scene "cold," that is, with his voice the only sound to come over the loud-speaker. Music can create a mood suitable to dialogue and action, and can prepare the listener for what's to come. Besides, in this instance, music really belongs in the scene, because who ever heard of a street carnival that didn't have at least one off-key merry-go-round?

In writing this scene we'll assume that the previous scene in the program has ended with a ringing speech by the British prime minister and that this speech has been "tagged" (i.e., ended) with something appropriate even to a Labor Government, such as Elgar's "Pomp and Circumstance." It's necessary then to "segue" to other music. The word "segue" originally meant "it follows," a direction that the following music is to be played immediately. Through improper usage it has come to mean (to script writers) that one bit of music is to end and another is to begin, and that the transition can be slurred without an abrupt stop to the first bit of music. This may not be clear to you, but it will be to the musical conductor on the program who long since has accustomed himself to the fact that writers are seldom students of musical literature.

Well, you have decided to begin with music, but what music? Obviously nothing could be better here than "And the Merry-Go-Round Broke Down." It has the right oompah-oompah carnival note. The next thing to be decided is whether to stop the music before the narrator begins, whether to let him start talking and "fade" the music until it can no longer be heard, or whether to keep the music behind the narration and dialogue for the whole scene. Here it seems proper to keep music as a background to the scene because it would be in character. The orchestra plays more softly than usual and, in addition to that, the

control room engineer will keep down the input on the orchestra "mike" so that the music doesn't interfere with audibility of the words. But the music will be there throughout, just as it actually would be at any street fair.

So you start your scene this way:

[MUSIC: *Tag with phrase from "Pomp and Circumstance," segue to "And the Merry-Go-Round Broke Down."* Hold in clear, fade and keep in b.g. (background) throughout entire scene]

AND A PINCH OF SOUND

There are two kinds of sounds, those made by the sound engineers assigned to a broadcast and those made by the cast. To avoid confusion, I suggest that the first be labeled "SOUND" and the second labeled "AD LIB." Actually, "ad lib" calls for extemporization, but if there are certain words a writer wants spoken, he should go ahead and put them on paper. Some writers use the word "biz," an abbreviation of "business," instead of "ad lib." This is another radio misuse. On the stage or in the movies, "business" is some kind of action. Let the ingénue light a cigarette, pour herself a slug of the cold tea that's supposed to be whiskey, or go over to a table and pick up the Racing Form—any of these is "business." But "biz" in radio usually calls for sounds by the cast. Sometimes the cast is asked to work at the same time the sound engineers play a "crowd" recording. In that case, write "SOUND AND AD LIB."

As to the sound effects of things instead of persons, there's no need for the writer to worry how the sound is to be managed. Sound effects have been the subject of so many magazine feature stories that by now most people know the crinkling of cellophane in front of a microphone will create the impression of a roaring forest fire, that to swirl a little water in a small tub will make a mighty ocean. But nowadays many sound effects, if not most of them, have been recorded from actual sounds and it's no longer necessary to perform them manually. Opening and shutting a door, ringing a telephone bell, taking a telephone off the hook, or walking up steps—these are actually done in the studio, but

254 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

to shoot a machine gun or to fly an airplane, the sound engineer merely puts a needle on a recording on a turntable.

The newcomer to script-writing is apt to be a little too explicit in regard to sound. A student once handed me a script calling for "SOUND: *Night wind through poplars.*" I suppose there's some difference between a day wind and a night wind and that it sounds differently through poplars from the way it sounds through catalpas, but the sound technicians and the director have enough worries as it is. Better, just "SOUND: *Wind, rustling of trees.*"

At any rate, in our current story, we won't have much to worry about except a cash register, a scuffle or two, and some crowd noises. And those will be easy.

DIALOGUE

More latitude is permitted dramatic script writers than straight news writers in presenting spoken words. If an actual quotation is involved, it's forbidden to go beyond a person's exact words—nor should a writer quote out of context. But a slight degree of fictionalization in dialogue is permissible under two conditions. First, the dialogue should be in character. Second, it shouldn't in any way embarrass an identified person. Bad grammar, malapropisms, atrocious accents—all of these are out.

The writer must beware of speeches that are too short and too long. A common mistake for a beginner is to call for an elaborate sound pattern and then to provide only a few words of dialogue. The listener's ear is not given sufficient time to accommodate himself to the sound before the words are uttered and gone. He is understandably confused. And long speeches are just boring. But let's get on with our Simple Simon script and see how it might be developed:

[MUSIC: Tag with phrase from "Pomp and Circumstance," segue to "And the Merry-Go-Round Broke Down." Hold in clear, fade and keep in b.g. throughout entire scene]

NARRATOR. It's all right to be a hermit if you're not a miser, too. The failure of a man to part with less than one-millionth of his money

led this week to the biggest surprise the town of Danville, Illinois, ever had. (AD LIB: *Sneak in low crowd murmur*) A street carnival was playing there and a man who had been living as a hermit near Danville, a man the neighbors had known as Simple Simon, approached a hot dog stand.

HOT DOG MAN. They're hot. They're red hot. Get 'em while they're hot. Four for you. Right. That's forty cents.

[SOUND: *Ring of cash register*]

H.D.M. Okay. Who's next? How about you?

SIMON. I'll take one.

H.D.M. Right. There's the mustard. (*To crowd*) They're hot. Red hot. Get 'em while they're hot. Who's next? (*Suddenly, to SIMON*)

Hey, you. You, there with the beard. That's a dime, brother.

SIMON (*obviously still eating*). Sure. Sure. Well, this is too bad.

H.D.M. Whatsa matter?

SIMON. I seem to have left all my money in my other trousers. Yes, I remember now. I . . .

H.D.M. Oh, yeah? Well, look again.

SIMON. I just don't have any money with me. I'll go home and get it and pay you later.

H.D.M. No credit here. Quit stalling. Gimme a dime or I'll take it outta your hide.

SIMON. You and who else?

H.D.M. I'll show you who else.

[SOUND AND AD LIB: *Scuffle, some good body blows and grunts.*

Crowd noise increases, cries of "fight," "what's the trouble," etc.]

VOICE. Ya better break it up. Here comes a cop.

[SOUND AND AD LIB: *Scuffling continues, more crowd noise*]

COP. Hey, what's going on around here? Break it up, you two. (*Obviously exerting himself*) I said break it up and I mean it. There.

Now we'll take a little trip to the station house.

[SOUND: *Out*]

[MUSIC: *Segue to "Prisoner's Song" and sharply out*]

NARRATOR. The man known as Simon and the hot dog merchant were carted off in a Black Maria. At the police station Simon was searched, and a policeman and the desk sergeant received the shock of their lives.

COP. Sarge! This guy has more than a hundred thousand dollars!

Look! Here it all is. He had bills stuck in every pocket.

SERGEANT. Where'd you get all that dough?

SIMON (*sullenly*). It's mine and none of your business.

256 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

SERGEANT. We'll see about that. (*To himself*) A hundred grand.

Whew. (*To cop*) Find anything else, Mike?

COP. Not much. He said his name was Simon but I found an auto license in his pocket made out to—lemme see—to a guy named G-O-U-G-E-R. Looks like Gouger. Bertram Gouger.

SERGEANT (*excitedly*). Bertram Gouger! Did you say Bertram Gouger?

COP. Yeah. Who's that?

[SOUND: *Slight scuffle*]

COP. Hey, watch him!

SERGEANT. None of that, fella. You can't get away from here that easy.—Not unless you want to get conked.

COP. Say, who *is* this guy Gouger anyway?

SERGEANT. Don't you ever listen to the radio? Can't you read? Why, he's the guy they've been looking for in Washington in that war profits case. Holy smoke, Mike—you've made yourself an arrest!

NARRATOR. And it *did* turn out to be the long missing witness that a Congressional Committee has cited for contempt. Tonight Gouger is on his way back to testify, and faces a long jail sentence—all because he wouldn't pay a dime, the tenth part of a dollar, a millionth part of a hundred thousand bucks.

[MUSIC: *Tag with phrase from "Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?"*]

HOME TO IOWAY

The device of a fictitious story was adopted merely to show the format of script-writing and the fusing together of music, sound, and dialogue. Now we will look at some actual broadcasts. First two excerpts from the "March of Time" of March 2, 1939, reproduced with the permission of *Time*, Inc., the copyright owner. The first is an effective example of the technique of making a fairly routine political story live and breathe. The voices of Harry Hopkins and the others, of course, were simulated. "Van" is Cornelius Westbrook Van Voorhis, the familiar voice of "Time Marches On." You will notice that the script centers the names of the people in the cast rather than putting them at the left of the page. Both formats are commonly used; the director usually decides which he prefers.

VAN

This week with the political temper of the U. S. turning slowly but surely conservative, Franklin Roosevelt's lieutenants hastily set about political fence-mending in his absence. Following up the President's Miami speech of reassurance to business is an announcement by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau that business will be plagued with no new taxes. And this week on a station platform at Grinnell, Iowa—
[REGISTER CHEERS: *Hurray for Harry, our Harry, welcome home Harry, hooray!*]

HOPKINS

[*Cheers out*] Well, folks, it sure is heart-warming to see all your familiar faces again—this welcome touches me—I'm happy to be back in Iowa—er, Ioway—er—it's nice to be home!

[*Cheers & laughter*]

[*Into brass band & singing of "Ioway—That's Where the Tall Corn Grows, etc."*]

VAN

Number One political fence builder and rumored 1940 Presidential choice of Franklin Roosevelt this week is Harry Hopkins. This week Grinnell, Iowa, greets its favorite prodigal son, newly appointed Secretary of Commerce—and off for his baptism of fire as a politician is Hopeful Harry. First stop: a basketball game at Grinnell College. (*Gym effects & ball bouncing*) Political objective—the local boy touch.

HOPKINS

To you, Mr. Henderson, as captain of the basketball team, it gives me great pleasure to present this fine—well. this blanket.

CAPT.

Thank you, Mr. Hopkins.

HOPKINS

I hope you get in there and fight. When I played on this team they used to call me Dirty Hopkins. (*Little laughs around*) Of course, I was very ambitious as a boy.

CHEER LEADER

All right, fellas, how about it—a short cheer for Harry Hopkins!

CHEER

[*By mob*] Gri-nell! Gri-nell! Gri-nell!

Ra-Ra-Ra-Ra-Ra-Ra-Ra-Ra-

Hopkins—Hopkins—HOPKINS!!

[*Raaaaay into music*]

VAN

Time—next morning; place—Grinnell's Main Street; political objective—the homespun touch.

HOPKINS

Good morning—I seem to have forgotten to pack—I mean I was wondering if you could rent me a dress suit?

CLERK

Why, certainly. We just fill out the card here—for the deposit you know—name?

HOPKINS

Hopkins—Harry Hopkins.

CLERK

Harry Hop—Harry Hopkins!

HOPKINS

Uh—yes.

CLERK

[Calling] Hey, Pop—it's Mr. Hopkins.

HOPKINS

Well—uh—

CLERK

This is my father, Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins wants a dress suit.

HOPKINS

Well—uh—

POP

[Talking at same time] Why, certainly, Mr. Hopkins.

HOPKINS

Well, now the deposit—

POP

You just let us come to see you in that big house in Washington after 1940, Mr. Hopkins, that's deposit enough for us.

VAN

That night in clothes whose carelessness rivals Abe Lincoln's, Harry Hopkins faces the first citizens of Iowa, faces a microphone as well; for word has gone out that this is to be no run-of-the-mill cabinet member's speech but an important pronouncement of government policy. Solemnly, deliberately, Harry Hopkins begins to speak:

HOPKINS

I am glad to be back in Iowa tonight. I was born and raised here. My father and mother spent their lives here. (*Fade*) I realize full well that whatever I do and think is profoundly influenced . . .

VAN

With such homespun sentences begins Harry Hopkins. Then, his tone changing, he hammers home three main points. Point Number One, on Labor:

HOPKINS

The "divide and rule" philosophy has not worked out in the relations between business and labor in this country. Business is finding it increasingly difficult to progress in the face of a divided labor front. Government is doing what it can to end that division.

VAN

Point Number Two, on Business:

HOPKINS

Lack of business confidence is a hard stubborn fact. The Administration in an effort to face that fact has shifted the emphasis from reform to recovery. I believe any Federal taxes which freeze the necessary flow of capital should be amended. Businessmen have to make money to hire workers.

VAN

Point Number Three, on Harry Hopkins:

HOPKINS

This country has treated me very kindly—it gave me the security of a happy and contented home in childhood—it gave me a reasonably good education—in adult life, it has given me an opportunity to earn a living—it has given me the opportunity to have a host of friends. I have every reason and desire to continue serving that country well.
[Music up & down]

DEATH ON TRIP SIX

And now, from the same broadcast, here is the way the "March of Time" tells a more dramatic story, again with all voices simulated. One word of explanation. A "filter" is used to cut both highs and lows out of a voice. In other words, the resulting speech sounds as though it were coming over a telephone or over a short wave broadcasting channel.

VAN

Oakland, California. The Special Sessions Room of Oakland's new Alameda County Courthouse.

GLASS

Now then, Captain Stead, you were the pilot on Trip Six from Medford, Oregon, on November 29 last?

STEAD

I was, yes, sir.

GLASS

And it was just after midnight when you took off from Medford?

STEAD

Yes, sir. If I may refer to the log, I stopped over at Medford for nearly half an hour, (*fade*) because of weather conditions.

VAN

[*Music simultaneous*] To a four-man Air Safety Bureau Committee, out to find the reasons why a United Air Line Douglas Transport crashed in the pounding surf of the Pacific Ocean last November, Captain Charles Stead tells his story, a story taken, minute by minute, from the log of the ill-starred Trip Six to Oakland, California.

[*Music up & down*]

VOICE I

[*Filter*] Elko calling Stead. Trip Six not heard . . . (*fade*) Elko calling . . . etc.

VOICE II

[*Over fade*] [*Filter*] Sacramento calling Stead. Trip Six not heard. (*Fade*) Sacramento calling . . . etc.

VOICE III

[*Over fade*] [*Filter*] Portland calling Trip Six. Trip Six not heard. (*Fade*) (*Repeat under VAN*) Portland calling . . . etc.

VAN

[*Over fade*] It is just before three o'clock, on the morning of November 29. From all up and down the Pacific Coast come dispatchers' queries for Trip Six, off its radio range and silent for more than an hour.

PHIL

[*Filter*] Oakland calling Stead. Trip Six not heard. Trip Six not heard. Trip Six not heard . . .

STEAD

[*Under scene, plane hum as heard over short wave*] [FILTER: Buzzes & static] Stead, Trip Six—to Oakland. Stead to Oakland.

PHIL

This is Oakland. We've been missing your signals. Are you in trouble?

STEAD

I lost my radio range. There has been interference on my radio range.

PHIL

How are you?

STEAD

Okay, I think. Can you tell me where the north leg of the Fresno radio range intercepts the northeast leg of the Oakland range?

PHIL

Oakland to Trip Six. One minute. (*Pause*) Oakland to Trip Six. The range interception is in the vicinity of Fairfield—

STEAD

Stead, Trip Six to Oakland. Okay now.

PHIL

Are you on the beam now?

STEAD

Yes—on the northeast leg of the Oakland range. Should be in in fifteen minutes.

PHIL

Okay, Trip Six. [*Plane hum up & down*]

VAN

[*Music simultaneous*] The northeast leg of the Oakland radio range would lead Trip Six to Oakland in fifteen minutes. But Pilot Charles Stead is on the northwest leg, headed out to sea.

[*Music up & down*]

STEAD

[*Filter*] Trip Six to Oakland . . . Stead, Trip Six to Oakland. There is something wrong with this course.

PHIL

Oakland to Trip Six. Are you on your radio range?

STEAD

There must be something wrong with the range. Don't know exactly where I am.

PHIL

Take a bearing on the Oakland Range with your loop.

STEAD

Just a minute. (*Pause*) Stead, Trip Six to Oakland. I've got it.

PHIL

What's your orientation?

STEAD

I'm west of Oakland on northwest leg of Oakland range. I must be fifty minutes out to sea. I have gas for one hour. What is best manifold pressure to conserve it?

PHIL

Decrease revolutions per minute to 1700. Increase the pressure with your throttle. You've got to get about 22 inches on your manifold pressure.

STEAD

Trip Six to Oakland. (*Pause*) Okay. I've got it throttled down. I think I'll be okay.

PHIL

Okay, Trip Six. [*Plane hum up & down*]

VAN

[*Music simultaneous*] Sixty gallons of gas left in the tanks of Trip Six. Enough to keep aloft only sixty minutes. For at Medford, four hours back, despite adverse weather conditions, Trip Six had not been re-fueled.

[*Music up & down*]

VAN

Half-an-hour later, (*inside plane under*) in the pilot's cabin of Trip Six, First Officer Lloyd Jones glances below, turns to Captain Stead:

JONES

Stead—look down—see?

STEAD

Maybe that will give Oakland a better line on us. (*Click*) Stead, Trip Six, to Oakland. We are still out over the water.

PHIL

[*Filter*] Oakland to Trip Six. Your signals are getting stronger all the time. Will you give us another gas check?

STEAD

Stead, Trip Six. We are practically out of gas.

PHIL

Can you see any lights?

STEAD

Can now see a light straight ahead of me at compass course 65 degrees.

PHIL

The light is Point Reyes light. Point Reyes has peninsula, semi-circular. Do not land on the beach. Land on level ground above, on shore side of light.

STEAD

Landing lights, Jonesy.

JONES

Okay.

STEAD

Stead, Trip Six. Our lights are on and we will land.

PHIL

Oakland, Trip Six. If you land on water, wheels up. If you land on ground, wheels down.

STEAD

Ready, Jonesy?

JONES

Any time.

STEAD

Stead, Trip Six, ready to land now. We are over water, right on the shore. Jonesy, have they all got their belts on?

JONES

They're on okay—

PHIL

Oakland to Stead. Follow the shore line. Trip Six not heard.

STEAD

Stead, Trip Six. The shore looks too rough for landing. Okay, Jonesy. Let's go. (*Plane motor descending*) Wheels up—

JONES

We're at one hundred and twenty.

STEAD

Right.

PHIL

Oakland to Trip Six. Trip Six not heard.

JONES

Ninety.

STEAD

Right.

PHIL

Oakland to Trip Six. Trip Six not—

JONES

Forty.

STEAD

Right.

JONES

Twenty.

STEAD

Right.

PHIL

Oakland to Stead. Trip Six not— (*Plane lands with a splat & a splash on water*) . . . to Stead. Trip Six not heard. (*Wave up &*

down) (*Music sneak*) Trip Six not heard. Trip Six not heard—
[*Music up & down*]

VAN

That night, as all the world knows, co-pilot, stewardess, and three of the four passengers of United's Trip Six were dashed to death by the Pacific's surf against the rocky shore of Point Reyes; only its captain and one passenger were able to struggle to the bluff and safety in the dawn. This week, following an exhaustive study, minute by minute, of the log of the ill-starred Trip Six, made public is the result of the Air Safety Board's investigation:

INVESTIGATOR

Responsibility for the accident must be placed on the consistently bad judgment of the first pilot, Captain Charles B. Stead, and two Oakland dispatchers, Thomas Van Sceiver and Philip Showalter; for failure to give proper consideration to fuel requirements; for continuing to fly west for an excessive period of time; for failure to conserve fuel in accordance with sound practice; for failure to demonstrate reasonable initiative and judgment in the presence of obvious emergency. Also under blame is the inadequacy of procedures established by United Air Lines western division for such conditions of emergency. It is recommended that airline competency ratings of the pilot and both dispatchers be permanently revoked.

VAN

And this week, says Charles B. Stead:

STEAD

When a man makes a terrible mistake like mine, they should fix it so he can't make one like it again. That's what they've done. I've got no complaints.

VAN

Time marches on!

THE CORN IS GREEN

You will see that as late as 1939 the "March of Time" normally didn't use people who actually had participated in events. That refinement, adding authenticity to dramatic news broadcasts, came later. But the program known as "We the People" was developing the technique of interspersing real characters among actors. Max Wylie has selected as one of the best broadcasts of 1938-39 the exciting story of an amnesia victim. On

January 17, 1939, the circumstances were dramatized and the man then known only as "Mr. X" spoke on the program. Four weeks later came the sequel, with powerful dramatic impact. There may be some who will declare this an example of "corn," that it is mawkish and is aimed too directly at the emotions. I disagree. Corn is not only useful in the human diet, in stock-feeding, the distillation of bourbon and a thousand ways, but with quotation marks around it, "corn" is a godsend to radio entertainment. I'm for it and so, with the permission of the copyright owner, Young & Rubicam, let's see some tall corn grow!

FIRST INSTALLMENT: JANUARY 17

Here is the story of Mr. X, the narrator being Gabriel Heatter:

HEATTER. On the afternoon of June 25, 1931 . . . to a hospital in Jackson, Mississippi . . . police brought a well-dressed man who had collapsed on a city street. For weeks he lay in a coma . . . hovering between life and death. Then one morning the patient regained consciousness, and Dr. Hunt of the hospital staff stood at his bedside . . . happy to see his patient coming back to life. . . .

DOCTOR (cheerful). Well . . . you're feeling better this morning, aren't you!

MAN (weakly). Yes . . . doctor.

DOCTOR. That's fine. . . . Well, now, the first thing I'd like to know is your name. You see, there was no identification in your clothes. We'd like to get in touch with your relatives. Let them know you're all right.

MAN. My name? Why, yes . . . it's . . . er . . . (*disturbed*) Why . . . I . . . I . . .

DOCTOR. What is it? Is there something wrong?

MAN (struggling). Doctor . . . that's funny . . . I . . . I can't seem to remember. But . . . I know where I live. My address is . . . it's . . .

DOCTOR. Yes?

MAN (it hits him). Doctor . . . I can't remember that either.

DOCTOR (concerned). There, there, now take it easy. You're . . . you're sure you can't remember?

MAN (terrified). No . . . doctor. I can't remember. But I must

know my name! My name is . . . it's . . . it's . . . No, doctor, I can't remember! I can't remember anything!

HEATTER. For days the doctors in that hospital worked to help that man recall something about his former life. He couldn't remember a thing. Somewhere . . . somehow the link that bound him to the past had snapped. The days became weeks, and the weeks became years. Every agency, every possible source of information was exhausted . . . without discovering a single clue. The man became known as Mr. X. And tonight that man is here beside me. And being here means so much to him . . . his heart is so full of emotion . . . it may be difficult for him to speak to you. For he comes here with a heartbreaking appeal for help. "We the People" presents the man known as Mr. X.

MR. X. Today, I live at the Mississippi State Hospital in Jackson. Doctors there say I am about seventy years old. Physically I have changed little since I was found in 1931. I am almost bald, and what hair I have is gray. But my eyebrows are very heavy and black. My eyes are brown and I wear glasses. I am 5 feet 7 inches tall and weigh 145 pounds. My doctor believes I was well educated. From the very first day I have chosen books from the hospital library that would only be interesting to a well-read man. And I have read every newspaper and magazine I could, hoping to find some clue to my past. It is also evident that the care of flowers was either my profession or a hobby, because I can identify unusual plants by their botanical names. And I know a lot about making them grow. Also, I remember the rules of complicated card games like bridge, and I am sure I was once familiar with financial statements. Gradually I have recalled several places where I have been . . . but I do not know when or with whom. I remember best Pensacola, Florida. I remember a man there who took me to the Osceola Club. He used to have a special brand of cigars, and I used to joke with him about it. My doctors have checked my description of Pensacola and have decided I was there about 30 years ago. I remember distinctly playing cards with some friends . . . a druggist and his wife . . . but I cannot recall their names. The doctors at the Mississippi State Hospital have done everything in their power to help me discover who I am. . . . Now, after eight years, it seems impossible, hopeless. I will be forever grateful to "We the People" for giving me this last chance. I am an old man. There are only a few years left for me on this earth. Somehow . . . I must find out who I am, where I came from, whether I have

loved ones who have given me up for dead. I can only pray with all my heart that someone listening in tonight will recognize something I have said about myself . . . or my voice. I do not want to die nameless and alone. . . .

HEATTER. Ladies and gentlemen . . . if you have any clue to the identity of Mr. X . . . no matter how insignificant it may seem . . . "We the People" asks that you let us know at once . . . please.

SECOND INSTALLMENT: FEBRUARY 14

HEATTER. Four weeks ago tonight a man seventy years old stood before this microphone and made a dramatic appeal for help. For that man did not know his own name. Nor who he was. For eight heartbreaking, agonizing years he had lived in the Mississippi State Hospital. Unless he could find out who he was he would die there . . . friendless, alone, known only as Mr. X. Then he found help . . . help from "We the People." Telegrams, letters, telephone calls poured in from every part of America . . . a tidal wave of human sympathy, eager to help. Tonight he is no longer Mr. X. Tonight he is William Henry Lawrence of Birmingham, Alabama. And he is waiting at this minute in a radio studio in Birmingham. He and his sister, Mrs. J. P. Haley, who identified him. First . . . Mrs. Haley, who will tell you what happened when the family of Will Lawrence first realized their brother had joined the world of missing men. All right, Birmingham. [*Switchover*]

MRS. HALEY. My brother, Will, was a single man, a traveling insurance salesman. He was often away from home for months at a time. On May 24, 1931, he left to go on one of his trips. During the first few months we got several letters. The last one was postmarked Jackson, Mississippi. In it Will said he was leaving Jackson. He did not say where he was going. We did not hear from him again. At first we didn't worry, because Will had always been a poor letter writer. But as months passed without a word, our alarm grew. We notified police and missing persons bureaus. Every possible agency joined in the search. It was useless. Will had apparently vanished from the face of the earth. Month after month we prayed, hoped we would hear something, anything that would give us a clue. But after a year and a half, we had to admit what seemed to be the terrible truth. Will was dead. Eight years passed. Time helped to soften our grief . . . a little. Then one day last

week a neighbor telephoned. She said she had heard a Mr. X on this program, "We the People." Mr. X had said he was from Jackson, Mississippi, where Will was last heard from. The next day my son rushed into our house. He had pictures of Mr. X out of *Time Magazine* and the Memphis *Commercial Appeal*. I looked at the pictures, and all the hope that had died in me years ago came surging back. The face in those pictures was not the face I remembered. . . . It was a face grown sad with grief and despair. But I knew Mr. X was my brother Will. My brother Ben and I hurried to the hospital in Jackson. As long as I live I shall never forget the hopes and fear that raced through my heart as we waited in the anteroom, praying we weren't wrong. Finally Dr. Donaldson said, "This is Mr. X." It was Will. Ben and I rushed to him to take him in our arms. We were both crying with happiness. But Will just stood there. He did not know us. We showed him pictures of the family. We talked of old days. We could see him trying desperately to think back. It was useless. Ben and I were stunned. We could not stand the tragic suffering written on the face of our brother. Then Dr. Donaldson told us there was one last chance. We were a link connecting Will to the past. Under the influence of a mild drug, that link might be strengthened. We went to Will's room. Dr. Donaldson administered the drug . . . sodium amytol. We sat there waiting. Suddenly I saw Will turn his head and look at me. Recognition dawned on his face. He knew me. My happiness was so deep I could not speak. And as long as I live . . . I will never forget the look on my brother Ben's face as he clasped the hand of the brother we had loved and mourned as dead. My brother Will, the man you knew as Mr. X, is here with me . . . waiting anxiously to speak to you. All right, Will.

WILL [MR. X]. Four weeks ago when I spoke on "We the People," I was a lonely unhappy old man. My life stretched ahead of me, a long, weary road. And I believed that broadcast was my last chance to find out who I was. Tonight my happiness is complete. I am back with my loved ones, and what is left of my life I shall spend rich in their love.

Tonight, from the bottom of my heart, I want to thank the thousands of people who tried to help me. I want every one of you to know your letters were each and every one a thread of hope. I am eternally grateful. I remember now that fateful morning of May 24, 1931, when I left Birmingham to go to Jackson. I remember writing from Jackson, Mississippi . . . I remember writ-

ing a letter to my nephew and going out of the hotel on an errand. I had money in my pocket. But when or how I lost my memory I cannot remember.

The doctors believe I was drugged and robbed. But one day stands out in my memory, February 7, 1939, when suddenly a dark cloud lifted from my mind, and I saw my brother and sister bending over me. Suddenly . . . I knew who I was. Sixty-two years of my life came rushing back to me. The memories of my childhood, my family, and my friends.

It seems strange that I had to travel 1,000 miles to ask help . . . when all those years, my family lived less than 100 miles away. If it were not for "We the People," I would still be in the Mississippi State Hospital . . . a nameless, lonely old man . . . an old man denied even his memories. Instead, the time that is left to me on this earth is filled with the promise of happiness. There are no words to tell what is in my heart . . . but as long as I live . . . I will remember in my prayers . . . all those who helped me in my time of need.

THE SEVAREID SAGA

There was obviously one step further to be taken in connection with the stories of individual exploits. That was to have the participants themselves act as their own narrators throughout dramatizations with actors. That couldn't always be done because among the many defects of the American school system is the fact that practically no voice training is given. Even a well-educated man has difficulty in reading aloud, has even more difficulty reading into a microphone, and is utterly unaware of dramatic values. He doesn't know what words to stress and doesn't know when a pause is more effective than a hundred words. It must be admitted, however, that these deficiencies didn't seem to interfere with the display of bravery in battle. A Congressional Medal of Honor winner might stutter through a fifty-word speech, but there was no hesitation in manner or action when he wiped out an enemy machine-gun nest.

A program in which we frequently made use of non-actors as narrators was "Dateline," a series of eye-witness stories broadcast throughout most of the war. Sponsored at various times by

Philco and Armour, these programs were written by Margaret Miller, the dedicatee of this book. One of the best stories was that told in person by Correspondent Eric Sevareid, who had been forced to bail out in a Burmese jungle. His story was told in two separate programs, one produced on November 19, 1943; the second, a week later. Both scripts are copyrighted, 1943, by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., and are now reproduced by permission.

PART ONE

ANNOUNCER. Dateline . . . Burma!

[ORCHESTRA: *Theme . . . in and fade out behind*]

ANNOUNCER. Tonight, we present another in a series of radio programs, "Dateline." Each week at this time we will dramatize for you a firsthand account from the war's most famous correspondents. Tonight's Dateline is "Burma"—to be presented in two parts. Eric Sevareid of CBS World News is here to tell for the first time the full account of his experiences during a month in the Burmese jungle surrounded by head hunters. Although the bare details of this adventure were released on August 30th, it has taken until tonight—two months and three weeks later—to clear the entire story through censorship. And now . . .

[ORCHESTRA: *Roll of tympani*]

ANNOUNCER. Dateline . . . Burma!

[ORCHESTRA: *Jungle accent*]

ANNOUNCER. With Eric Sevareid in person.

[SOUND: *Sneak in plane motor under*]

SEVAREID. Our plane was full to capacity when we took off on the bright morning of August 2nd. I knew none of the passengers except the two I was traveling with—John Davies, the second secretary of our Embassy in Chungking, and Captain Duncan Lee. I had just met on the take-off William Stanton of the Office of Economic Warfare. There were two Chinese Colonels in our party, and the rest of the group were United States Army personnel. We had put on our parachutes at once with the usual bad jokes about sending them back if they failed to work. We had been flying for an hour over the mountainous jungles of India, and I was deep in notes for an article on the difficulties of this particular supply route when (SOUND: *Engines sputter, and one goes out*) a corporal came climbing over the baggage, and in a tone of pleasurable excitement shouted in my ear.

CORPORAL. Guess what, Mr. Sevareid . . . we're only on one motor now. Left one's cut out completely. Kind of exciting, huh?

SEVAREID (*preoccupied*). Yeah . . . (*double-take*) What!

CORPORAL. Yeah, just one motor!

SEVAREID. I tried not to think about it, and went on scribbling notes. Fifteen minutes later, one of the crew ripped open the door, and the shout came back to us.

VOICE. All passenger baggage out! All passenger baggage out!

AD LIB (*shouts*). But that's impossible! I can't throw away my baggage. What's the big idea . . . how'll I ever replace this stuff? (*fading under*)

SEVAREID. We watched Sergeant Ned Miller, an old-time Army man, shove suitcases and barracks bags out the doorway. And then suddenly I saw the crew up front running out and jerking themselves into their chutes.

VOICE. We can't stick with this baby any longer.

VOICE 2. We're gonna have to bail out!

VOICE 3. Get ready to jump, back there!

DAVIES. Where are we?

VOICE. We're not sure, Mr. Davies.

DAVIES. Well, are we over Jap territory or not?

VOICE 2. Sorry. Don't know, Mr. Davies.

[AD LIB: *Keep ad lib excitement going behind all this*]

SEVAREID. There was no organization at all, and everything was confusion. There was a jam at the doorway. Everyone hesitated. Then John Davies with a curious grin on his face hopped out and was whisked away. I said to myself, "Good-bye, John." I never expected to see him again. And he was a man I liked. John had broken the ice. A few more went over. Then I jumped, like the others for the first time in my life. (AD LIB: *Out*) I can't tell you what I was thinking because I wasn't thinking anything in particular. The plane had started to turn over on its side, the door side down, obviously going into a spin. So I just went, headfirst. (SOUND: *Fade out*) I closed my eyes. There was a terrific rush of wind over my body.

[MUSIC: *Falling music . . . in . . . then behind*]

SEVAREID. I seemed to know what I was doing and waited a second before pulling the ring, with both hands. I was jerked upright with a terrible jerk, and I said aloud with great surprise: "My God, I'm going to live." I opened my eyes, and everything was silent. I saw a river and a native village. Almost directly below

me a terrifying geyser of orange flame was spurting out from the mountainside where the plane had just crashed. I could see three chutes, boys who had jumped even later than I, and one was floating rapidly toward the flames. I looked away and said a short, concise prayer . . . I was drifting toward the wreck blowing backwards and I struggled to turn myself around. I had to avoid landing in those flames. I tugged frantically. But it wouldn't work, and I was rushing headlong at the earth. I was tense now, waiting for the smash . . . hoping that when I hit I could somehow run . . . somehow escape the flames.

[MUSIC: *Up with a downward rush . . . then bump*]

SEVAREID. And then I was rolling over and over through a thick tangle of brush. When I came to a stop I almost laughed with the realization that I was quite unhurt. But that feeling didn't last very long.

[MUSIC: *Up, bright . . . then segue to foreboding, ominous jungle stuff and keep behind*]

SEVAREID. I jumped to my feet and struggled desperately to get out of my parachute harness. There was, of course, no hurry, but panic was quickly possessing me. I could see no more than 10 feet ahead in the incredibly thick underbrush. I was already soaking wet and felt the buzzing and stabbing of jungle insects. In my panic I began crashing through the brush in the direction of the wreck, trying to shout to the others between impulses of retching. Those were the worst moments of my thirty years. I had no idea of my whereabouts, whether India, China, or Burma. No idea if we were in Jap territory or not. No idea if the natives were friendly or hostile. No food. No clothes but those I stood up in. And I was armed only with a pen knife. Hysterical thoughts were crowding to the top of my mind. How would I live? Berries? I could see some. Would I die of insect bites? Already blood was streaming down my pants from leeches. Could I make my way out alone? I thought of a boy from my home state, a boy named Haugland, who lived forty days in the New Guinea jungles. If he could, I could. No. I couldn't. I knew I couldn't.

