

**THE
EGYPTIANS**



**1968-69
YEAR BOOK**

**THE
EGYPTIANS**



**1968-69
YEAR BOOK**

THE EGYPTIANS

1968-69

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Historical	iv
Constitution and By-Laws	v
Officers and Members	viii
“Saco and The China I Knew” S. ShepherdTate	1
“Why Southerners are Different” Arthur W. McCain	17
“The Irresponsible Press” Ed Lipscomb	25
“The Birth of Some Tall Tales” C .B. Weiss	41
“The Lessons of History” John H. Todd	53
“Agriculture 2000 A.D. or Sooner” Rudi E. Scheidt	69
“Memphis Metropolitan Airport Expansion” E. W. Cook, Jr.	81

HISTORICAL SKETCH

The Egyptians, "a club for the discussion of scientific, religious, economic and other topics pertaining to the welfare, culture and happiness of the people," was organized at a meeting of fifteen men held in the home of the late A. S. Caldwell on June 21, 1913. These men had been meeting as an unorganized group since 1911. The fifteen founders were: Charles N. Burch, A. S. Caldwell, J. B. Cannon, Elias Gates, Charles J. Haase, E. M. Markham, C. P. J. Mooney, Sanford Morison, J. Craik Morris, A. B. Pittman, J. W. Rowlett, A. Y. Scott, Bolton Smith, B. F. Turner and J. C. Wilson.

Before the organization was completed, fifteen others were enrolled as charter members, namely: Albert W. Biggs, E. C. Ellett, W. H. Fineshriber, J. R. Flippin, Thomas F. Gailor, Marcus Haase, Herman Katz, James P. Kranz, Walter Malone, R. B. Maury, H. Dent Minor, A. E. Morgan, Israel Peres, Alfred H. Stone and Luke E. Wright.

The name chosen for the organization was proposed by W. H. Fineshriber. The fact that ancient Memphis was in Egypt suggested the name. The by-laws stated that the membership should "consist of not more than thirty-three men of recognized standing, ability and influence in Memphis and Shelby County, Tennessee." It was further stated that members were to present their contributions in the form of papers and that all papers were to be issued in printed form. This clause has resulted in the largest and most significant literary production of a general nature ever made by any group of Memphians.

From the beginning, The Egyptians were guarded against internal friction by a constitutional provision that "no resolution shall ever be passed committing the club as a body to any proposition." The club is unique in the unwritten law that its name is not to appear in the press in any connection.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

As Amended to May 31, 1960

ARTICLE I.—Objects.

Section 1. The subscribers hereto associate themselves for the purpose of discussing, at stated times and in a social way, such topics as pertain to the welfare, culture and happiness of the people, particularly of our own locality, state or nation. No resolution shall ever be passed committing the club as a body to any proposition.

ARTICLE II.—Name and Membership.

Section 1. This organization shall be known as THE EGYPTIANS, and shall consist of not more than thirty-three regular contributing members, who shall be citizens or residents of Shelby County, Tennessee, of recognized standing, ability and influence in the community, with other associates as provided in Section 2.

Section 2. Honorary membership may be tendered only to non-resident persons distinguished in the walks of education, literature, science or art; and such associates having no votes, shall be exempt from payment of all dues and assessments.

Section 3. Any member may nominate an individual for membership, submitting a brief statement of the candidate's qualifications to the officers of the club. If by majority vote of the officers, the candidate is acceptable, the officers shall circularize these qualifications to the members of the club at least one week prior to the following meeting. A secret ballot shall be cast by mail, with the minimum number of affirmative votes for election equalling at least two-thirds of the total membership, and if not more than two adverse votes be cast by the members, it shall be the duty of the secretary to invite such person to become a member.

ARTICLE III.—Officers.

Section 1. The Officers of the club shall be a President, Vice-President and Secretary-Treasurer, each to be chosen by ballot at the last meeting in May, to serve one year, or until a successor shall be elected.

Section 2. As a compensation for his services, the Secretary-Treasurer shall be exempt from the payment of all dues, charges and assessments.

ARTICLE IV.—Meetings.

Section 1. Regular meetings of the club shall be held at 6:30 p.m., the third Thursday in each month, between October 1st, and June 1st, beginning the third Thursday in October, except as provided in Section 2.

Section 2. The club may, at any session, change the date of a succeeding meeting, or the President, with reason therefor, may change the date of the next meeting or call a special meeting as may be required.

Section 3. In the event of change or call for special meeting, as provided in Section 2, the President shall direct the Secretary to notify members thereof.

Section 4. Any member who shall fail to attend at least three meetings during a season without excuse shall be conclusively presumed to have resigned and such implied resignation shall become effective without action of the club. He shall, however, be sent the publications of the club for the full period for which he has paid dues.

Section 5. The time consumed by any paper shall not exceed thirty minutes and in the discussion which follows, no member shall speak more than once and not exceeding ten minutes, until all other members present shall have had the opportunity of speaking.

ARTICLE V.—Dues and Assessments.

Section 1. The annual dues shall be nine dollars and ninety cents, payable in advance, provided that a member admitted after February 1st shall be required to pay only one half the annual dues for the balance of the year

Section 2. A special assessment, if necessity arises, may be levied at any regular meeting by an affirmative vote of a majority of all the members of the club.

Section 3. Failure to pay dues or assessments within sixty days of notice shall be considered as forfeit of membership.

ARTICLE VI.—Quorum.

Section 1. Eight members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE VII.—Amendments.

Section 1. This Constitution and By-Laws may be amended at any regular meeting, provided the proposed change has been announced at the previous meeting and is adopted by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present; and provided, that not less than eight affirmative votes shall be necessary.

Section 2. Article II may be altered or amended only at the annual meeting (last meeting in May), previous notice of proposed change having been given.

ARTICLE VIII.—Papers.

Section 1. Any member of the club who shall fail to present a paper or deliver an address on the date assigned him, without an excuse that shall be satisfactory to the Officers, shall thereupon forfeit his membership. The Secretary shall give each member, to whom a paper or address is assigned, at least three months notice of the date assigned to such member. The subject of any paper or address shall be selected by the writer with the advice of the Officers and the Secretary shall announce topics for discussion not less than two months in advance.

Addendum.

On January 10, 1922, the following rule was, on motion, unanimously adopted and recorded: That out of town guests brought by members of the club be welcome; That members introducing guests who are residents of Memphis, be charged \$2.25 (or such an amount as shall be determined from year to year) per meeting for each guest.