[MUSIC: *Fade out under*]

MILLER (*way off mike . . . shouting*). Hello! Hello, there! Hello! Anybody around?

SEVAREID. I wasn't alone. Maybe there was a chance. A minute later I joined Sergeant Miller and a kid named Signor. And then there was another call.

OSWALT (*off mike*). Hey! Hey, you guys. Come here, will you? It's me, Oswalt. I need some help.

SEVAREID. Oswalt was the plane radio operator who stuck to his microphone until the last possible second, giving our position. When we reached him, he was sitting on the ground holding his leg. His ankle was already swollen and red.

OSWALT. Damn it, the biggest man in the outfit and I get hurt.

SEVAREID. He weighed two hundred and ten pounds, and he hit a stony ridge when he fell. I cut off a piece of parachute silk I'd brought with me and tied it around his ankle. (*SOUND: Movement in bushes*) And then we heard something moving in the bushes.

[*SOUND: Getting closer*]

MILLER (*tense*). Hey, hold it!

SIGNOR. What's that?

SEVAREID. We stood wondering what might be coming at us, and then we saw him, half-dragging his body along, half-crawling.

MILLER. It's Neveu!

SIGNOR. He's hurt!

MILLER. Here, let me give you a hand.

NEVEU (*groans*).

OSWALT. What's the trouble?

NEVEU. I don't know. A rib, I guess—nothing serious.

OSWALT. That's tough. One hurt guy's enough.

SEVAREID. He sat down by a tree. He was Flight Officer Harry Neveu, the pilot of our plane.

NEVEU. This is terrible—you guys having to jump into this mess. I'm sorry—awfully sorry.

OSWALT. Forget it, Neveu. You couldn't help it.

MILLER. I don't like to rush you guys. After all, we ain't exactly pressed for time. But don't you think we ought to start doin' something?

OSWALT. Have you got any ideas, sergeant?

MILLER. Yeah, I think we ought to get up to the wreck.

[*MUSIC: Bridge*]

SEVAREID. We found the plane a smoking mess. The metal was too hot to poke around. But we saw no one. (*SOUND: Sneak in plane motor behind*) Then we just sat there staring and wondering what to do next. We must have sat there an hour.

[*SOUND: Plane motor up*]

SIGNOR. Hey, listen! That's a plane!

274 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

MILLER. Made in Japan, I'll bet.

SIGNOR. Yeah, that's what I was thinkin'.

OSWALT. We'd better duck for cover!

NEVEU. C'mon, Signor. Can you give me a hand?

MILLER (*fading off*). Here's a good spot.

SIGNOR. Wait a minute. I don't think that *is* a Jap plane.

MILLER (*off mike*). Whaddaya wantta do, chum?—Flag it down and identify it?

OSWALT. Hurry up, Signor.

SIGNOR. But listen to it. It's one of ours!

NEVEU. Come on. Come on.

SIGNOR. Look! See what I told you? See those two motors and the white star? It's a D.C.-3.

NEVEU. My God, he's right!

OSWALT. It's ours! It's ours, and they've spotted us!

[SOUND: *In strong . . . then fade*]

SEVAREID. They parachuted two packs to us in the brush. One was an emergency pack with two Springfield rifles, jungle knives, blankets, and food. The other chute didn't quite open. But from its yellow color we knew it contained radio equipment. We were hunting for it when we heard natives yelling behind us.

[MUSIC: *In behind*]

[SOUND: *Record of natives yelling*]

[AD LIB: *Native background with record*]

SEVAREID. They came over the rise, carrying spears and knives, and were dressed only in a wide leather belt and kind of G-string. They were middle-sized muscular men with tattooed arms and chin. The handles of their knives were notched—one notch for each head taken. These natives were head hunters. I took a firmer grip on my jungle knife and waited, whispering to Neveu not to reach for his gun nor show any sign of hostility or fear. For some strange reason, the visitors stuck their spears in the ground and came up smiling and offering us food and drink. By signs I got a dozen of them to hunt for the missing chute bag. They found it quickly.

[MUSIC: *Out*]

[AD LIB: *Continues in b.g.*]

[SOUND: *Record out*]

NEVEU. Looks like the transmission apparatus is broken, but the receiver seems okay.

MILLER. This is good. Signal panels. That's what these long strips of cloth are. And here's a code book on how to use 'em. We'd better signal for food and medicine.

NEVEU. Hey, look here! Here's a message . . . "Remain near wreckage until rescue party reaches you. You are safe from enemy action there. Give some sign of life to searching aircraft by building fire or displaying unusual signs by parachute panels. Further provisions coming by air tomorrow."

SEVAREID. We were no longer lost. But we still had the job of getting everyone to the village, a mile away, and a lot of our group were still sweating up the hill. By late afternoon we had reached the outskirts of the native huts. A few of our group were already there. And when they saw us coming, they ran to meet us.

VOICE (*Off mike . . . shouting*). Come right in . . . the chicken and eggs are fine. We're in the town hall.

[MUSIC: *Sneak in music behind*]

[SOUND: *Plane coming over*]

SEVAREID. Some minutes later we saw our rescue plane coming over again and most of us were running over the hillside retrieving bales of food and trying to keep the natives from running off with the parachute cloth, for which they fought one another with everything except, fortunately, their knives. Then for some reason, the plane circled and was coming back. I watched three bales come out and three chutes open. I was too tired to move until the bales grew legs and turned into men. I couldn't have been more astonished. It was incredible that men would, of their own free will, come to us so far out in the wilderness. They were floating down the hillside, and I ran blindly after them—blindly I know, because for the first time in the whole catastrophe there were tears in my eyes. I came panting and sliding up to the first man, who was calmly unwrapping protective bandage from his knees. He smiled and put out his hand.

FLICKINGER. Hello, I'm Colonel Flickinger. I'm a doctor. We saw your panel saying you needed medical help.

SEVAREID. It was just unbelievable. My throat was stuck and I could scarcely get out a word. Flickinger and his aides had not received orders to jump. In fact, General Alexander, back at the base, was opposed to their doing so unless our medical needs were very serious. We didn't know ourselves how serious they were. But these men who could have been back at an airbase that night eating well-cooked food, maybe playing a hand of poker, and then sleeping in

comfortable bunks, had jumped down to us anyway. And at that moment they didn't know whether they'd ever get out or not. Gallant is a precious word but gallant is the word for what they did.

[MUSIC: *To tag*]

PART TWO

[MUSIC: *In . . . and behind*]

SEVAREID. Twenty-one of us had bailed out of our plane when the motors failed over the Burmese jungle. Most of us were together now. Head hunters had found us and taken us to their village. But John Davies of the American Embassy in Chungking and a few others were still missing. We were worried about them. And we were worried about ourselves. It was a question how long the natives would stay friendly. Some of us were hurt. Oswalt, the radio operator on the plane, had a bad ankle—maybe sprained, maybe broken. Neveu, the pilot, thought he had a cracked rib or two. Our best piece of luck had come late in the afternoon when three medical corpsmen had jumped down to us from a rescue plane. They were Colonel Don Flickinger, Sergeant Richard Passey, and Corporal William MacKenzie. Flickinger and his aides had already gone a long way in cementing our friendship with the natives. They had spent a long time in the evening giving the natives medical help—treating their ulcers and sores with sulfa powders. Things might be looking up for us, but we could never be sure. These natives were head hunters, and there was no getting around it—we had a nice selection of heads. (SOUND: *Sneak in rain*) It was night now. We were in a basha—a big one that was built for the town hall. It was raining out, and we were trying to sleep. But it wasn't much use. None of us could sleep that first night.

[MUSIC: *Out*]

[SOUND: *Up*]

OSWALT. Wonder how long we'll be stuck in this hole.

NEVEU. I don't know. But now that the rescue plane's found us, we won't have to worry about supplies. They'll be dropping stuff to us every day.

MILLER. It's gonna take a long time to get a rescue party through this country to lead us outta here.

[SOUND: *Sneak in record of natives yelling in distance*]

SIGNOR. Yeah. Wonder how long these natives will keep those smiles on their faces.

OSWALT. Aw, stow it, Signor.

MILLER. Why talk about it?

SIGNOR. Hey! Hey, listen!

[SOUND: *Up a little*]

MILLER. It's them. They're comin' this way.

SIGNOR. I wish they wouldn't yell like that. It gives me the creeps.

OSWALT. Shut up.

MILLER (*slightly off*). Hey, you can see 'em through the bamboo strips here. They're carrying torches.

[SOUND: *Natives up . . . closer . . . closer*]

MILLER. Well, we've got our guns. But we'd better not act as though we intend to use 'em, unless they really look rough.

OSWALT. Here they are.

[SOUND: *Natives yelling on mike*]

[AD LIB: *Native background with record*]

SEVAREID. They burst into our basha carrying their torches high.

Their black bodies were streaming wet from the rain. (SOUND:

Fade yelling . . . rain continues) They crowded into our basha, and then I heard the unmistakable voice of John Davies.

DAVIES (*State Department Harvard accent*). Well . . . well. Doctor Sevareid, I presume.

[MUSIC: *Bridge*]

SEVAREID. The natives had come from a neighboring village. They had yelled that way to give the natives in our village notice that they were bent on a friendly mission. They brought Davies and

four others of our party with them. Now our whole plane load was together except for two. Lt. Charles Felix, the co-pilot, and Corporal Basil Lemmon were still missing. But the next morning a native runner had made signs that indicated a man lying down.

Then he struck his knee several times with the edge of his hand.

MILLER. It must be Lemmon or Felix down with a broken leg.

NEVEU. Wonder where he is.

DAVIES. Why, I imagine this good man will take us. You're a nice-looking chap. Let's move along to our friend now.

SEVAREID. The native grinned at Davies and led us off to the wreckage of our plane. (SOUND: *Sneak in native background*) When we

turned up the path to the wreck, I knew we should find a dead man. The natives had discovered Lt. Felix beneath the wreckage

and dragged his body to one side and covered it with strips of aluminum. He had not been burned at all, but one leg was cut at the knee. He had obviously died instantly. (MUSIC: *Sneak*) Flickinger's medical aides, MacKenzie and Passey, buried Felix in a parachute. They erected a cross at his grave. And the natives stopped to listen, when MacKenzie began reading with tears in his eyes.

MAC KENZIE (*high, thin, young voice*).

The Lord is my shepherd,

I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures,

He leadeth me beside the still waters,

He restoreth my soul. (*Begins to fade*)

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death,

I shall fear no evil, for thou art with me. (*Fades out under*)

[MUSIC: *Up and out*]

SEVAREID. Our rescue plane came over later that day and dropped bales by parachute . . . food and supplies for us . . . rock salt to barter with the natives.

[MUSIC: *In and behind*]

SEVAREID. Four days after we'd parachuted to the jungle, runners arrived very excited. They indicated to us that one of our party was being brought in, down the path. It could only be Corporal Lemmon. Some of us went along the trail to meet him with a stretcher. Lemmon was staggering along, his arms over the shoulders of two brawny savages. Colonel Flickinger and his aides took care of him. He was exhausted when he arrived, and it was two days before he told us his story . . .

[MUSIC: *Up and behind*]

LEMMON. It was terrible out there. You see, I thought we were in Jap territory. I was afraid to go much of anywhere for fear the Japs would get me. And whenever I saw natives, I'd hide. I was afraid they'd take me to the Japs. The bugs out there were awful. They ate me up. At night I tried to cover myself up with banana leaves, but the rain came right through. I was soaked. Finally I just got up and stood there in the rain. I didn't have anything to eat. My matches were wet. So I just chewed my cigarettes for some stimulation. Then after a couple of days I didn't give a damn any more. I didn't care whether the Japs got me or not. I crawled into an old empty hut and just lay there . . . I didn't even care

if I died. Then the natives found me. I was scared at first. But they just squatted down beside me and patted me. They patted my shoulder and built a fire, and I knew I'd be all right. Then they started carrying me here. But the trail went straight up and straight down. And it was awful hot. One little guy had me on his back. I finally felt so sorry for him, I got down and tried to make it under my own steam. . . . Can you imagine a little guy like that trying to carry me three or four miles in this jungle?

[MUSIC: *Up and out*]

SEVAREID. That day the natives looked good to us. (SOUND: *Sneak in plane*) But it wasn't very reassuring when our rescue plane flew over and dropped us a note.

[SOUND: *Plane zooms over low and out*]

OSWALT. They're really keeping us up to date. Two deliveries a day—it's better than the mail service back home.

MILLER (*off mike*). I got it. It's a message all right. (*Panting and coming on*) Here it is. It says: "The British political agent is with us this morning trying to identify your position from the air. The land party will start as soon as we know where you are. Important that you stay where you are until we get to you. The agent is sure there are unfriendly natives all around you. They will have to be fixed before you can go through safely."

[MUSIC: *In and behind*]

[SOUND: *Sneak in yelling natives approaching*]

SEVAREID. That note didn't make us feel any easier one afternoon when we heard a crescendo of screams. Hundreds of natives poured over the hill in our direction, and I was frightened. They were yelling a kind of chant, and I thought they had really come for our heads that time. And then one of us saw that they were pulling along a bull. We knew it was all right. The chief slaughtered the bull in our honor . . . and then he made us a speech.

[MUSIC: *Out*]

CHIEF. Atsoya atsoya peh lam we madun oo. Gumpraw jaw nah. Nangete jing pawni peh masan dum aiy majaw-majan kasataing. (*Fading under SEVAREID*) Ganyu masha shungoon moo. Ya jing pawni ante peh. (*Fade out*)

SEVAREID. It was an impressive speech. And when he finished an impressive reply was obviously in order.

DAVIES. Gentlemen, I think we owe it to these brave people to give them a bit of Americana. I suggest "I've Been Workin' on the Railroad."

AD LIB. Why not? Good idea, John. That's great stuff. Let's go.

CAST (*singing*).

I've been workin' on the railroad
All the livelong day.
I've been workin' on the railroad
Just to pass the time away.
Can't you hear the whistle blowin'
Wake ya up so early in the morn . . .
Can't you hear the captain shoutin',
"Dinah, blow your horn."

[MUSIC: *To tag*]

SEVAREID. That ceremony made us officially friends. We did a roaring business trading rock salt and cloth to the natives for their spears and dahs for some two weeks. Then the rescue party found us, and we started our long trek out. We went all the way on the double to avoid clashes with unfriendly tribes. It was the toughest hiking imaginable. There were times when it seemed impossible to take one more step. But there were compensations. One unforgettable day the rescue plane dropped us beer, and then they told us over their radio . . .

VOICE (*on filter*). Tomorrow, fried chicken and ice cream. This is no joke. Repeating. This is no joke.

SEVAREID. It took the thought of fried chicken and ice cream to keep us going . . . to keep us putting one foot forward in front of the other . . . to climb up one steep mountain after another. A Public Relations Officer blithely came to meet us. But he hadn't reckoned on that terrain. He hadn't gone far, when he knew he couldn't move farther. He had a pack on his back, and a young native came swinging down the trail past him. It was hot, and the P.R.O. was panting.

P.R.O. You coolie, carry pack, carry pack five miles—much rupee, much rupee.

SEVAREID. The native listened gravely and then replied:

BOY. Look, chum. I'm on my way to the mission high school and I'm just as tired as you are.

SEVAREID. And then, at last, we were back to civilization . . . better food . . . stronger liquor . . . and censors. I could think of nothing but getting my story out, and the Army seemed willing. One officer told me . . .

ARMY. By all means, Sevareid. By all means. Get your story out. No trouble at all.

SEVAREID. No . . . not so very much trouble. That was the first of September. Well, today—13 weeks later—the last of my story was finally passed by the censors.

[MUSIC: *Theme*]

THE STORY OF ALBERT

If I were backed into a corner and forced to choose one script as my all-time favorite from all of the dramatic news programs I've produced, I would have my answer immediately at hand. It was "The Story of Albert," written by Bill Slocum, Jr., and broadcast on "Report to the Nation" in the program of December 21, 1943. The script is copyrighted, 1943, by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., and that organization should be written for permission to re-enact it. If, in producing it, you are unable for any reason to use music as indicated, merely substitute pauses or "fades" at the end of scenes.

As you will see, the script is almost actor-proof, but tribute for outstanding work should be paid actors Carl Eastman, as Silvers, and Ted Osborne, as Albert, in the original presentation. But here it is:

NARRATOR [Doug Edwards]. The Army has discharged some men in the past year. "Report to the Nation" heard recently that Sid Silvers was one of them. Sid is one of Hollywood's and Broadway's funniest writers and actors, and we figured he'd be good for a funny piece on life in the Army. He did tell us some very funny stories. But he also told us the story of Albert . . . the greatest guy in the United States Army. This is what Silvers told "Report to the Nation."

SILVERS. I met the big hillbilly the first day I got to camp. I had thirteen tough weeks of basic training ahead of me, and I had just kissed my little daughter good-bye. I was sitting on my bunk feeling lousy. So were a lot of other guys. Suddenly I heard . . .

ALBERT (*hillbilly*). I hope this heah now war lasts forever. I swear I do.

SILVERS. You what . . .

ALBERT. Shorty, I hope this heah now war lasts forever.

SILVERS. Are you nuts . . .

ALBERT. Why, no . . . where else can ya make fifty bucks a month?

SILVERS. I looked up at six foot something, and 200 pounds of bone, muscle, and contentment. I asked him where he was from.

ALBERT. Tennessee . . . same's Sergeant York.

SILVERS. What's your name, chum? Mine's Sid.

ALBERT. Nope, I like Shorty better. My name's Albert.

SILVERS. Albert became my protector in things military, and I helped him over a few mental problems. But you can be sure I needed him a lot more than he needed me. One day he said:

ALBERT. Shorty . . . I got it figgured out . . . I know why there's a war on . . . we're fighting a guy named Hitler . . . why?

SILVERS. Why? . . . Well, there's a lot of reasons, but I guess the main one is because Hitler pushed people around. . . .

ALBERT. Where's this Hitler at?

SILVERS. Berlin . . . Germany.

ALBERT. Are Berlin as big as Knoxville?

SILVERS. A lot bigger, Albert.

ALBERT. What's this Hitler do to people?

SILVERS. He takes things away from them.

ALBERT. You mean he's a crook?

SILVERS. Yes . . . the biggest thief of all time . . . he steals a man's right to go hunting or fishing . . . he thinks he's better than anybody else . . . he says a man can't worship God the way he wants to . . . he kills people because they're Jews. . . .

ALBERT. He's a low critter, ain't he?—What's a Jew? I ain't never seen one.

SILVERS. Albert, I'm a Jew.

ALBERT. Well, what'd anybody want to kill you for . . . 'cept maybe the sergeant. . . . (*Narrowly*) Shorty . . . the Jews do anything to this Hitler feller?

SILVERS. No. This Hitler wants to be boss of the world. He kills Jews or Catholics or Protestants or Frenchmen or Englishmen or Americans. He kills anybody that says he ain't boss.

ALBERT. Well, I'm sure glad we're fightin' him . . . I sure am. Why, he's nothin' but a skunk . . . a miserable low down no good son of a . . .

[MUSIC: *Patriotic music wipes out his next words*]

SILVERS. That was the last I heard of Hitler from Albert. But I had other problems. A big, rawboned bruiser moved into our barracks. His name was Joe. Joe was a bully. He didn't speak for anybody but himself, but he said the same thing every night. It was always like this . . . the last thing in the barracks. First the Sarge:

SARGE. Lights out . . . hit the sack . . . everybody.

SILVERS. Then Joe. . . .

JOE. Gotta go to sleep I guess . . . boy, I'd sure sleep better if I could beat up a Negro or a Jew tonight.

SILVERS. Every night it was the same . . . every single night. . . .

JOE. I'd sure sleep better if I could beat up a Jew or a Negro tonight. . . .

SILVERS. I stood it as long as I could and still look at myself in the mirror. One night I got all the courage into me I could, and when Joe said it I walked over to his bunk. . . . Heh, Joe . . . Joe . . . come on out back, I got something for you.

JOE. Sure . . . okay, Shorty . . . be right with you.

SILVERS. We went out back. . . . I said to him . . . Joe, you've always said you wanted to beat up a Jew . . . well, I'm a Jew and I think you can do it . . . but you're gonna have to do it right now or shut up.

JOE: Shorty . . . it's a pleasure.

[SOUND: *Heavy punch, scuffle*]

[MUSIC: *In and fade*]

SILVERS. Joe didn't kill me, but it was a reasonable facsimile. When Albert saw me the next day . . . I hadn't gone to breakfast . . . he said:

ALBERT. Ain't you a pretty one, now . . . what happened?

SILVERS. I fell downstairs.

ALBERT. You did? Musta fell down a powerful lot of 'em. Shorty, you're a lyin' to me . . . someun gave you a beatin'. Who done it?

SILVERS. No. I fell downstairs. It was dark and . . . okay, Albert, you're right. Sit down and I'll tell you all about it . . . (MUSIC) . . . When I finished telling him about it, Albert looked at me . . . then up at the blue sky and said:

ALBERT. Joe beat you up because you're a Jew. Why, Shorty, that's just like Hitler.

[MUSIC]

SILVERS. He didn't say another word. But that night when lights had been out about a half hour he got up, walked over to the switch and turned them on.

ALBERT. Get up, everybody . . . just get up, I got something I want to tell you.

AD LIBS. Put out the light . . . tell us tomorrow . . . you'll get KP for a month, Albert. . . .

ALBERT. Get up! Everybody! What I got to say is important.

SARGE. Who put those lights on? Albert . . . are you nuts? Get to bed or I'll put you on report.

ALBERT. Do anything you want, Sarge, but don't touch those lights. I got something important. Listen, fellers . . . Joe beat up Shorty . . . look at the size of Joe and the size of Shorty.—You know why he beat him up? He beat him up 'cause he's a Jew . . . just like Hitler beats up Jews. Now you're in this heah Army cause big guys started licking little guys.

JOE. Get a soapbox, Albert. . . .

ALBERT. Joe . . . you be quiet . . . I'm comin' to you in a minute. Now, lookahere, fellers . . . the reason we're in this Army is so's we can fix things so no big guy'll kick a little guy around . . . so's nobody'll get killed just 'cause he's a Jew or an Eyetalian or something . . . so's we can all live peaceful like, huntin' and fishin' or sellin' things in the cities. . . . But how we gonna ever do that if some of us is pushing little guys around? Now I want every single one of you all to promise me you won't listen to no more of that Hitler stuff and won't never kick no guy around cause he's helpless. . . . You, Pete. . . .

PETE. Sure, Albert . . . you're right. . . . I promise.

ALBERT. Thanks, Pete. . . . 'N' you, McGill?

MC GILL. Sure, Albert. . . .

ALBERT. Thanks, Mac. How about you, Fred?

FRED. Absolutely, Albert. . . .

JOE. Whyn't you ask me, ya big hillbilly?

ALBERT. I'm comin' to you in a minute, Joe . . . and I ain't gonna ask you nothin' . . . how about you, Dick?

SILVERS. Well, he asked every man in the barracks . . . every one, even the Sarge and even me . . . then he came to Joe. . . .

ALBERT. Joe . . . come here. . . .

JOE. Nuts . . . I'm going to sleep.

ALBERT. Joe, you come here afore I go back and drag you out. . . .

SILVERS. Joe came . . . he had plenty of guts and he was just as big as Albert. They disappeared out back and we could hear some awful scuffling. In a couple of minutes Albert walked in . . . with Joe in his arms. He carried Joe to his bunk . . . and carefully laid him down, covering him like he was a baby.

ALBERT (*projecting*). Somebody get me a wet towel, please.—

(*Quiet*) Okay, Joe . . . you'll be all right in a second . . . thanks . . . here, Joe. This towel'll make you feel better.—Joe,

do you see what I mean now? You can't shove guys around just cause they're little . . . cause there's always somebody'll come along bigger than you. Hitler's findin' that out, now . . . do ya understand?

JOE (*muffled*). Yep . . . I understand, Albert.

[MUSIC: *Tag*]

SILVERS. And Joe did understand. He and I got to be friends, and I know Joe well enough to know that he'd never have admitted he understood unless he did. Albert could have licked him every night without making him admit anything he didn't believe. Albert was a great man. (MUSIC: *Sneak behind*) And one of the best things about the Army is my memory of Albert. This is a citizens' army, men drawn from every class and race and occupation and degree of education. And there seems to be in every unit one fighting man who impresses the will to fight and the hopes of mankind on every guy in his outfit. Albert was such a man—and tonight he's probably somewhere near the front lines in Italy. The prayer of all of us should be that Albert, and all the others like him, will come back . . . and soon.

[MUSIC: *Up to big finish*]

THE DOCUMENTARY WITH A PURPOSE

Although all of the scripts I've cited, with the exception of the Simple Simon fairy tale, have been "documentaries," there's another type which probably comes within the purview of news dramatization. That's the documentary with a purpose, call it propaganda if you will. The word "documentary" may be defined in this noun sense as the objective presentation of historical (usually written) facts. Every word must be true, or as true as patient and exhaustive research can establish.

One of the best documentaries was a powerful plea for racial tolerance, a drama known as "Open Letter," by William N. Robson. (Copyright, 1943, by William N. Robson. Reproduced by permission of the author and Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.) It may be argued that I'm somewhat inconsistent in saying that news commentators should not be permitted to preach but that "Open Letter," presented as a sustaining network feature, is "one of the best." A possible answer is that the subject is really not controversial. Where are you going to find any

responsible segment of society crusading for racial intolerance? There's such a section, all right, but it hides in nightshirts and behind masks. And the facts in favor of tolerance are on record to speak for themselves. But let's look at the manner in which Robson handled this difficult topic:

ANNOUNCER (*quietly*). This is an open letter to decent, law-abiding Americans of every color and creed from the Columbia Broadcasting System.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and behind*]

NARRATOR. Dear fellow Americans. What you are about to hear may anger you. What you are about to hear may sound incredible to you. You may doubt that such things can happen today in this supposedly united nation. But we assure you, everything you are about to hear is true. And so, we ask you to spend 30 minutes with us facing quietly and without passion or prejudice, a danger which threatens all of us—a danger so great that if it is not met and conquered now, even though we win this war, we shall be defeated in victory, and the peace which follows will for us be a horror of chaos, lawlessness, and bloodshed. This danger is Race Hatred!

[ORCHESTRA: *Up to tag*]

NARRATOR. Tonight Race Hatred is breeding and festering in a score of booming overcrowded war centers. And so tonight we ask you to hear what happened in Detroit, because we believe that no sensible, fully informed American will allow to happen again here at home, what he is fighting against all over the world.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and behind*]

NARRATOR. Sunday, June 20th, [1943] was hot. (*Pause. Orchestra up. Cue*) Detroit, sprawling across the flat Michigan prairie, baked in the nearly vertical sun. In the workers' camps on the fringe of the city, trailers and tents held the heat close and unbreathable. In the crowded flats and overflowing houses along Tireman, and Epworth Boulevard in the Negro district, the heat pressed down like the sweaty hand of John Henry.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up. Cue*]

NARRATOR. The Poles in Hamtramck felt it. And the two and three families crammed into one-family apartments, their tempers grew shorter as the day lengthened from one hot hour to another. Those who could find any way to get there, headed for lovely Belle Isle in the Detroit River, and a breath of fresh air.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and fade out under*]

NARRATOR. But when the flat hot sun dropped into the lake on the other side of Michigan, the twilight brought little relief, and still sweating, tempers shortened even more, they started home to another sticky sleepless night. The traffic moved slowly across the bridge from Belle Isle, cars creeping bumper-to-bumper, the crowds on foot, filling the sidewalk. Something happened there. No one is quite sure what—but something happened that Sunday last month, something like this—

[SOUND: *Automobile horns blowing. One foreground*]

GIRL. Eddie, you're not going to get us home any faster by blowing the horn.

GUY. If that guy ahead'll just move forward, I can get into the other line—

GIRL. Oh, Eddie.

GUY. Shut up—now I got a break.

[SOUND: *Car guns in first. Crash of bumpers*]

GIRL (*squeals*).

GUY. Did you see that—he pulled out in front of me.—Hey, you stupid jerk.

BLACK GUY (*off*). What's the big idea, bud—

GUY. Oh, a Negro. Listen, you. Get out of that car and I'll show you, you black . . .

BLACK GUY. I'm comin', punk—

[SOUND: *Car door opens*]

GIRL. Oh, Eddie, please.

GUY. I'll show him.

[CAST: *Crowd begins angry ad libs drowning out actual dialogue of two antagonists*]

NARRATOR. You know how crowds are. Nothing like a good fight— You push up as close as you can, and you get pushed, and it's usually all in good fun. But this crowd was tired and hot, and full of deep-seated grievances. It promptly took sides, and taking sides, broke up into other fights—and those out on the edge couldn't tell what was going on, and the reports they got were garbled, and they got garbled worse—

[CAST: *Fades into music*]

[ORCHESTRA: *Agitato rumor. Cue back following*]

NEGRO. What's going on?

SECOND NEGRO. Couple of guys fighting—that black boy's quite a baby with his fists.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

THIRD NEGRO. A fight about a baby on the Belle Isle Bridge—

[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

FOURTH NEGRO (*woman*). A baby thrown off the Belle Isle Bridge—
[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

FIFTH NEGRO. Yeah, I tell you Lucius just got back from Belle Isle.
He saw it. There was a big fight—and a white fellow threw a
colored woman and her baby off the bridge into the river and they
were drowned.

[ORCHESTRA: *Out*]

NARRATOR. That's the way the rumor hit the slums of Paradise
Valley, the Negro section, a month ago, and it spread. There was
another rumor. The white version.

[ORCHESTRA: *Rumor cue under*]

WHITE. What's the trouble?

SECOND WHITE. I dunno. Tangled bumpers I guess. That's the
white guy's gal sittin' in the car.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

THIRD WHITE. Fightin' over a white gal on the Belle Isle Bridge.
[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

FOURTH WHITE. There's trouble over on Belle Isle—Negro and a
white gal—

[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

FIFTH WHITE. Negro attacked a white gal over on Belle Isle—call
up the guys—

[ORCHESTRA: *Out*]

NARRATOR. Rumor! More dangerous than dynamite. More deadly
than a plague. Rumors tailor-made. One for black ears. One for
white ears. Stories about things that never had happened. The
trouble had started.

PUZZLED WOMAN. But just because a couple of men had a fight on
Belle Isle Bridge?

NARRATOR. Oh, no. It goes much deeper than that. Much further
back.

PUZZLED WOMAN. Really?

NARRATOR. Yes, back nearly a quarter of a century. You see, Detroit
grew up fast.

MR. D. I'll say it did, brother. Want some figures on that?

NARRATOR. Why, yes, if you don't mind?

MR. D. Not at all. Not at all. That's what I'm here for. From 1920
to 1930, while Detroit was putting the world on wheels, our popu-
lation increased by a half a million and today we're on our way to

. . . er . . . pardon me, I see some prospects. Hey, you, mister.
How'd you like to work in a defense plant in Detroit?

AKRON. Nope, not me. I got a good job at the tire plant right here in Akron.

MR. D. How about you?

PITTSBURGH. Pittsburgh's good enough for me. We got to make the steel before you can make the guns.

MR. D. What do you say, pal?

TOLEDO. Listen, lay off. Toledo's got its own manpower problem.

MR. D. Okay, okay, no harm in asking. Hey, you down there in South Carolina.

HILLBILLY. Who, me?

MR. D. Yes, you. How'd you like to come up North and work in a defense plant?

HILLBILLY. Well, now, I hadn't thought about it.

MR. D. Pay the highest wages. Better'n you can make in the cotton mill.

HILLBILLY. Yeah?

MR. D. You'll be livin' high on the hog in Detroit. Beautiful town. Right on the lake. Bring along the missus and the kids.

HILLBILLY. Well, I'll think about it.

MR. D. You can clean up quick in Detroit and after the war you can go back down South and retire.

HILLBILLY. I could, huh?

MR. D. Sure. Report Monday?

HILLBILLY. Yeah, mister. Sure—and thanks.

MR. REASON. Er . . . pardon me?

MR. D. Yeah, what?

MR. REASON. Why are you recruiting labor in the South, when you've already got a big supply of labor in Detroit?

MR. D. What are you talking about?

MR. REASON. The Negroes.

MR. D. Listen, Bud, we're not hirin' any Negroes—

MR. REASON. But the War Manpower Commission ordered that local labor had to be exhausted before you could—

MR. D. Maybe they did, but they're not enforcin' the order—and we don't want any black—

STOOGE. Hey, boss.

MR. D. Yeah?

STOOGE (*whispers*).

MR. D. No! Is that a fact?

290 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

STOOGE. Yeah. So you better do something fast.

MR. D. Okay. Pardon me, pal.

MR. REASON. Go right ahead.

MR. D. Hey, boy.

NEGRO. Yassuh?

MR. D. Want a good job?

NEGRO. Suah do. What do I have to do for it?

MR. D. Nothin'. Just come to Detroit.

NEGRO. Detroit?

MR. D. Sure—work in the war plants makin' tanks and guns.

NEGRO. Suah 'nough?

MR. D. On the level.

NEGRO. But I'm a field hand. I don't know nothin' about workin' in a factory.

MR. D. That's all right. We'll teach you.

NEGRO. Well, I don't—

MR. D. You can make more in a month than you get in a year workin' in the fields.

NEGRO. Is that a fact?

MR. D. Yeah. Plenty of chance of advancement, too.

NEGRO. Advancement?

MR. D. Yeah, nothin' to hold you back in Detroit. Why, if you make the grade, we might even promote you to straw boss.

NEGRO. You ain't just joshin' me?

MR. D. No-siree—you'll be living in Paradise in Detroit. . . .

NEGRO. Paradise?

MR. D. Well, Paradise Valley.

NEGRO. Mister, it sounds too good to be true.

MR. D. I can count on you?

NEGRO. Yes, sir, you sure can. (*Fading*) You sure can.

MR. REASON. But didn't you say a minute ago that you didn't want any Negro labor?

MR. D. Yeah, but I just got word that the boys back home have changed their minds. They've hired all the Negroes in Detroit—and we got to get more labor. Lots more.

NARRATOR. More. Lots more. In three years Detroit has imported 500,000 Negroes and whites, mostly from the South.

MR. D. That's right. As many people as live in New Orleans or the State of Arizona. It's a big operation.

NARRATOR. It certainly is. But Detroit doesn't have houses for a half million extra people. Detroit doesn't have enough street cars and

buses to move the State of Arizona back and forth from work. Detroit doesn't have enough parks, or movie houses, or bowling alleys to entertain an additional New Orleans. (*Pause*)

VOICE. Today it is impossible to rent a decent house within fifty miles of Detroit.