THE EGYPTIANS

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS

YEAR 1968-69

Officers 1968-69

Otto H. Alderks President
Rudi E. Scheidt Vice-President
Edward F. Thompson Secretary-Treasurer

Honorary Member

Rabbi W. H. Fineshriber

Members

Otto H. Alderks	Ed Lipscomb
John David Alexander	Arthur W. McCain
Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.	John F. Moloney
S. J. Buckman	Clark Porteous
Lucius E. Burch, Jr.	Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes
W. J. Michael Cody	Rudi E. Scheidt
E. W. Cook	Elder L. Shearon, Jr.
John E. Farrior	Dr. Newton S. Stern
Frank Faux	Dr. Thomas N. Stern
Hubert Garrecht	S. Shepherd Tate
Dr. Henry B. Gotten	Dr. Jack H. Taylor
A. Arthur Halle, Jr.	Edward F. Thompson
Dr. T. S. Hill	John H. Todd
Dr. Ralph C. Hon	Thomas F. Turley, Jr.
Mr. M. K. Horne, Jr.	C. Lamar Wallis
Ed Jappe	Dr. C. B. Weiss

SACO AND THE CHINA I KNEW

S. SHEPHERD TATE

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," Wednesday, October 16, 1968

In September, 1944, while serving as the Operational Intelligence Officer at Curacao, Netherlands, West Indies, I received orders to proceed to Washington, D. C., for further transportation to the U. S. Naval Group China, at Chungking, the wartime capital of China.

Little did I realize that I was to become a member of a top secret and fantastic organization, better known as SACO.

This organization, often dubbed "The Rice Paddy Navy," was one in which Chinese and Americans worked together in friendly cooperation in their united effort against the Japanese, in observing weather, gathering intelligence, training and operating with Chinese guerillas against Jap troops, installations and communications, and sinking Jap shipping, mining water-ways, rescuing downed airmen and in various other missions.

SACO is principally the story of two unusual men: Vice Admiral Milton E. Miles, U. S. Navy, and Lieutenant General Tai Li, Chief of Nationalist China's Bureau of Investigation and Statistics (BIS) China's secret police.

The day after Pearl Harbor, Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations, gave Miles, then a Commander, secret oral orders: to go to China, prepare the China coast for U. S. Navy landings in three or four years, and in the meantime, to do whatever could be done to help the Navy and to heckle the Japanese.

There were three important tasks to begin with: to lay mines and harass Jap shipping along the seacoast and the rivers, especially the Yantgze; to gather intelligence; and most importantly, to obtain weather information. It is a simple fact that weather in the Western Pacific travels from west to east, and that whatever the weather might be today in the interior of China, might be the weather tomorrow in Japan. The Japanese, with weather stations in the home islands, in Man-

churia, in China, and also to the south had a decided advantage over the U.S. Fleet, which was blind on weather conditions to the west and would have to depend on guesswork. The answer, of course, was to set up a weather net in China.

Miles was a natural for this difficult and hazardous assignment. First of all, he was an old China hand, having had eight years of experience in two tours of duty in China. Also, he was quite an expert in mines.

At the Naval Academy, Miles was given the nickname of "Mary," because his name resembled that of a popular movie actress, Mary Miles Minter, and this nickname stuck with him throughout his life.

The other strong SACO personality, Tai Li, had been graduated from the Whampoa Military Academy at Canton, of which Chiang Kai-shek was the founder and commandant. Tai had been the Generalissimo's trusted friend and protector from the very first days of Chiang's rise to supremacy.

Tai, realizing the need for counter-espionage, in 1932 organized the BIS, China's version of our FBI, and directed it until his death. *Time* magazine stated, ". . . it became one of the world's biggest undercover agencies. It planted operatives from Bali to Burma, from Singapore to Sinkiang. It specialized in espionage and counter-espionage; it kept watch on Communists, foreigners."

But Tai Li was thought by many to be a second Himmler, an assassin, a brutal torturer of political prisoners. Others said that he was a fine man, a straight-talking Chinese with plenty of power, a man who could help Miles. Miles, who had heard the good and the bad about Tai Li, determined not to prejudge him.

The day after Miles arrived in Chungking, in May of 1942, Tai Li, who had been assigned by the Generalissimo to work with Miles, called on him. They talked of the prospects for weather intelligence. When Miles suggested that he wanted to take a trip to the coast and see conditions behind the Japanese lines, the General instantly agreed.

These two men in time would receive the dubious honor of having the highest prices placed on their heads by the Jap-

anese Government—several million U. S. dollars each! And many attempts were to be made on their lives.

Tai Li pointed out that the United States wanted weather reports to guide their planes and ships, intelligence of Japanese intentions and operations, mines in the channels and harbors, ship watchers on the coast, and radio stations to send the information. He then asked Miles if the Navy could arm 50,000 of his guerrillas and train them to fight against the Japs and protect the operations of the Navy. Miles said, "O.K."

This initial project between the Chinese and Americans had been given the name of "Friendship Project," and the word "Friendship" was the password. The project grew, but it needed to grow even more if it was to serve a real purpose. Miles asked his superiors in Washington for more personnel to train the Chinese and more supplies.

At this juncture, it was decided to prepare a formal agreement, setting out the responsibilities of the Chinese and American Governments. On April 15, 1943, an agreement, written in Chinese and English, and establishing the Sino-American Cooperative Organization, was signed by Premier T. V. Soong (then Foreign Minister) and Tai Li, and by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, Brigadier General William J. Donovan, Director of O.S.S., and Miles. The agreement was approved by the Generalissimo and President Roosevelt. Under the agreement, Tai Li was Director and Miles was Deputy Director. The agreement specifically stated that the abbreviation "SACO" should be pronounced similarly to the American word "SOCKO," with the significance of powerful or sudden attack. It provided that the Navy was committed to supply all materials and equipment without charge on the basis of friendship, and to send to China technical personnel to supervise training the Chinese members of SACO. In turn, China was to supply personnel and physical requirements, such as offices, laboratories, living quarters and furniture. SACO was organized, according to the agreement, for the purpose of attacking by common effort the common enemy of China and the United States. This SACO was the amazing outfit I was to join in December of 1944.

About the time I arrived by air at Calcutta, India, the Japs were making a drive in Burma toward Kunming and Chung-

king, and transportation of more personnel into China was delayed. At that time the Ledo Road, later to be named the Stilwell Road, had not been completed, so the only way for the SACO personnel to get into China from India was over the treacherous Himalayas, or the "Hump," as it was called. Flights during the daytime had mostly been cancelled due to the activity of the Jap Zeros.

After remaining in India for about a month, I was given short notice to be ready to proceed about 10 o'clock one night. I boarded a C-47 plane at Dum Dum Airport, headed for Dinjan, India, which was one of the three jumping-off places for the Hump flights.

After making a stop at Kunming, which was the base for the U. S. 14th Air Force, we took off over the mountainous terrain of Szechwan Province for Chungking.

After arriving in Chungking, I was transported in a Jeep over a tortuous, bumpy road for about twelve miles to the mysterious "Happy Valley," Tai Li's tight little kingdom where the Headquarters of SACO was located and where I would remain for almost a year. It was really not a valley, but a series of rocky hills with towering mountains behind. Rice paddies were everywhere, and armed Chinese sentries guarded every path.

The closest liaison and cooperation was maintained at all times between the Chinese and American Departments. Joint Sino-American orders were issued to field commanders. The same offices were used, and interpreters were shared to exchange the information. Daily staff conferences were held in the mornings.

I remember quite well an argument that arose at one of these conferences between Miles and Tai Li. The Americans in the field were complaining that they were training the Chinese guerrillas, but the Chinese commanders would not allow the Americans to accompany the guerrillas on their missions. Our field personnel complained that it was only through being with the trainees in combat that they could further their training, check on the use of the weapons and evaluate the training to date. The charge had been made that Tai Li was not allowing the Americans along because he was hoarding the Ameri-

can arms for post-war use against his bitter enemies, the Communists, and he didn't want to be found out. Tai Li and his staff vigorously denied the charge and stressed that the denial of the right of the Americans to be in combat was based solely on his desire to protect the Americans. Miles insisted, and thereafter, the Americans accompanied the Chinese.

As a mark of the power, extensiveness and effectiveness of Tai Li's police and guerrilla force, American personnel were able to work behind Japanese lines, to cross Japanese lines, and to operate against the Japanese, and of the approximately 1,800 American personnel serving in China with SACO, although there were several deaths, not a single one was by enemy action.

Tai Li's biographer quoted Tai Li as telling his subordinates:

"Besides fighting against the enemy, let us fulfill our duty of protecting the lives of the American intelligence personnel. Thus, whenever the battle is raging, we must venture our lives first to prepare the way so that when they go in and out of enemy areas, they will not encounter danger."

As American personnel and supplies were made available and sent into China, SACO expanded, and its efforts brought results. By the end of the war, 14 naval units had been established, which ranged from Shanghai to Kunming and from Shenpa to Canton.

The primary mission of SACO of building up a weather net was so successful that weather data gathered from the Gobi Desert to Indo-China, was charted and sent out daily from the Weather Central at Happy Valley to the U. S. Fleet. These reports, given for every offensive in the Pacific, became the principal ones received by the Fleet in its operations against Japan.

Intelligence, which was the secondary mission of SACO, expanded from the mere collection, processing and dissemination of intelligence to the providing of a coast-watcher system to advise of enemy ship movements. By the end of 1944, a daily bulletin was sent to all Army and Navy Forces.

Perhaps the most spectacular result of SACO intelligence related to Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., who had asked

SACO for targets in the Indo China waters. On January 1, 1945, the coastwatchers reported so many targets that Halsey's fliers managed to "cover the waterfront." His fliers that day sank 40 ships totalling 120,000 tons, including a Jap cruiser and eleven other naval craft.

On January 23, 1945, an Americal SACO coastwatcher sighted near Amoy eleven Jap transports at anchor. This intelligence was relayed to the nearest U. S. submarine, the BARB, which came in and sank all eleven ships, namely two large tankers, five troopships and four destroyers.

You will recall that in December of 1942 Admiral King had told Miles to prepare the coast of China for a U. S. Navy landing in three or four years. Anticipating such an event, two most complete surveys of the coast, from Shanghai to Hong Kong, were made, and SACO participated in these undertakings.

The coastwatchers performed another great service—that of rescuing downed airmen. Up until July 1, 1945, this included 30 pilots, 46 air crewmen, and one war correspondent.

Of course, the training and operating with guerrillas was not the original mission of SACO but a side-line, and—as I will point out later, this was a source of constant friction with O.S.S. and the Army. Over 25,000 guerrillas were trained by the Naval Group.

The U. S. Information Service reported: "In the early years of the war, Chinese guerrillas lost in combat three men for every Jap killed. By 1945, with SACO equipment and training, this ratio was reversed. Between June 1, 1944, and July 1, 1945, SACO-trained guerrillas, at times led by U. S. Navy and Marine Corps personnel, killed 23,540 Japanese, wounded 9,166, captured 291. They destroyed 209 bridges, 84 locomotives and 141 ships, and 97 depots and warehouses.

The saga of the various camps and units of SACO and the stories connected with them are vividly detailed in a fascinating book, *SACO—The Rice Paddy Navy*, by Commander Roy Olin Stratton, Supply Corps, U. S. Navy (Retired), who was the SACO Supply Officer.

But the accomplishments of SACO were not without difficul-

ties, and some of these were major. In a recently published book, *A Different Kind of War*, by the late Vice Admiral Milton E. Miles, USN, as prepared from the original manuscript by Hawthorne Daniel, in a no-holds-barred manner, Miles tells "how professional jealousy and distrust of Tai Li led U. S. Army, State Department and O.S.S. leaders to duplicate his efforts and to thwart him by cutting off much-needed supplies." The publishers point out that this is a controversial book, and "even more controversial is his (Miles') contention that high-level American misunderstanding of the Communist China threat not only hindered Allied efforts against the Japanese, but also did irreparable harm to the future of China."

Perhaps the underlying friction between the Army and the Naval Group was the fact that the Navy was *in China*. As a matter of fact, people have often asked me, "What were you doing in the interior of China during the war, and, of all things, with the *Navy*?"

The Army was constantly making the point that the "Navy had no business in China," and certainly, the training and operating with the guerrillas was "Army business."

Miles made the point that the Navy was in China because, immediately after Pearl Harbor, the Chinese military in Washington, D. C., had offered Tai Li's guerrillas to the U. S. Army and had been turned down, and that when the offer was subsequently made to him by Tai Li, he accepted.

Lieutenant General Albert C. Wedemeyer succeeded General Joseph W. Stilwell in September, 1944, as the Commanding General of the China Theater, and Miles was placed under him.

Vice Admiral C. M. Cooke, Jr., a member of Admiral King's staff, had admitted that "a sea-going sailor has no damn business fighting guerrillas in the hills," but he said that since the Naval Group was successful, he had urged Wedemeyer to get behind the Navy and give full cooperation, and to pay Miles a visit in the valley.

In the fall of 1944, Miles had explained to Wedemeyer, "I just stumbled into this. Admiral King gave me a green light after I had Stilwell's permission, and now the guerrillas are really beginning to pay off."

This brings us to a story about Stilwell. Briefly stated, Stilwell, who was known as "Vinegar Joe," a brilliant, courageous soldier, had been fighting the Japs in Burma. He wanted to defeat them and open a road into south China. In order to accomplish this, he desired more forces. According to the book, *Wedemeyer Reports!* by General Albert C. Wedemeyer, Stilwell had apparently been taken in by the Chinese Communist propaganda into believing that these Chinese Communists were not real Communists, but were just "agrarian reformers" and "elements of a patriotic democratic party." Stilwell wanted placed under his command not only the Chinese Communists, but also the forces of Chiang's National Central Government. Chiang was firm in his position that these Communists were real Communists, that they would not fight the Japanese under Stilwell's orders, but would seek to impede the war effort, and that they would seek to overthrow the Kuomintang Party or National Central Government. This position Chiang Kai-shek makes clear in his book, *Soviet Russia in China*.