[ORCHESTRA: *Punctuation*]

NARRATOR. No houses. But jobs, plenty of jobs for black and white, for native Americans, and Polish-born immigrants. And all the prejudices of Detroit's polyglot population awaited the new army of war workers. Subversive organizers and native Nazi orators took to the soap box outside a dozen war plants—

GEORGIA JERK. I'd rather see Hitler and Hirohito win, than work beside a nigra on the assembly line.

NARRATOR. Detroit was dynamite. The fist fight on the Belle Isle Bridge set off the fuse. By the dawn of Monday, the 21st, Detroit blew up.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and behind*]

NARRATOR. That bloody Monday, Woodward Avenue, the wide boulevard which divides the city, became a hunting ground upon which no Negro was safe. Along Hastings Street in the heart of Paradise Valley, bands of Negroes fired by rumors, smashed the windows of white storekeepers, overturned the cars of white motorists, and were shot by the police. On Woodward Avenue a hundred thousand white men armed with lengths of pipe and beer bottles beat up Negroes until their arms ached.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

NARRATOR. And in the great factories of Detroit, which proudly claims the title of "Arsenal of Democracy," few men worked that day. From bloody dawn to bloody dawn, in that single day these insurrectionists wasted one million man hours. How many of your sons will die for lack of tanks and planes and guns which Detroit did not make that day?

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

NARRATOR. We lost Bataan gallantly. We surrendered Corregidor with honor. We were defeated at Detroit by ourselves in shame and humiliation.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and out*]

NARRATOR. But not all Detroit went blind with blood lust that hot Monday. There were black people and white people whose conduct proved them first of all to be human beings. There was a prominent Negro doctor who was leaving his office on his way to an

292 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

emergency meeting of city officials, at the Negro Y, when the white druggist in his building called to him—

DRUGGIST. Dr. Johnson—Dr. Johnson.

JOHNSON. Oh, Mr. Stuart. You shouldn't have opened your store this morning.

DRUGGIST. I didn't know how bad it was. Now I don't know what to do.

JOHNSON. Well, you'd better close up and go home.

DRUGGIST. I'm afraid they'd mob me before I got to Woodward Avenue.

JOHNSON. Yes, they might. I'll tell you, you lock up right now, and I'll drive you through.

DRUGGIST. But you're taking a chance.

JOHNSON. You're my friend, Mr. Stuart.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and under*]

NARRATOR. And the white man was driven through the threatening jeering Negro mob by his colored friend, to safety close to the "no man's land" of Woodward Avenue.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up*]

NARRATOR. And there were white people, too, who acted with sanity and bravery on that insane day.—In a streetcar crawling through the mobs on Woodward Avenue sat a woman and her daughter.

[SOUND: *Mob outside. Streetcar travelling slowly*]

YOUNG WOMAN. Oh, Mother, look at them beating up that poor man.

MOTHER. It's disgraceful—outrageous.

YOUNG WOMAN. Look, the mob's coming toward this car.

MOTHER. Now don't get excited, Elsie.

YOUNG WOMAN. And there's a colored man sitting across the aisle.

Oh, Mother—

MOTHER. Well, they won't get him. Psst—you, mister.—You, come here.

NEGRO. Yes, ma'am—?

MOTHER. Quick.—Get down here under the seat.

YOUNG WOMAN. Mother, what are you—?

MOTHER. Be quiet, Elsie. Spread out your skirts so you hide him.

NEGRO. God bless you, ma'am.

MOTHER. Shh.

[SOUND: *Banging on car doors. Car stops. Door opens. Mob up*]

MOBSTER. Any nigras inside?

MOTHER. There are not.

MOBSTER. Okay, ma'am, just want to make sure. All right, boys, you can let this car go through.

[SOUND: *Door closes. Car starts*]

NEGRO. God bless you, ma'am.—God bless you.

MOTHER. Now you stay right where you are, until we get out of this. Those hoodlums! I've lived all my life in Detroit, and today I'm ashamed of it.

[ORCHESTRA: *Tag*]

NARRATOR. And there were three sailors that bloody Monday who proved how much courage a mob has—

HOODLUM. There's one—

2ND HOODLUM. Get the black b—

[CAST: *Mob running*]

YOUNG NEGRO. Please, let me go. I ain't done nothin'.—I'm just on my way home from work.

HOODLUM. Shut up, you dirty—

[SOUND: *Smack*]

2ND HOODLUM. Lemme get a crack at the son of a—

SAILOR. Hey, let that man go.

HOODLUM. Well, well, the U. S. Navy to the rescue.—You got friends, Eight Ball.

[SOUND: *Smack*]

YOUNG NEGRO. Don't—please. For the love of God, don't—

SAILOR. Let him go.

2ND HOODLUM. What's it to you, sailor?

SAILOR. I'll tell you, bum. I'm just payin' off a debt. There was a colored guy on my ship that saved the life of one of my buddies.

HOODLUM. You got me weepin'—

SAILOR. Ace, give this fellow a hand.

2ND SAILOR. Right. Come along, kid, we'll get you out of this.

YOUNG NEGRO. Thank you, sailor, thank you—

HOODLUM. Listen, gob, if you didn't have that uniform on, you wouldn't get away with that.

SAILOR. Okay, I'll be glad to oblige. I'll take it off.—Ace, better peel outa your jumper too.

2ND SAILOR. A pleasure.

SAILOR. Would you mind holdin' these for us, kid?

YOUNG NEGRO. Sure thing, sailor.

SAILOR. Okay, you punks, do you want to take us on one at a time, or both together?

[CAST: *Crowd mumbles*]

294 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

HOODLUM. We ain't pickin' no fights with white men.—We're after colored guys.

SAILOR. Yeah, and you're stirrin' up the kind of trouble we went to war to stop. Now you jerks better get off the streets before the Army gets into town and starts using you for target practice.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and behind*]

NARRATOR. Late that night, the Army finally did arrive, and for the first time in 24 hours a fitful peace reluctantly fell on the debris-filled streets of Detroit. The score:

VOICE. Eighteen hundred arrested. 85 per cent Negroes.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

2ND VOICE. Six hundred injured. The majority Negroes.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

VOICE. Thirty-five dead.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

VOICE. Twenty-nine Negroes.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

VOICE. Seventeen of them shot by the police.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and under*]

NARRATOR. Accomplished?

VOICE. Nothing.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up . . . and out*]

NARRATOR. Two nights after the troops arrived, the class of 1943 was graduated at Northeastern High School. Its members included 29 Negro boys and girls. The sincere words of the commencement speaker that night seemed tinged with bitter irony.

SPEAKER (*echo*). See if you can analyze the problems of today. See if you can work out your own destiny through democratic processes. You must if democracy is to survive. The world cannot go on half-free and half-slave. Intolerance and race hatred are the products of ignorance. The great contribution of democracy is that it can teach the masses to participate in a better way of life. Democracy is more than just casting your ballot. It is something that must be lived 24 hours each day. It is learning to live collectively.

NARRATOR. In the park outside the high school, 80 policemen stand on guard. And behind them little groups of hoodlums, toughened by two days of street fighting, gather in the shadows. A lesson their elders had proved they had not learned. A challenge, difficult to accept, when you have for two days watched democracy go up in the smoke of burning automobiles, and trickle away in the bloody gutters. (*Pause*) It is nearly over, the last moments of their four

years together—their last song together—black and white voices blending—

[ORCHESTRA AND CHORUS: "America"]

NARRATOR. The hoodlums out in the park hear the song through the open windows.—The mob begins to form. The policemen stiffen, glance nervously about.

[ORCHESTRA AND CHORUS: *Song up to end*]

NARRATOR. And then the song is over, and with congratulations and well wishes cut short by the 10 o'clock curfew, the Negro and white members of the Northeastern High School class of 1943 step out into the world.

[CAST: *Angry mumble*]

NARRATOR. The police line wavers. The girl graduates in their summery dresses cringe. The boys stand there a moment indecisively.

BOY. I'm not going to let them think they can scare me. Come on, who's walking my way?

2ND BOY. I'll go with you.

3RD BOY. So will I.

NARRATOR. The three classmates, two Negro, one white, start down the street. Across the way, behind the line of police, the mob passes them.

BOY. Don't walk too fast.

2ND BOY. Jeez, I'm bein' inducted into the Army next week—to fight for them.

3RD BOY. Doesn't seem worth it.

NARRATOR. At the street corner, the mob breaks through the police line, (CAST: *Mob roars*) sweeps across the street, and then suddenly halts.

[SOUND: *Truck motors up to stop*]

NARRATOR. Four truckloads of soldiers with fixed bayonets roll up to a stop—

OFFICER. All right, boys, on the double—clear the area.

SOLDIERS (*off*). Move on there. Break it up. Get going.

NARRATOR. Slowly at the point of the bayonet, the rabble of Kluxers, cowards, and crackpots retreat into the shadows whence they came. Northeastern High School Class of '43 has graduated—without bloodshed.

[ORCHESTRA: *Tag*]

NARRATOR. So an armed peace came to the troubled streets of Detroit, and most of us, knowing little, and perhaps caring less why such things occur, forgot about it. But not the rest of the world.

296 *Sound and Fury, Signifying Headaches*

GERMAN RADIO (*filter*). This is Berlin calling. In the Asiatic Service.

The disturbances in Detroit have now also come to an end owing to the intervention of the troops whom Roosevelt dispatched to the scene. There is no doubt about the fact that the problem of labor and capital cannot be solved by the present rulers of the U.S.A.

NARRATOR. And listen to the voice of Tokyo addressing the billion brown and yellow inhabitants of Asia.

TOKYO RADIO (*filter*). The Detroit riots of June the twentieth in which hundreds of Negroes were sacrificed to the altar of American white superiority complex was nothing more than the latest of a series of acts of intolerable cruelty of the people who pay lip service to democracy. How can America hope to bring an order of liberty and equality among the more complicated, vastly more difficult family of races in the world, when it can't manage its own race problems? It simply can't.

NARRATOR. Those words have the ring of logic to millions of people all around the world—millions who look upon us with justified suspicion. And the question those words pose is not rhetoric, but literal. The answer lies with each one of us. We cannot command the respect of mankind with the blood of fellow Americans upon our hands.

[ORCHESTRA: *Punctuation*]

NARRATOR. There are some places in the nation where citizens are showing common sense, tact, and tolerance. In Houston, Texas, for instance, last month rumors were launched that there would be a race riot on Saturday, June 19th, when the Negro population celebrates the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation in the festival they call Juneteenth. A committee of prominent Negro and white citizens headed by the mayor stopped this trouble before it started with a full-page advertisement in the Houston papers, which read:

VOICE OF HOUSTON. Don't do Hitler's work. Stop circulating rumors which create tenseness and interfere with war production, and attend to your own business. The colored people of this vicinity are entitled to celebrate their traditional "Juneteenth" holiday Saturday pleasantly and in peace, and the fact that they gather for their customary celebrations on that day is no evidence of any intention on their part to create a disturbance. Law enforcement authorities are prepared to deal with thoughtless hoodlums, white or colored, who provoke trouble. Don't be a rumor monger.

NARRATOR. There was no riot in Houston on June 19th because decent law-abiding citizens saw one coming and did something about it. Each of us can do the same thing in his community. It's not the people who serve on the committees and lead the parades and make the speeches who will stop race hatred. It's each one of us, each anonymous citizen keeping his head on his shoulders, his fists unclenched and his mouth shut. We've got too tough an enemy to beat overseas to fight each other here at home.

[ORCHESTRA: *In . . . and behind*]

NARRATOR. We hope this open letter about the irreparable damage race hatred has already done to our prestige, our war effort, and our self-respect, will have moved you to make a solemn promise to yourself that wherever you are and whatever is your color or your creed, you will never allow intolerance or prejudice of any kind to make you forget that you are first of all an American with sacred obligations to every one of your fellow citizens. Sincerely yours, The Columbia Broadcasting System.

[ORCHESTRA: *Up to tag*]

TIDYING UP

Before leaving the subject of radio news drama, there are a few pieces to pick up.

One of them is the advice to practice and to keep on practicing. Take a news story, any news story that interests you, and try to put it in dramatic terms. Your efforts may be amateurish, but you'll improve.

Try to end every important scene with a robust line. Nothing so dulls the interest of a listener as a "throw-away" line just before a musical tag. And although there can be no rule about it, try to put long vowels into your last line. The sounds of "ay," "ee," "eye," "owe," and "oo," as in school, are much more commanding than broad or short vowels.

There are times when you will want to indicate that a speech is going on, or some other dialogue is continuing behind a conversation or narration to which you want to give prominence. In that case write in parallel columns, with the words to be spoken in the background to the right, as follows:

NARRATOR. On and on, through the list of 27 indictments, the court questioned the jury. The verdict on each count was "guilty." One of the worst racketeers in New York's history now faces a prison sentence of 99 years.

COURT. What is your verdict on the third count?

FOREMAN. Guilty.

COURT. On the fourth count?

FOREMAN. Guilty. [Continue, "fifth," "sixth," etc. until narration ends.]

Almost from the beginning of radio script-writing, there have been attempts to break up long narration by the use of several voices. This is still done along these lines:

NARRATOR. This week, government economists estimated that recent authorized price increases would cost the public more than 150 million dollars a year.

1ST VOICE. Radios, toasters, and chinaware. Up from 3 to 12 per cent.

2ND VOICE. New automobiles. Up 15 per cent.

3RD VOICE. Beer. Up a cent a glass.

And so on. Actually there's some evidence from a Stanton-Lazarsfeld study that this effect, which is called a "montage," is resented by the public. The different voices are unexpected and generally baffling.

And now for some generalities:

In selecting items for news drama, try to use only those that have conflict and suspense.

In constructing the script, try to establish the conflict as early as possible. Clearly identify every character. Have your people talk as people *do* talk.

Use sound and music sparingly. Remember that music is usually an obtrusion and is useful merely for mood and atmosphere. Try to identify every sound effect.

Put in explicit instructions to the director and the cast. Use parenthetical notes such as (*Laughingly*), (*With rising anger*), (*Long pause*), etc. The director may grumble that you are trying to tell him his business. But let him grumble. He's usually well paid for it.

17. AT THE SCENE

*The Story of Sports, Special Events,
and Interviews*

YOU MAY REMEMBER that at the time of the Press-Radio treaty back in 1934, the networks agreed not to maintain their own news services but reserved for themselves the right to report from the scene of events. The four years between the signing of that treaty and the Austrian Anschluss brought the wildest collection of screwball antics in radio's history. This period was madcap, competitive, and a kind of juvenile fun. An entire book could be written about it—and one was. Schechter's book, *I Live on Air*, was largely devoted to what radio calls special events.

Described in Schechter's book are broadcasts about such diverse subjects as the Pyramids of Egypt, a contest among singing mice, an Arctic expedition, floods in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, a parrot competition, around-the-world flights, and every conceivable kind of sporting event, with the possible exception of a cricket match and a jacks tournament at Jones Junior High in Toledo.

It is a temptation for me to become anecdotal, to look down the years and recall the dizzy rivalry between Schechter and myself. I doubt whether the public was as entranced as we were; indeed, there may have been times when we achieved new highs in audience apathy. But, in justification, we can say that radio news had yet to put on long pants, had yet to shave, and the

frantic efforts for "scoops" (they were often called that in those days instead of "beats") were all part of growing up.

THE SALE OF A BIRTHRIGHT

But for the most part I shall try to resist the temptation to Tell All. There are a few stories of the past, however, that are revelatory and that deserve a place in the consideration of special broadcasts.

To begin with, let's look at the sports situation. The first big sports events in which broadcasting "rights" were sold were heavyweight championship fights. Later, the World Series "rights" were sold. In assenting to these sales, radio made one of the biggest mistakes of its comparatively short life. A small immediate gain brought about a wholesale loss.

There's no more reason why all radio should not cover all sporting events than there is why individual newspapers or press associations should not have their reporters at the scene. But, one by one, the major sports have been "sewed up" either by networks or by advertisers. As of 1947, ABC had the championship fights, NBC had the Rose Bowl football game, MBS had the World Series, and CBS the Kentucky Derby, to mention just a few. The other networks were effectively barred from broadcasting from the scene of these events, although of course they could carry the results.

Had radio executives fought this trend, I think they soon would have had sports promoters at their mercy. It's doubtful that the big "gates" expected in post-war years would materialize, if radio networks and stations simply refused to broadcast from the scene unless the contests were put on a "come one, come all" basis. The money derived from the sale of time for these broadcasts is picayune compared with the immeasurable loss of prestige.

I write as a penitent. On my conscience is the fact that I was one of the worst offenders in negotiating "exclusive" contracts in various fields of sport, such as baseball, horse racing, golf, tennis, and even polo. At the time it was simply a competitive

game. Not until years later did I realize that I had helped to do radio a great disservice.

To be sure, at the height of the Schechter-White rivalry, no one took these "exclusives" very seriously. CBS had the golf rights sewed up one year, and Ted Husing was all set to interview Ralph Guldahl who won the National Open at Oakland, Michigan. But Tom "Red" Manning of NBC had other ideas. Authorized by Schechter to add \$500 to Guldahl's income, Manning arranged an impromptu studio in a garage adjacent to the golf course, and guided the tournament winner to this garage while Husing was promising his audience that he expected Guldahl to put in an appearance at any moment.

Then there was a time that NBC had made an arrangement with the Amateur Athletic Union and was promised exclusive broadcasting rights at the annual A.A.U. meet in Marquette Stadium in Milwaukee. Husing couldn't get a microphone into the stadium, but he did manage to get permission from a Lutheran pastor to set up his gear on the roof of a church-owned schoolhouse overlooking the scene of the track meet. Ken Fry, one of NBC's special events men, was wild with fury when he heard of this dark plot. He attempted without success to persuade the pastor that use of the schoolhouse roof was defeating the ends of justice. Then Fry complained to the city building inspector that Husing had erected a platform on the roof without a building permit. The inspector, however, was not interested and said, "While the platform was erected without a permit, the network did apply for one later and I'm going to excuse the original error as an inadvertence." Fry then hoped he could block the view from the roof by hanging up hundreds of yards of cheesecloth, but Milwaukee apparently afforded no such vast amount of cheesecloth and there would be difficulty in hanging it anyway. But let's have Schechter take up the story from there:

According to reports, further plans considered by Fry were the following:

1. Hiring a brigade of small boys to shine sun reflections into Husing's eyes by means of small hand-mirrors.
2. Persuading track meet officials to confuse Husing by hanging wrong numbers on the athletes.

3. Hiring an airplane to fly over the schoolhouse roof and confound Husing by dropping things on him, and by drowning out what he was saying with the aid of a motor that was made to roar its loudest.

4. Hiring a South American blow-gun artist to pick off Husing with a poison dart.

5. Arranging with a firm of building wreckers to tear the building down right from under Husing's feet.

All of these plans had to be abandoned because it was the third of July and people got so independent thinking about Independence Day that you couldn't get anybody to do any work, much less dirty work.

Well, Husing triumphed. He broadcast the meet. However, as I consult our scrapbook I am delighted to learn that it was a qualified triumph. The Milwaukee *Journal* assures me that the roof was beastly hot. It is also comforting to learn that the view was not very good. When our Mr. Fry informed me of this I, naturally, thought he might be slightly prejudiced, but it is comforting to read a newspaper clipping which says:

"The Husing roost was not the ideal spot for watching and telling the world just what was happening. It was outside looking in, and the view of the track was far from special. . . . The view consisted chiefly of two opulent elms. The leaves were beautifully rich and green but the track southward to the finish line was thoroughly screened. . . . It was a triumph for Ted Husing, but it may have been a Pyrrhic victory, for when Husing climbed down from his platform he appeared to be in grave danger of sunstroke."

These episodes have been recounted in the forlorn hope that their very absurdity will influence radio managements to mend their ways. There simply shouldn't be any such thing as exclusiveness in broadcasting at any sports event, and it ought not to be too difficult for executives to get together and to agree not to perpetuate the practice after existing contracts have run their course. Granted, there would be slight monetary losses at the beginning. Granted, some sports officials would boycott all radio for a time. But it wouldn't take long for the promoters to realize that broadcasting keeps interest alive in sports and adds spectators to the next attraction. Radio is old enough and strong enough in public affection to take a forthright stand.

THE HOWARD HUGHES EPIC

As to exclusive coverage on other events that are not public spectacles and where no admission is charged, that's another matter. But it's practically impossible to insure that you get what you pay for. Take as an example the Howard Hughes round-the-world flight in 1936. Originally NBC had arranged for exclusive radio rights to this flight and had even contributed the advisory services of a radio engineer. But Hughes then made a publicity tie-up with the New York World's Fair, and that gave CBS and MBS a big talking point. If they too couldn't have Hughes' broadcasts, they would ignore the Fair. (Not that they would have; it was merely customary to utter dire threats.) But the Fair officials were sufficiently worried to persuade Hughes to agree that all networks could participate. The most important broadcast, at least at the time, was the first one from the plane in flight, and it had been agreed with Hughes' publicity man, Albert Lodwick, that this broadcast would be a "joint" one. But here again we will let Schechter tell the story:

The broadcast was to take place at 10:30 that night. At about 10:15 word came from RCA in New York that this was to be an exclusive CBS show. We informed RCA that this could not be a CBS exclusive because of the arrangement entered into by the three broadcasting systems whereby this was to be a joint show.

The man in charge of this operation in the RCA office said, "My orders are to take instructions from Mr. Lodwick as to the allocation of broadcasts. He tells me this one is Columbia's." By the time we were able to get hold of Lodwick it was too late to prevent Columbia from getting the broadcast exclusively.

When I finally got hold of Lodwick, I did not address him in a very dignified manner. In fact, I seem to recall that I threatened to knock his block off. Al has since acknowledged that we had not been fairly treated and insists it was all a mistake; so we patched it up.

Meanwhile, NBC had a good opportunity to demonstrate how well it could take a ribbing. The Howard Hughes round-the-world flight which had originally been an NBC exclusive had next become an NBC-CBS-MUTUAL operation and was now a Columbia exclusive. We got a thorough joshing and deserved it.

In some way Paul White had put one over on us. When a thing of this kind happens there is no sense in making a lot of excuses. Whatever you say is interpreted as cry-baby stuff. The lamest of all excuses is to say that the other fellow was unethical. Most people interpret such a lament as an effort to get back at a rival who beats you to a story.

You find yourself taking your kidding as philosophically as you can and making such mental notes as this: "That so-and-so put one over on me. I'll have to get back at him sometime."

It is owed to Schechter to explain how the 10:15 broadcast was landed. I'm afraid that, having been assured that Lodwick was eating, someone, who may or may not have been CBS correspondent Bill Dunn, asked a telephone girl at the airport to transfer all telephone calls to Lodwick to Wickersham 2-2000, which happened to be the CBS telephone number. Then a man giving his name as "Mr. Lodwick" called RCA and said the 10:30 broadcast had been moved ahead 15 minutes, to inform the engineer in the plane to that effect and that furthermore this was to be a Columbia exclusive.

"But I understand that the broadcast is to go to all networks," protested the man at RCA.

"Your understanding is wrong," said "Mr. Lodwick."

"But how can I make sure you are Lodwick?" asked the RCA man.

"I'll hang up. Just call me back here at the airport," said "Mr. Lodwick."

Sure enough, the CBS switchboard operator having been informed that any calls to a man by the name of Lodwick were to be put through to a certain extension, a call soon came from RCA by way of the airport. "Mr. Lodwick," in a voice suspiciously like that of Dick Swift, a CBS program executive, confirmed the previous orders. And CBS got the program exclusively.

The entire episode, as Schechter has implied, was unethical and cannot be too strongly condemned.

THE GRAF SPEE AND I ARE SUNK

I'm not so philosophical as others and can't look back upon a bad drubbing without feeling anew a sense of unutterable anguish. For example, I find it all but impossible to write of the events of Dec. 17, 1939, when the famous pocket battleship *Admiral Graf Spee* was scuttled off Montevideo, Uruguay.

Special announcers were on hand for both NBC and CBS. Microphones were installed along the waterfront. The broadcasts were to be broadcast to Buenos Aires and picked up and re-broadcast to New York from there. It was expected the broadcast would be merely routine, that the announcers would report an effort of the *Graf Spee* to elude smaller British men-of-war that had already crippled her.

But the *Graf Spee's* Commander, Captain Hans Langdorff, stood in a small boat and pressed a button that blew up the ship. James Bowen of NBC was right on the job. "Gimme the air, quick," he shouted, and then told the graphic story:

The ship is moving now, rolling from side to side. There goes another explosion! The after turret has gone up. Evidently the powder magazine caught fire. She is going down. She is going down by the stern. The stern is now completely under water. Flames are shooting into the air and there are great clouds of smoke.

It was a great broadcast but where was our man? He, too, was talking and telling the story but the broadcast just simply didn't get through. To this day I don't know why. It's probable that no wires were cut and no technicians were bribed to prevent our broadcast from reaching us. In a valiant effort to achieve a philosophical attitude, I can only express the hope that some day Schechter may write another book and shed some light on this painful mystery.

THE "WALKIE-TALKIE'S" FUTURE

But enough for retrospection. It's time to consider the past only in relation to the present and the future. There are indi-

cations that special events and sports will be of increasing listener interest and although I don't look for any return to the slap-happy days of yesteryear, I do foresee radio stations improving their public service by their at-the-scene coverage of events.

For one thing there'll be vast technical improvements. At one time short-wave reception was so uncertain, and various types of recording apparatus were so inferior that it was almost always necessary to install special telephone lines. These installations took time and were expensive. I once saw a Grade-B movie—or it may have been Grade-Z—in which the hero was a special events announcer. Whenever he saw a five-alarm fire or a homicide conveniently staged within his vision, he would whip out a microphone and start talking to the great unseen audience. Needless to say, this somewhat strained my credulity because it's forbidden, by the Federal Communications Commission, even to use an ordinary telephone line to describe an event for radio. I've never understood the reason for this, think that the American Telephone and Telegraph Company somehow pulled a fast one with the F.C.C., and on occasions I've conveniently forgotten the rule. But the time may be rapidly approaching when radio will not depend on telephone lines. "Walkie-talkies," portable short-wave transmitters, received their baptism of fire in World War II, and on the whole performed with great success. I'm confident that technical advances will soon enable the special events announcer to perform much as the hero did in the movie.

Recording equipment is getting better and better, too, and broadcasts can be made on spools of magnetized wire or on "tape" and sped back to the studios to be played later. Recordings have a certain advantage in that they can be edited. Radio often tries to cover some things such as parades and mass meetings that turn out to be excruciatingly dull. But if the tedious spots are eliminated through proper editing, the programs become interesting. Oddly enough, in view of the frequent complaint that its monopoly prevents it from being sufficiently aggressive, the British Broadcasting Corporation makes better use of recordings than do the American networks. For a long time NBC and CBS banned the use of recordings, except in rare emergencies, in order to try to put a premium on "live" broad-

casting. But this ban no longer obtains in news broadcasting, and the future is certain to see more and more use of on-the-spot recordings properly condensed to provide a maximum of entertainment.

SOME "DO'S" ON SPECIAL EVENTS

A special event outside of the studio is called a "remote." At one time it was called a "nemo" but the reason for using that word is lost in antiquity and the term is becoming obsolete. The first thing to do in planning a remote is to consult your engineering staff. What kind of facilities will be required? How many microphones and of what type? Where should they be placed? A special event broadcast is usually only as good as the engineering that goes into it, and too often news directors have given orders to engineers rather than taken advice from them.

The next thing to do is to select your announcer or announcers and brief them as thoroughly as possible on the job at hand. Although of necessity there'll be occasions for ad libbing, it's highly advisable to have as much copy written out as possible. Frequently there are long delays in scheduled events and it will be necessary to stall for time. A few yards of previously prepared material will see the announcer over that hurdle.

Among radio newsmen it's generally conceded that Bob Trout, who becomes a more dignified Robert Trout when he does his regular news broadcasting from a studio, is the best "ad libber" the broadcasting business has ever produced. But he's also the most painstaking radio man I've ever known in preparing for every broadcast. For one thing he has saved notes, scripts, newspaper clippings—everything he can think of—that might have a bearing on some future assignment. File cabinets overflow his apartment until other furniture is engulfed.

Quite early in his career Trout had an experience that taught him the value of preparation. President Roosevelt had made a voyage to Hawaii, and Trout was assigned to cover his return to the mainland at Portland, Oregon. A circuit was reserved for an hour, and in those days an hour was an hour. It never occurred to anyone that a musical standby could be scheduled and that it

wasn't absolutely necessary for an announcer to hold the air once he had started talking.

Possibly because he enjoyed listening to Trout, the President remained aboard his ship. Trout, at dockside, kept speaking. He told of the President's visit to Hawaii, extolled the beauties of that island paradise, recited the words of "Aloha," and painted a vivid picture of Waikiki. Still no sign of the President. Trout began to describe the vessel on which the President had cruised, warmed to the subject and covered extensively the history of the American Navy, carefully explained the differences among battleships, cruisers, and destroyers, and then touched upon the careers of John Paul Jones, Farragut, and Dewey. The minutes dawdled past, but still the President remained on his ship. A breath and Trout was again in full cry, this time devoting his attention to the Pacific Northwest. Its mountains, its churning rivers and the salmon therein, the civic virtues of Portland, Tacoma, Seattle, and Spokane—all came in for their full attention. At last, as the clock had ticked off its fifty-ninth minute, the President came down the gangplank.

"Won't you say a few words, Mr. President?" Trout asked.

"Hello, Bob," said Mr. Roosevelt. "Yes, it's grand to be back."

That was the end of the broadcast except that Trout barely had strength enough to thank the President, and to close the broadcast with network identification.

AND SPORTS PREPARATION, TOO

The sports broadcasters, whose glibness is so remarkable, also spend hours of preparation for every broadcast. Husing, "Red" Barber, Bill Stern, Harry Wismer—these men and others can afford to shrug off the hackneyed joke that the reason they speak with such speed is that there's no brain to get in the way between what they see and what they say. They know and know full well how detailed is their research for a football game, to cite just one example.

The good football announcer arrives several days ahead of time in the city where the game is to be played. He talks with

coaches of both teams and gets a description of complicated formations. Needless to say, he's completely trusted by the coaches, and I'm certain this trust has never been violated. Wherever possible, the announcer looks at movies taken of the two teams in previous games. He examines team and individual records, talks with football scouts, tries to memorize every conceivable strength and weakness.

And when the opening whistle blows on Saturday afternoon all of this preparation pays off. Sometimes autumn rains obscure the numbers on the backs of players' jerseys, but the announcer usually knows to a nicety who's carrying the ball, who's making the tackles.

"FIRSTS" AND BIG NAMES

During the thirties there was violent competition to get a "first." The networks wore themselves out trying to put on the "first" broadcast from Albania, the "first" short-wave conversation between an airplane and a submarine, the "first" description of a parachute jump by a man wearing the 'chute. These "firsts" went to elaborate lengths. I remember that one time I sent the members of a girl trio aloft in three separate airplanes, with a piano player in a fourth plane, and by wearing headphones, they all achieved some kind of reasonably satisfactory harmony. But it soon became evident that the public was not so amazed or amused by such displays of ingenuity as were the news directors who planned them. Slowly, the general rule was adopted: "Never mind whether this is the first time it has been done; just make sure it's a good broadcast."

The same thing was true of big names. At one time it was considered a great thing to be the first network or station to "hook" a prominent person who had never before broadcast—John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Professor Albert Einstein, and Chief Justice Hughes were among many, but by the time the forties arrived this sport had lost its zest. It had become apparent that the important thing was not whether a person had broadcast before, but whether he actually had anything to talk about.

An apex in something or other was achieved one afternoon when, a few minutes before a scheduled broadcast, I received a worried telephone call from Ted Church, then the network's Washington news chief and years later my successor at CBS.

"I'm at the White House," said Church, "for that talk by Mrs. Roosevelt."

"Yeah," I said. "You take the air in about two minutes. What's the matter? Isn't she there?"

"Oh, she's here all right," Church came back, "but she asked me what group she was supposed to be addressing—and I've forgotten."

I didn't know, either.

"Hold on," I said. I made a check of the publicity and production departments—for some reason the introductory continuity was to be read from New York instead of from the White House—and found that Mrs. Roosevelt was to address the Campfire Girls. There was only a matter of seconds to spare when I relayed the word to Church. But the gracious First Lady got the news in time, and spoke as easily as though she were reading a prepared script.

UNCONVENTIONAL CONVENTIONS

Every four years when the Elephant and the Donkey hold court the radio special events men have their most intensive workout. Few members of the general public realize how much influence radio exercises in the operation of a national political convention. I don't mean, of course, that the influence extends to picking candidates, but it's certainly dominant in regard to when sessions will be held and the exact time they will start. At convention after convention I've seen the newspapers slavishly listing the starting time at 8:30 P.M., when the radio men knew that the opening gavel would not fall until a minute and 30 seconds after 9 P.M. That minute and thirty seconds would be required for an introduction, a bit of scene-setting.

I've heard Joe Martin, himself a newspaper publisher and chairman of the Republican convention, muttering: "Now, let's

see, we open at 9:01:30, is that right? Who'll hand me a stopwatch?" And Sam Jackson, the Indianan who was chairman of the Democratic convention in 1944, also quickly became radio-minded. As he started one session, he turned around facing the broadcasting booths and questioningly put his forefinger to his nose, wanting assurance that he had started on time. I made an "O" of my thumb and forefinger, the radio signal indicating that everything was going jim-dandy, and Jackson smiled back happily.

Actually, the political parties still have a great deal to learn about radio and its uses. National conventions, as presently conducted, are an anachronism. There are too many repetitive speeches, and conventions last so many days they become a dreadful bore. The only speeches remembered by most people from the conventions of 1944 were those by Clare Boothe Luce, Republican, and Quentin Reynolds, Democrat. Both were intense, had something to say, said it with unusual clarity, and their talks were mercifully short. One rousing speech, the placing of the candidates' names in nomination, the balloting for President and Vice-President—these should be enough. The delegates would be pleased, so would be most of the professional politicians, and the listening public would be ecstatic. I predict a landslide victory for any major party that is ever smart enough to streamline its convention.

I've written earlier of the need of radio stations for proper coverage of Washington. The same thing applies to the conventions. Stations get their news of what's happening from press associations or from their networks, but these sources are unable to do a bang-up job of covering the state caucuses and other news of most interest at home. Only in the 1940 and 1944 conventions did the stations begin to send their own special events men in any numbers. At Chicago in 1944 I recall that there were radio reporters from cities as far apart as Tulsa and Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Baltimore. It's a safe bet that the radio gallery will soon be more crowded than the press gallery, but since the conventions are held largely for the benefit of the voters in their homes, this is as it should be.

A HOT TIME IN THE OLD TOWN

Election Night is another event that calls for the newsmen to get in there and pitch. In addition to returns, radio carries all kinds of features on Election Night—reports from the candidates' headquarters, an interview with the nation's oldest voter, with the youngest (an 18-year-old in Georgia because that state enfranchises youngsters of that age), with the first voter of the day (usually someone from a New England hamlet where all of the votes are cast a little after midnight), and with the last voter (usually someone from the State of Washington where the polls don't close until 11 o'clock Eastern Standard Time).