Chiang resisted the efforts of Stilwell and our State Department to force him into an agreement with the Communists and to turn over the remainder of his forces—some of which were containing the Communists in the northern border area. It must be remembered that Stilwell had under him two or three Chinese divisions which he had trained in India.

Wedemeyer relates that Stilwell, on September 16, 1944, sent a note to Foreign Minister T. V. Soong, saying that "if the Generalissimo did not meet the demands concerning his appointment to command all of the Chinese forces, he (Stilwell) would recommend that the United States withdraw from China and set up its Asiatic base in the territory of the Soviet Union."

In a dispatch to President Roosevelt, the Generalissimo courteously but firmly refused, saying that he could not turn over the responsibilities as President of China, and that if the United States withdrew American forces and lend-lease, China would have to do the best it could with what it had, and that it would continue to fight. He asked that Stilwell be relieved from all duties and responsibilities in China, and this was done. Perhaps Stilwell had not liked Tai Li. Miles did.

The Army's biggest open objection in fact to Miles and SACO was the affiliation with Tai Li. Wedemeyer had written, "Intelligence should be conducted by a joint Army and Navy organization and should not be permitted to have any contacts whatever with the Tai Li organization." This statement went on to say that there was "evidence that Tai Li is a gangster chieftain and gestapo leader combined who kills, robs and oppresses Chinese opposed to the 'fascist' government now in power in order to perpetuate that government for selfish purposes of power and profit."

In defense of this affiliation with Tai Li, Admiral Cooke wrote:

"Actually General Tai's duties have included operating a Chinese secret police, and in that capacity dealing with subversive activities, smuggling, tax evasion, and many other things, and there is no doubt that his execution of these duties has been accomplished by means which are cruel and barbarous according to our standards. However his methods have been normal according to the standards of China, his loyalty to the Generalissimo has been complete, his work has been effective, and his methods under Miles' guidance have changed steadily in the direction of our own ethical standards. The forces actively opposed to Tai Li are simply the forces opposed to a strong central government in China. They include the Chinese Communists, the nations, organizations and individuals whose self-interest lies in a weak China which can be forced to grant new special concessions and thus restore the ability of these forces to exploit Chinese people and again reap large and easy profits. These forces have heavy representation on Wedemeyer's staff and in O.S.S., and their influence is powerful in the State Department, in the press and elsewhere. They have opposed Ambassador Hurley just as they have opposed Miles.

. . . Any government at war is inherently a fascist organization for the time being and the present Chinese government has been at war continuously throughout its existence. That government has been our loyal ally, and it is difficult to understand why we should object to our loyal ally employing its secret police to defend itself against revolution and subversion. . . . To turn against Tai Li now in the face of his record and forbid further contacts with his organization would certainly be

cause for our good ally, the Central Government, to consider us inwardly unfriendly."

This focuses attention on the question of Communists versus agrarian reformers. As stated before, apparently Stilwell was taken in by the Communist propaganda. Miles and Wedemeyer wrote that many press correspondents were.

Wedemeyer admits that he was prejudiced by Stilwell's reports as his chief, General George C. Marshall, who was to later come to China as U. S. Special Envoy, but Wedemeyer says that unlike Stilwell and Marshall, he had the benefit of experiences which alerted him to the menace of Communism.

On the other hand, Wedemeyer recognized that his State Department political advisors not only were sympathetic to the Communists, but were doing everything to stir up distrust of the National Central Government. Wedemeyer makes it clear that they recommended supporting the Communists and eventually ditching the Nationalists.

Miles points out that Wedemeyer thought that the Nationalists and the Communists could get together and settle their differences amicably. Miles referred to Wedemeyer's own book in saying that Wedemeyer "has said that it took him some time to realize the truth about the Communists."

Wedemeyer states that Ambassador Hurley, in an interview with Molotov in Moscow, in September, 1944, had been assured that the Soviet Government was not "associated with" or "responsible for" the Chinese Communists. Perhaps this beguiled Hurley into thinking a coalition could be had. I remember quite well Hurley saying, on a visit to Happy Valley, that the Communists were not real Communists, but were just another party like the Republicans or the Democrats. According to Wedemeyer, Hurley never wanted or tried to compel the Generalissimo to share power with the Communists.

Hurley, later, before leaving China, realized the Commies were Commies, and denounced the State Department advisors in China and threw his entire support behind Chiang.

The Army repeatedly told the Naval Group that we must not refer to the Communists as such, but as "bandits" or "our allies."

I started out with SACO in Intelligence, but soon thereafter was moved into Operations, and in about May of 1945, I became the American Operations Officer working under General Yi Lok-sin, the SACO S-3. I remember quite well an Army dispatch asking Miles to make a full disclosure on whether or nor our units had been fighting these Communists, and also to supply information about some weapons which had reputedly been captured by the Communists from SACO troops.

Our investigation revealed that our guerrillas never attacked the Communists. There was evidence, in fact, and I remember this distinctly, that the Japanese would at times withdraw and let the Commies come through and fight our SACO guerrillas.

Incidentally, we never found any proof that the Communists ever fought the Japs. Wedemeyer reached the same conclusion.

Miles had given the word to all of our outfits that they were not to fight "our allies." When one of the unit commanders asked him what to do if the Reds attacked, Miles sent a dispatch to all SACO units that they would be guided by the internationally accepted doctrine of "hot pursuit" and pursue such attackers until they were captured or killed.

The Army rapped his knuckles and told him to rescind the order on "hot pursuit" and issue the theater policy—"if attacked by Communists, the men should retire to the nearest airfield and wait to be picked up." As Miles stated it, "Such behavior is 'pusillanimous.'"

Of course, on the question of whether the Yen-an Communists were Communists, we at SACO knew that Russian advisors had been working with the Chinese in Yen-an.

Shortly after the war, we sent out Intelligence teams into all heretofore occupied areas to evaluate our intelligence and to make an estimate of the situation. One of my good friends, upon his return, told me that the Russians were taking up the railroads, the factories and everything of value in the northern areas. Rumor of this reached the States and the press, and the State Department denied the charge. Later they admitted that this was true and justified the Russian action by saying that the Russians were taking away "booty of war." The Gimo in his book points out that the Russians looted the factories and

mines and stripped the northeastern provinces of all important industrial equipment.

Shortly after the Japanese surrender on August 14, 1945, I was sent from Happy Valley into Chungking to serve as the Naval Liaison Officer with General Wedemeyer's Headquarters. One of the pluses of this assignment was that I was to be quartered at the Naval Attache's house.

During that time, Henry Luce, Editor of the *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune* magazines, came and visited with us for almost a week. In May, 1965, Mr. Luce was in Memphis as the guest speaker at the Memphis & Shelby County Bar Association Law Day Banquet, and I spoke with him about his visit to Chungking.

I said, "Mr. Luce, at that time the word was that you were making this trip to Chungking to square away Teddy White, Annalee Jacoby, and any of your other writers who were reporting that the Communists were not real Communists but were just agrarian reformers."

He replied, "That is exactly right, and I told Teddy that I did not want any more political reporting from him," but he went on to say, "But Teddy got the best of me. I saw a picture of General Marshall standing in front of a four-motored bomber ready to depart for China. Under his arm, he carried *Thunder Out of China* by Theodore White." This was White's and Jacoby's best-selling book, telling about the corrupt Chinese Central Government versus the agrarian reformers, and urging a coalition government.

In his book, Wedemeyer is critical of his close friend and chief, General Marshall, and points out that Marshall "would seem to have failed to understand the nature and aims of communism in general and of the Chinese Communists in particular" and that Marshall "approached the problem of unifying China on the false supposition that Chinese Communists were not real Communists under Moscow's command, but simply a Chinese faction that could be induced by diplomatic negotiations to come to terms with the National Government."

The Generalissimo's first meeting with Marshall was in Chungking on December 17, 1945. Much mediation between Marshall, the Communists, and the Nationalists followed. The

first cease-fire order was issued on January 10, 1946, and the Generalissimo contended that the Commies violated it shortly thereafter.

In April of 1946, the U. S. stopped its 500-million-dollar loan to the Chinese Government, and later, the United States stopped its supplies of arms to the Chinese Government. Apparently, both of these actions were brought about through Commie objection to the United States' aid, saying that the United States was siding with the Nationalist Government in the mediation.

In December, 1946, the U. S. announced its termination of its mediation efforts in China, and the following January, Marshall left to return to the United States to become Secretary of State.

After returning to the States in May, 1946, Wedemeyer was sent by President Truman back to China in July of 1947, and directed to make an appraisal of the situation. His report was presented to the President in September of 1947 and was immediately suppressed. In his Report, Wedemeyer concluded that: "A China dominated by Chinese Communists would be inimical to the interests of the United States," and he recommended "that the United States Government provide as early as practicable moral, advisory and material support to China and South Korea in order to contribute to the early establishment of peace in the world." Wedemeyer points out that his Report "was simply buried until, in the course of time, it was exhumed by Senate Committee investigators alarmed at the imminent loss of China to the Communists," and that his suppressed Report was eventually published in 1949.

Wedemeyer reflects: "Perhaps I made a grave mistake and was derelict in duty to my country when I returned to military duties following the suppression of my report on China and Korea. Maybe if I had resigned and spoken my mind, I might have brought the truth home to the American people and thus saved China from the Communist conquest which led inevitably to the bloody, futile Korean war."

Time played on the side of the Commies. These negotiations gave them the opportunity to regroup and to be rearmed. The Russians, according to the Gimo, had turned over the arms of

more than a million Japanese and puppet troops to the Chinese Commies.

The rest of the story is well-known. The Chinese Commies pushed the Nationalist troops off the mainland and over into Formosa.

As late as March 11, 1948, President Truman reaffirmed his original statement of policy that inclusion of the Chinese Communists in the Chinese Government was the *sine qua non* of American aid and support.

In March of 1946, Admiral Cooke called upon Tai Li, who was in Nanking, to come to Tsingtao and help the Navy in a matter. Tai Li immediately flew there and accomplished the desired results. On the return flight, his plane crashed, and all were killed. One of the means of identifying Tai Li was a small American pistol which Miles had given to him.

Tai Li was one of the most active anti-Communists in China, according to Miles, who was personally convinced that there would have been a complete crushing defeat of the Communist Army in China if Tai Li had lived. Miles attended at Nanking the funeral of his old friend. Later, the Communists tore up the burial tomb, but the coffin of Tai Li had already been removed to Formosa.

In an appraisal of what happened in China, Miles has had this to say: ". . . we lost the war in the first moments of the peace. Before we had the wit to recognize it, we had tied the hands of our friends and turned over quantities of arms to their enemy and ours. As the war came to an end, we lacked vigorous, well-informed and aggressive leadership that would have recognized where the best interest of the United States actually lay. I know that the problem was complex but, so far as China was concerned, I am strongly of the opinion that, from Roosevelt and Truman through Marshall and the Army, our leaders were themselves misled. I believe, too, that many later problems that have arisen in the Far East can be traced to that."

WHY SOUTHERNERS ARE DIFFERENT

ARTHUR W. McCAIN

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," Nov. 16, 1967

If an anthropologist were asked this question he might answer that there are no reasons because Southerners are no different from other Americans. But the visitor from other parts who comes to the South for the first time generally notes what he thinks are differences and often points them out. In New York if a man meets a good friend on the street, after exchanging greetings, his typical remark is "We must have lunch together sometime." But in the South after a meeting between little more than casual acquaintances the parting words are likely to be, "You all come to see us real soon now." In Yankeeland a caller or shopper is sped on his way with a brief "Good-bye" whereas in Dixie, after being waited upon in a leisurely manner, he is told to "Hurry back."

But it seems to me that there are distinctly different Southern characteristics which are more fundamental than peculiarities of language and accent and I suggest that these traits can be traced to some specific causes. Slavery, climate, agriculture, and reconstruction each had its own particular effect and at the same time served to re-inforce some of the attitudes produced by the other causes.

The institution of slavery had a tremendous influence in molding the social and economic life of the South, and the manners, attitudes and character of its people. The slave is a servant who can't protest or refuse service. In this situation the master naturally tends to become very independent, even dictatorial and haughty. He expects to get his way and quickly. He is likely to resent any opposition or suggestion that his way is not necessarily the right way or the only way.

We have a friend, Mrs. Mimi Griffith, from Danville, Virginia. Some years ago she was visiting friends in Muncie, Indiana. At a dinner party the group was amusing themselves by each member recounting his most embarrassing moment. Finally the hostess turned to Mimi and said, "Now, Mimi, it's your turn to tell us your most embarrassing moment." Mimi's

reply was, "I'm from Virginia. I have never been embarrassed."

The Southern spirit of independence has made it very difficult for unions to organize in the South. It is not only owners and managers who oppose union recognition but the workers, too, in many cases resent the idea of making themselves subject to union rules and officials.

At least partially traceable to slavery is the attitude of the poorer white class of the South toward Negroes. Dr. Gordon Allport, the Harvard psychologist, points out that a characteristic method of building up one's own ego is looking down upon another. The slave served in this capacity for the poor white no matter how low his own condition, and it is in the poor white group that racial prejudice is now usually highest.