All this is done by the networks, but many local stations unfortunately haven't tried to match the networks with as intensive coverage of their own listening areas. At intervals on Election Night, the networks give prearranged "cut-away cues," words indicating that what's going to be said next isn't of extreme importance nationally—and at such times, every local station should go on its own and cover city, state, and regional returns fully.

In chapter after chapter of this book I've stressed the need for greater local news coverage. But I doubt that overemphasis is possible. Radio has proved itself in world news. It has still to do so locally. But wherever one station in a community does a real job the other stations will be forced to compete. That means more news personnel for stations all over the country and increasing importance for radio. Those things I'm for.

"PLEASE TELL OUR LISTENERS . . ."

One of the most interesting facets of radio news and special events—it's a combination of both—is the interview. It's interesting, but also phony. In nearly every case the interview is read from script, and the man asking the questions knows exactly what the other fellow is going to say. Too often, this becomes apparent in the first few words of the interview, and the advantages of putting on the air an actual participant in some vivid experience are thus carelessly tossed away.

Good interviewing for newspapers is an art. It's even more of an art for radio. The questions should be phrased so adroitly as to make it appear that they are being asked spontaneously and that the answers are unsuspected. There must be an anomaly—a carefully rehearsed casualness about it.

Few radio men have turned in as many first class jobs of interviewing as has Webley Edwards, of KHON, in Honolulu. At that Pacific crossroads during the war it was his job to interview, as he puts it, "All the gold braid and stuffed shirts, pompous characters such as visiting Congressmen, timid G.I.'s, and extroverted heroes."

Edwards developed a theory about interviewing that worked out superbly well in practice.

"I came to think of an interview," he told me, "as something like a little play, with lines to be spoken by two or more characters who, whether or not they like to be called that, are actors. A little play needs a sound plot, a good opening and closing, proper development of the sequence, and bright dialogue. One actor feeds lines to the other but the fact that the first actor (the interviewer) has far fewer lines than the other actor (the person interviewed) should not detract from the amount of careful writing put into his brief lines.

"As for rehearsal of interviews, that's just as important as rehearsal of any radio play. Not very many of the people to be interviewed have the manner and delivery of a trained actor, but by working with them, reading the script over and over, and writing in easier-to-read phrases here and there, it's possible to improve them a great deal. Familiarity with their material helps to melt personalities that before rehearsal seemed frozen behind reluctance, indifference, belligerence, suspicion or just plain fear."

EVERYTHING BUT THE STORY

Because most people who are being interviewed aren't news-men, it often happens that they just aren't aware of the best and newsiest part of their stories. Edwards has an anecdote concerning that feature of his work:

I remember one time interviewing a young Marine flier in a hospital. He had been shot down by the Japs and pretty badly smashed up. Actually the fight wasn't much. He was flying along and a Jap came out of the clouds and shot him down and he had to bail out. That was all there was to that, and it could be told in about that many words. But he spent at least 15 minutes telling every detailed little move he went through.

The point was that the most important thing to him was the flight. Then he spent a long time telling me about his swim to a coral reef, from where he ultimately was rescued by some natives after spending all night on the beach. He continued to mention how painful it was for him to swim, since he had a broken pelvis. I asked him about this, and he said it had been broken when he landed in the water. I showed my surprise that such a landing could do so much damage and he said, "Oh, I forgot to tell you. My parachute didn't open!"

Here was a guy who had bailed out of a fighter plane at 2,000 feet and hit the water with a closed parachute, but who had the presence of mind to hold himself as rigid as a stick as he went into the water. Although he was knocked giddy, he still remembered at the bottom of his dive to pull the valves of his Mae West jacket, which took him half-conscious to the surface and kept him from drowning. A terrific story! But it had taken him almost 45 minutes to get around to the telling of it.

A FEW FACTS ON FRANCOLAND

For some reason not known to me—and this is a generalization I might find hard to document—women seem to have a special knack of writing interviews so that the characters in Edwards's "little plays" get the most out of their lines. One young School of Journalism graduate I can cite is Ruth Ashton, who wrote many interviews in handling the program "Feature Story." Miss Ashton soon learned how best to employ the sympathetic talents of Harry Marble, interviewer on the program, to get the story from the interviewees and to weld them together so that the interviews seemed believable. Here is one example of her skill. I've put in marginal notes to point out some of the virtues and a possible defect or two of the script.

FEATURE STORY, MAY 22, 1946, 5:00-5:15 P.M.

MARBLE. This is Harry Marble with today's "Feature Story." And I'm beginning to think maybe this is correspondents' week. George Moorad came in from China on Monday, you may remember; and now Sidney Wise is back from covering Spain and is in our studio today. We've been wanting to talk to Sidney, because what he has to report has a direct bearing on one of the most pressing problems of the United Nations at the moment—what to do about Franco Spain. But let's introduce special CBS correspondent Sidney Wise right now.—Well, Sidney, it's nice to see you. But I must say we didn't expect the pleasure so soon.

WISE. I left Spain a little earlier than I expected to, Harry.

MARBLE. Yes. In fact, the rumor around here was that you departed in front of a Franco boot. Is that right?

WISE. Well—not entirely. You see, I did leave voluntarily. But I must admit, my stay wasn't . . . wasn't exactly encouraged . . . by certain government authorities.

MARBLE. Sidney, I wish you'd tell our listeners just how you did happen to leave Spain. I haven't heard anything like it since before the war—since reporters "weren't exactly encouraged" to stay in Germany.

WISE. Well, it was a Saturday . . . April 6th, and I was writing a script for the CBS morning news roundup. It was actually to go on the air at two P.M. Madrid time, but I finished around twelve-thirty, and was sort of polishing it up, when the phone rang. It was the Propaganda Ministry. They called to say I had to come see them

Notice how Marble doesn't insult the listeners' intelligence; he starts out by saying that he has heard the story and now wants the audience to hear it. His careful parroting of Wise's "wasn't exactly encouraged" phrase is good radio, too.

Wise's material is written in an excellent conversational style. There's an engaging lack of formality about the whole thing—and he has gotten into his story quickly and without frippery.

This is all highly credible language. Too often script writers have the radio interviewees saying things that might look well in a textbook on grammar, but have never really been said by anybody anywhere.

This colloquialism is interjected as a means of establishing that a rapport now exists between interviewer and interviewee. It isn't patronizing. It's just human.

right away. I said, "I'm sorry; I'm rather busy at the moment." The answer to that was: "You'll have to come; it's very, very urgent." Well, you carry an argument just about so far in Spain.

MARBLE. So you went!

WISE. That's right; I went. As soon as I got in the door, the official in charge barked out: "You must surrender your correspondent's credentials." Incidentally, without them, you can't work in Spain. In the meantime, the Spanish Gestapo had notified all the cable companies—everybody connected with communications—that I was forbidden to report from Spain. I told the official I didn't have my credentials with me. He said: "Surrender your credentials within fifteen minutes. If you don't get them here, the police will come to your apartment. If you still don't give them up, we'll expel you from the country." Well, I gave them up. I was shut out of everything anyway, so there was no use putting up a fight.

MARBLE. They had you on every side. But, Sidney, what kind of an explanation did they give? They certainly must have offered some.

WISE. Oh, they did. A short, skinny little fellow had taken care of me.

MARBLE. Really taken care of you!

WISE. That's right; and he told me my credentials were taken away because of my consistent hostility to the regime, and my utter lack of sympathy with Franco. I asked if this were temporary or permanent. And he pounded the table and ranted and raved: "This is absolutely permanent. As long as I hold this job, you will be forever forbidden to report inside Spain."

This irony is somewhat heavy-handed and doesn't quite come off.

Here, although Marble obviously knows what Wise's answer is going to be, he has asked a sensible question probably most listeners would want to ask if they could be doing the interviewing.

MARBLE. I remember the broadcasts you made, Sidney. We were a little astonished that you were allowed to say the things you did—about underground activities and such, but I don't exactly remember your calling Franco a "heel" or anything like that.

WISE. Well, you see, Harry, I reported what I did about the underground and about the generals, because—well, for one thing, you can't be a reporter in Spain without seeing them. And then, the Spanish Government said, as you probably remember, there's no censorship in that country. As a matter of fact, the American Embassy in Madrid protested on the basis of that announcement when I was relieved of my credentials.

MARBLE. Anyway, you voluntarily left pretty soon after Saturday, April 6th, isn't that right?

WISE. That's right.

MARBLE. Now, Sidney, this example you've given us certainly sounds like Fascism, all right. And not even the nations that recognize Franco argue that it doesn't exist there. But how complete is it . . . how deep does Fascism go in the Spanish Government?

WISE. It starts at the top, and spirals right down through everything in the country. Franco, of course, is all powerful; he's surrounded by his generals and his Fascist officials; and the structure is complete—an exact copy of the Nazi structure in Germany. Then, of course, there's the terrifying and vast Gestapo police system. Well . . . just as an example, in the budget for this year, the police received more than eight times the amount of money given to the Ministry of Agriculture; and Spain is an agricultural country. The Gestapo have a hand in everything. And I can speak from

three personal experiences, it isn't pleasant to have them come into your home. That's a shadow the Spanish people live under all the time.

MARBLE. That's appalling to think of, particularly when many people believe we just fought a war to get rid of it. But, Sidney, one way the Fascist governments have played for support has been by offering a high standard of living—enough food and clothing for everyone—what about that in Spain?

Notice the brevity of Wise's sentences and how effective they are in creating a picture of Fascist Spain.

WISE. It doesn't hold true. The economy is completely lopsided. Wages have stayed the same, and prices go up all the time. The black market is everywhere. Of course, you get an illusion of grandeur when you walk down the streets of Madrid. People seem well dressed. The store windows are beautifully filled. But that's just the illusion. Madrid has always been a show-case city. When you go out into the suburbs and small cities, you see acute and wretched poverty. People living in caves.

MARBLE. You mean actual caves?

WISE. Yes, actually holes in the side of the hill. Some people are still living in wrecked buildings. They're thin and undernourished. Bread riots are all too frequent.

MARBLE. That's certainly no inducement. But then, what does Franco hold out?

WISE. Well, Harry, he holds out fear, primarily. The Gestapo has an eye on everyone. They've shot off and killed leaders of the opposition. The jails are still filled with political prisoners. Just as I left, ten men were arrested and taken off to the dungeons for running a secret press.

MARBLE. But there is a secret press?

WISE. Yes, and it's one of the most wonderfully dramatic things in the world. Hun-

Marble isn't an attorney in a court of law and thus is entitled to

*ask leading questions.
They're designed to
elicit the most newsy
information Wise can
supply—and are please-
antly brief.*

dreds of policemen continuously try to break it up. But despite all efforts, it keeps right on. It's almost like a game of cops and robbers.

MARBLE. That's one encouraging thing, anyway, if the underground is really active.

WISE. And it is very active. Of course actually, Harry, about 80 per cent of the Spanish people are anti-Franco.

MARBLE. You mean, it's that large . . . 80 per cent?

WISE. Yes, but you see they can't get together in a very large organization because of this vast Gestapo system. And some people take advantage of something else Franco holds out. You see, there are certain privileges given for loyalty to the regime, and the regime knows how loyal you are practically to the exact degree.

MARBLE. Just as an example, Sidney, what are some of the privileges?

WISE. Well, in jobs, for instance. To hold a job, you have to have a syndicalist card. The Government operates the syndicates, and anyone who wants to work has to belong to one. In that way, people work only at what the Government wants them to. Just say, you want to be an announcer, and your political record with the regime isn't so good. You may get a card to be a ditch-digger. That's how the Government buys off many people. And people with talent who want to sell out can . . . and do.

MARBLE. In other words, you wouldn't have to be good; you'd just have to be loyal to get into almost anything.

WISE. More or less. That's the way it works.

MARBLE. Well, Sidney, what does that do to . . . say, art, or anything creative inside Spain? Can there be much with such a system?

Speaking of generalizations! This probably would be somewhat better if Wise had qualified his statement with the words "in my opinion." But if that's what he believes, he has every right to say it.

A rather abrupt transition, but this is where the interview has been headed ever since the introduction.

Skillfully, the interview has been brought to the point where Wise has his "mes-

Wise. In the seven years the Franco regime has been in power, Spain has failed to produce a single painter, sculptor, singer, writer, any artist of any merit whatsoever despite the inducement of subsidies. On the other hand, probably one of the greatest modern painters, Pablo Picasso, is a Spaniard who refuses to go back to Spain; Pablo Casals, a fine and well-known cellist, refuses to go back to Spain; one of the most famous surgeons in the world is a Republican Spaniard in London who refuses to go back to Spain. Creative thinking in that country has been killed. Or maybe it would be better to say . . . stifled; all free air has been choked off.

MARBLE. Now to a popular question of the moment. Do you think that Franco Spain is a threat to world peace?

WISE. That's a big question, Harry. It really depends on what you mean by a "threat to peace." If you mean is Franco going to march through Europe like Hitler did, the answer is no; he isn't strong enough militarily. But to get to the main thing, he is a threat in spirit! We know he's against us. Look at the record in this, the first year of peace. We've asked him to give up more than two thousand dangerous Nazis in Spain; he refuses. This clearly shows that Franco is still sympathetic to the Nazis even today. The ideals the Falange preaches are—and we know they are—absolutely against everything we stand for, and everything U.N. stands for. Who can tell what a hostile nation like Franco Spain might do if the chance ever came that way?

MARBLE. So actually, Sidney, after seeing Spain and living there, you think the Security Council has a pretty big responsibility when it comes to doing something about the Spanish question.

sage." His two closing speeches are longer than most of the others and thus he's given a chance to put over the views in which he is most interested.

The interview ends on a high point of contemporary interest. The writer has left the audience wanting more.

WISE. I do, indeed. I think the Security Council has a terrifying responsibility. In fact, if the issue is postponed, and no realistic solution is applied, I think it will be just about the same as the League of Nations doing nothing about Mussolini and nothing about Hitler. After all, Harry, how could Hitler have been proved a threat in the middle thirties? If you speak of an ideology, you can't touch it. You can't pick it up off the floor and say: "Look here, this is a threat." We can know when a nation is against everything we've fought for—and that's Spain today.

MARBLE. Sidney Wise, I want to thank you very, very much for your enlightening report on Spain, and for coming into the studio and talking with us today. I think you've given us all some very important and new thoughts on one of the world's most disturbing questions.—And that was today's Feature Story, a program brought to you on every weekday, Monday through Friday, at this same time.

18. GREAT DAY IN THE MORNING

Radio on June 6, 1944

FROM THE VIEWPOINT of radio, World War II was the greatest special event of all time. It was the first war radio had ever covered, and never before had the American public been so close to the front lines.

True, there had been sporadic indications of what might be expected of radio in warfare. In 1936 across the Spanish border from Hendaye, France, there was first heard on American air the ominous rumbling of things to come. H. V. Kaltenborn was in Hendaye when the Rebels were battling Loyalists in the frontier city of Irun, and the conflict was drawn in farm land outside the city and not far from the International Bridge. Kaltenborn somehow managed to get his microphone and cable to the comparative safety of a haystack and from that vantage point described the battle in progress. The whine of rifle bullets, the bursting of shells and bombs could be heard as plainly as static permitted.

Radio had passed up a similar opportunity. In 1934, during the war between Bolivia and Paraguay in the Gran Chaco, a swarthy Latin came into my office and wondered if any advertiser would be interested in sponsoring battles. I said I thought not. I explained that one of the things most wanted by advertisers was *regularity* of broadcasting. This periodicity—an advertising word if ever I saw one—kept the customers coming back week after week at the same hour to be entertained or informed, and to learn the values of three-way toothpaste and watermelon nectar in cigarettes. But my visitor was unperturbed. He insisted

I didn't understand. He was able to deliver, he said, the very thing the advertisers wanted. He had many friends among the generals on both sides, he explained, and he could guarantee a battle a week at whatever hour we insisted upon. Both sides could use the money for the broadcasting rights, and we would really be doing a service if we could interest an advertiser in a series of bullet-laden programs.

I still insisted that we would not be able to recommend the idea in any conscience, contending that the American public's taste for sensationalism probably was not sufficiently catholic to accept a commercial program in which people were being killed and wounded. With many a muttering about the lack of Yanqui initiative, my visitor departed.

THE LONG WAY 'ROUND

Then, too, radio had a slight firsthand acquaintance with war in connection with the Italian conquest of Ethiopia. There were no workable transmitters with the Italian forces, but there was a wheezy one in Addis Ababa, over which we heard broadcasts about the plight of the helpless Ethiopians. Incidentally, the dying days of that campaign provided an illustration of radio's effectiveness—code radio rather than voice, but radio nonetheless.

Rioting Abyssinians, to whom, in their depressed fortunes, all white men were alike, had begun to stone the American Legation in Addis Ababa. Help was available at the British Compound some eight miles away, but there was no telephone, and it was debatable whether any message could be taken to John Bull Garcia unless the messenger wanted to fill himself full of holes. In desperation the Americans sent out a wireless plea for help. It was picked up at Cavite in the Philippines, relayed to the State Department in Washington, and quickly flashed to the American Embassy in London. The latter notified the British Foreign Ministry, and a radio message was soon on its way to the British Compound. British-officered native troops arrived in trucks at the American Legation, dispersed the rioters, and led the Americans to safety. All of this because radio had carried a message

around the world, some 25,000 miles, to reach a point eight miles away!

But all previous radio experiences in war paled in comparison with the events that began on Sept. 1, 1939, and then saw our own entry into the war on Dec. 7, 1941. Although broadcasting did an increasingly efficient job after Pearl Harbor, I think it safe to say that its greatest day was June 6, 1944.

There may be some question in regard to the selection of "D-Day" as radio's greatest. But many reasons dictate this choice. In the first place, as General Eisenhower has since pointed out, it was a critical day in the prosecution of the war—a magnificent gamble with eventual victory as the stakes. In the second place, the result was not then known. "V-E Day" and "V-J Day" were in a sense routine because the events had been anticipated and discounted. In the third place, all American networks, all American radio, worked as a team to insure the best possible coverage. War Department officials and technicians on both sides of the Atlantic toiled unceasingly to provide proper transmission; radio executives abandoned their customary competitive attitudes in the interest of public service.

The story of radio and "D-Day" has not been published in full detail in any book such as this. Paul Hollister and Robert Strunsky of the CBS Sales Promotion Department wrote and edited a mimeographed account of what took place on that celebrated day, but the circulation of their hundred-page volume was restricted to working personnel, advertisers and their agencies, and affiliated stations. Later their story appeared in a CBS-published book, "D-Day through Victory in Europe." (Copyright, 1944, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. Selections which follow reproduced by permission.)

One other preface. I will be describing what went on behind-the-scenes and on the air at CBS, but the description for the most part is equally applicable to NBC, ABC, and MBS. In anticipation of "D-Day," four-network conferences among the various network news directors, William Brooks of NBC, G. W. "Johnny" Johnstone of ABC, John Whitmore of Mutual, and me, together with Army public relations officers such as Colonel Edward Kirby and Major Jack Harris—not to leave out Com-

mander Jack Hartley—were weekly and semiweekly occurrences. Our Army-installed and operated circuit to London passed through all four network offices. In that way everyone knew the business of everyone else. It was customary for one of us in New York to take down and pass along important messages to our rivals; the same thing happened in London. In the height of the excitement "pool" broadcasts—those available to all networks—were the rule rather than the exception. The teamwork and sportsmanship were, in a word, magnificent.

WHAT'S IMPORTANT

All of us knew, of course, that the invasion of continental Europe from the west was coming. The only question was when. The preparations were of all types—covering personnel, technical installations, advice to everyone who might possibly be concerned. Late in February I sent out a memorandum which said in part:

Military experts have warned us that a frontal attack on Hitler's fortress may cost a record number of casualties. But bad handling of the news may cost plenty of casualties, too, either because the workers at home may believe prematurely that the war has been won and take it easy, or because they worry unnecessarily and are not able to do their jobs. Accordingly, as far as Columbia is concerned, let's stick to these few simple general instructions:

1. No matter what the general tenor of the news, keep an informative, unexcited demeanor at the microphone.

2. Give sources. Be sure to label every report that is not officially released. Recently there have been at least two instances where this practice which we have long followed has paid off. One was at the Anzio bridgehead, where German claims of victory proved to be unfounded. The other was at Truk, where the Japanese tried to make the world believe that American forces had landed. As a rule of thumb, let us in every case "lead" with the latest Allied communiqué or report from one of our own correspondents and then, if there are contrary reports either from enemy or friendly sources, label them and subordinate them. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that accuracy should never be risked for the sake of a prospective "beat."

3. Be careful even in the choice of words. For instance: "Allied

forces today *rolled* toward X"; Allied air *armadas* today continued their *round-the-clock* bombings"; "The German defenses of Z today were *pulverized*." The italicized words in those sentences are apt to be exaggerations and breed a dangerous optimism. If the facts in the above instances call for more moderate language, then sacrifice colorful writing and say, "Allied forces today *moved* toward X"; "Allied *air forces* today continued their *repeated* bombings"; "The German defenses of Z today were *hard hit*." Even the word "counter-attack" may be a misnomer. It may be an out-and-out attack. Naturally, we cannot hope to edit the language of official communiqués, but if there seems to be any ground for suspicion that the full story is being withheld, we are at liberty to point out discrepancies within the known record.

4. When we don't know, let's say so. If the last official word on an invasion force came 20 hours ago and was to the effect that "satisfactory progress" was being made in an attack on Y, then let's not lead a news broadcast with some locution such as this: "Allied troops were believed today to be progressing toward Y." We simply don't know, and there's no use pretending to any knowledge we don't possess. Far better to do it this way: "Nothing has been released for the past 20 hours concerning the Allied attack on Y. The last official word was, etc."

5. In short, always aim for the listener's confidence, and remember that winning the war is a hell of a lot more important than reporting it.

These were general instructions. But on May 15 the time was at hand to be specific. Everett Holles, my assistant, had spent days composing a fifteen-page memorandum outlining the method by which we intended to function from the instant the news of invasion reached us. Immediately, the hours of network broadcasting were increased in order to reduce the possibility of being "off the air" when the big news came. The 15 pages went on to give instructions such as these:

Should the flash come between 2:00 A.M. and 5:00 A.M. on weekdays, call Master Control. Order up the network. A recorded program of music is set to run for 55 minutes; cut in and out of it as you wish. There's a great possibility that first reports may come from enemy or "neutral" sources. If that's the case, the news judgment of the editor-in-charge will be called upon. It may be that we will want

to go on the air with such a bulletin, provided the editors believe there is good foundation for such a report. However, it is extremely important that any such bulletin be concisely and unmistakably labelled for what it is, and that we point out that there has been no Allied confirmation as yet. We must not reach beyond the facts.

Call all key personnel. Miss Gauss [my secretary] will check on arrangements for delivery of coffee to news staff.

Advise the AT&T and RCA to set up monitors for us on their London circuits . . . In addition to the London circuits, we will have an Army Signal Corps circuit from London (handled through the AT&T) and known as "FAX." This circuit will not begin to function for us until the invasion has actually begun, but thereafter we will maintain a constant 24-hour monitor on it in Studio 9. Most of our coordination messages will be handled over FAX. But if the West-to-East FAX circuit is tied up when we want to get a service message to London, we can send such a message through the War Department Signal Center in Washington . . . 50 words . . . address "ARL 470 FOR RELAY TO MOI."

In addition, keep a constant monitor on BBC through an extension from the short-wave listening post. The listening post is to be fully manned. Attached you will find a list of foreign expert-consultants in New York, to be called at any hour.

I GET A PIANO . . .

In addition to telling people what to do, radio executives went about the job of getting the tools with which to do it. Early in the spring, technicians completed the job of installing on my desk a rather weird looking instrument immediately dubbed a "piano." It was only vaguely like a keyboard, equipped with push buttons, dials, bits of colored glass, and switches. Using the switches, dials, and some of the push buttons, I could listen in on trans-Atlantic broadcast facilities through a loud-speaker in my office. Using the colored buttons, the engineers could tell me whether a signal from abroad was "good," "fair," or "unusable" (or non-existent, for that matter). Using the remainder of the push buttons I could direct the announcers in the near-by news studio—Studio 9—as to what point they should introduce next, and I could direct the engineers as to which circuit should be used

after the announcer had made his introduction. There was also attached a headset which enabled me to overhear all conversations on the FAX circuit between broadcasters of the other networks and their home offices. In fact, this instrument panel on my desk, this "piano," could do about everything except make a milk-shake and eliminate static.

. . . AND A PANDORA'S BOX

Then, less than three weeks before "D-Day," there appeared on the wall of Studio 9 a pine cupboard that looked like a medicine cabinet. It was locked, and there were 11 numbered keys given to 11 newsmen, at least one of whom was scheduled to be in the newsroom at any hour, day or night. Inside the cabinet was a microphone attached to a good deal of wire that would stretch to a view of any of the 13 automatic printer machines in the newsroom, or any of 5 other machines linking us with cable companies in the adjacent network traffic office. There was also a switch. At any time that switch was depressed a fraction of an inch, the entire network would be shunted aside and that microphone would become the main-line express. All intermediate controls would be abolished and whatever was said into that "flash mike" would have the complete right-of-way.

There were myriad other details of preparation. Representatives of advertising agencies were called in and told our plans, were asked to have special "D-Day" scripts available in case their programs weren't canceled out. Affiliate stations were advised of plans, and many of them made plans of their own. WLAC in Nashville, for instance, volunteered to call civic leaders to tell them of the invasion at whatever hour the news was received. WABC in New York arranged to notify the Mayor, and he planned to let the city's air-raid sirens extend themselves in a prolonged blast—first having informed the public of the reason for the prospective din. The War Department in Washington didn't like the idea, and it was abandoned. Nevertheless the Mayor—who at that time was F. H. LaGuardia—asked to be telephoned anyway. As a matter of fact, he was telephoned. He sounded interested, but sleepy.

As May progressed events themselves showed that the hour of decision was close at hand. One sign came from Italy where Alexander's Army, long thwarted at Cassino, finally achieved a junction with the forces that had burst the seams of the Anzio pocket. It happened that the first news of this junction came from correspondent Eric Sevareid. Far away from the main thread of this chapter is an exchange of cables between Sevareid and myself. Mine to him—and I hope you will have little difficulty in decoding the cablese:

Congratulations you did it again your story upjoining southern etanzio forces uppicked every press association widely frontpaged stop if you manage find anything sufficiently potable then blow yourself [Winston] burdett [Farnsworth] fowle large evening stop our accounting department later unblinkingly approving expense item amid respectful silence

And Sevareid's reply:

Thanks muchly your cable hope untoo much publicity this beat which due entirely dumb luck having broadcast as scheduled exact moment announcement was released stop matter fact they forgot awake me smorning eye last reporter reach scene junction stop all aware my beat now saying quote we shoulda stood in bed unquote

MISS ELLIS GIVES US PRACTICE

By the first of June the tension was electric. On June 2nd I decided that I would cut down still further the number of hours that the network was normally off the air. This communication went out to all affiliates:

Confidential and unpublishable. Beginning tonight, June 2nd, and nightly until further notice, we will operate our full network until 3:05 A.M. EWT. The decision to start this overtime operation is not based upon any military information, but it will provide additional protection to you in case extraordinary news does develop.

The next day, Saturday, June 3, gave us all a workout. The War Department had installed a special telephone in the news-rooms of all networks, a phone that had the loudest call bell

I've ever heard, and it was emphasized over and over again that we would get plenty of warning of "the" announcement, and that it would come only from SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force) through the War Department.

But the AP's printers that Saturday made it look as though SHAEF and the War Department had been scooped. In the London office of AP was a young teletype operator by the name of Joan Ellis. In beginning her work that evening (it was after 10 o'clock at night in London) she somehow inserted some ticker tape that had been typed out as a practice flash on the invasion into a cable circuit to the New York office. At 4:39:15 P.M. in New York, Bob Trout put it on the air, interrupting Ted Husing's description of a horse race to do so. At 4:41:30 Trout again interrupted Husing to say that the AP had sent a "hold" on the flash. Later that afternoon the story was finally killed, and the rueful explanation came sputtering over the AP machines. But Miss Ellis had given American radio a valuable rehearsal.

The next day Mark Clark's Fifth Army reached Rome. Monday, June 5, was quiet, and no news of any possible invasion had leaked. Actually, I went to bed that night with a pretty fair idea I would have a good night's sleep. The War Department had told me that Ed Murrow had been selected as the radio voice to read General Eisenhower's proclamation, and that night at 6:45 P.M., EST (which was 12:45 A.M. on D-Day itself in London) I talked with Murrow on a two-way "cue channel," so called because the correspondents abroad wear headphones, and over that channel hear the "cue" that tells them to start their broadcasts. These "cue channel" conversations, of course, are not usually heard by the general public, although at the time all conversations were listened to carefully by censors in New York and London.

Mindful of this censorship and still trying to get a hint from Murrow, I said:

"Well, I suppose I may be talking with you later tonight."

"No," he said, "I'm pretty tired and am planning to get to bed early."

A GOOD NIGHT'S SLEEP-IN PROSPECT

That was enough for me. I told the staff it was improbable we would get any action that night, and I went to my hotel room two blocks away from the studios prepared to do some sleeping while the sleeping was good.

But sleep for a good many hours to come ended violently at 12:37 A.M. The AP machine carried a bulletin that began:

New York, June 6—(AP)—The German transocean news service has announced that the Allied invasion has begun.

Jesse Zousmer, the editor on duty, dialed extension 694—my hotel room was on the inter-office communications system in order to bypass switchboards and thus save precious seconds—and told me the news. I said I'd be over within 10 minutes. Then, still tieless but otherwise dressed, I called him back.

"Any confirmation?" I asked.

"Nope," said Zousmer, "but INS is now carrying the German report, too."

"Oke," I said, "put it on the air."

Ned Calmer, who had finished his own day's work at the microphone, but had stayed on to write a script in French for the Office of War Information, sauntered into the newsroom just as Zousmer hung up. Calmer said later he had never seen anyone as frightened as Zousmer. There was no announcer on hand at the time, and Zousmer was about to make his debut on the air with one of the most important stories of all time.

"What in the hell is the matter with you?" Calmer asked.
"You look like you're going to sneeze or die."

Zousmer held out a trembling hand.

"Here," he said, "put this on the air." And these were Calmer's first words into the microphone:

We are interrupting this program to bring you a special bulletin. A bulletin has just been received from the London office of the Associated Press which quotes the German Transocean News Agency as asserting that the invasion of Western Europe has begun.

This report—and we stress it is of enemy origin with absolutely

no confirmation from Allied sources—says that American landings were made this morning on the shores of northwestern France.

There is as yet no reason to believe that this report is anything more than a German propaganda move or a fishing expedition for information. You will recall that Prime Minister Churchill warned us not long ago that the actual invasion would be preceded by feints and diversions. Nevertheless, until confirmation or denial of this German report is forthcoming, the CBS World News staff is standing by and will bring you developments as reported.

12:46 A.M.-3:32 A.M.

Thereafter both Calmer and a hastily summoned announcer, Ed Darlington, kept putting on the news at intervals, carefully qualifying every German report. I arrived in the office, called Washington on the 24-hour-a-day private telephone that linked the New York and Washington offices, and tried to see if there were any sign of confirmation. No word except that "more lights than usual are on at the War Department" and that some public relations officers could not be reached at their homes. Presumably, they, too, had been routed out of bed.

Zousmer was still on the telephone, as were others of the overnight staff, calling in the personnel necessary for the night. Soon after 1:15, fearful that some of the stations might be planning to leave the air, I had Darlington tell the public (and the stations themselves) that we were planning to stay on the air all night, regardless of whether the news was confirmed. Then I tried all available circuits to London. I pressed button after button on the "piano," hauled over the small microphone on my desk, and kept up a monotonous chant, "Hello, London . . . Hello, London . . . CBS, New York, calling London . . . Hello, London." No answer.

Then the short-wave listening station picked up a clue. BBC in London, speaking to Europe, was overheard to tell citizens who lived along the Atlantic coast within 18 miles of the beach to stay off roads and railways and bridges. Later the German short wave began to talk about an invasion, and also said that the ports of Calais and Dunkirk were receiving a terrific air bom-

bardment. Whether this was actually the case or whether the Germans, as usual, were "fishing" for information, was not clear. It was still more bewildering when, from somewhere, came a report that the invasion was in the vicinity of Cherbourg, and a few minutes after that the BBC started warning Dutch listeners in their native language. Some or all of this was certainly a smoke screen. We simply couldn't be attacking all the way from Cherbourg to Holland. It was time for some analysis of these various rumors and reports, and by that time the hastily summoned experts were assembling. Bob Trout, Major George Fielding Eliot, Quentin Reynolds—these were among the first arrivals. They were given time only to digest what little hard news there was—it wasn't until much later we heard for certain about the Normandy peninsula—then sent to the microphone to hazard their explanations of what it all added up to. Thousands and thousands of words had been pre-written on every conceivable subject from details of William-the-Conqueror's invasion in 1066 to a scholarly discussion of June climate in Normandy and Brittany, but since no one knew exactly where the invasion, if any, was taking place, most of these words were useless.

The press associations, normally fairly quiet at that time of morning, were keeping their wires humming with reports and speculation. Finally, at 3:00 A.M. I had the flash mike rigged up for Bob Trout, and sent him into the newsroom where he could roam from one printer machine to the other, able to give the authoritative news at the second any news agency got it first—in case any did.

At 3:07 the loud bell rang on the War Department special phone. This, I thought, was it. I picked up the phone only to hear an unidentified voice saying the War Department was making a routine check of the circuit. "Come in, one at a time, all networks," said the voice. "Give the name of your company and your own name." Four frantic persons in four frantic newsrooms answered the roll-call. "Thanks," said the voice. "When are you going to have anything definite?" I asked. "Get back to you later. Good-bye," said the War Department.

The coffee and sandwiches had arrived. One of the first persons called that night was a caterer. I worked the buttons on my

table endlessly and unavailingly. Trout talked on and on. The minutes were lumbering tortoises hanging with all their weight to the red second hand of the clock. Then, at 3:27 the War Department bell clanged a single, long imperative. Once more, a roll call. Then said the voice:

"Stand by for an important message over the FAX Army Signal Corps Channel at 3:32:zero. Repeating, stand by for an important message over the FAX Army Signal Corps Channel at 3:32:zero. Come in and confirm, please."

We all confirmed. I wigwagged to Trout to give his microphone to Major Eliot, and let the latter talk for a few minutes. Then I explained to Trout that he was to switch to London at 3:32:00, but not to say anything about the War Department's call before switching. Enemy ears might be listening and if, in fact, there were no invasion, I didn't want anyone tipped off ahead of the announcement.

There was time to tell Jimmy Sirmons of network operations what was going to happen, and he in turn told the control room. Someone popped his head in the door and said the phone company had reported all 143 stations still on the air and waiting. I nodded and watched that red second hand. I vaguely heard Trout, who had taken back the microphone from Major Eliot. Just ahead of 3:32 there came the words, "And now, for a special announcement, we take you to London."

3:32-10:00 A.M.