Even as early as 1830 de Tocqueville commented upon the effect of slavery upon Southern character and practices. While the Emancipation Proclamation changed the legal status of the Negroes it didn't make much change in the attitude of one race toward the other. It wasn't until the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt that the relationships were really influenced by government pressure.

As slavery disappeared from their states the Americans in the North became dependent upon their own labor or that which they could hire. The growth of the cities tended to create diverse occupations and, with the influx of European immigrants, many different attitudes and points of view. The employer couldn't be too autocratic since his employees could protest and frequently did. What he gained or had came from his own efforts, not a slave's, so he became cautious, practical, frugal, and thrifty.

On the other hand, as there were slaves to do the menial daily tasks and to provide the necessities of living the Southerner was under no compulsion to do hard labor. So he didn't and idleness, or better perhaps, leisure became a way of life. He had the time to let his imagination and fancy wander to more entertaining and pleasurable things. Since much that he had came from the efforts of others he was likely to be more generous, open and frank than his Yankee counterpart.

Some time ago Life magazine published a series of pictures of people walking along the downtown streets of Chicago and

New York. The photographs were taken with telephoto lens from across the street so the individuals were unaware that they were being photographed. Without exception the facial expression was pre-occupied, tense, drawn and worried. One doesn't find this in Memphis. Walking down Main Street in Memphis the faces one sees are cheerful, smiling, frequently laughing. They are the faces of people who seem to be having a good time, relaxed enough to stop and chat if by good luck they meet an acquaintance.

The gayety of social life, the grandeur of large houses, a style of gracious living, a love of outdoor sports, riding, fishing, hunting all were to the Southerner's taste. Even today in Memphis the opening dates of the dove and duck seasons he ranks in importance only a little below Christmas as the eventful days of the year. He had time for conversation and imaginative ideas but not much push or persistence to bring them to actual fruition.

When the Union Planters Bank opened its new building in 1952 it was done with a celebration that included local public officials, visiting tycoons, banquets and speeches to emphasize the high point in the institution's development. The day after the opening one of the important directors came in to see Mr. Alexander, Chairman of the board. He said "Vance, I'm awful sorry I had to miss the bank opening yesterday but I had a date to go fishing."

The forces shaping the habits of Southern men had their influence upon the women as well. Some years ago I read an article in a national magazine on "What Makes Southern Girls Different." I wanted to re-read it for this paper but couldn't remember the name of the magazine or the author. I mentioned my problem to the Southern wife of one of our members. "Oh," she said, "I read that article and it made me so mad that I cut it out and saved it. I'll find it and let you have it." Let me just mention some of the points made in that story. The Southern girl has an elusive quality called Southern Charm. Softness is the big difference between Northern and Southern women. Southern women, and men too for that matter, are greatly given to paying compliments. They don't like to call a spade a spade but they prefer euphemisms with much use of superlatives. People are called "darling" or

"honey." You may remember that the papers at the time of President Kennedy's assassination reported Mrs. Kennedy angered when Vice President Johnson called her "honey." He was not being familiar or presumptuous. In the emotion of the moment he simply slipped back into his natural Southern way of speech.

A Southern woman's duty is to entertain, to please by compliments, and by conversation that creates harmony. She pampers her man and in turn is pampered. She displays a helpless quality that requires masculine aid and support without letting the clinging vine become too obvious. In mixed company or on a date the Southern girl hides her intelligence. She may be a Phi Beta Kappa from Vassar or Southwestern but she will still make the man feel superior.

I think it was this last statement that made so angry the lady who lent me the article. When I returned it to her she said she was still mad but after re-reading the article she had to admit that she found this an accurate description of her own conduct. The Southern girl's behavior may look like an act to an outsider but actually the manner in which she has been brought up has become perfectly natural to her.

Although at first glance slavery might seem to be the cheapest form of labor, in actual practice it is both expensive and inefficient. So true is this that the South found it was impossible for industry there to compete with the more productive hired labor of the North. Thus the economy of the South was turned to agriculture, largely one crop agriculture, cotton, tobacco, or sugar cane, cultivation which could use the type of labor that slaves provided. This widespread development of a similar type of activity produced a conformity and conservatism in Southern attitudes and thinking. And as slavery was essential to this form of production Southerners were forced by economic pressure into uncompromising defense of slavery even against their moral judgment. The agrarian structure of the South meant that the population was widely scattered. Few large cities arose and social life tended to center around the home.

Mr. Joshua Green and his wife, now of Seattle, Washington, both come from a little Mississippi town near Greenwood. Mr. Green, who is now ninety-five and has lived in Seattle over

fifty years, is still pure Delta. He calls his wife Missie and she always calls him Mr. Green. He told me that when the Illinois Central came through their town a meeting of citizens was called to discuss the advisability of building a hotel. Mr. Green's father opposed the idea. He said a hotel would just bring to town a lot of individuals whom no one knew anything about. He said he had a big house with plenty of room. Jack Raymond and other friends were in the same situation. So if someone worthwhile came to town anyone of them would be glad to have the visitor as a guest. On this basis the idea of erecting a hotel was abandoned.

Wealth was generally represented by land. As was pointed out in a recent seminar at Southwestern farming is the kind of operation where the young members of the family can grow up into a job for themselves. There was no great need to leave home to make a living. This led to a much greater family stability than in other parts of the country. Along with that stability there naturally came a pride of family and the importance of a name. Signs of these qualities show up in every day speech. It was quite common to refer to the plantation owner's home as "the big house" and among my friends in Memphis I frequently hear them speak of some house in the city as "the old home place."

When I was a recent arrival at the bank in Memphis I was trying hard not only to meet people but to find out what they did. There was some frustration. An associate would introduce a customer to me. Then later when I asked him who the man was, instead of hearing that he was a cotton or lumber merchant I was often told, "Oh, don't you know, he married Miss Sallie Simpson's niece."

A president of the United States Chamber of Commerce told me that during a speech in Mississippi he made the statement that he thought the customs of the Mississippians were as unchanging as "the laws of the Medes and the Persians." After the speech a sweet young lady came up to congratulate him and said, "Mr. Campbell, I just loved your speech, especially that part about the Medes because you see my mother was a Mead."

The hot southern climate did its part to discourage any unnecessary physical exertion. In the days when palm-leaf fans

plus the kind supplied by funeral parlors were the principal weapons against the heat, it was very attractive to sit on the front porch and let someone else do the heavy work. It was important to have a wide porch on a house with high ceilings and halls that breezes could blow through. Southern climate is probably what made night weddings fashionable in the South instead of the afternoon ceremonies of the North. After all, before air-conditioning, the prospect of formal wedding attire at four o'clock on a hot June afternoon just couldn't be faced.

Moving about the country was difficult. Railroad passenger service was poor and roads were usually paths of dust or mud. In Arkansas to describe a road as "a good road" meant that you could drive on it without getting stuck if caught in a sudden rainstorm. Country towns are about ten miles apart because in pre-automobile days that was about as far as one could travel conveniently in a day. The difficulty of traveling served to keep people within relatively small areas, making them dependent upon themselves and their immediate neighbors for social life. Interests and conversation became local and personal. Reading what happened to whom 25, 50, and 75 years ago in the Commercial Appeal is still a fascinating pastime for many Memphians. About five years ago when I had my passport renewed I learned from the number of people who spoke to me about it how careful a check is made of passport application lists to see who are going abroad and where they are going. A Northern lady who had moved to Charleston, South Carolina, said one day to her next-door neighbor, "We get the New York Times sent to us. Wouldn't you like to read it after we finish?" To which the Charleston lady replied, "Oh, no thank you so much. You see I don't know a soul in New York City."

The long maintenance of slavery and the agrarian economy with its isolated rural life built up the conservatism for which Southerners are known in many fields. It is south of the Mason and Dixon line that there is the Bible Belt. Tennessee and Arkansas are famous for prohibiting by state law the teaching of the theory of evolution. In Dixie the old time religion is still the prevailing kind. Dr. Johnson of Idlewild Church in talking about the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who came down to settle the Piedmont area of North and South Carolina said,

"They kept the faith and everything else they could lay their hands on."

Perhaps the rather emotional attitude toward religion and the generally low level of education would account for the demagoguery that the South has produced. Jeff Davis in Arkansas, Bilbo in Mississippi, Huey Long in Louisiana, and Wallace in Alabama seem to have known how to make a special appeal to Southerners, and Wallace also found some groups in other parts of the country whom he could reach.

But in the political sphere is where Southern conservatism has been quite notable. Local pride and common attitudes are not unusual as far as cities are concerned. So we speak of the characteristics of Boston, New Orleans, or Los Angeles. To a somewhat lesser degree this is true of whole states, Texas and California for examples. But I think it is uniquely in the South that conformity of ideas and aims is so widespread on a regional basis. The most important underlying cause of this condition was the Civil War and the Reconstruction Period that followed. The Confederate States are the only group of states bound together by a war for a Lost Cause. True the North fought to maintain the Union but when the war was won the Union was still there as it had been before. The Confederates were defeated, their aims and purposes overthrown, the sacrifices of lives and wealth proved useless, and about all they could do was think about what had been and what might have been. This state of affairs influenced people from Virginia to Texas.

If the plans which Lincoln and Johnson formulated for treatment of the defeated South had been carried out they might have changed Southern feeling. Unfortunately this didn't happen. In 1867 Congress passed an act dividing the South into five military districts under generals who were to take orders from General Grant, not the President. Thus the Southerners became the only Americans who have known what it means to live under military occupation. When we today see, hear and read about the reactions of the Czechs to the Russian occupation of their country, it is easier for us to understand what a catastrophic effect government by Union troops had on our grandparents and great grandparents. This change and the enfranchisement of the Negroes were a Re-

publican stratagem designed to give that party permanent control of the Federal Government. These and other Reconstruction actions were such a great shock that they over-rode all other issues in uniting the South in the Democratic party. So that a hundred years later the grandfather attitude is still probably the most potent factor in determining how Southerners vote. The conservative Southern block is a recognized influence in the Congress.

In 1968 in the political sphere, at least, we are beginning to see some change. Who knows? Perhaps with northern industry moving in, union labor, minimum wage, airplanes, interstate highways, air-conditioning, mechanical farming, civil rights and respectable Republican candidates the things that made Southerners different are going to vanish. But who among us really wants to exchange Southern charm for any other style of life?

THE IRRESPONSIBLE PRESS

ED LIPSCOMB

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," December 19, 1968

Tonight we tread on sacred ground, but ground which is becoming less sacred with each passing year. Despite the pride of the press in its role as the Fourth Estate, despite its reluctance to take a hard critical look at itself through its established associations, and despite the dimness with which it views noisiness or criticism on the part of others, its credibility is slipping in ways that call loudly for discussion and correction.

It is in a spirit of constructive service to the press, to the public, and to the preservation of political freedom that we propose to explore some disheartening trends, give our assessment of causes and motivations behind them, review major techniques which contribute to them, and suggest ultimate results or alternatives.

The term "press," as we shall use it here, refers to all commercial media of news communication, but particularly to television and radio, newspapers, wire services, and news magazines. We do not intend to imply that all news reports, all features, or all broadcasts are irresponsible; but we do maintain that the percentage and degree of irresponsibility, especially with respect to sensitive subjects affecting the public welfare, have reached proportions which demand nationwide concern.

For approximately three decades I have endeavored to keep eyes and ears open for the difference, where one existed and was discernible, between what was printed or broadcast and what the accurate story really was, or was likely to be. Out of that experience, backed by a documentary file much too extensive for more than limited reference here, I am fully convinced that irresponsible elements of the press are due much of the blame for broadening, intensifying, and in some cases helping to create today's problems in racial antagonism, violence in the street, conduct of the Vietnam war, the rebellion of

youth, the national trend to the left, the decline of patriotism, and others.

These are serious charges, and we do not propose to leave them unsupported. However, assume with me for a moment that there is substance to them. How has such a situation come about? What are the motivations? If we can answer these questions first, the practices themselves will become more easily understandable.

Except for deliberate slanting of political reports and prejudiced coloring of political personalities, we certainly would not claim that the press has intentionally sought to bring about many of the results it has achieved. These are outgrowths or by-products of other motivations. Far out front is the simple but consuming motive of money, and the pace-setting offender in the bare-knuckled search for it is television.

Have you ever stopped to analyze TV as a commercial medium of communication? It has one purpose, and one only. That purpose is not to entertain, it is not to bring you athletic contests or news or public events. The one purpose of TV is to assemble an audience to look at, and listen to, commercial advertising. This is its only source of revenue, and the amount of revenue is directly related to the size of the audience that can be assembled. Rates quoted for a commercial minute on a particular show are normally accompanied by the audience count for that show.

The job then is to get people—the largest possible number of people—in front of the tube. Shut-ins and unoccupied housewives may settle for a few sweet situation shows during the middle of the day, but for the big audiences and the big money there must be melodrama, plenty of action, fights, friction, and crises. News must be colorful; personalities must be exciting or controversial; the show must draw emotional response either by creating pleasant agitation or by rubbing raw nerves.

In fairness it must be said that the quick come-and-go of television impressions and the immense cost of network production make showmanship a must, but the result of it as currently practiced is what we have outlined. We shall come to specific methods later.

Faced with this new competition, newspapers have responded in kind. Unlike TV, they do get some revenue from subscriptions and street sales, but their primary source of funds is advertising. Rates per line of advertising must be kept proportionate to circulation; circulation is determined by audience appeal; and competition with TV in audience appeal requires that histrionics, controversy, and sensationalism be injected to the fullest possible extent into news stories, photographs, and features. The same principle applies to news magazines.