One second. Two. Three. Four. At five seconds after the minute the senior public relations officer of SHAEF, Col. R. Ernest Dupuy, begins to speak. In 26 words he tells the story:

"Under the Command of General Eisenhower, Allied Naval Forces, supported by strong Air Forces, began landing Allied Armies this morning on the northern coast of France."

I had arranged that Major Eliot broadcast whenever London was finished, but had no idea the broadcast would be so brief. But a 26-word text can provide several lengthy sermons for a military analyst, and the Major has no difficulty filling the time while the news directors of the other networks and I find out

what's coming next. It's to be Ed Murrow reading General Eisenhower's Order of the Day, and that's scheduled at 3:37:40. Here is the text:

Soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force: You are about to embark on a great crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere go with you. In company with our brave Allies and brothers in arms on other fronts you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

Your task will not be an easy one. Your enemy is well trained, well equipped, and battle hardened. He will fight, fight savagely. But in this year of 1944 much has happened since the Nazi triumphs of 1940 and 1941.

The United Nations have inflicted upon the Germans great defeats in open battle, man to man. Our air offensive has seriously reduced their strength in the air, and their capacity to wage war on the ground.

Our home fronts have given us an overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war, and have placed at our disposal great reserves of trained fighting men.

The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory. I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full victory.

Good luck and let us all beseech the blessing of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.

Control of the air then passes back and forth between New York and London for the next few minutes while the latter point pours out oddments of news held up by censor until the "important announcement" had been released. But by 3:47 it's time to hear the voice of General Eisenhower himself, speaking to the captive peoples of Europe:

People of Western Europe . . . the hour of your liberation is approaching . . . follow the instructions you have received . . . continue your passive resistance, but do not needlessly endanger your lives until I give you the signal to rise and strike the enemy. . . . A premature uprising of all Frenchmen may prevent you from being of

maximum help to your country in the critical hour. Be patient. Prepare.

Those who have common cause with the enemy and so betrayed their country will be removed. As France is liberated from her oppressors, you yourselves will choose your representatives and the government under which you wish to live.

In the course of this campaign for the final defeat of the enemy you may sustain further loss and damage. Tragic though they may be, they are part of the price of victory. I assure you I shall do all in my power to mitigate your hardships. I know that I can count on your steadfastness now, no less than in the past.

This landing is but the opening phase of the campaign in Western Europe. Great battles lie ahead. I call upon all who love freedom to stand with us. Keep your faith staunch. Our arms are resolute. Together we shall achieve victory.

As 4 o'clock nears we've no idea as to how large an audience we have. But we know it's almost certainly the biggest ever to be listening at that hour. Stations around the country wire in that lights are on all over the city, that men are coming out into the streets and bellowing, "Turn on your radios!" In many war plants the night shift workers are told the news; they listen for a moment, their jaws tighten, and they go back to work a little harder and a little faster. Power companies report an unusual load for electric current.

And now there's a parade of international celebrities. Recorded in advance, King Haakon of Norway, the Prime Minister of the Netherlands, and the Prime Minister of Belgium speak to their peoples.

"Fellow countrymen, keep together and be prepared. Long live the cause of freedom!"

One wonders why there's no address from de Gaulle. It turns out later there had been a display of Gallic temperament because the French leader felt he, instead of Eisenhower, should be giving orders to the French. At last, de Gaulle agreed to make a recording, as we shall see later, but it was not made in time for this broadcast.

But thus far there has been no actual eye-witness account. Finally, London advises that the first correspondent is back and

his copy is cleared by censors. He is Wright Bryan of NBC, who went to cover the war for the Atlanta *Journal* and WSB. All networks pick up his report:

I rode with the first group of planes from a troop-carrier command to take our fighting men into Europe. I watched from the rear door of our plane, named "Snooty," as 17 American paratroopers led by a Lieutenant Colonel jumped with their arms, ammunition, and equipment into German-occupied France. . . .

Down the long passenger cabin I walked to see how the paratroopers were riding. More than half of them had taken their colonel's advice and were dozing with their heads back against the wall and their feet stretched out in front of them. The others were sitting silently except for two or three who talked among themselves in whispers. Half-way across the channel, planes one by one switched out their formation of lights. . . .

"Tiny, tell the colonel it's 30 minutes until jump time," yelled pilot Pete. . . . None of us spoke but each looked at the other. The navigation had been perfect. We could see the beach ahead precisely at the point we had studied it on maps or on aerial photographs and carefully modelled relief maps. The moon was almost full. Clouds were riding occasionally in front of it, but visibility was excellent. . . . The small fields looked peaceful with their orderly rows. . . .

"Are you all set?" asked the colonel. "Get this thing hooked for me," he said, as he took his own place closest to the door. They blinked as the pilot threw his switch and before I could look up they began jumping. I wanted to know how long it would take the 18 men to jump. I tried to count 101, 102, 103, to estimate the number of seconds. Before I had counted to 10 seconds—it may have been 11 or 12 but no more—our passengers had left us, all but one of them. The paratroopers shoved each other so swiftly and heavily towards the open door that they jolted against the door frame. One man among the last half-dozen hit the rear of the door so heavily that he was thrown into the back of the cabin and was dazed. The men behind shoved him aside and went on jumping. Before the unhappy soldier could get to his feet our plane was well past the drop zone and in a matter of minutes it was back over the water and setting a course for home.

And now Quentin Reynolds, who has been up the corridor stowed away in a little office, confides that he has written a

"piece." A veteran newsman who had covered the Dieppe raid of 1942, Reynolds knows at first hand what the foot-soldier is now encountering. There's nothing else available from London at the moment and Reynolds has the microphone:

There seems to be no doubt that our forces struck boldly at the very heart of the German defenses, the best defended part of the French coast. If the conventional pattern of military tactics is followed we will, or have already, landed on the flanks of this main operational area.

Dieppe is on the southern flank, only about 40 miles from the northern extreme of our landing area. It is only fitting that we make one of the landings on the beaches in front of Dieppe. Those of us who paid another visit to Dieppe in August, 1942, are hoping that our troops will make Dieppe a target. We have a lot of unfinished business there.

And our troops will get a lot of help on the Dieppe beaches. Two years ago we left some 3,500 Canadians at Dieppe. Many were made prisoners, many more died there on the black shale beaches. They were buried where they fell, many of them, and if the ancient words of the army song are correct, we know that old soldiers never die. It is not too fantastic to assume that the spirit of those Canadian dead have been waiting patiently for this hour. It has been a long wait for them but the revenge will be sweet.

Now at last those who died at Dieppe will know that their lives were not wasted. . . . The main object of the Dieppe raid was to test out the German defenses—to find out as much as we could about them. We accomplished that object. Without that dress rehearsal this big show would have been impossible. We learned many lessons at Dieppe. We depended then entirely upon the element of surprise. We did no preliminary bombing. We used no airborne troops.

Reports from France during the night and early morning tell us that there was not only a strong preliminary air bombing of the French coast but a terrific naval artillery barrage as well. Dieppe taught us that we needed this bombardment before we could land with maximum safety. At Dieppe we used no airborne troops, and German reserves hurried up unopposed. Last night thousands of airborne troops were landed and dropped inland. Dieppe taught us that we needed airborne troops to cut off enemy roads, to demolish enemy blockhouses, to disorganize German reserves.

At Dieppe we landed on what was roughly a five-mile beach area. The whole Luftwaffe came at us, concentrating its strength in that small area. Dieppe taught us that this was a reckless method of landing, that only by spreading over a period of miles and striking in several places simultaneously could we split the Luftwaffe up into several smaller units which could be handled easily by our air force fighters.

There are those who still say Dieppe was a failure. If you think of Dieppe in terms of lives that were saved during the past seven hours, Dieppe was not a failure; it was a glorious success. Every lesson that our military commanders learned at Dieppe was utilized during the long hours of last night. The lives of those men who fell at Dieppe were not wasted. And today the ghosts of those who fell at Dieppe hover proudly over the French coast, satisfied that finally they have come into their own—they know now and the world knows that their sacrifice was not in vain and, being soldiers, they are content.

This broadcast received more fan mail than any other during that morning. Here is one letter:

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS:

It is with the deepest gratitude that I heard your speech yesterday over CBS. My husband was killed in his Spitfire over Dieppe on that day of Aug. 19, 1942—the first American fighter pilot believed to have been lost in the European theatre. After almost two years of hearing the words “disgrace of Dieppe,” “worthless bloodshed,” and “the Dieppe failure,” I had come to the conclusion that only those of us who *had* lost someone there that day could possibly know the sorrow and anger such a national reaction could bring. It is a hard thing to be told that you have lost your husband for a failure, for a national disgrace. I had the feeling that people would like to forget his sacrifice because it had accomplished nothing.

And so, during all the wild excitement and exhilaration of yester-morning, I kept wishing that he could have been there too, that he could have shared in the honor and thrill of a successful landing on the shores of “Hitler’s Europe”; that he could have been flying with his squadron on this other and more fruitful mission.

It was then that you spoke, and the pride and gratitude that I felt cannot be easily expressed on paper. I can only say that I felt with you, that he *was* there and that, through his mission two years ago, he was guiding these flyers in, saving the lives of hundreds of other young men, and that now I could know he died for a reason.

I should be deeply indebted to you if you could let me have a copy of your talk, so that his son would know what, in the eyes of one who had been at Dieppe and at many other scenes of action in this war, his father had accomplished for him.

Next, back to the pool. John Vandercook of NBC does an analytical broadcast from London at 4:40 and eight minutes later comes another eye-witness, this time James Wellard of ABC, then called the Blue network. Says Wellard:

I have just seen the first American troops preparing to storm ashore on the continent of Europe. At 6:23 the Marauder bomber in which I was riding dropped the last load of bombs on the coastal target just before H-Hour. . . . I could see no evidence of the landings beyond a small number of parachutes lying on the ground. With the exception of German tanks moving up the beachheads or hiding in hedges, we saw no signs of enemy resistance. . . . At this point I'd like to report that Sgt. Paul Stopp of Cedartown, Georgia, the waist-gunner with whom I was riding, promptly turned his machine guns on one German tank by a crossroads and claims to have set it on fire. I saw the tank burning. . . .

You will have to forgive the superlatives, but they are an accurate description of the facts in this case. The air and sea armadas I saw this morning were the biggest that nations at war have ever launched at one time. At briefing, our pilots were told to stay at a level below 6,000 feet over England. The air was filled with other planes—Fortresses, Liberators, Thunderbolts, Spitfires—hundreds of them crossing and criss-crossing above and below us. The pilot of our ship called out over the intercom telephone, "There are planes strung out ahead and behind us like strings of sausage." Even more incredible was what we could see on the water. Long lines of ships sailing in single file. Vast convoys from above looked like water beetles. There were literally ships as far as the eye could reach, and the eye can reach a long way at 5,000 feet up. The weather was clear; the sun was shining on Brittany, and visibility was good. Farms, roads, hamlets, and enemy tanks were all plain to the naked eye.

Then things began to happen fast. First, our 18 fifty-pound bombs were away. I watched these and other bombs cascading down from our formation. When they hit the earth they seemed to draw out plumes of dirty, oily, yellow smoke. From the amount of high explosives we were pouring on the land below, it seemed impossible for anything however small, or however deeply hidden, to survive. As our

flight of 50 Marauders were on their bomb run, we were met by only a few puffs of inaccurate flak. . . .

Though our gunners trained their guns several times, not a single enemy fighter or plane was sighted. In fact, the only time our guns were fired was when our boys cut loose on the German tanks. It was the same all the way out and back to England.

Our flight was as peaceful as a skyride between New York and Chicago.

The next pool broadcaster, at 5:07, is Richard Hottelet of CBS, also back from his ride in the first wave of Marauders over the French coast. Says Hottelet:

We saw medium bombers and fighters crossing on the way to the target, without a sign of a German plane. We turned in over the coast about 10 minutes before H-Hour. We saw a fast assault-boat race along parallel to the beach laying a smoke screen. We opened our bomb bay doors. The flight ahead of us dropped their bombs, the guns on the ships off shore resumed fire. The bombs and the shells burst together. Four and a half thousand feet up our plane was rocked by the concussion and we got the stench from the explosives. . . . One thing we can say already, and that is that our air supremacy over the invasion zone today is not seriously challenged.

Next in line is Dave Anderson of NBC, who has further news of the Allied air successes:

There is no doubt in my mind that Hitler was literally caught with his pants down by the Allied landing on the north coast of France. I was able to gain substantiation for this opinion while working together with a wing of an RAF Tactical Air Force, somewhere in England, up to a few hours ago. For some time after H-Hour, there was practically no sign of German Army transport on any of the roads in the whole of the invasion area.

At 1:30 yesterday afternoon I entered the gates of an RAF station. The Adjutant introduced me to the Group Captain, the youngest, incidentally, in the entire RAF. He's only 27. He smiled briefly and said out of the corner of his mouth: "I've been waiting for this for a long time." . . . Each man had his area of attack. Each man knew what was expected of him.

I was waiting in the briefing room as the first pilots reported. Their task had been to hunt out and shoot up or bomb any German

transports on the road to the French coast. From the very beginning, it was hoped that none would be seen. This would be a definite indication that the Hun didn't know where we were going to land. And as the boys came back, one by one, this hope was realized. Except for a few scattered cars on the road, nothing was seen. Most of the pilots saw no transports whatsoever, so they concentrated on bombing road-junctions and railways. The Germans were caught napping.

The pool is dry now and Ed Murrow and I get permission from censorship to have a two-way conversation broadcast to our own network. No questions and answers are submitted in advance; the censors just take it for granted we won't violate their rules. Our conversation becomes a kind of party line on which the constantly increasing audience is invited to eavesdrop. Although Dick Hottelet has been heard from, I'm anxious to hear about our other correspondents. Anxious and a little bit worried:

WHITE. Hello, Ed Murrow. Hello, CBS London.

MURROW. Hello, Paul.

WHITE. I just thought that perhaps the audience would be interested in how we're setting up these broadcasts, and since we understand there is no more "pool" copy available at this moment, I thought we'd have a little conversation with you.

MURROW. Well, Paul, what we're doing is this: we're going to continue to "pool" for the next hour or two, simply trying to move the material as fast as it comes in to all four of the networks. By the way, what kind of signal are we putting in?

WHITE. Very fine. Congratulations to the engineers over there, the signal has been uniformly good. Ed, is it now possible to reveal the disposition of our staff, where we have various men?

MURROW. Well, Paul, we hope to have some action recordings back from the Navy before long. Charlie Collingwood is out on an LST, and Larry Lesueur is with the American ground forces, and Bill Downs with the British, and Bill Shadell is somewhere at sea.

WHITE. All right—fine. As a matter of fact, all of the men who were on from the various networks have turned in a swell job. I don't know how much of an audience we had, but all networks were on all night. We'll stay right with the pool operations. Let me know when you have something new.

As I sit at my desk talking with Murrow the sun rises—at 5:29, EWT—behind the East River, and New York City's

towers light up in pale gold. Diagonally across the street from our building and down a block the faithful are already trudging toward St. Patrick's Cathedral. Scrubwomen on their way home, early risers on their way to work, they enter the House of Worship and speak the insistent prayer that is in their hearts.

The broadcasting goes on. There's still a lack of real news but at 6:01 SHAEF comes through with more information:

Air attacks began shortly before midnight when well over 1,000 heavy bombers of the Royal Air Force Bomber Command opened up on German coastal defenses. During the night, troop carriers and gliders of the United States Ninth Air Force and the Royal Air Force flew paratroops and airborne infantry into the zone of operations while light bombers of the Second Tactical Air Force attacked roads and rail junctions and bridges.

At daybreak more than 1,000 heavy bombers of the United States Eighth Army Air Force and waves of United States Ninth Army Air Force medium bombers took up the air bombardment of gun emplacements and defensive works in support of landing operations.

Fighter-bombers have made repeated attacks during the morning on gun batteries and communications in and behind the assault front. Fighters have been out in large numbers, supporting the heavy bombers and covering land and sea operations.

At 6:24 Charles Shaw of CBS in London is ready with a feature story of how London took the news. You think of him as Paul Revere in reverse, but there's something wrong with that metaphor. At any rate, Shaw says:

For an hour after the broadcast of communiqué No. 1, I played town crier to a London generally unaware that France had been invaded. I rode and walked through the Strand, Fleet Street, past St. Paul's along the Thames Embankment to the Houses of Parliament and Westminster Abbey, up to Piccadilly Circus and other parts of so-called downtown London, asking people here and there what they thought of the news. In most cases, I found out that I had to report the news before getting any comment. It looked like London any morning, between 9:30 and 10:30 . . . the streets comparatively deserted, soldiers of all nations ambling about, streetcleaners running their brushes along the curbs.

I asked a taxidriver to take me around the city, because I wanted to see how people were reacting to the news. "Incidentally," I asked

him, "have you heard the news?" "I heard something about it," he said, "but I don't know whether it's official." I assured him it was, because I had just returned from the studio where the communiqué was broadcast. Waiting for a traffic light, we drew alongside a car driven by a girl, wearing the uniform of France. I leaned out and said: "What do you think of the news?" "What news?" she asked. "The Allies have landed in France." All she said was: "Thank God!"

For the next two hours, Trout, Calmer, Eliot, Joe King, and Alan Jackson in New York, and Bill Henry and Bill McCaffrey in Washington "keep the air hot." There's nothing much new to report except an optimistic statement by Prime Minister Churchill before Commons, but at every minute all over the country people are getting up, switching on their radios and hearing the news for the first time.

At 8:24 there are more pool broadcasts, this time by Stanley Richardson and Merrill Mueller of NBC:

RICHARDSON. I've just returned from the Channel approaches to the coast of France where I was privileged to watch the opening phases of the largest scale military invasion operation in history. My ring-side seat was the heaving deck of a United States naval patrol torpedo boat on which I traveled across the Channel with the first contingent of a naval task force. This force was composed mostly of American units.

In the area we covered, we could see hundreds of bombers and fighters shuttling back and forth, dropping their bomb-loads and returning to England for more explosives to blast the enemy. And we could see the big two-engined American transport planes, also in the hundreds, returning to their bases in the United Kingdom after dropping their airborne troops in France.

MUELLER. This is Merrill Mueller reporting from the Advance Allied Command Post of the Invasion Forces. Things started moving when one man pressed the theoretical button some hours ago. That man was the Supreme Allied Commander, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who thinks of himself modestly as a Kansas farmer. As "H" Hour, "D" Day approaches, there is nothing more tactically useless than a supreme commander, except as an inspiration. General "Ike" is certainly that. I have never seen him more popular with his troops. I have never seen *any* commander receive greater acclaim for buoying his men than does

General Eisenhower. One British battalion cheered him as they climbed aboard their vast landing barge, and he waved a friendly hello and that broad grin lit up his face—a face that showed nothing but confidence in his men, a face in which fatigue is miraculously erased whenever it mirrors the Allied esprit de corps and the fighting spirit of the little men with the rifle and the bayonet. He came back from the port full of a sense of victory. No finer force ever went into battle with a better spirit or with greater courage than this one that General Eisenhower has.

Now Douglas Edwards comes in and takes over some of Trout's chores. At 9:15 he introduces a recording made by Charles Collingwood of CBS, a recording made just as his LST was leaving Britain. Collingwood first sets the scene:

Now we're up here, on the deck, on the main deck of the LST, which is crowded and packed with vehicles of every sort. The trucks are full . . . just reading the names on the boxes of some of them . . . here's one that says "cartridges" and another one says "hand grenades" and there are also bags and bedrolls.

Collingwood now interviews a Staff Sergeant Alexander Ham of Chicago and the craft's skipper, a Captain Wood, but both are too security-conscious to say anything of note. So Collingwood concludes:

The soldiers are settling down now, and the trucks are all on, the soldiers are all on, and all around us there are other LST's in the same condition as this one, with soldiers lining the rails and with trucks full of equipment, inside, on the back deck, and up on the main deck, which is where we're standing now on our ship. The LST-48 is just beginning to get under way. We're pushing away from the harbor, away from the shore where we loaded, and we're going back to our anchorage where we will stay until we set off on this coming expedition. Our last link with the land has been cut.

After the Collingwood recording is finished Charles Shaw comes on the cue channel from London, and he and I have another talk piped in for the benefit of the audience. A bit of news comes from this conversation.

SHAW. By the way, the King's coming up at nine tonight.

WHITE. That's three in the afternoon our time.

SHAW. Right.

That's how casual we are about royalty in 1944 A.D. "The King's coming up." No fanfare of trumpets there. Just a few words spoken into a London microphone and you know that His Majesty, the symbol of Empire, is going to broadcast to his subjects a few hours hence.

It's getting close to 10 o'clock, the hour when the network commercial schedule usually starts. There isn't any news and there's no prospect of another communiqué for some time. At 10 will come the end of the seventh hour of consecutive broadcasting about invasion. Trout has been on the air some 25 times, Major Eliot 10. No one has anything fresh to say, but is the public in the mood to hear about anything else? Finally, Paul Kesten, executive vice-president, makes the decision. We will resume normal operations at 10, breaking in only when there's news of importance.

10 A.M.-12:41:05 P.M.

And so now comes a procession of soap operas. First, "Valiant Lady." The next program, "Light of the World," is held up a few seconds for Douglas Edwards to announce:

President Roosevelt will go on the air tonight at 10 o'clock Eastern War Time, with the hope that the public will join him in a prayer he has written for the occasion.

Now come "Open Door," "Bachelor's Children," "Honeymoon Hill," "Second Husband." The short-wave listening station picks up a report that General de Gaulle's recording is finally ready and will be broadcast at 11:30. Maybe no one else has heard this announcement, maybe no one else cares, but we cancel a commercial and much to our surprise find ourselves the only network carrying his words. Says the leader of French resistance:

The supreme battle is at last under way, after great sorrow and long suffering; here at last is the decisive clash for which we have

waited so long. Yes, this is the Battle of France, and this is France's battle. Help has gone out to us, in the vast machinery of war which is now beginning to flow from the shores of old England.

This same England, not so long ago Western Europe's outermost bastion of defense, before which the tide of German oppression was stopped, today has become the base for the launching of our liberation. And France, submerged for four years, but not destroyed nor vanquished, is rising again today to take her own part in this fight for freedom.

As de Gaulle speaks, the prayer written by the President, the prayer he himself is going to read at 10 o'clock that night, has come in on press association wires, and Holles has asked Edwards to read it on the air but to conclude by 11:45 so that the "Aunt Jenny" program can start on time. But Edwards, reading the prayer clearly and with undertones of emotion, finds he simply can't speed up, despite the fact that Holles's arm is behaving like a windmill in the traditional "rush it" gesture of a radio director. At last the prayer is concluded and Holles says, accusingly: "Doug, you ran 45 seconds over."

"Listen, Ev," Edwards retorts, "tell me just how I get out of the President's prayer once I get into it, will you?"

By this time I have gone to the executive offices for a conference. We're not certain the right decision was made to continue regular programs. As for myself, a newsman, I'm convinced we've made a terrible blunder. A group of executives sit about, discussing the matter, dialing to the other network stations. We discover we're the only ones maintaining a semblance of regular schedules. We tune in to our own station and Paul Kesten looks up and says, "Well, what do you think?" Paul Hollister says the right thing at the right moment.

"I think," he declares, "that if I have to listen to any more of the stuff going out on our station, I shall have to vomit."

That settles it. We decide to cancel most of the regular programs and return to news—even though there really isn't any news. So at 12:41:05 the doings of the characters in "Helen Trent" are left up in the air and the soap operas are abandoned for the day. Not a bubble of complaint comes from the public.

12:41:05 P.M.-7:00 P.M.

The early afternoon brings other broadcasters to the microphone, among them Quincy Howe, John Daly, William L. Shirer. Before the latter left his post in Germany he had been taken on an "escorted tour" of the French coast by the German military. Says Shirer:

Mr. Churchill in his first address to Commons today spoke of the underwater barriers being overcome easier than had been expected. Three years ago, upon that Channel coast, I had a look at some of those barriers. They consisted mostly of steel contraptions put in two lines for the tides; one out two or three hundred yards from shore, and one maybe within 50 yards of shore, and which were designed to stop landing boats from coming up on the beach. The way to get at those, of course, is by torpedoes and exploding your own mines and, so far as we can see, our troops do not seem to have any great deal of difficulty in overcoming these water barriers.

There have been pictures in our papers, which have come from German sources, showing great underground forts along the coast of France, and while undoubtedly some of those do exist (I saw some of them), they have been greatly over-exaggerated and there are not a large number of these underground forts.

As a matter of fact, while the Germans have erected strong defenses here and there along the whole coastline in Western Europe, the truth is that the ballyhoo about the Atlantic Wall has been largely a product of German propaganda.

And now, from the Hooper survey group, we begin to get an inkling of how important all this news and comment is to the American listener. More than 218 per cent of the radio sets normally turned on at this season and time of day are going full blast. America is clustered around its radio, and is rewarded by revealing tidbits of news. Fierce fighting is reported from Caen, nine miles inland. Our bombers, both mediums and heavy-weights, are smacking the be-daylights out of enemy targets. The Germans say Allied forces are attacking westward from captured Bayeux to cut off the Cherbourg peninsula. Washington reports that General Marshall and Admiral King have an air of confidence about them. London discloses that the invasion

had originally been set for Sunday night but was called off by bad weather even though some of the ships in the vast armada had already sailed for France.

But now it is close to 3 P.M. and, you'll remember, "the King is coming up." The circuit provides a beautifully clear "signal" and we hear George the Sixth:

Four years ago our nation and empire stood alone against an overwhelming enemy with our backs to the wall, tested as never before in our history, and we survived that test. The spirit of the people, resolute and dedicated, burned like a bright flame, surely from those unseen fires which nothing could quench.

Once more the supreme test has to be faced. This time the challenge is not to fight to survive, but to fight to win the final victory for the good cause. Once again, what is demanded from us all is something more than courage, more than endurance.

That we may be worthily matched with the new summons of destiny, I desire solemnly to call my people to prayer and dedication. We are not unmindful of our own shortcomings, past and present. We shall ask not that God may do our will, but that we may be enabled to do the will of God. And we dare to believe that God has used our nation and empire as an instrument for fulfilling his high purpose.

If from every place of worship, from home and factory, from men and women of all ages and many races and occupations, our intercessions rise, then, please God, both now and in the future not remote, the predictions of an ancient song may be fulfilled:

"The Lord will give strength unto his people, the Lord will give his people the blessing of peace."

The next few hours bring a parade of voices to the nation's loud-speakers. In Washington, Bill Henry introduces a group of Congressmen—Maas of Minnesota, Rogers of Massachusetts, Voorhees of California, Hebert of Louisiana. John Daly in New York interviews Mrs. Marguerite Magat, a refugee from Caen, apparently the scene of the bitterest fighting. She tells us:

When the Germans came to Caen, they announced they had 200 fifth columnists in the city. The Germans will find now that the Allies have 70,000 fifth columnists working for them!

Two Englishmen tell their eye-witness stories—Herbert Marshall of the BBC and Commander Anthony Kimmins of the Royal Navy. But it isn't until 20 days later that Kimmins, reaching New York, relates an anecdote deserving a lasting place in the annals of invasion. This is the story he told, as related by Hollister and Strunsky:

As the landing craft assembled and swung into line in an English harbor, the power plant of one vessel refused to work. Fearing he'd lose his place in the invasion procession, the C.O. hailed a dowdy civilian tug, an ancient coal-burning harbor taxi: "Hi, give us a tow." The tug took over, hauled the landing-ship into line, and then because she got no orders to cast off, hauled on, all night. Somewhat surprised at dawn to learn that he was off the Norman beach, the tug's skipper was permitted to unhook and make his way home across the Channel. Late that night he opened his wife's bedroom door. "Where 'ave you been?" "I'll 'ave you to know," he replied simply, "that I've been to France." "You 'AVE not!" she cried, and the battle was joined.

New voices all the time, each adding a little to the story. Bill Costello and Joseph C. Harsch from Washington; Harry Marble, Edwin C. Hill, and Fielden Farrington from New York.

The second communiqué has been promised for 5:30, but it doesn't arrive on schedule. At 6:00 Quincy Howe is on the air, expecting to switch to London for the communiqué, which is supposed to be broadcast from there the instant it's released. But radio makes its first bobble. The communiqué, a routine affair largely confirming previous unofficial reports, suddenly begins to come in on the Reuters "machine" and Howe is handed the text in "takes." A short time later AP, UP, and INS have the communiqué. Then someone dashes from short-wave listening and reports the BBC has broadcast it. But so far the FAX circuit is mute. Holles, working the cue channel while I am arranging programs for later in the evening, screams in anguish to someone in London.

"All the wire services have it here," says Holles, "and the BBC is reading it on the air. How come we were beaten?"

London promises investigation. "Something slipped up," says London. "Won't happen again." (As a matter of fact, it didn't.)

7:00 P.M.-12:36 A.M.

The flow of news drops off sharply after midnight has come and gone along the beaches of Normandy. Throughout the early evening programs of news and analyses intermingle with special broadcasts, such as one Norman Corwin has arranged with Charles Laughton reading Carl Sandburg poetry, and with regularly scheduled programs such as George Burns and Gracie Allen comedy (a satisfying relief) and a documentary tribute to medicine, "The Doctor Fights." Soon it is 10 o'clock and time for the President to speak his prayer, the same prayer that hours earlier had caused Douglas Edwards to run 45 seconds over. President Roosevelt had written the prayer as he lay in bed after midnight of D-Day. The man in the White House didn't know then that he wouldn't live to see the invading armies triumphant, didn't know that the strain of office would make him a casualty of war within a year. But his voice is firm as at this poignant hour he calls upon his fellow-Americans to pray with him:

Almighty God, our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true. Give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness to their faith. They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. The enemy is strong; he may hurl back our forces; success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again, and we know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

They will be sore tried by night and by day, without rest till the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violence of war. These are men lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest; they fight to end conquest; they fight to liberate; they fight to let justice arise and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return.

Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy Kingdom. And for us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas, whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them—help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts. Give us strength, too, strength in our daily tasks to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and material support of our armed forces. And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, oh Lord, give us faith, give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters, of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose. With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogance. Lead us to the saving of our country and, with our sister-nations, into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men and a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen!

Next, more news, more comment. We hear from Trout, Reynolds, Shirer, Eliot, Calmer, Daly, and Marble in New York; from Murrow and Shaw in London, from Don Pryor in Washington. Each contributes an item or two, an explanation, a feature story. And survey reports keep coming in to indicate that listening is almost double that of normal.

But something seems lacking. No one knows quite what it is. The circuit to London has gone sour, and I can barely hear Murrow telling me something about a recording by George Hicks.

"Put it on and play it," I tell him. "Let's see how it sounds."

The recording begins but the static drowns out Hicks's voice. "We'll have to wait for a better circuit," I report.

"All right," says Murrow, "I'll see what other channels are available. I think you'll like this Hicks piece."

At a little after 11:15 the circuit becomes listenable and the quality consistently improves. We decide to use the recording at 11:30. Hicks, a Blue network reporter, had made it aboard the Allied naval flagship the night before, and a small boat had carried it back across the Channel. Despite Murrow's suggestion that I might like the recording, I had no idea then it would create the sensation it did, that it would be played and replayed, that it would earn Hicks more radio awards than any other individual broadcast of the whole war.

There's no more certain proof that type can't duplicate the tremendous impact of the human voice than to read the Hicks broadcast. The dispassionate and unemotional delivery amid scenes of tremendous excitement can't be translated into print. But, even now in copying the transcript of broadcast, I experience once again the emotion that held us that night, that kept us silent as his voice fought with the magnetic disturbances that occasionally blurred a word here and there. This is what we heard:

HICKS. This is George Hicks speaking. I am speaking now from a tower above the signal bridge of an American naval flagship, and we're lying some few miles off the coast of France where the invasion of Europe has begun. It's now 20 minutes to six and the landing craft have been disembarked from their mother ships and are moving in, in long irregular lines toward the horizon of France which is very plain to the naked eye.

Our own bombardment fleet lying out beyond us has begun to blast the shoreline, and we can see the vivid yellow burst of flame quite clearly although the sound is too far away to be heard, and at the same time from the shore are answering yellow flames as the Nazi batteries are replying.

Overhead planes are high up in the thin cloud which is a gray screen over the sky but which is not thick or heavy, and is not low enough to be an inconvenience to bombing.

The LCT's and LCI's have begun to pass alongside of us.

Those are the amphibious beach-landing craft that carry the tanks, trucks, the bulldozers, and finally the men ashore. They have been churning along and are bouncing along in the choppy channel sea now, and all around us on either side are stretched the vast transports at anchor, which have disembarked the small craft. All over the surface of the sea here they can be seen cutting and zig-zagging and then falling into those somewhat irregular lines that make a black pencil-point across the sea itself, heading towards the ribbon of land that's France and the coast of Normandy.

It's now becoming quite near daylight as 6 A.M. approaches on June 6th, 1944. We can hear the thud of shells or bombs landing on the French coastline, perhaps eight or ten miles before us, and the steel bridge on which we stand vibrates from the concussion of the heavy guns that are firing on the American and British battleships and heavy cruisers on the long line right behind us. I can count 22 of the squat square-nosed landing craft, carrying vehicles, as they turn and bounce in the choppy sea awaiting the exact timing to form their lines and start in toward the beach.

On our first (*static*) . . . it was the shore batteries of the Nazis that had spotted us here at sea, (*static*) . . . and our naval bombardment squad has replied to them.

One battleship is in as close as three miles, and one of the famous American battleships, the *Texas*, was . . . (*static*) . . . finally in her firing position. (*static*) . . . battleships lying just a couple of miles off the French shore and firing broadsides into the land. The Germans are replying from the land with flashes and then the battleship lets go with its entire broadside again. The whole side of the battlewagon lights up in a yellow flare as a broadside goes off, and now we can see brown and gray smoke drifting up from her, from her gunbarrels. And now batteries are firing from the beach. The broadsides of the battleship are pouring it back at them. Overhead, high, planes are roaring. They just came in and dropped a salvo of bombs.

The (*static*) . . . one of America's famous cruisers, is in off the shore near (*static*) . . . as well as the *Texas*, the *Nevada*, and the *Arkansas*; old battleships. They're just anchored off shore and blowing into the Nazi batteries on shore. The first Allied forces are reaching the beaches in France. . . .

That baby was plenty low!

I think I just made the statement that no German planes had been seen and I think there was the first one we've seen so far . . .

just cleared our stack . . . let go a stream of tracers that did no harm . . . (*Sound of ship's whistle*)

Our own ship has just given its warning whistle and now the flak is coming up in the sky . . .

It's planes you hear overhead now . . . they are the motors of Nazis coming and going. The reverberation of bombs . . . (*Sound of crash*)

That was a bomb hit, another one. That was a tracer line, shaped arching up into the darkness.

Very heavy firing now off our stern. Fiery bursts and the flak and streamers going out (*several words drowned out by voice in background and static*) in the flak. (*Sound of explosions*)

Now, it's died down. We can't see the plane. . . . Here comes a plane. More anti-aircraft fire . . . in more toward the shore. The Germans must be attacking low with their planes off our stern because the streamer fire of the tracers is almost parallel with the water. (*Noises in background*) . . . Flares are coming down now. You can hear the machine gunning. The planes come over closer (*sound of plane*) firing low . . . Smoke . . . brilliant fire down low toward the French coast a couple of miles. I don't know whether it's on the shore or is a ship fire.

Here's very heavy ack-ack now. (*Heavy ack-ack*) The plane seems to be coming directly overhead . . . (*Sound of plane and machine gun fire and ack-ack*)

Well, that's the first time we've shot our guns . . . directly right over our head . . . as we pick up the German bombers overhead.

VOICE. What was that—a bomb?

VOICE. Cruiser firing over there.

HICKS. Heavy fire from the naval warships . . . 20 millimeter and 40 millimeter tracers . . . was the sound you just heard.

Well, it's quiet for a moment now . . .

If you'll excuse me, I'll just take a deep breath for a moment and stop speaking . . .

Now the air attack has seemed to have died down. See nothing in the night . . .

Here we go again! (*Noise*) Another plane has come over . . . right over our port side. Tracers are making an arc right over the bow now . . . disappearing into the clouds before they burst.

Looks like we're going to have a night tonight. Give it to her, boys. Another one coming over. A cruiser on . . . pouring it out.

Something burning is falling down through the sky and hurtling down. It may be a hit plane. (*Terrific noises in background*) Here he goes . . . They got one! (*Voices cheering*) They got one!

VOICE. Did we?

HICKS. Yeah. Great splotches of fire came down and are smouldering now just off our port side in the sea . . . smoke and flame there. (*Various sounds and voices in background*) The lights of that burning Nazi plane are just twinkling now in the sea and going out.

To recapitulate, the first plane that was over was a low-flying German JU88 that was leading the flight and came on the convoy in surprise, we believe, because he drew up and only fired as he passed by, and perhaps he was as surprised as we were to see each other. One bomb fell astern of this warship, 150 yards away as the string of rockets were fired at a cruiser beside us on the port side. No damage was done and gun Number 42 at our port, just beside the microphone, shot down the plane that fell into the sea off to the port side. Scheiner of Houston, Texas, who is the gunnery control officer, and seaman Thomas Snyder of Baltimore, Maryland, handled the direction finder. It was their first kill for this gun and the boys are all pretty excited about it. A twin-barrel 40-millimeter anti-aircraft piece.

They are already thinking of painting a big star on their chart and will be at that first thing tomorrow morning. . . . It's daylight . . .

After that, everything was anti-climax. The news personnel held the air until 12:30 and then turned it over to a dance band. At 12:36, just 24 hours after the first German report of "D-Day," I finished checking tomorrow's schedules with Murrow and prepared to go home and to bed.

Not until weeks later did I get the statistics from Hollister and Strunsky:

During D-Day we broadcast 15 hours and 52 minutes of invasion news. Twenty-nine broadcasts originated overseas, totaling 3 hours and 7 minutes. Seventy-five originated in the United States for a total of 12 hours and 45 minutes. Seventeen sponsors gave up their regular time totaling 5 hours and 5 minutes. Trout spoke 35 times, Eliot 13, Reynolds 10. Between 4:00 and 5:00 P.M. listening averaged 138 per cent over normal. The CBS short-wave listening post heard broadcasts in 15 languages, wrote

digests of 100 of them, totaling 30,000 words, sent out 12,000 words by teletype to the AP, UP, INS, and New York newspapers, and to *Time* and *Newsweek*. The network's 5 short-wave transmitters broadcast during the day 67 programs of invasion news to Europe and Latin America in 10 languages for a total of 17 hours and 7 minutes. The usual broadcasts to German soldiers were suspended on the theory that the German soldiers might be too busy to listen.

But I didn't know any of these things then. As I trudged the seemingly interminable two blocks to my hotel in the balmy June night, there was a great deal I didn't know. I didn't know thousands of letters already were on their way to the networks thanking them for their coverage. I didn't know that *Time Magazine* would exclaim, "This was radio's greatest day. Radio did a job."

I didn't know, for sure, that the day had built a bridgehead to victory. I only knew that I was bone-and-marrow tired.

19. SO YOU WANT A JOB?

A Discussion of Opportunities in Radio News

IF BY THE TIME you reach this point in the book you've decided on radio news as a promising career, you're entitled to know your chances. How do you go about getting a job? If you get the job, what are you going to get paid? And what does the future hold in the way of more money and promotions? Do women have the same chances as men?

Every youngster—man or woman—asks these questions, and a serious attempt should be made to answer them. This is such an attempt.

First, about getting a job. There aren't any hard and fast rules, of course. Those who go to schools of journalism, especially schools that operate radio stations either in the standard broadcast band or "wired radio" to dormitories and fraternity and sorority houses, have a big advantage. They're used to working in the medium. They've been up against tough decisions on news judgment. They've learned writing the hard way.

And directors of schools of journalism have a fairly steady call for help. In one day recently I saw two requests for news writers come in to a journalism head. One was from a large station in Kentucky (offering \$50 a week for a good rewrite woman or \$60 for a man). The other was from a small station in Iowa offering \$50 a week for a news announcer.

But newcomers to radio can't expect that they'll be placed through schools. With more and more colleges and even high schools adding radio courses to their curricula, it's easy to see that the supply of people with some training and teaching is out-

racing the demand. There are things going on behind the scenes in radio that may change this situation (an explanation of this comes later), but the forecast for the late 1940's is jobs for only the best.

DEAR SIR:

Well, assuming that you're one of the best, what do you do? You try one of two things. You try to get an introduction to the news director of some station, preferably at first a small one. Failing that, you write a letter asking for an appointment. It might be a good idea to write a letter anyway, even if you have gained an introduction in some way. The news director probably will say to you, "No, I haven't anything in mind right now. I'll tell you what you do. Write a letter telling me about yourself and then I'll have it in my files." That will be a good time for you to say, "Yes, sir, I thought of that. I have a letter with me. Does it give you all you want to know about me?" Chances are the news director will be so stunned by this display of foresight that he'll read the letter, think to himself, "Say, this guy's got some stuff on the ball," and will not confine your name to the files, but will think seriously of job possibilities.

What do you put in your letter? Not very much. Remember, you're asking for a job in radio, and radio calls for condensation. Tell all the relevant facts about yourself—name, age, education, experience if any, why you've chosen radio as a career, what you think are your best skills. Try to do it all on one well-typed page. If you're particularly proud of a script you've written, attach it to the letter. Or if you've both written and spoken the script, take or send along a recording.

There's a story about that. Soon after V-J Day I got through the mails an unlabeled recording from a city in Oklahoma.

On one day a week I listened to recordings—various announcers on other stations, some of our own programs that went on at hours when it was inconvenient to listen, new program ideas, etc. I put on the record from Oklahoma and heard something like this:

Good morning, Mr. White. Or good afternoon or good evening. Whatever time of the day it is when you hear this.

You don't know me. My name is . . . I live in . . . I've just returned from overseas where I flew in the Eighth Air Force.

Now that I have your ear I want to talk to you about a job. I've never worked in radio except at our base in England where we put on some shows for the crew, but I . . .

And he went on that way. Very informal. Likable. To the point. I was sufficiently impressed to write him telling him that I admired his ingenuity, thought that he probably would make the grade in radio, and that I'd be glad to write some friends in stations near his home town. Back came a letter thanking me but saying that I needn't bother. When he sent off the recording to me, he also sent others to stations in Kansas City, St. Louis, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Chicago. And by the time I'd gotten around to listening to the record and writing him, he already had a job lined up with a near-by station.

It doesn't pay, though, to be too coy and original. I once received by mail an elaborately printed piece of self-advertising from a job candidate that was about as modest as a circus poster. It was, in a word, repulsive. Later I happened to mention it to the news head of another network and it turned out he, too, had received one.

"That fellow," he said, "certainly went to a lot of expense to make sure he wouldn't get a job."

THE APPLICANT'S EMILY POST

Either through a letter of application or through a friend's efforts you'll probably be able to get an interview with a prospective employer. Are there any special rules to follow in such interviews? Is there any etiquette you should observe? What do you do? How do you act?

I'm afraid this is going to sound like a series of platitudes that would put a Sunday School teacher to shame. There really isn't any advice except obvious advice. But here goes anyway:

1. Be neat, not gaudy. If you're a woman, for heaven's sakes don't overdo make-up. And don't even make up further in the reception room while you're waiting for your appointment. If you looked all right when you left for the appointment, the chances are you still look all right. Don't try to gild any lilies because the man you want to see may come out any moment and find you primping. If you're a man, don't slick down your hair too sleekly. Be sure your shoes are shined and your nails are clean. Take off your overcoat and hat while in the reception room so there won't be any awkward fumbling around when the time comes for your interview.

2. Be natural. There's no strain on the other man, with whom you obviously want to be friendly, unless you create it through nervousness.

3. Let the prospective boss set the pace. If he wants to listen, then it's up to you to talk. If he wants to talk, then you listen.

4. If your interview is interrupted for a telephone call or some kind of a conference—and it's a long interruption—have a newspaper or magazine in your coat. Go get it and read it and relax; don't fidget. And don't read his mail upside down on his desk. (Later, if you get the job, you'll learn how to do this very well but it's not considered good form when you're only an applicant.)

5. Don't be too flattering. Don't say, "I want to work here, Mr. Blank, because I think you run the best news department there is." That sort of thing makes anyone suspicious.

6. If you seem to be getting somewhere, and a job is in prospect, and Mr. Blank asks you how much money you'd want, don't say, "Oh, I'll leave that up to you." Be forthright. Name a figure about ten dollars a week higher than you expect to get. If he then hires you at your figure less ten dollars he will think he's a shrewd bargainer.

7. If Mr. Blank says there's nothing doing right now but he'll keep you in mind in case anything develops, just thank him and

leave—quickly. About a month later write him, recall your interview and tell him you are still hopeful that a job will turn up. If you get no answer, forget the whole thing. If you get an answer, be guided as to future moves by the content of the reply.

To sum up, here's a reasonable table on your job chances in radio news, assuming that you've had no experience. *On a small station*—good, if you're good. *On a large station*—fair, if you're outstanding. *At a network key station*—poor, even if you're excellent. *As a network foreign correspondent*—nil. Anyway, good hunting!

HOW MUCH PAY?

Bill Slocum, Jr., once made a talk to a group of students in which he said this:

Radio is tougher than newspaper work. In the first place you've got to think faster. You've got no copy desk to catch you up on your mistakes. When you cover a story for a newspaper, you go look at the thing, write it, hand it to a telegrapher, and then go off and read a book. But in radio you've got to stay with the story. Even while you're on the air. A million things can go wrong and often they do. It's a much tougher job—take my word for it—than newspaper work. But there's one other interesting thing in comparing the two. I wouldn't like this to get any further, but in radio you get better paid than you do on newspapers.

The truth, in regard to salaries, may not be on Slocum's side. I don't know that any comparative study of radio and newspaper salaries has ever been made, but I think they tend to be about the same. This may not have been true several years ago, when most radio stations and networks got their newsmen from newspapers and press associations, and had to pay more money to attract the newcomers. But nowadays many trained students arrive on the scene every year.

Radio, though, is still quick to borrow from other media. Just as it got its first comedians from vaudeville, movies, and the theater, it still gets some of its first-rank reporters and analysts from the newspapers and the magazines. To that extent, the

Slocum theory is correct. There are very few top-flight radio news personalities who did not first have a thorough grounding in written news before they turned to the oral variety. Exceptions include Edward R. Murrow, Robert Trout, and John Daly.

Opportunities for more news jobs in radio depend upon two things—new inventions and stiffer competition. In the next chapter I'm going to devote more space to the things that are coming—facsimile, frequency modulation, and television. When they're ready to reach mass audiences, there should be a sharp rise in the demand for radio newsmen. Until that day arrives, however, the best chance for more jobs is that stations will find they have bigger audiences if they expand their news staffs to cover local and regional news. There's a decisive trend in that direction, which I talk about in detail in Chapter 5.

But to get right down to cases. As of 1947 the inexperienced rewrite man who got a job on a small station could expect a minimum of \$30 or \$35 a week; an experienced man \$50 to \$60. On a larger station, where there was a union contract, the figures might be raised to from \$50 for the inexperienced man, to \$75 for the experienced man. On a still larger station or network, they would go higher—from \$60 to \$100. In general, the radio wire services of press associations pay at about the same level, the salary depending largely upon the size and the importance of the bureau point.

There are a few rewrite men whose incomes mount to five figures yearly. These include Prosper Buranelli, who assists Lowell Thomas, and Jesse Zousmer, who helps Robert Trout.

But if the newsmen is expected both to write the news and to broadcast it, he is paid more. The lowest figure is probably around \$50. The highest is astronomical, as with such broadcasters as Walter Winchell.

News editors and directors have a low of about \$60 and a high of close to \$500 a week.

In regard to the future, I think it safe to say that most stations and networks review salaries at least once a year, and merit raises are common.

SEX REARS ITS COMPETENT HEAD

You will remember that a Kentucky station offered a certain salary for a woman and a higher one for a man. Is that typical? In non-union newsrooms it probably is, but no discrimination in pay is permitted by the Authors League or the Newspaper Guild, the organizations that have the majority of contracts with radio stations and networks.

One discovery was forced upon radio during World War II. With a manpower shortage steadily growing more acute, stations had to employ women. And they found that women became good reporters and were able at rewrite. It became a cliché among radio news directors, however, to say that women had no news judgment. This, like all generalizations, was unfair. The proper piecing together of a news program called for keen and accurate judgments, and over the years I'm proud of a number of newswomen whom it was my privilege to supervise. Listing them in the alphabetical order of their surnames, a somewhat cautious device, I can point to Jane Dealy, Patricia Lochridge, Margaret Miller, Alice Weel, and Beth Zimmerschied as capable workers, easily holding their own in a male-dominated field. Oddly—or perhaps not—of the five I've named, none had much experience outside of a school of journalism. One of their mutual abilities was to hear a news story as they read it.

I believe, too, that the presence of women on a radio news staff working on easy terms with men and with completely comparable salaries, is a constructive force in office morale. So long as women understand they are to be treated as equals, with the same opportunities and responsibilities as their male colleagues, then they are not apt to request extra privileges such as days off or lighter hours. In the presence of women, an office becomes less slovenly and in between-broadcast bull sessions there's more serious discussion of one's work and actual study of the news itself. There doesn't seem to be so much concern about what happened in the Fifth at Aqueduct or, for that matter, about what the G.I.'s called "Topic A." Besides, they're good-looking and nice to have around.

PORTRAIT OF A PARAGON

I've devoted most attention to rewrite men and women and news broadcasters, because most jobs are available in those fields. But the "plums" are the posts as foreign correspondents, and I suppose that 90 per cent of those in radio news have such positions as an ultimate ambition.

Frequently, I've been asked—most frequently, it seems to me, by college professors—to draw up a list of qualifications for a radio foreign correspondent. Although the last thing wanted is correspondents off an assembly line without the individuality and the personality that radio emphasizes so distinctly, this might be as good a list of qualifications as any:

He should have integrity, else he shouldn't be in any business at all.

He should have curiosity, else he shouldn't be in the news business.

He should have energy, and a lot of it, because his working day will often be as long as from 8 A.M. to 1:00 A.M. of the following day.

He should have a hardy constitution, but this I don't insist upon. There are times when I don't believe there *is* such a thing as a healthy radio correspondent.

He should know at least one language other than English, and preferably two. He should be well grounded in economics, political philosophy, and know at least enough about physics to tell the difference between a cyclotron and a handful of uranium.

He should be able to write objectively and yet colorfully with particular ability in the creation of word pictures.

He should be able to speak the English language, not too mellifluously, but as though he were speaking it and not writing it.

His voice should be authoritative.

He should be able to survive innumerable toasts at a Russian banquet or enjoy tea-repeat tea—with General Montgomery.

Then, of course, he should be tactful, resourceful, kind to dumb animals, and good to his mother.

If anyone knows such a man tell him not to bother to write a letter. Just have him put his name and address on his halo and send it in.

20. FOREWORD TO THE FUTURE

Including a Preview of Television

THERE WAS no doubt about it. Radio covered its first war with spectacular distinction. But V-J Day found it as unprepared for the uneasy peace that followed as was the rest of the country. There were new responsibilities. What was the broadcaster's job, and how could this job be performed well, consistently, and conscientiously?

Quentin Reynolds summed up the plight of war correspondents at the time the Army removed 400 reporters from the list of those entitled to free Army messes, free flights with the Army Transport Command, privileges at Army Post Exchanges, and occasional free drinks. Said Reynolds:

The war just isn't commercial any more. I don't want to see war pictures. I don't want to hear dramatized war incidents on the radio. I don't want to read war books. But the hell of it is that's all we've got to sell—we 400. If anyone can use 400 slightly soiled war correspondents we can be had cheap. You can have us in singles or in carload lots. You can have us hot or cold. All we want is three meals a day, an expense account, and a little spending money. We are strictly from hunger.

But before too many tears are shed for these pitiable men, we might profitably inquire into their reconversion. And already we find that they have peacetime uses, and can eat thrice daily even if they have to use their own money. Many stayed on in Europe and Asia to keep their alert eyes open to watch the restive world. Others returned to the United States and found

themselves covering a different kind of conflict, that between labor and management, or that between the conservative and New Deal elements in Congress. It wasn't so exciting as armed warfare, but it was in many ways more of a challenge to individual resourcefulness.

A LOOK-AROUND AT HOME

And there was reassurance that radio news executives were aware of their task. Said William F. Brooks, vice-president of NBC, in a memorandum to his news staff:

Basic news patterns which have been over-shadowed by the war are emerging again. There will be no dearth of news events. Fires, wrecks, hurricanes, industrial reconversion, economic trends, politics—all these will assume new news values. Many will lend themselves to special events broadcasting on the spot, and we should plan for this coverage as soon as technical equipment is available. We will have to go behind the press service reports to get the personalized and colorful touches which will continue to make our news reports different and outstanding. Our news staffs will have to get out of their chairs and make direct contacts with news sources and we will have to pay more attention to local news in all of our newsrooms.

There must be no attempt to preach or crusade for causes which, however meritorious they may seem, have any selfish or underhanded motives. Ours is the job to report—and to report accurately and impartially. We are determined to establish the fact that when listeners hear news over NBC it is accurate and uncolored by private or personal motive.

This is not easy, but if we exercise care and make sure that our staff is experienced and unselfish, we will make fewer mistakes. Transmission facilities which have been developed as a result of the war will enable us to give listeners at home on-the-spot broadcasts of history in the making these next few years. We must have men who realize their responsibility, and who will dedicate themselves to this cause.

AND A VIEW OF PROBLEMS ABROAD

In regard to international broadcasting, Edward R. Murrow has this to say:

How do you report suffering to people who have not suffered? How do you explain new and perhaps revolutionary political experiments to people who have not themselves witnessed the defeat and disintegration of traditional policies and practices? The real problem is going to be that there is no common denominator of experience. Words such as "sacrifice," "shortages," even "freedom," and "democracy" have come to have a different meaning on different sides of the Atlantic. I have an idea that radio's job is more than that of a mere translator. If it is to be effective, it must transport the listener to the country from which the broadcast is originating and say to him: "Look, Joe, if you were here this is what you would see and hear and smell and taste."

The quotations from Brooks and Murrow emphasize that the present news job is more difficult than during wartime. Radio has had to rediscover our own country, our own states, our own cities, our own people, our own opinions and prejudices.

The men and women in radio newsrooms had been looking so long at Okinawa and Luneberg and Iwo Jima and Frankfurt that they had begun to forget that things could happen at home, too. News was not only B-29 raids on enemy targets, news was not only atomic fission, but also a blizzard in Buffalo, a kidnaped child in Chicago, a mine disaster in Kentucky, floods in Missouri and Illinois. News was the prices of what we buy and our take-home pay and stockholders' dividends.

There may be some who believe that foreign affairs should still receive the major emphasis in radio news coverage. It can be argued that what happens abroad is most important to the future of the world, to civilization itself, and shouldn't take second place to domestic news. That point of view has a certain validity, but it's equally arguable that the American economy will also have a vital effect upon the world, that not until we in the United States have finally settled upon what we are to have, and what we are to be, can we take our rightful place in international leadership.

MORE SETS AND MORE LISTENERS

It must be remembered, too, that there are going to be a lot of new listeners. To quote an article by William C. Ackerman in the *Public Opinion Quarterly*:

All signs point to still greater expansion for broadcasting in the post-war years. Professor Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard has pointed to a pent-up demand for 23,000,000 radio receivers. Dr. Orestes H. Caldwell, the former Federal Radio Commissioner, has estimated the market for civilian radio products, within a year following the defeat of Germany, at \$1,000,000,000. Actually only a fraction of this figure was achieved in sales, because set manufacturers encountered labor disputes and resultant strikes, and were handicapped by shortages, particularly of copper wire. A survey by Stewart Brown and Associates reported a post-war market for an estimated 100,000,000 new receivers within the first five or six years after total victory. Radio products, almost entirely for war use, were manufactured in 1944 at the rate of \$4,000,000,000 a year in comparison with a peacetime rate of \$325,000,000.

No discussion of radio news in the future would be complete without mention of the technical developments almost certain to come, particularly in the fields of frequency modulation, facsimile, and television.

It's significant, I think, that in a *Broadcasting Magazine* survey of radio stations, it was found that inclusion of more local news in news programs was the most frequently changed program policy of 1946. No less than 76 per cent of the stations said they had arranged for more local news, and 16 per cent said they were planning such a move soon. If we can assume that 8 per cent of the stations already had put in increased local news before 1946, then every radio station is now handling local news. A fire on Main Street has become important again.

FM AND FACSIMILE

Frequency modulation, or FM, is supposed to operate in an almost static-proof and fade-proof fashion. Its enthusiasts believe (probably too optimistically) that ultimately it will supplant the present system of transmission (amplitude modulation, or AM) as the preferred radio service for the great majority of listeners. As I've said in earlier chapters, FM may permit many more stations than exist today, and that will tend to make broadcasting increasingly democratic. Audiences may tend to be attracted to the stations with the best programs rather than to stations with the most power or the best wave-length.

A form of FM termed "frequency shift-keying" has already been used successfully on international code radio circuits. This has meant that many circuits previously operated only at intervals because of some kind of atmospheric disturbance, are now in regular, almost uninterrupted use.

Facsimile also probably has an important place in the radio future. Facsimile is the transmission of a message (or a page of type or a document) by sending a photograph of it rather than spelling it out letter by letter. This can be done by radio, over telephone lines, or through cables. Granted proper transmitting and receiving equipment, it has long been possible to print a page of news in a radio set. Presumably, its use would have a profound effect upon American home life. The husband could come downstairs after shaving, tear off the Facsimile Digest which has been printed through radio impulses as he slept, read it, reset the dials for the latest vocal news, and not have to go to the door on a wintry morning and shiveringly gather in the morning paper. Perhaps his wife could be persuaded to deal with the milk bottles and to let the dog out, too.

It has been proposed that press associations transmit their reports to radio stations and newspapers by facsimile, speeding up the flow of news faster and cheaper than it's handled by automatic printers. Few are aware of the extent to which facsimile is already in use. *World Report* in its issue of Aug. 15, 1946, says in an article citing vast reductions in cost of world communications:

Facsimile communication already has expanded to a far greater extent than is generally realized. Financial reports, legal documents, and other papers where accuracy is essential now are commonly transmitted by this means. Thousands of blueprints for armaments were radioed between Allied capitals during the war.

The industry sees no reason why facsimile should not eventually replace teletype and telegraphy entirely. Technically, the process has been developed to near perfection. Its one big disadvantage is that it requires a very wide band of frequencies. The FCC is reluctant to allot the broad sector of the overcrowded radio spectrum that large-scale facsimile communications would require.

An up-to-that-date article on facsimile, written by Robert M. Yoder, appeared in the Nov. 23, 1946, issue of *The Saturday Evening Post*. The article, entitled "Will Your Newspaper Come by Radio?", says that the equipment for facsimile is considerably ahead of the plans for using it.

Describing the post-war facsimile system, Yoder says that the first message sent over it might appropriately have been, "It's wonderful but what good is it?" He continues: "For home printing arrived bringing a wagonload of questions; it is something as if the violin had been built before there were any violin players. Only the broad possibilities are clear and they are subject to a host of ifs.

"A newspaper so printed and distributed would have no need for the giant presses now used or the pressmen; no need for linotypes or for any type, unless the original editions are set in type; no need for the fleets of trucks which now distribute the papers; no need for newsboys and corner newsstands. But who pays for the receiving sets in subscribers' homes? . . . The engineering, as is so often the case in this off-phase century, is several laps ahead of the economics."

BUT WHAT ABOUT TELEVISION?

The public, however, seems to have more curiosity about television than about the other science-is-wonderful aspects of the radio future. "When will we have television?" The answer is that we have it now, that sets will be too expensive until they are mass produced, that the public won't buy the sets until programs are good and transmission perfected, that advertisers won't spend money for good programs and station time until there's a really big audience. This constitutes some kind of a circle, but the fact is that the economics of television have yet to be resolved. As far as the broadcaster is concerned, millions of dollars are going to be lost until a single dollar of profit is made.

There's also the problem of whether television is anti-social. People can and do talk, read books, play cards, sew, cook, scrub and tinker while a radio set is going full blast. But television is

more demanding. You can't look at a series of pictures and do much else at the same time. Even conversation is an intrusion.

For that matter, the announcer's voice accompanying television is often an annoyance. Those who saw the Louis-Conn championship fight by television in 1946 said they wished the announcer would keep quiet. They were able to see things as well as he, and his words had a high nuisance value. Television reporters will have a great deal to learn, one of the most important things being when to keep still.

There's no question, however, that television has tremendous possibilities, especially in the fields of news and special events. The news broadcaster, assisted by maps, charts, films, animation devices, and photographs, should be able to give the news a dimension not possible when it is heard only by the ear and not seen by the eye.

I recall a parade in New York of the 82nd Airborne Division. The three men assigned to broadcast a description of that parade were all moved by the spectacle, and yet, despite good reporting, it was all but impossible to put into words what they felt, to translate to the spoken word what the eye saw. The entire situation cried aloud for television. The same will be true of all types of sports events.

Already some fears have been expressed that if television becomes as important a part of American daily life as radio now is, there'll be a sharp decrease in the number of spectators at these events, thus making them unprofitable for promoters. These are familiar fears and can be dispelled quickly in the light of journalistic history. There were no really big crowds at sports events until newspapers began to cover them. When radio came on the scene and covered prize fights, baseball, football, and the major horse races, the crowds increased rather than decreased. I predict that television will lead to still larger crowds. There should be millions of persons, especially women, now oblivious to sports, who will develop a keen interest after watching them in television pictures with accompanying descriptions. You will live to see larger ball parks, racing grounds, and fight stadiums.

It will be argued that seated at home you can see the action of a game more clearly through a television receiver than if you

were seated in the fifty-fifth row of the third tier of a stadium. That's true, but in a sense it's equally true today of broadcast descriptions of football games. The people actually at the game usually don't have nearly so accurate an idea of who carried the ball, who did the blocking, who did the tackling, as the man or woman seated before the radio in the family living room. There'll always be the desire of the fan to be able to say, "I was there."

NEW SKILLS, NOT NEW TOOLS

But radio in the future calls as much for new talents and skills as for new inventions and devices. The biggest difficulty of the job ahead is just plain fact-getting. There aren't any briefing officers any more to tell reporters what they should write. Reporters now are going to have to find out for themselves. The era of the handout and the hold-for-release is on the wane, or at least I think and hope it is.

The black cloud of censorship still hangs over news gatherers in too many places. In fact, there are times when the situation seems worse now than in wartime. Russia, which permitted broadcasting by American correspondents throughout the war, now forbids it. Argentina and Spain are quick-tempered if a reporter tries to do an objective job. The Russian-dominated countries of central Europe are hostile to those who try to see and to tell the truth. There may be a slight hope that a United Nations Committee will be able to do something about this, to let in the sun and to air out the international house, but don't count on it. Whatever else may have been accomplished by World War II, it didn't seem to help our global communications.

It isn't censorship when paid press agents get between news sources and news reporting here at home, but often the effect is the same. In covering contentious news such as industrial disputes, radio (and press) should try to by-pass the publicity stooges, send reporters to the picket lines, into the homes of strikers, into the offices of company management. And after they

have found out all they can they must report their findings fairly, without innuendo, slyness of accentuation, or bias.

None of this is easy. There are many pitfalls both at home and abroad. I think reporters should be especially wary of generalities that concern whole populations or sections of society. "The Soviets say this . . .," "the Germans act this way . . .," "this is labor's point of view." Phrases such as these are apt to be misleading, and there's much more harm in badly informing a public than in not informing it at all.

Then, too, this is probably the time to repeat a favorite dictum of mine, which on occasion has been more honored in the breach than in the observance. It goes like this:

Be first with the news. But if being first means any sacrifice of accuracy, then much rather be last than broadcast something that shouldn't have gone on the air at all.

Granted that radio achieves more and more hair-trigger accuracy, gets better reporting and writing, increases its vast audience, what then? Will all that contribute to the peace of the world, to the betterment of mankind; will it enable us to avoid a third and catastrophic world war?

The answer here, I suspect, is only "maybe." We were the best-informed public in the world in 1933, but that didn't prevent a madman from taking over the reins of government in Germany. We were even better informed in 1941, but that didn't prevent Pearl Harbor. All that can be said is this: It certainly is worth while to be ever on the alert. It certainly is worth while to try to bring to every listener every conceivable fact that will help him to understand what is going on around him. It certainly is worth while to arm that citizen in an effort to keep man from destroying man and probably from destroying the earth itself.

And one final thought: I firmly believe that a free and democratic radio, presenting the news as clearly and accurately as possible, is one of the greatest exports we can give the world.

FOR THE STUDENT

CHAPTER 1

For Further Reading

Rudolf Flesch, *The Art of Plain Talk* (Harper and Brothers, 1946). This book deals with readability in general, not especially with radio, but it will help you improve your radio writing.

For Practice

1. Rewrite the following news story for a radio news program to make it easily understandable.

NEW YORK—Egypt, long a contender against British forces within her boundaries, called on the United Nations today to guarantee the countries of the strategic Middle East against domination by the great powers.

In a speech before the U.N. assembly as the fourth day of general debate opened, Mohamed Hussein Heykal Pasha also called for condemnation of “the maintenance of military forces on the territory of any country without the specific consent of the government involved.”

Egypt has been involved in an old dispute with Britain over the presence of British soldiers in that land, but some diplomatic officials hoped that with a tentative agreement on the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which was announced Sunday night at Cairo, a solution of the Anglo-Egyptian row might be at hand. However, they conceded this was made highly uncertain by Prime Minister Attlee’s denial to Commons today that Britain had pledged a withdrawal from the Sudan.

2. Read aloud all the lead paragraphs on the first page of a current newspaper. How many of them are easy to read aloud and easy to understand? Rewrite those that are not.

For Discussion

3. Take the question referred to on page 2: Which one of these do you think did the best job of serving the public during World

War II—magazines, newspapers, moving pictures, or radio? How would you answer that, and why?

4. You will find it interesting and helpful to keep a record for one week of the time you spend listening to radio news, reading newspapers, and reading news magazines. Do you think you hear and read as much news now as you did during the war? In surveys it has been found that the average adult hears about two newscasts a day, and spends about 30 minutes a day with his newspaper. How do you compare with the average?

5. Do you think there is any difference between readability and hearability? If so, why? And how would you try to prove it?

6. Read again the standards for readability on page 13. These deal with making news more easily understandable by improving the style. What barriers to understanding are *not* considered?

CHAPTER 2

For Further Reading

Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Harry Field, *The People Look at Radio* (University of North Carolina Press, 1946). This is the most extensive national survey ever taken to find out what people think of radio. For a discussion of what makes radio different from newspapers and magazines, read Lazarsfeld's *Radio and the Printed Page* (Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1940). If you want to dig still deeper, try G. W. Allport and Hadley Cantril, *The Psychology of Radio* (Harper and Brothers, 1935).

For Practice

1. In your local newspaper mark all the stories that would ordinarily not be handled by a radio station. In each case, why not?

2. Listen to a late evening broadcast and list all the stories. Check these against the first page of your morning newspaper. Does radio in general "play" the same stories? Or does radio overlook a great many page one news items?

3. Choose an important current news story. Notice how it's handled on the radio and by the newspaper. If there are essential differences, how do you explain them?

For Discussion

4. If you had to do without either radio or newspapers, which one would you give up? and why?

5. After you've heard the account of a news event on the air (for

example, the complete broadcast of a football game) do you want to read about it in the newspaper? why?

6. I stress the advantage in speed which radio has over the press. What are the dangers in that speed? Can you cite any specific examples?

7. Do you agree that the radio must be more cautious than the newspaper in handling sex and lurid crime stories?

8. In regard to the comparative honesty and reliability of radio and press, how much influence do you think advertisers have over what news goes into print and what goes out over the air?

CHAPTER 3

For Further Reading

See the Bibliography, pages 397-398, under the heading "History." You will probably find the Chase and the Schechter books most readable.

For Practice

On pages 37 and 38, Schechter tells how he covered the world for radio by telephone. The telephone is still the most important instrument in any newsroom. Here are some problems that you can solve with a telephone. In every case, we are assuming that only ten minutes or so are left before air time, and it is impossible to send a reporter to the scene.

1. You get a tip that there's a big fire in town. How do you get information about it?

2. A rumor reaches you that there has been a train wreck 20 miles out in the country. Whom do you telephone?

3. Your local high school has been playing an important game with a rival high school in the next county. You know the game is over because it is now too dark to play. No word of the score has come over your news service. How do you get the score and the story of the game in time for the newscast?

(The answers to the above problems are fairly easy because there are a number of possibilities in each case. The next two are more difficult. No answers are supplied in this book, but if you have trouble you probably can get the answers by consulting your local telephone company officials.)

4. You are in a network key station in New York City, and you get a wire from your station in Kansas City asking you to check on a report that a prominent official from Kansas City has been drowned off the New Hampshire coast. How do you check on this?

5. On a holiday, you want to get in touch with a prominent person to verify a story. You find out that he is at his office, and the telephone number is CI 2-4000. You dial that number and there is no answer. You dial the building phone and there is no answer. What can you do with a reasonable chance of reaching your man quickly?

For Discussion

6. What are your earliest memories of hearing radio news?
7. Do you think newspapers would do a service by publishing more elaborate radio programs?
8. Do you see any vestiges of the press-radio war in your own community?
9. Do you think radio would have been better off if it had kept a wire news service of its own?

CHAPTER 4**For Further Reading**

Station KMBC, Kansas City—which does an outstanding news job—has published a history of radio's first 25 years. For a study of the amazing Orson Welles incident there is Hadley Cantril's *The Invasion from Mars* (Princeton University Press, 1940).

For Practice

1. The years after 1934 were the most news-crowded in history. Among the great stories were the Hauptmann trial, King Edward's abdication, the coronation of George VI, Anschluss in Austria, the Munich crisis, the beginning of World War II, Pearl Harbor, D-Day, the death of President Roosevelt, V-E Day, the dropping of the first atomic bomb, and V-J Day. Then, too, there were the various presidential elections. Thinking back over these stories, which do you remember most vividly—what you heard on the radio or what you read in print? Can you identify now any of the broadcasters or reporters who covered these stories?

For Discussion

2. What outstanding war broadcasts can you recall in addition to those listed on page 49?
3. If you had to make an award to one person for war news broadcasting, to whom would you give it?
4. How about a similar award for political convention and election coverage?

5. How do you explain the panic caused by the Orson Welles "Man from Mars" broadcast? Have you any personal anecdotes about what happened that night? Do you know of any other incidents in which people confused radio dramatic fiction with news?

6. Have you ever thought of how much fuller your life has been because radio news was given the green light in the thirties? What has radio news meant to your knowledge and depth of understanding in these last years?

CHAPTER 5

For Further Reading

Jerome Sill: *The Radio Station* (George Stewart, 1946). Probably the only book in the twenty-five-year history of broadcasting that deals with the problems of operating a successful radio station.

Judith Waller, *Radio: The Fifth Estate* (Houghton Mifflin, 1946). This contains some material on station and network organization, illustrated by diagrams.

For Practice

1. If there's a radio station in your community, try to arrange a visit, and look particularly at the news set-up.

2. Assuming you have no space or budget limitations, outline what seem to you ideal news facilities and personnel for a large station and for a small station. If you have any talent as an architect, draw floor plans.

For Discussion

3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a news broadcaster writing his own material?

4. There's no longer much competition between radio and newspaper for the honor of first breaking the news. Where, then, are the areas of competition in news gathering between the two?

5. During World War II, the networks had large staffs of foreign correspondents, and therefore enjoyed an advantage over the local station in news coverage. Now, with so much emphasis on local and regional news, which the network can't supply, does the network any longer have an advantage over the local station in news coverage? This assumes that the local station has the major wire services.

6. Have you any personal anecdotes—through your listening—similar to the one told in the closing paragraph of Chapter 5?

7. How often do you think a station should broadcast news? How

many of its daily news broadcasts should last 15 minutes and how many should be shorter?

CHAPTER 6

For Further Reading

Phil Newsom's *United Press Radio News Style Book* (United Press Associations, 1943) and Tom O'Neil's *For Reading Out Loud* (Press Association, 1944), both quoted in Chapter 6, should be read in full.

For Practice

1. That's the word. Practice. You've come to the place now when no exercise will be so useful to you as writing. Practice rewriting the stories in a daily newspaper. If you have access to a wire news service—or better still, services—rewrite those stories. Review the principles in Chapter 6, and apply them. Try to make your stories good enough to go out on the air, good enough so that anybody can understand them. From now on, if you're ever going to amount to anything in radio news, there's simply no substitute for work. And work means writing. And writing. And writing. And self-editing. And writing again.

2. In addition to your own writing, listen every chance you get to skilled broadcasters. You can learn a lot from them. Radio is so young that new techniques are being discovered all the time. Therefore, no one broadcaster can know all the answers, and no book can give you fixed, unchanging rules. You have to keep up with what's going on, and with what's going out on the air.

For Discussion

3. Of the principles set forth in Chapter 6, does any seem to you to apply only to writing for the ear?
4. What is the distinction between repetition and redundancy?
5. What do you think of the way numbers were handled in the last election broadcasts you heard?
6. In your opinion are most of the broadcasters you hear following the ideas given in Chapter 6?

CHAPTER 7

For Further Reading

Actual current scripts, which probably will be supplied upon request by your local station or by other near-by stations. (Further hearing is

a good idea here, too, before you start in on the practices. Pay particular attention to organization of the material in news broadcasts.)

For Practice

1. If you have access to press association material, use that. If not, use a newspaper. Write a five-minute and a fifteen-minute script.
2. After these scripts are completed assume that two stories break shortly before air time. One is an official United Nations announcement that uranium has been found in almost unlimited quantities in Antarctica. Another is that a school bus has crashed into a truck in your community, killing the driver and injuring 24 children, none of them critically. The detail on these stories becomes quite complete before your programs are broadcast. How do you change your script to accommodate these stories, and what stories would you throw out?
3. On another day, try your hand at a five-minute script in the Bill Henry manner of putting together your material, described on page 94.

For Discussion

4. Do you find the Henry technique works better or worse for you—in contrast to the method of having all of the copy segregated and in front of you, as you put together a script?
5. In connection with your listening, how many stories are usually used in five-minute and fifteen-minute broadcasts? Is there the wide variation such as was found in one study where one station averaged 14 stories in a single broadcast, and another competing station used 44?
6. Is the fictional script reproduced in Chapter 7 properly put together, in your judgment, from the point of view of the amount of "play" given each story? If not, how would you rearrange it?

CHAPTER 8**For Further Reading**

Further reading after all that? As a matter of fact, this chapter is in itself almost a textbook on big-time news and radio operation. If you study these examples and learn everything there is to learn from them, you'll be fairly well prepared for almost any assignment that may come to you in a radio newsroom.

For Practice

1. Suppose that you are in charge of a station newsroom with all three wire services, and that you are instructed to break into the

station's regular programs at any time with a news bulletin of sufficient importance. At what point in the flow of copy from the sentencing at Nuernberg would you break in with a bulletin?

2. Suppose that on the morning of the Nuernberg sentencing you've decided to devote five minutes air time at 8:30 to the news of the trial. More details will be coming in on the three wires during those five minutes. Prepare your news broadcast making allowance for additional bulletin material.

3. Do the same thing with ten minutes of news from Nuernberg at 9:00 A.M.

4. Write eight minutes (of a fifteen-minute news broadcast) at 1:00 P.M., summarizing news from the trial. Try this first using only one news service; then again using all three.

For Discussion

5. No wire news service is always better than the others. One is better on a certain story, another on another story. In its handling of the Nuernberg sentencing, what seem to you to be the ways in which each wire news service excelled? Consider such factors as ease of handling, accuracy, speed, completeness, colorful detail.

6. Just as you have examined the press association copy, so should you also study the handling of it by the several broadcasters. What seem to you to be the particular qualities in which each broadcaster excelled?

7. Do you agree with the news judgment that caused Heatter, Henry, and Collingwood to "lead" that night with Secretary Hull's illness rather than the trial, even though the earlier story was 13 or more hours old?

8. How about the news judgment used on the 6 o'clock broadcast in regard to the baseball score?

9. How important would a story have to be to take the news play away from the Nuernberg story at 9:30 in the morning? Invent a few stories to talk over the comparative importance.

CHAPTER 9

For Further Reading

A good radio news broadcaster will be familiar with *World Words* by William Cabell Greet, and *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* by John S. Kenyon and Thomas A. Knott. For books dealing with articulation and speech making, see the Bibliography on page 407.

For Practice

1. Practice reading the news scripts that you've written. If you can, record them and hear them played back—the best way to improvement is self-improvement. The next best way to practice is to read them over a public address system to listeners who will criticize frankly. Third choice is to have someone else read your copy while you listen critically.
2. Does your copy read easily? If not, why not? Are the sentences too long? Are the sound combinations awkward? Are the words too clumsy? Is emphasis misplaced in the sentences? What else?
3. Listen to as many news broadcasters as you can, paying special attention to delivery rather than content.

For Discussion

4. Who's your favorite news broadcaster? How much of your liking for him is due to the way he reads the news, how much to the way his news is selected and written?
5. Do you think most announcers read news too fast? Some American listeners to BBC news complain that the British announcers speak too slowly, but the BBC contends that it arrived at its rate of speed after scientific tests that showed listener retention was higher when the news was read more slowly. What seems to you the most effective rate at which news may be read?
6. As you know, there are relatively few women news broadcasters. Why?
7. Some announcers read copy that they, themselves, have written; some, copy which has been prepared for them. Do you think you can tell which is which? What makes you think so? Do you think your ear's keen enough to spot those who have prepared only a part of their copy?
8. Can you put into words what makes you think some news broadcasters are authoritative, others not?

CHAPTER 10**For Further Reading**

Middletown in Transition, by Robert S. Lynd, contains sections on the ideas of the community as to what is good taste. Almost all textbooks on basic reporting present definitions of news. These definitions are worth reading and comparing with others.

For Practice

1. List the three stories most interesting to you in a newspaper. When you have chosen them, try to decide *why* they are most interesting. If you are in a class, or if you are entertaining friends at home, you can try the same thing either with a newspaper or with a news broadcast. List the three most interesting stories in order. See how much agreement there is among the choices.

2. A common way of building a news broadcast is to lead with the story which the newsman considers most interesting at air time. Listen to several news programs within an hour, and see how much agreement there is on the lead story.

3. If you have an opportunity to talk to radio news editors or newspaper editors, ask them how they pick out a good news story, and whether they think of any special groups, or any special interests in their audiences when selecting news. They may also be able to tell you whether they abide by any set rules for defining good taste in news. Some stations and newspapers have codes of practice in this respect. You will be interested in reading some of them.

4. Arthur M. Barnes, director of the radio news laboratory at the University of Iowa, made a study of all the news programs broadcast by eight Midwestern stations on three midweek days during the year after V-J Day. He found that the news content of the fifteen-minute news broadcasts of local origin was divided as follows:

	<i>per cent</i>
National news	52
Foreign news	19
Regional news	18
Feature stories	6
Weather forecasts	5

This is an average. It does not mean that you should make your news broadcasts conform to similar proportions. But you may find it interesting to chart several news broadcasts and to compare the results.

For Discussion

5. If the radio news editor stays within the law in editing his copy, why should he concern himself further with the problem of good taste?

6. You probably remember the story of William Heirens, who was convicted in 1946 of several sensational crimes in Chicago. What do you think of the way that story was handled on the radio? Can you

devise a set of workable principles by which radio can proceed in handling such stories?

7. Assume that within the hour before your news broadcast, the following five stories break:

- a. One of the senators from your state has been taken to a hospital in Washington, D. C., and doctors say that his condition is critical.
- b. An auto accident 50 miles from your town involves a local man. He is injured but not seriously. The driver of the car with which his car collided was killed.
- c. The star halfback of your local football team is declared ineligible to play in a championship game.
- d. At least 40 persons have been killed in renewed food riots in Bombay.
- e. The House Ways and Means Committee reports a bill proposing a 2 per cent cut in individual income taxes.

In deciding how to build your newscast, how would you rank these stories in importance? (And don't write in and ask me!)

8. What do you think of middle commercials? If you were running a station would you eliminate them, even if it meant a considerable loss of revenue?

CHAPTER 11

For Further Reading

Leading cases on the problem of whether defamation by radio is slander or libel are: *Sorenson v. Wood*, 123 Neb. 348 (1932); *Summit Hotel Co. v. National Broadcasting Co.*, 336 Pa. 182 (1934); *Miles v. Louis Wasmer, Inc.*, 172 Wash. 466 (1933); *Coffey v. Midland Broadcasting Co.*, Fed. Supp. 889 (1934).

Almost every university law library has these cases on file. Discussions of them can be found in the following: Daniel G. Fortunoff, "Liability of Radio Corporation for Defamatory Statements Uttered over the Air," 12 *Air Law Review* 316 (1941); Andrew G. Haley, "The Law of Radio Programs," 5 *George Washington Law Review*, 157-197 (1935); Andrew J. Newhouse, "Defamation by Radio: A New Tort," 17 *Oregon Law Review* 314 (1938); *Restatement of the Law of Torts*, 1938, Sec. 568; Lawrence Vold, "Defamatory Interpolations in Radio Broadcasts," 88 *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 246 (1940); "Defamation by Radio,"

2 *Journal of Radio Law* 673 (1932); and "The Basis of Liability for Defamation by Radio," 19 *Minnesota Law Review* 611 (1935).

For comments on *Mau v. Rio Grande, Inc.*, 28 Fed. Supp. 845, one of the few cases on privacy involving radio, see comments in 74 *New York Law Review* 430; 88 *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 374; 11 *Air Law Review* 83, 38 *Michigan Law Review* 748; and 18 *Texas Law Review* 356. A compilation of the laws affecting radio can be found in Elmer Lewis's *Radio Laws of the United States* (Government Printing Office, 1944). The most complete text on the whole field of radio law is A. W. Socolow's *The Law of Radio Broadcasting* (Baker, Voorhis and Co., 1939, 2 vols.).

For Practice

1. If you are one of a group studying radio news, it's to be hoped that your teacher will assign students to the various cases mentioned in the above bibliography. Then reports on them can be written for classroom reading. If you are studying the subject individually, and are limited as to time, I recommend the Fortunoff discussion.

2. Listen to news programs and see how often you find what you consider defamation. In each case, in your opinion, was the defamation defensible and on what ground?

For Discussion

Take three hypothetical examples and, from the summary supplied in Chapter 11, try to decide how you would handle them (if at all) on news programs.

3. There has been a brutal killing of a farmer's wife near your community. A tramp, who previously served a prison term for criminal assault, is being questioned by county officers. An under-sheriff informs reporters that there's no doubt the tramp is guilty, and that the tramp's now dictating a confession.

4. State auditors announce they've checked your city's books and have found an unaccountable deficit of some \$100,000. The City Treasurer cannot be found. Investigation reveals that although he makes a salary of \$5,000 a year, he had a bank balance until a few weeks ago of more than \$50,000. A race-track bookie who declines the use of his name, says the missing man owes him \$30,000 on horse bets. The City Attorney says he will introduce evidence on the case before the Grand Jury.

5. You find out that a charity organization in your community gave a "benefit" dinner which netted a profit of only \$10.31. Among the

"expenses" were two cases of champagne served the diners, an unitemized \$100 to the chairman for his "personal" expenses in arranging for the dinner, and another amount for the rental of slot machines which are illegal in your state.

CHAPTER 12

For Further Reading

By all means, don't miss H. V. Kaltenborn's classic *I Broadcast the Crisis* (Random House, 1938), a saga of a time when radio commentary was practically a one-man monopoly. And Dixon Wecter's three articles in the *Atlantic Monthly* (see Bibliography under "Radio Commentaries") are another must—in themselves a thought-provoking commentary.

For Practice

1. Take some controversial issue of the day, do as much research as you can on the pros and cons. Then write an analysis of the issue trying your best to be objective. Do you believe you've made the whole thing more clear; have you added to the average person's store of information; provided him with information that will help him to make up his own mind?
2. Now write the commentary as biased and one-sided as you can. Urge a course of action. Do you think you've been so persuasive that the listener would think there really was no other side to the story?

For Discussion

3. It's probably unnecessary to outline points of discussion in regard to this one, because it nearly always touches off fireworks with students and practitioners of radio news. Perhaps someone will find a middle ground that answers my point of view and also Vandercook's. Is freedom of speech at issue here at all? Can radio ever assume its full stature without a strident editorial voice?

4. You will realize that there are always certain inevitable pressures behind news on the air. One is from the government, which through FCC licenses stations. Another from business, which pays the bills. Another from the public, which apparently prefers straight news to commentators (see Chapter 14, page 224). And still a fourth from station or network management which has its own interests to serve. How can these pressures best be equalized in regard to a policy for commentators?

CHAPTER 13**For Further Reading**

By all means read the complete articles by Davis, Benton, and Gerber in the *Journalism Quarterly* for June, 1946. Then see the section of the Bibliography headed "Radio As a War Tool." I think that of these the best written is Taylor's *The Strategy of Terror*; the most painstaking in the analysis of propaganda, Matt Gordon's *News Is a Weapon*. This entire field opens fascinating vistas for graduate students who are working on theses.

For Practice

1. Examine newspapers, news broadcasts, and news magazines for a few days to see if you can find the "Joe Blow" technique at work. (You may be surprised to find how much there is around.)
2. Draw up the salient points in a convention (or treaty) which you think should be adopted by the United Nations to permit complete freedom from censorship in international broadcasting.

For Discussion

3. If you and several others have performed Practice 2, you'll have enough material for unlimited discussion. Does it necessarily follow that lack of censorship makes for peace?
4. Do you agree with Davis's statement that "Propaganda . . . is not always or even often false"?
5. Can a Joe Blow happen here? Are there any people now broadcasting who consistently follow any, some, or all of the propaganda techniques listed?
6. In one Midwestern state a news broadcaster was almost nominated for Governor. In another, a news broadcaster was almost elected Senator. Do you see any dangers in a newsman's use of the microphone as a figurative springboard to a political career?

CHAPTER 14**For Further Reading**

The most usable book about radio audience research is Matthew N. Chappell and C. E. Hooper's *Radio Audience Measurement* (Stephen Daye, 1946). This describes the telephone survey, the interview method, and the radio diary. Two books by Paul Lazarsfeld and Frank Stanton, *Radio Research*, 1941, and *Radio Research*, 1942-43 (both published by Duell, Sloan & Pearce), contain ar-

ticles on the audiences for different kinds of programs. *Radio and the Printed Page*, by Paul Lazarsfeld, previously mentioned, is also full of material on radio audiences. The national survey quoted in Chapter 14 may be read in full in *The People Look at Radio*, by Paul Lazarsfeld and Harry Field (University of North Carolina Press, 1946). The survey of "Middleville" by Schramm and Huffer is described in the *Journalism Quarterly* for June, 1946.

For Practice

1. Your local station will be glad to show you any material it has published on its audiences. Some stations have maps showing where their fan mail has come from. Others have made surveys of listeners and their preferences.
2. On a small scale, you can try most of the methods of audience research yourself. You can organize a "coincidental" survey by telephone. Get a dozen or so of your friends to help. Choose a half hour when several good programs can be heard in your town. Station each of your friends at a different telephone. Devise some way to choose names at random—for example, the third name from the top of each page in the telephone book. Have each person place as many calls as he can during the half hour. He should ask:

"Were you listening to the radio just now?"

"To what program were you listening?"

"Over what station is that program coming?"

"What advertiser puts on that program?"

By putting all the answers together, and figuring what percentage of persons called were listening to each program, you can "rate" the programs in terms of their popularity for your town.

3. You can find out a great deal about listening habits by asking a number of people to tell you what hours they usually listen to news broadcasts, how many they usually hear each day, who their favorite newscasters are, what they think of the reliability of radio news as opposed to newspaper news, etc. This is known as a "recall" method.

4. Listeners' "panels" are a good way to find out how well people like certain kinds of news programs or news broadcasters. One interesting experiment to try with a panel is to let those participating hear a news broadcast, asking them to record at the end of each minute or half minute how interested they are at that time. They can do that by writing a number between 1 (very interested) and 5 (not inter-

ested). Meanwhile you record what is in the newscast. By adding up all the ratings for each interval, you can tell where general interest was high, and where it was low. You can make some generalizations, therefore, about what kind of story must have interested the audience.

5. To college and university readers of this book—particularly graduate students—it is hardly necessary to say that there are many fine thesis topics in this field of audience research. The field is new, and most of the big questions are unanswered. Even for those that have been wholly or partly answered, the situation may change as radio changes. There will always be a need for radio to study its audiences.

For Discussion

6. How much do you think that a news broadcaster should depend on his fan mail to tell him what his listeners think of him? Are the people who write fan letters apt to be typical of his audience?

7. If you were a news broadcaster, what would you most like to know about your radio audience?

8. If news broadcaster or commentator A has a higher Hooper rating than B, is he necessarily better liked than B? Is he necessarily more influential than B?

9. You can measure the circulation of a newspaper by the number of copies it sells. How close can you come to measuring the "circulation" of radio news?

10. How do you interpret the survey figures quoted in Chapter 14, concerning what people think of radio news as compared to newspapers?

CHAPTER 15

For Further Reading

On programs for women, children, and farmers, see Judith Waller's *Radio: The Fifth Estate*, Chapters 9, 13, and 15. A good book for children's programs is Howard Rowland, I. Keith Tyler, and Norman Woefel's *Criteria for Children's Programs* (The Federal Radio Education Committee, 1942).

For Practice

1. Take a copy of your daily newspaper, select from it news items you think would be especially interesting to children, and write a news broadcast designed to hold their attention. Do the same thing for women, for sports fans, and for farmers.

2. Take individual stories from your newspaper (not items which would especially appeal to children) and rewrite them so that children can understand them.
3. Find out what special sources your newspaper or radio station has for news of interest to the groups discussed in Chapter 15.
4. Try to find out from children why they like some programs and dislike others.

For Discussion

5. At what time of day are large numbers of children, women, sports fans, and farmers most apt to listen? Do the programs of the stations in your area seem well adjusted to the habits of these groups of listeners?
6. Why do you think people, especially women, listen to daytime serials? (See Lazarsfeld's *Radio and the Printed Page*, Chapter II.) What do you think of daytime serials?
7. What are the common criticisms of children's programs? Can you remember any you especially liked or disliked? Why? Are any of them still on the air? Have they changed in any important way?

CHAPTER 16**For Further Reading**

This field of news technique—the documentary, dramatized program—has been reported on more fully than most other types of radio news. Excellent examples will be found in the several books by Erik Barnouw and Max Wylie, and you'll also probably enjoy (and learn a lot by reading) the Norman Corwin and Arch Oboler collections. (See Bibliography under "Radio Writing.") I also recommend Earle McGill's *Radio Directing* (McGraw-Hill, 1940).

For Practice

1. After studying the scripts in Chapter 16, take stories out of the current press and news magazines, and try your hand at dramatizing them.
2. If you and others are interested in how a good script will sound when re-enacted, cast and produce "The Story of Albert." Try to make a recording of it for self-criticism.
3. Take the second part of the "We the People" broadcast in regard to the amnesia victim, and dramatize that rather than have long speeches by the actual people involved. This can be made into a highly dramatic series of scenes.

4. As in every other form of radio writing, Rule #1 is practice, practice, and more practice.

For Discussion

5. During the war some of the documentary programs received criticism because they were thought overly realistic. In your opinion, are the scripts reprinted in Chapter 16 subject to that criticism?

6. To what extent do you think writers of dramatized news should have "poetic license" in presenting stories? I refer to plausible rather than actual dialogue and other dramatic fictions that cannot be documented.

7. Compare the emotional impact of news dramatizations you have heard with "on the scene" events. Which have been the most exciting? If you heard both the actual news of V-E Day, as it came over the air, and Corwin's celebrated "On a Note of Triumph," which to you was the most interesting? Why?

CHAPTER 17

For Further Reading

Schechter's *I Live on Air*, previously mentioned, is an entertaining account of a special events director's life. *Ten Years before the Mike*, by Ted Husing (Farrar and Rinehart, 1935) is a lively book of reminiscence by a veteran sports broadcaster.

For Practice

1. You can practice many of the techniques of radio without a microphone. One of them is in sports. Go to football practice with one of your friends. Take turns describing the game to each other. (If you sit by yourselves and talk softly enough, perhaps no one will think you're crazy.) You can do the same thing at a basketball practice, or a practice baseball game, or a track meet. You can even practice broadcasting from the moving pictures of a football game. Some students have practiced "broadcasting" parades and convocations to each other. Almost any special event will give you a chance to practice.

2. Listen critically to as many broadcasts of sports events and special events as you can. Does the broadcaster catch the exciting seconds for you? Does he give you the same thrills you would feel if you were at the scene? Does he lose your interest between climaxes? Does he tell you enough? Too much? Does he give you the color that lets you imagine yourself at the scene? What is his technique for putting the exciting happenings into a few words?

3. Suppose that you were going to broadcast a special event such as a parade, or a sports contest, or the appearance of a celebrity. Prepare the background material you would take with you to the scene.

4. Suppose that within the next week you expect to interview the mayor of your city, the star quarterback on your team, a movie star, a senator from your state, the British ambassador, and the 4-H club boy who showed the prize calf at your county fair. Prepare an outline of the points you want to cover and the questions you would ask.

For Discussion

5. What are the advantages and the disadvantages of the ways of presenting news discussed above as compared to regular news programs?

6. What are some of the faults of interviews you've heard on the radio?

7. What are some of the advantages of the unprepared interview? What are its dangers?

8. Some sports broadcasters give the impression of remaining calm even during the most exciting parts of the game. Others allow the mounting excitement of the game to creep into their delivery. Which method do you prefer, and why?

CHAPTER 18

For Further Reading

CBS has published two pocket-sized books, *From D-Day through Victory in Europe* and *From Pearl Harbor into Tokyo*. These contain pool material from other "big days" in radio, in addition to broadcasts by the network's own men. The two books taken together supply a thrilling radio history of World War II. The first 55 pages of the Pocket Book entitled *Franklin Delano Roosevelt—A Memorial* provide a brief account of radio coverage of the President's death.

For Practice

1. Throughout this book I've suggested rewriting newspaper and press association copy for radio. Now let's try the reverse. Take the George Hicks broadcast—which had a vigorous impact at the time it was first heard—and write a newspaper story as you might have done had you undergone the same experience as Hicks.

2. Along the same line, and assuming there was no military censorship at the time, write for a trade magazine an account of how network radio is preparing for "D-Day coverage."

3. Look up newspaper files for June 6 and 7, 1944, and contrast press coverage with that of radio.

For Discussion

4. Have you any personal anecdotes to relate in regard to radio's D-Day coverage? When did you get the news, and did you spend a long time at the radio?

5. Would you have chosen any other day as "radio's greatest"?

6. No one likes to think of a World War III. But if there should be one and *if* it isn't an atomic war—a big *if* indeed—how do you think radio will cover that—in contrast to World War II?

CHAPTER 19

For Further Reading

Your attention is directed again to Judith Waller's *Radio, the Fifth Estate*. You may find some other field of radio such as programing, production, promotion, and publicity more to your tastes than news. And by all means read *Your Career in Radio* by Norman V. Carlisle and Conrad C. Rice (Dutton, 1941).

For Practice

The only essential practice under Chapter 19 is to write a letter asking for a job and outlining your qualifications. Perhaps to make a recording, in addition. If you perform this practice, I suggest you put your letter away for a while after you are pretty well satisfied with it. Then, when you've forgotten just what you've written, re-examine it. Is it what you wanted to say? Can it be rewritten and improved? If so, do it over again. The same advice, of course, applies to a recording.

For Serious Consideration

As I've pointed out, there are more job openings in newspapers than in radio—at least as far as we now can foresee. Yet in one school of journalism after another, radio seems to hold out more fascination than press—the number of students concentrating on radio courses, when offered, is wholly out of line with probable available positions. So, if chances for a job are less in radio, should you devote much time to learning it unless you're convinced you're absolutely top rank?

For Discussion

1. In view of the responsibilities, what do you think of the salary scales I've mentioned?

2. What about unionization of news staffs? Do the size of stations and the size of newsroom personnel affect advantages and disadvantages of unionizing?

3. Maybe this will start a fight. In general, do women seem as able as men in news handling? Why has no network or large station, so far as I know, entrusted its news direction to a woman?

CHAPTER 20

For Further Reading

See Chapter V of Jerome Sill's *The Radio Station* referred to previously. You may want to read more about television in one of three books: *Television, the Eyes of Tomorrow*, by Capt. William C. Eddy (Prentice-Hall, 1945); *Television Programming and Production*, by Richard Hubbell (Murray Hill, 1945); or *Television Show Business*, by Judy Dupuy (General Electric, 1945). FM and facsimile are so new and changing so fast that you will probably have to keep up with them in the periodicals.

For Practice

1. If you have an opportunity, see a television broadcast. Notice what kind of studio is necessary, how the movements of the actors are restricted, what kind of make-up is needed, how the scene is changed, how much rehearsal seems to be required. What is the difference between television acting and stage acting? between television and movies? between television plays and ordinary radio plays?

2. The ordinary facsimile page is 9 x 12 inches, or a little larger. Even without a facsimile transmitter, you can try making up a few pages of a facsimile newspaper. What kind of newspaper would you like to receive by air in your home? There is no reason why a facsimile newspaper would have to look like a printed newspaper. Let your imagination go. Most facsimile papers so far have been in three columns. Try one in two. Try one in three columns, and experiment with placing pictures in various positions. See what kind of layout looks best to you.

For Discussion

3. FM will probably have less effect on news broadcasting than will television or facsimile. But it may, nevertheless, have an effect. Suppose that, thanks to FM, the number of broadcasting stations in this country is tripled, with each station covering less territory than

present AM stations do. What effect would this be likely to have on the news that each station chooses to send out?

4. What kind of news will be improved by television? What kind of news will be no better? What will be apt to happen to the ordinary fifteen-minute news broadcast when it goes on television?

5. When you've seen a football game on television, will you want to read about it in the newspaper? If so, what kind of information will you want to read? What will be television's effect on the audiences for football games and on other entertainment which is often televised?

6. Facsimile is so fast (500 words a minute), so effective at transmitting pictures, and so convenient that it will almost certainly play a large part in the communication picture of the future. What part will it play? Will it compete with the newspaper, and if so, how? Will it be a supplementary service to radio or newspapers or magazines? Will it be a special news service for businessmen, persons in rural areas, etc.? How can it be worked economically into the system?

7. Changing to FM, television, and facsimile will mean a terrific bill for new transmitters, new sets, and new kinds of programs. What are you willing to pay to have a television set in your home? a facsimile receiver? an FM radio? Check these against the current or predicted price of these receivers.

8. What kind of radio news do *you* want, now that the war news is no longer? Do you want more local news? more national news? more news interpretation? Does it seem to you that the news has been any less interesting since V-J Day? Can peacetime news be as interesting as war news? If you were writing a letter to your favorite news broadcaster telling how to make the news as interesting as possible to you in this post-war period, what advice would you give him?

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY is based on one prepared by a committee of the National Council on Radio Journalism and printed in the *Journalism Quarterly* (June, 1946). The chairman of the committee, of which I was a member, was Dr. Wilbur Schramm, director of the State University of Iowa School of Journalism.

RADIO IN SOCIETY

History

ARCHER, GLEASON L. *History of Radio to 1926*. American Historical Society, 1938.

— *Big Business and Radio*. American Historical Society, 1939.

Dr. Archer offers, in two volumes, an elaborate account of the development of the business of broadcasting. Emphasis is placed on the roles of RCA and NBC in this development. The books' organization is poor, and they are at times repetitious and verbose. A careful reader will find much of value in them.

BICKFORD, LELAND. *News While It Is News*. G. C. Manthorne & Co., 1935.

A colorful, though at times mildly bilious, account of the news operations of the Yankee Network in 1934-1935.

CHASE, FRANCIS S. *Sound and Fury, an Informal History of Broadcasting*. Harper & Brothers, 1942.

The book's subtitle describes it. It covers interestingly and anecdotally the aspects of broadcasting of interest to the layman. Accurate in net effect, though not always in detail.

CODEL, MARTIN (editor). *Radio and Its Future*. Harper & Brothers, 1930.

Twenty-nine articles by competent authorities on all aspects of broadcasting. Now outdated, it gives a good picture of radio in 1930.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS. *Chronology of 25 Years of Radio*. Special 25th Anniversary Bulletin. No. 8. May 2, 1945.

SCHECHTER, ABEL A. *I Live on Air*. Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1941.
A breezy collection of tales, some of them revealing, about the radio news experiences of the man who directed NBC's news activities during the press-radio war.

Radio's Relation to Government and the Public

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. "Radio," edited by Dr. Irwin Stewart. Supplement to Vol. 132, March, 1929.

Authoritative articles covering the whole field of radio, including point-to-point communication as well as broadcasting.

— "Radio: The Fifth Estate," edited by Herman S. Hettinger. Vol. 177, January, 1935.

Twenty-nine competent articles on the organization of American radio broadcasting, its programming and its relationship to society.

— "New Horizons in Radio," edited by Herman S. Hettinger. Vol. 213, January, 1941.

Twenty-four authoritative articles under the subheads "Broadcasting as a Social Force Today," "Current Problems in Radio," and "Coming Developments in Radio."

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA. *Broadcasting and the Public*. Abingdon Press, 1938.

A restrained and readable discussion of the relations of broadcasting and the public. Especially strong in its chapter on "religious broadcasting."

FRIEDRICH, CARL J., and others. *Studies in the Control of Radio*. Littauer Center, Harvard University, 1940.

Six studies conducted on a Rockefeller Foundation grant under Mr. Friedrich's direction, from 1940 to 1943. Titles: 1—Development of the Control of Advertising on the Air. 2—Controlling Broadcasting in Wartime: A Tentative Public Policy. 3—An Analysis of the Radio-broadcasting Activities of the Federal Agencies. 4—The Problem of the Educational Institution

and Radio. 5—*The Problems of Broadcasting Control in American Democracy.* 6—*The Psychological Aspects of Radio-broadcasting Control.*

FROST, S. E. *Is American Radio Democratic?* University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Development of the thesis that American broadcasting should be operated more in the interests of the public and less in those of the station owners.

HILL, FRANK E. *Listen and Learn.* American Association for Adult Education, 1937.

The author surveys radio as a cultural force, and reviews adult education on the air.

HUTH, ARNO. *Radio Today: The Present State of Broadcasting in the World.* Columbia University Press, 1942.

LANDRY, ROBERT J. *This Fascinating Radio Business.* Bobbs-Merrill, 1946.

A book designed more for the layman than the broadcaster.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS. *NAB Code.* NAB, 1939.
— *NAB Code for Wartime Broadcasting.* NAB, 1941.

Broadcasters' codes put into effect October 1, 1939, and December 19, 1941. Includes material to help stations put the code into practice.

NEWSPAPER-RADIO COMMITTEE. *Freedom of the Press.* 1942.

Testimony of six "expert witnesses" for the Newspaper-Radio Committee before the FCC "newspaper-radio" hearings in 1942. Excellent commentary and background on the development of the free press—free speech concept, historically, legally, and practically, and its contemporary meaning.

PAYNE, GEORGE HENRY. *The Fourth Estate and Radio.* Microphone Press, 1936.

Four addresses on broadcasting, the public and the government, delivered in 1935 and 1936 by the then member of the FCC.

ROBINSON, THOMAS P. *Radio Networks and the Federal Government.* Columbia University Press, 1943.

A clear and factual exposition of federal regulation of American

broadcasting from 1912 to 1942, with special attention to the FCC action on chain broadcasting.

ROSE, C. B., JR. *National Policy for Radio Broadcasting*. Harper & Brothers, 1940.

Thorough critical analysis of American broadcasting in its technical, commercial, programming and "freedom of the air" aspects, with a section on proposed national policy for broadcasting.

SILL, JEROME. *The Radio Station*. George Stewart, 1946.

Probably the only book in the twenty-five-year history of broadcasting that deals with the problems of operating a successful radio station.

SUMMERS, H. B. (editor). *Radio Censorship*. H. W. Wilson Co., 1939.

A compilation of quoted material describing attitudes and practices in censorship of broadcasting from early days until 1939.

SUMMERS, ROBERT E. (editor). *Wartime Censorship of Press and Radio*. H. W. Wilson Co., 1942.

A compilation of periodical and book material on censorship in the early days of the war. Contains the American radio censorship code in its first form.

WAPLES, DOUGLAS (editor). *Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy*. University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Ten papers on "the administration of mass communications in the public interest."

Radio as a War Tool

CHILDS, HARWOOD L., and WHITTON, JOHN B. *Propaganda by Short Wave*. Princeton University Press, 1942.

Analysis of European radio propaganda methods and of the shortcomings of American policy and practice in this field before 1942.

DRYER, SHERMAN H. *Radio in Wartime*. Greenberg, 1942.

A criticism of the failure of American radio to be fully effective on the home front in wartime. The author subjects his criticisms to the "rebuttals" of well-equipped experts in several fields.

GORDON, MATTHEW. *News Is a Weapon*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1944.

A serious discussion of the various methods used by the Axis powers in their futile effort to sway public opinion.

GRANDIN, THOMAS. *The Political Use of the Radio*. Geneva Research Center, 1939.

A sound and thoughtful study of radio's use as a political tool in Europe in the years before the invasion of Poland.

KRIS, ERNST, and SPEIER, HANS. *German Radio Propaganda: Report on Home Broadcasting During the War*. Oxford University Press, 1944.

Contains an excellent discussion of use of radio news for propaganda purposes in Germany.

ROLO, CHARLES J. *Radio Goes to War*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1942.

Excellent analysis of radio as a war—and pre-war—propaganda instrument in all the major countries of the world.

SIEPMANN, C. A. *Radio in Wartime*. Oxford University Press, 1942.

Describes coordination of radio with other weapons in modern strategy.

TAYLOR, EDMOND. *The Strategy of Terror*. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940.

A foreign correspondent's thoughtful and keen-sighted analysis of the psychological aspects of modern warfare, with emphasis on the Nazi use of radio.

ZACHARIAS, CAPT. ELLIS M., USN. *Secret Missions*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1946.

An exciting story of psychological warfare against the Japanese by the officer who planned and executed it.

RADIO NEWS

News Writing and Style

Franklin Delano Roosevelt—*A Memorial*. Edited by Donald Porter Geddes. Pocket Books, Inc., 1945.

A book on the late president including an excellent chapter of the broadcasts carried over CBS immediately after his death.

From D-Day through Victory in Europe. Edited and published by CBS, 1945.

The eye-witness story of the war in Europe as told by war correspondents on the air.

From Pearl Harbor into Tokyo. Edited and published by CBS, 1945.

The story of the war in the Pacific as told by war correspondents on the air.

LEATHERWOOD, DOWLING. *Journalism on the Air.* Burgess Publishing Co., 1939. (Mimeographed.)

A pioneer handbook on radio journalism for classroom use. Contrasts newspaper and radio styles. Now out of print.

NEWSOM, PHIL. *United Press Radio News Style Book.* United Press Associations, 1943.

Contains many helpful suggestions on how to make news as appealing to the ear as it is to the eye.

O'NEIL, TOM. *For Reading Out Loud.* Press Association, 1944. (Pamphlet.)

Discussion of how to achieve clarity in radio news writing.

WAGNER, PAUL H. *Radio Journalism.* Burgess Publishing Co., 1940. (Mimeographed.)

A brief study of the history of newscasting and the technique of radio news writing. Now out of print.

Radio News Sponsorship

DENISON, MERRILL. "Editorial Policies of Broadcasting Companies." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 1:64 (January, 1937).

A discussion of determinants of the editorial policy of programming.

SMITH, BERNARD B. "What's Wrong with the Broadcasters?" *Harper's* 185:1105 (June, 1942).

Analyzes monopoly by big advertisers and the effect on programs, including news commentary.

Press and Radio

ANONYMOUS. "The Press and the People—a Survey." *Fortune* 20:2 (August, 1939).

Study includes a comparison of radio and newspaper news preference and reliability.

BARNETT, STANLEY F. "The Press and Radio: Past and Future." *Journalism Quarterly* 20:4, p. 326 (December, 1943).

Discusses opportunities for closer cooperation between press and radio.

CALDWELL, LOUIS G. "Freedom of Speech and Radio Broadcasting." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 177 (January, 1935).

Comparison of press and radio freedom.

LAZARSFELD, PAUL F. *Radio and the Printed Page*. Duell, Sloan & Pearce. 1940.

See annotation under Radio Audience Research.

MORRIS, FRANK D. For Further Details——. *Collier's* 103:17 (April 29, 1939).

Reasons for the "must nots" that govern radio news.

NEWSPAPER-RADIO COMMITTEE. *Freedom of the Press*. 1942.

See annotation under Radio's Relation to Government and the Public.

PATT, JOHN F. "Journalism of the Air." *Quill* 26:9 (September, 1938).

Subtitled, "Radio and the Press Are Found to Have Much in Common."

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA. *Fourth Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Broadcasting*. Commonwealth Government Printer (March 13, 1944).

Detailed background of press-radio agreements for newsgathering and presentation; recommendation for Australian Broadcasting Commission to establish its own newsgathering service.

RIEGEL, O. W. Radio-Press News Exchange. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 5:1 (March, 1941).

Brief survey of the news exchange agreements between the networks and the major press services.

Radio Commentaries

CANTRIL, HADLEY. The Role of the Radio Commentator. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 3:4 (October, 1939).

Results of a study among listeners to Boake Carter's broadcasts, concerning his appeal, intimacy, news sources.

FISHER, CHARLES. *The Columnists*. Howell, Soskin. 1944.

Primarily a book about newspaper columnists, this book gives useful and revealing material on such newspaper-radio figures as Winchell, Miss Thompson, Pearson, and others.

HOWE, QUINCY. Policing the Commentator: A News Analysis. *Atlantic Monthly* 172:5 (November, 1943).

Author says four groups are struggling for power in name of freedom of the air—government, the radio industry, sponsors, commentators.

KALTENBORN, H. V. Covering the Crisis. *Current History* 51:2 (October, 1937).

Defines functions of news analyst.

WECTER, DIXON. "Hearing Is Believing." *Atlantic Monthly* 175:6, 176:1, 2 (June, July, August, 1945).

Three thoughtful, hard-hitting articles on the American radio commentators.

Books by Radio News Correspondents and Commentators

BROWN, CECIL. *Suez to Singapore*. Random House, 1942.

Contains a description of British censorship in Singapore.

HUSING, TED. *Ten Years before the Mike*. Farrar & Rinehart, 1935.

Lively reminiscences of a veteran sports broadcaster.

KALTENBORN, H. V. *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Random House, 1938.

— — — Kaltenborn Edits the War News. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1942.

These two volumes contain selections from the author's radio commentaries.

LESUEUR, LARRY. *Twelve Months That Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1943.

Radio newsman's experiences in Russia in 1941-42.

- MURROW, EDWIN R. *This Is London*. Simon & Schuster, 1941.
Selections from CBS correspondent's broadcasts from London from August 25, 1939, to December 31, 1940.
- SAERCHINGER, CESAR. *Hello America!* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938.
Pioneer in transatlantic broadcasting describes experience in establishing international radio broadcasts.
- ST. JOHN, ROBERT. *From the Land of Silent People*. Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1942.
The dramatic adventures of a radio reporter in covering the wake of war.
- SEVAREID, ERIC. *Not So Wild a Dream*. Knopf, 1946.
One of the most exciting and literate books (by a correspondent) to emerge in the postwar era.
- SHIRER, WILLIAM L. *Berlin Diary*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.
One of the better on-the-scene reports by a radio correspondent.
- SMITH, HOWARD. *Last Train from Berlin*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1942.
Correspondent's account of the psychological and economical conditions inside the Reich.
- SWING, RAYMOND GRAM. *Preview of History*. Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1937.
— *How War Came*. W. W. Norton & Co., 1939.
Commentaries broadcast before the crisis and after the Nazi-Soviet pact.

RELATED FIELDS OF RADIO

Radio Writing

- BARNOUW, ERIK. *Handbook of Radio Writing*. Little, Brown & Co., 1930.
Principles of script writing, and excerpts from successful scripts.
- *Radio Drama in Action*. Rinehart, 1946.
An excellent collection of radio dramas, documentaries, and other radio shows, representing most of the leading radio writers.

- BOYD, JAMES (editor). *The Free Company Presents*. Dodd, Mead & Co., 1941.
Ten radio plays by outstanding writers.
- CORWIN, NORMAN. *They Fly Through the Air*. Vrest Orton, 1939.
— *Thirteen by Corwin*. Henry Holt & Co., 1941.
— *More by Corwin*. Henry Holt & Co., 1944.
— *On a Note of Triumph*. Simon & Schuster, 1945.
Radio plays by the winner of the first Wendell Willkie award. His well-known "We Hold These Truths" is in More by Corwin.
- CREWS, ALBERT R. *Professional Radio Writing*. Houghton Mifflin, 1946.
A textbook largely devoted to continuity and dramatic writing and containing instructive assignments.
- MAC LEISH, ARCHIBALD. *The Fall of the City*. Farrar & Rinehart, 1937.
— *Air Raid*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1939.
— *The American Story*. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1944.
The first two of these volumes are single plays by the well-known poet. The third contains ten scripts produced in 1943.
- MARTIN, JOHN T. W., and SEYMOUR, KATHERINE. *Practical Radio Writing*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1938.
Different techniques of radio writing are discussed and illustrated.
- OBOLER, ARCH. *Fourteen Radio Plays*. Random House, 1940.
— *New Radio Plays*. Random House, 1941.
Some of Mr. Oboler's most successful scripts.
- WHIPPLE, JAMES. *How to Write for Radio*. McGraw-Hill, 1938.
A broad survey of radio writing.
- WYLIE, MAX. *Radio Writing*. Farrar & Rinehart, 1941, revised 1947.
One of the most usable of the textbooks. Contains exercises and examples.

- WYLIE, MAX. *Best Broadcasts of 1938-1939*. Whittlesey House, 1939.
- *Best Broadcasts of 1939-1940*. Whittlesey House, 1940.
- *Best Broadcasts of 1940-1941*. McGraw-Hill, 1942.
Anthologies of radio programs including talks as well as scripts.

Radio Speaking

- BENDER, JAMES F. *NBC Handbook of Pronunciation*. Thomas Y. Crowell, 1943.
Shorter than Greet's book, but includes more American words and more words other than names.
- FAIRBANKS, GRANT. *Voice and Articulation Drillbook*. Harper & Brothers, 1940.
A thorough treatment of problems of voice production, vocal quality, and articulation. Contains hundreds of corrective exercises.
- GREET, WILLIAM CABELL. *World Words*. Columbia University Press, 1944.
Recommended pronunciations, largely limited to foreign names and place names, compiled by the CBS consultant on pronunciation. A 35-page discussion of pronunciation in foreign languages is useful for words not listed in this book.
- KENYON, JOHN S., and KNOTT, THOMAS A. *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*. Merriam, 1944.
Especially useful in determining acceptable pronunciations for various portions of the United States.
- PARRISH, WAYLAND M. *Reading Aloud*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1941.
Theory and practice of oral interpretation. Selections and exercises for reading practice and voice improvement.
- WINANS, JAMES A. *Speech-Making*. Appleton-Century, 1938.
Although not written primarily for radio speaking, chapters II and XX are a basic introduction to a successful approach either to a visible or to an invisible audience. Chapter XXII by C. K. Thomas is probably the best short treatment of voice problems in print.

Radio Directing and Production

ABBOT, WALDO. *Handbook of Broadcasting*. McGraw-Hill, 1941.

A text intended for use by student and teacher, listener and the occasional radio speaker, and dealing with the problems of preparation and presentation of practically all types of programs.

ARNHEIM, RUDOLF. *Radio*. Faber & Faber, 1936.

An analysis of the effective use of speech, music, and sound effects in broadcasting; the art of speaking to everybody; and the psychology of the listener.

BARTLETT, KENNETH L. *How to Use Radio*. National Association of Broadcasters, 1938.

An outline of practical suggestions for the teacher and radio chairman for use in planning and producing community and educational programs.

CARLILE, JOHN S. *Production and Direction of Radio Programs*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940.

An applied text on the radio program and the qualifications of those who produce it, plus the problems and practices of producing the program.

CREWS, ALBERT R. *Radio Production Directing*. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1944.

Evaluation of the medium, qualifications of the production director, the tools needed and used, and the "how-to-use" application for practically all types of radio productions.

DENNY, GEORGE V. "Town Meeting Tonight!" *Atlantic Monthly* 170:3 (September, 1942).

The story of the idea for "Town Meeting" on the air, steps in planning and producing the programs, and principles and practices followed in producing this effective program series.

MCGILL, EARLE. *Radio Directing*. McGraw-Hill, 1940.

The fundamental problems of broadcasting, including use of microphones, studios, and sound effects; preparation and rehearsal; procedure in handling different types of programs.

ROWLAND, HOWARD; TYLER, I. KEITH; WOEFEL, NORMAN. *Criteria for Children's Radio Programs*. The Federal Radio Education Committee, 1942.

Guidance manual for program planners, writers, and producers on what constitutes good radio programs for children, based upon study of children's and parents' reactions, plus codes and standards developed by child psychologists.

Radio Law

DILL, CLARENCE CLEVELAND. *Radio Law, Practice and Procedure*. National Law Book Co., 1938.

Deals with legal and technical problems and with procedures before FCC. Excellent on station licensing applications, hearings before FCC, and on grant and transfer of licenses; very little on law of operations of a radio station.

FRIEDRICH, CARL JOACHIM. *Congress and the Control of Radio-broadcasting*. Radio-broadcasting research project at the Littauer Center of Harvard University, 1944.

HETTINGER, HERMAN S. *Radio Regulations: A Case Study in Basic Policy Conflicts*. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. (May, 1942.)

LEWIS, ELMER (compiler). *Radio Laws of the United States*. Government Printing Office, 1944.

Contains text of all federal statutes on radio from 1910 to 1943.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS. *Decisions of the National Labor Relations Board Affecting Radio Broadcasting Stations*. (Vols. 1-48.) 1943.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS. *Radio and Municipal Regulations*. The Institute, 1944.

ROBINSON, THOMAS PORTER. *Radio Networks and the Federal Government*. Columbia University Press, 1943.

Excellent on legal problems growing out of network arrangements. Contains forms for standard NBC and CBS affiliation contract.

SOCOLOW, ABRAHAM WALTER. *The Law of Radio Broadcasting*. Baker, Voorhis and Co., 1939. (2 vols.)

The best work on the broad field of radio law. Where questions have not yet been decided by the courts, the author supplies his own theories.

U. S. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION. *Rules and Regulations*. Pts. 1-15, 41-62. Government Printing Office.

Radio Advertising

AGNEW, HUGH E., and DYGERT, W. B. *Advertising Media*. McGraw-Hill, 1938.

The general problem of media selection. Merits and demerits of all media are listed for comparison. One chapter on Radio as an Advertising Medium.

CONNAH, DOUGLAS D. *How to Build the Radio Audience*. Harper & Brothers, 1938.

Audience building and techniques of program planning and promotion, with emphasis on public relation factors and problems.

DYGERT, WARREN B. *Radio as an Advertising Medium*. McGraw-Hill, 1939.

What the business man and advertising executive should know about radio. Maintains the point of view of the advertiser—the man who signs the checks.

HETTINGER, HERMAN S., and NEFF, W. J. *Practical Radio Advertising*. Prentice-Hall, 1938.

1. Fundamental considerations (a descriptive survey). 2. Planning the Radio Campaign. 3. Executing the Radio Campaign. Also chapters on retail radio advertising, foreign radio advertising, and radio advertising organization. Appendices on What the Advertiser Should Know About Radio Mechanics, and Structure and Rates of National and Regional Networks.

WEISS, E. V., KENDALL, F. C., and LARRABEE, C. B. *Handbook of Advertising*. McGraw-Hill, 1938.

An anthology of papers on advertising subjects. Contains a chapter on media by J. J. Doyle, of McCann-Erickson, and one on radio by H. K. Boise, vice president in charge of sales of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

SANDAGE, C. H. *Radio Advertising for Retailers*. Harvard University Press, 1945.

The economics of this side of radio advertising.

Radio Audience Research

ALLPORT, G. W., and CANTRIL, HADLEY. *The Psychology of Radio*. Harper & Brothers, 1935.

The only book devoted entirely to this subject. The studies on which it is based are now exceeded in large part by more thorough and up-to-date material.

CANTRIL, HADLEY. *The Invasion from Mars*. Princeton University Press, 1940.

Notable not only for the script of the famous Orson Welles broadcast, but as an important case study of the impact of the event on listeners.

CHAPPELL, MATTHEW, and HOOPER, C. E. *Radio Audience Measurement*. Stephen Daye, 1944.

A study of the coincidental and recall methods, and of some of the facts about radio listening these devices have uncovered.

LAZARSFELD, PAUL F. *Radio and the Printed Page*. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1940.

— and STANTON, FRANK. *Radio Research*, 1941. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1941.

— and STANTON, FRANK. *Radio Research*, 1942-43. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1944.

These three volumes report studies of audience response to press and radio, many of which were conducted through the Office of Radio Research (now the Office of Applied Social Research) of Columbia University. In the first volume are elaborate comparisons of newspaper readership to radio listenership, and discussions of program popularity at different levels; in the second, studies of foreign language broadcasts, serious music, young people's response to press and radio, and radio and the farmer; in the third, daytime serials, radio in wartime, popular music, and progress in listener research.

— and FIELD, HARRY. *The People Look at Radio*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1946.

A report on a nation-wide survey of what people think about radio.

Television, FM, Facsimile

- ANONYMOUS. "Television II: 'Fade In Camera One!'" *Fortune* 19:5 (May, 1939).
Television's program problems as the first broadcasts were made.
- "Television—A Case of War Neurosis." *Fortune* 33:2 (February, 1946).
Thorough analysis of the "troubled past and angry present" of television.
- "Revolution in Radio." *Fortune* 20:4 (October, 1939).
One of the earliest articles on FM.
- DE FOREST, LEE. *Television, Today and Tomorrow*. The Dial Press, 1942.
An easy-to-read technical book by a man who contributed materially to the development of radio broadcasting.
- DUPUY, JUDY. *Television Show Business*. General Electric, 1945.
One of the most complete texts available on the production of television programs. Covers all types of programs telecast by WRGB.
- DUNLAP, ORRIN E., JR. *The Future of Television*. Harper & Brothers, 1942.
A broad picture of television by the former radio editor of the New York Times. It is non-technical with special chapters on news and education.
- EDDY, WILLIAM C. *Television, the Eyes of Tomorrow*. Prentice-Hall, 1945.
History and development of television, including a brief popular explanation of its technical characteristics. Special attention to lighting, miniatures, color, film, and studio design.
- HUBBELL, RICHARD W. *Four Thousand Years of Television*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1942.
Describes the dramatic development of television.
- *Television Programming and Production*. Murray Hill Books, 1945.

A book that compares television with the theater, motion pictures, and radio. There is considerable attention to video and audio technique.

- JOHNSON, ALVA. "Television: Boom or Bubble?" *Saturday Evening Post* 218:36, 37, 38. (March 9, 16, 23, 1946.)
Three articles on the difficulties of television production.

- LEE, ROBERT E. *Television: The Revolution*. Essential Books, 1944.
A short book that presents an overall picture of television with emphasis on its meaning for the future. Lee DeForest has written an introduction that praises the author's analysis of "television commercials."

- LOHR, LENOX R. *Television Broadcasting*. McGraw-Hill, 1940.
A broad approach to television, including the social and economic aspects.

- LOWDERMILK, R. R. *Facsimile as a Possible Adjunct of Educational FM Broadcasting*. U. S. Office of Education, 1944.
Testimony presented before FCC.

- MUNRO, W. CARROLL. *Newspaper by Radio*. *Current History* 47:3 (December, 1937).
Author shows potentialities of facsimile transmission in changing the social life of the nation.

- TELEVISION BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, INC. *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference, 1944*. Television Broadcasters Association, Inc.
The television industry plans to hold each year an annual conference of persons active in television. The "Proceedings" are reports of the conference. They are probably the most up-to-date way of keeping abreast of the newest developments in a rapidly changing field.

- WALDROP, FRANK, and BORKIN, JOSEPH. *Television: A Struggle for Power*. William Morrow and Co., 1938.
A discussion of the "impending revolution in communications" and a charting of social and economic currents affecting it.

CAREERS IN RADIO

BARTLETT, KENNETH G., and MILLER, DOUGLASS W. *Occupations in Radio*. Science Research Associates, 1940.

A 48-page pamphlet describing the rise of radio, the organization of radio station and network, and the jobs radio offers—qualifications, training, salary, opportunities for advancement.

CARLISLE, NORMAN V., and RICE, CONRAD C. *Your Career in Radio*. E. P. Dutton and Co., 1941.

Intended to answer the question, "How can I get into radio?"

DE HAVEN, ROBERT, and KAHN, HAROLD S. *How to Break into Radio*. Harper & Brothers, 1941.

A handbook covering practically every phase of the industry.

KNIGHT, RUTH. *Stand By for the Ladies*. Coward-McCann, 1939.

An account of positions women are occupying in the radio industry.

MILLER, J. L. (editor). *Working for Radio*. National Association of Broadcasters, 1942.

Brief hints by radio writers, producers, musicians, and station managers on how to proceed toward a career in radio.

WALLER, JUDITH C. *Radio: The Fifth Estate*. Houghton Mifflin, 1946.

For anyone who expects to make radio a career, this is a good one-volume survey of the radio industry.

RADIO YEARBOOKS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

BBC Yearbook. British Broadcasting Corporation. 1928 to date.

Annual reports of program, technical and other BBC activities.

Broadcasting and Broadcast Advertising Yearbook. Broadcasting Publications, Inc. 1935 to date.

Radio Annual. Radio Daily Corporation. 1938 to date.

Variety Radio Directory. Variety, Inc. From 1937-1938.

BRODERICK, GERTRUDE G., and ROWLAND, RUTH M. *Radio Bibliography*. U. S. Office of Education, 1945.

A departmentalized bibliography strong in references on education by radio and radio in the schools.

INDEX

- Ackerman, William C., 368-369
Adams, Cedric, 28
American Broadcasting Company (formerly Blue Network), 26, 53, 57, 58, 59, 79, 144-145, 149-152, 153-155, 206, 300, 324, 340-341, 353-356
American Newspaper Publishers Association, 34, 40
American Telephone & Telegraph Company, 32, 36, 59, 306, 327
Anderson, Dave, 341-342
Anthony, Ed, 36
Ashton, Ruth, 314-321
Associated Press, 4, 10, 17, 32, 35-36, 41, 44, 53-54, 55, 56, 75, 95, 96, 122-137, 142, 177, 208, 234, 242-244, 330, 331, 350, 357
Association of Radio News Analysts, 205
Atlanta Journal, 337
Atomic bomb, 177-178
Audit Bureau of Circulation, 218

Barber, "Red," 308
Barrett, James W., 44, 174-175
Bate, Fred, 32-33
Baukhage, 157
Beattie, Edward W., 97-106
Beatty, Morgan, 148-149
"Beeps," 61
Bennett, Lowell, 119-121
Benton, William, 214, 216-217
Berkson, Seymour, 11, 79
Bickel, Karl A., 35
"Blasting" the microphone, 165
Blue Network, *see American Broadcasting Company*
Bowen, James, 305
British Broadcasting Corporation, 32-33, 45, 169, 214-215, 306, 327, 332, 333, 350
Broadcasting Magazine, 185, 369
Brooks, William F., 324, 367-368
Brown, Cecil, 49, 137-139, 157, 200
Bryan, Wright, 337
Buranelli, Prosper, 363
Burdett, Winston, 329
Calmer, Ned, 62, 331, 332, 344, 352
Carter, Boake, 36, 39, 43, 157
Censorship, 194, 217, 330, 342, 373
Chaplin, W. W., 157
Chicago Tribune, 28
Childs, Ralph, 53
Church, Ted, 310
Churchill, Winston, 69, 332, 344, 348
Close, Upton, 225
"Coffee pot," 50
Coffin, Tris, 27
Collingwood, Charles, 49, 155-156, 161, 342, 345
Collins, Ted, 234
Columbia Broadcasting System, 26-27, 31, 32-33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 52, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 79, 145-146, 152-153, 155-156, 166, 182, 199, 200, 205, 206, 225, 226, 235, 274, 281, 285, 300, 301, 303, 304, 305,

- 306, 324, 325, 332, 339, 341, 342, 343-344, 345, 356
 Columbia News Service, 38-43
 Commercials, 181-185
 Community radio, 58
 Conger, Clinton, 106-109
 Conley, Florence, 39-40
 Coolidge, Calvin, 31
 Cooper, Kent, 35-36
 Copyright, Law of, 195
 "Corn," 265
 Corwin, Norman, 351
 Correction of broadcast errors, 73
 Costello, Bill, 350
 Coughing while on the air, 166
 Coughlin, Father, 213
 Crime news, 20-21, 22, 33, 174-175, 180
 Crisis of 1938, 44
 "Cue channel," 330
 D-Day broadcasting preparations, 324-328, 329-330
 Daly, John, 348, 349, 352, 363
 Darlington, Ed, 332
 "Dateline," 269-281
 Davis, Elmer, 29, 149-152, 157, 190, 208-209, 232
 Davis, John W., 31
 Dealy, Jane, 364
 Defamation, 186-193
 De Gaulle, General Charles, 336, 346-347
 Democratic National Convention, 1924, 30-31
 Dempsey-Carpentier fight, 30
 Dempsey-Tunney, first fight, 31
 Dialogue, 254
 "Diary" Studies, 220
 Dillinger, John, 37
 Documentary news programs, 285
 Dow-Jones service, 38
 Downs, Bill, 49, 342
 Driscoll, Charles B., 247-248
 Drury, Joe, 239-240
 Duke, Doris, 39-40
 Dunn, Bill, 304
 Dupuy, Colonel R. Ernest, 334
 Eastman, Carl, 281
 Edward VIII of England, abdication, 44
 Edwards, Douglas, 159, 345, 346, 347, 351
 Edwards, John, 79
 Edwards, Webley, 49, 313-314
 Eisenhower, General Dwight D., 324, 330, 334, 335, 336
 Elections, 312
 1920, 30
 1924, 30-31
 1932, 35-36
 Eliot, Major George Fielding, 333, 334, 344, 346, 352, 356
 Ellis, Joan, 330
 Errors, reasons for, 51, 62-63, 158-159
 Exchange Telegraph, 38
 Facsimile, 370-371
 Fan mail, 47, 219, 229-233, 339
 Farrington, Fielden, 350
 FAX (War Department circuit), 327, 328, 334, 350
 Federal Communications Act, 1934, 193, 196
 Federal Communications Commission, 18, 22, 58, 182, 192, 196, 306, 370
 "Flash mike," 61, 328
 "Flubbing," 63, 166-167
 Forbes, Bill, 184-185
 Foster, Cedric, 140-144
 Fowle, Farnsworth, 329
 Fowler, Henry, 65
 Frequency modulation, 206-207, 369-370
 Fry, Ken, 301-302

- Gandhi, Mahatma, 32-33
Gallagher, Wes, 125-128, 131-137, 142
Gauss, Hildegarde, 327
General Mills, 38-39
George V of England, 32
George VI of England, 45, 346, 349
Gerber, John W., 214-216
Godfrey, Arthur, 27-28
Good taste, 20-21, 179-185
Gordon, Matt, 79
Graf Spee, 305
Gramling, Oliver, 17
Grandin, Thomas, 48-49
Greet, Cabell, 159
- Hale, Arthur, 222
Hamaguchi, Premier of Japan, 32
Harding-Cox election, 30
Harmon, Dudley Ann, 109-110
Harris, Ed, 34-35
Harris, Major Jack, 324
Harsch, Joseph C., 350
Hartley, Commander Jack, 325
Haugner, Al, 56
Hauptmann, Bruno, 44
Hayes, Art, 27
Hays, Will, 22
Heatter, Gabriel, 153-155, 157, 222, 265-267
Henry, Bill, 52, 94, 152-153, 222, 344, 349
Hiccuping while on the air, 166
Hicks, George, 49, 352, 353-356
Hill, Edwin C., 166, 350
Hodgins, Eric, 172-173
Holles, Everett, 326, 347, 350
Hollister, Paul, 324, 347, 350, 356
Hooper, C. E., 3, 220, 221-222, 234, 348
Hoover, Herbert, 35, 75
Hottelet, Richard, 341, 342
Howard, Roy, 34
Howe, Quincy, 157, 348, 350
Huffer, Ray, 226-229
- Hughes, Howard, 303
Human interest, 17, 172, 181, 241-243
Husing, Ted, 167, 301-302, 308, 330
Huss, Pierre J., 112-120
- Indecency, 195
Independent station, 55
International News Service, 5, 11-13, 35-36, 41, 44, 47, 48, 56, 79, 95, 96, 112-122, 139, 140, 177, 331, 350, 357
Iowa University, 28, 226
- Jackson, Alan, 344
Johnson, Earl, 13, 16-17
Johnston, Eric, 22
Johnstone, G. W., 324
Jolson, Al, 188
Journalese, 1
Journalism Quarterly, 187, 208, 214, 227, 388, 389, 397
- KDKA, Pittsburgh, 30
KHON, Honolulu, 313
KMA, Shenandoah, Iowa, 53
KSD, St. Louis, 185
Kaltenborn, H. V., 28, 36, 39, 43, 46, 47, 48, 157, 167, 198, 203, 222, 322
Kelly, Fred, 230
Kesten, Paul W., 182-184, 346, 347
Kimmens, Commander Anthony, 350
King, Joe, 344
Kirby, Colonel Edward, 324
Klauber, Edward, 182, 199
- LaGuardia, F. H., 328
Lazarsfeld, Paul, 221, 298
Leatherwood, Dowling, 171-172, 174
Lee, Alfred McClung, 209
Lee, Elizabeth Briant, 209
Lesueur, Larry, 166, 342
Lewis, Fulton, Jr., 222, 232
Libel, 186-193, 196-197
Lindbergh, baby kidnaping, 33, 44

- Lindbergh, Charles A., 31
 Literary property, 195
 Local news, 11, 52, 56, 248, 312, 363, 369
 Lochridge, Patricia, 364
 Lodwick, Albert, 303-304
London Telegraph, 37
 Long, Huey, 213
 Lord, Phil, 167
 Lotteries, 196
 Luce, Clare Boothe, 311

 Macedonian cry, 70
 Mackay Radio, 36
 Manning, Tom, 301
 Marble, Harry, 314-321, 350, 352
 "March of Time," 249-250, 256-264
 Marshall, Herbert, 350
 Mason, Frank, 40
 McCaffrey, Bill, 344
 Mickelson, Sig, 56
 Miller, Margaret, 270-281, 364
 Mills, James, 32
 Montage, 298
 Moorad, George, 315
 Moore, Herbert, 43
 Moscow Radio, 215
 Mueller, Merrill, 49, 344-345
 Multiple pickup, 45
 Murrow, Edward R., 46, 48-49, 161, 166, 330, 335, 342, 352, 353, 356, 363, 368
 Music in news dramatization, 252-253
 Mussolini, Benito, 32
 Mutual Broadcasting System, 26, 57, 58, 59, 137-144, 206, 300, 303, 324

 Narration, 250-252
 National Broadcasting Company, 26-27, 31, 32-33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 57, 58, 59, 146-149, 182, 188, 206, 225, 234, 300, 301, 303, 305, 306, 324, 337, 340, 341-342, 344-345, 367
 "National Farm and Home Hour," 234
 National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver, 2-3, 222, 223-225
 National political conventions, 310-311
 Negatives, good use of, 64
 Nervousness while on the air, 166
 Network affiliated stations, 58
 Network news personnel, 57
New York American, 36
 New York City Publishers Association, 34
New York Evening World, 34
New York Journal, 40
New York Times, 55, 182
New York World, 44
New York World-Telegram, 34
 News, definition of, 170-173
 News judgment, 174-178
 Newsom, Phil, 72, 78, 79, 80
 News recordings, 306-307
Newsweek, 357
 Nielsen Radio Index, 221, 222-223
 Nuernberg War Crimes Trial, 95-156
 Numbers, use of, 71-72

 O'Neil, Tom, 75, 78, 79
 Obscenity, 195
 Oestreicher, J. C., 121-122
 Office of War Information, 209
 Ohio State University, 237
 Osborne, Ted, 281

 Paley, William S., 182
 Parker, Dorothy, 236
 Pearson, Drew, 157, 222
 Petrillo, Cesar, 46
 Pettegrew, C. W., 237-238
 Phundra, 168
 Platt-Forbes, Inc., 184-185

- Plummer, Evans, 167
“Pool” broadcasts, 325
Pope Pius XI, 32
Porter, Roy, 148
Postal Telegraph, 36, 39
Present tense, 24-26
Press-Radio Bureau, 41, 43-44, 48,
 174
“Processed” news, 10-11
Profanity, 180-181, 195
Pronouns, use of, 78
Pronunciation, 159-160
Propaganda devices, 208-213
Pryor, Don, 49, 352
Public Opinion Quarterly, 368-369
Pulitzer School of Journalism, Co-
 lumbia University, 6, 168
Putnam, G. C., 139-140, 161-163

Quotations, use of, 68-69

Radio Corporation of America, 36,
 37, 303-304, 327
Radio interviews, 312-321
Radio listings in newspapers, 33-34,
 40, 43
Radio Madrid, 214-215
Radio salaries, 358, 363
Radio stations affiliated with news-
 papers, 29
Radio stations in U. S., 29
Radio stations owned by newspapers,
 29
Radio talks, do’s and don’ts, 167
Radio’s growth, 31
Railroad strike, 1946, 66-67
Readability, 12-17, 21
Redundancy, 67-68
Reedy, Thomas A., 128-129
Regional news, 11, 52, 56, 57, 247,
 248, 311, 312, 363
Repetition, 65-67
“Report to the Nation,” 190, 250,
 281-285
Reynolds, Quentin, 311, 333, 337-
 340, 352, 356, 366
Richardson, Stanley, 344
Richmond (Indiana) *Palladium*, 34
Right of privacy, 193-194
Robson, William N., 285-297
Roosevelt, Mrs. Eleanor, 310
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, 26, 35,
 52, 179-180, 307-308, 347, 351-
 352
Roper, Elmo, 222
Ross, David, 167
“Round-robin,” 60

Saerchinger, Cesar, 32
St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, 185
Saturday Evening Post, 371
Schechter, A. A., Jr., 36-38, 40, 299,
 301, 303-304, 305
Schramm, Wilbur, 226-229
“Scoring” copy, 160
Scripps-Howard newspapers, 34
Sevareid, Eric, 269-281, 329
Sex news, 20-21, 22, 180
Shadell, Bill, 342
SHAEF, 330, 334, 343
Shaw, Charles, 343-344, 345-346,
 352
Shepard, John, 43
Shirer, William L., 45-46, 48, 49,
 157, 222, 225, 348, 352
“Side-bar,” 122
Siebert, Fred S., 187-197
Sioussat, Helen, 166-168
Sirmans, James, 334
Slander, 186-197
Slocum, Bill, Jr., 281-285, 362
Smith, Kate, 234
Sneezing while on the air, 166
Sound effects, 253-254
Sports broadcasting, 25-26, 302, 308-
 309
Stanton, Frank, 221, 298
Stern, Bill, 308
“Stringers,” 39