The decline in objective responsibility which has accompanied the intensification of competition for audiences and advertising has been pushed further by the rapid growth of corporatism, multiple ownership, and absentee control of the various media. Where the editor once was a tough individualist who set his own policies, exercised personal control, and looked on his role as something of a trust from the public he served, today's media boss—by whatever name—is more likely to be the representative of a corporate board of directors or the appointee of a distant management whose overriding goal is to pay ever-increasing dividends. A former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission is authority for the statement that in television nine organizations control three-fourths of the stations reaching 40 per cent of all the homes in America.

How many in this room can even identify by name the current presidents of the three major TV networks? Or the editors of the three major national news magazines? Or the editors of *Life* and *Look*?

The largest magazine directed to women is controlled by a man who lives 3,000 miles from its headquarters, and who also controls Wesson Oil, Canada Dry, vegetable canneries, and other assorted companies. Our own city has neither a newspaper nor a commercial television outlet which is owned or controlled by local citizens. These examples are not cited either to criticize or to condone corporate or absentee ownership, as such, but rather to illustrate one factor in the ferocious scramble for audiences, and through audiences for greater revenue, which is foremost among motivations toward irresponsibility.

There are other lesser motivations which show up as the sum total of separate individual concepts and tactics rather than as over-all characteristics of the media. There are of course reporters and commentators whose anxiety to make a name for themselves exceeds their respect for objectivity. There are do-gooders and dewy-eyed idealists who see all news events only in terms of their particular personal prejudices or causes. There are youngsters who instantly become analysts, prophets, and practitioners of power when they face a typewriter or microphone. There is the unending pressure of deadlines which makes it easier to grab quickly for the sensational and far-out than to develop the real story and make it interesting.

The primary cause and motivation of irresponsibility, however, is money, which can be obtained only by matching or outdoing the competition in capturing the attention of a maximum audience.

What, then, are the methods and means? And how do they support the charges we made in the beginning?

Each medium has its own special devices for creating emotion to attract audiences to assure advertising to pay expenses and dividends. We shall list a few, with examples that demonstrate their contributions to irresponsibility. Since no paper of this length could possibly cover the entire field we shall concentrate largely on the leading offender, television.

With this medium, the most frequently used outlet for irresponsibility is the daily network newscast. Here the faked or contrived photographic sequence, the slanted narrative, even the tone and attitude of the announcer, can distort facts or create images far different from the truth of the event or development being reported.

For a quick and rather recent example, I talked personally with the man who organized the press headquarters which was set up voluntarily last spring by the citizens of Marks, Mississippi, in the hope that they might obtain reasonable treatment with regard to the "Poor People's Mule Train." He confirmed familiar reports about the methods of the networks—the removal of TV antennas from roofs and cars from front yards, the furnishing of tattered clothes, and insistence on using the most run-down shacks and buildings that could be

located. This was the setting for photography presented on the air as typical of the community, with the certain result of inflaming both Negroes and credulous whites in other areas of the country.

When they saw what was happening, local civic leaders flatly refused requests for taped TV interviews on the basis of warnings from a former media man as to the ease with which they could be trapped through loaded questions and by the subsequent editing of tape to eliminate favorable passages or explanations, thus producing distorted or even opposite impressions from those actually registered by the person being interviewed.

News coverage of the entire "Poor People's" march, in fact, can be compared with a TV serial—arrangements for each episode to start on a different day; shots of picturesque and destitute people, parading from each city until they got out of camera range, when some of the performers returned home and others proceeded by bus; little children brought in for dramatic effect; et cetera.

Even Bernadette Carey of the Washington Post, a publication normally sympathetic to liberal causes and anti-Southern propaganda, described those selected for network broadcasts as "the kind of group the movie-makers used to order from Central Casting . . . for supporting roles, walk-ons, and crowd scenes in films like the *Grapes of Wrath*, *Tobacco Road*, and *Meet John Doe*."

I have used this example because it is close to home. In New York I have a friend and business associate of 35 years standing whose seventh-floor apartment overlooks Gracie Mansion. He has told me on various occasions, with a combination of amusement and disgust, of groups of demonstrators who gathered in high good humor on the street below to await the arrival of TV camera crews. Thereupon they would take positions as instructed, become howling and menacing protesters through whatever film footage the cameramen might desire, and then go their separate ways as happy and cheerful as they had come. My friend had learned that on the same evening he could expect a dramatic news account of a spontaneous demonstration at the Mayor's home, ballooned into proportions

so far from the realities of the planned exhibition as to bring mental nausea to a responsible citizen who had witnessed the entire performance.

This same technique carries over into the creation of leaders and heroes out of colorful bums. When a TV newsman asked Whitney Young on a live interview how it was that his race could have produced a leader like Stokely Carmichael, Young's reply was, "We produced him? *You* produced him. If you would lay off he would be dead in a few weeks."

Dr. J. Ollie Edwards, chancellor of Stetson University, declared in a commencement address at Wake Forest last June that the news media made "heroes out of rabble-rousers," and he went on to charge that the idea of insurrection has been implanted in the minds of students "who never thought of it till they saw it on television." And a New Jersey official, speaking of the riots at Newark, has said in my presence that "when young Negroes looted they were playing out the roles taught them by TV and newspapers."

We could go on and on—a TV photographer in Los Angeles showing demonstrators how to set fire to a bus—the transformation of a peaceful crowd in Washington into a shouting, fist-shaking mob by the arrival of a camera truck—the testimony of a reporter who went to New Orleans to cover desegregation disturbances under the impression that the whole city was in an uproar, only to find that "fourteen ugly old women were going out every day to yell and scream in front of the television cameras. It was the same people every day"—and the episode in Chicago when the TV crew brought two girls to a selected spot in front of National Guardsmen and had them throw themselves at the troopers and begin screaming "Don't Beat Me! Don't Beat Me!" as the camera began to roll.

Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin, professor of American History at the University of Chicago, sums it up by saying, "The development of . . . television means that to be newsworthy almost by definition means to be violent."

With respect to the war in Vietnam, Alice Widener quotes four returned veterans as follows, "The propaganda here at home is something else! . . . Here at home the only way we can keep from blowing our stacks is to turn off the radio and

TV. Let's face it—the New York Times, Newsweek, CBS and NBC are against what we are doing in Vietnam and that's the way they report the war."

And U.S. News quotes a former Marine officer as saying that "From accounts of the rocketing of Saigon, I could only conclude that TV was covering a war different from the one I was observing."

From his high-level vantage point in Washington an FCC Commissioner commented with judicious restraint not long ago that "There is no doubt in my mind about the irresponsibility of some network news programs."

Another favorite vehicle which invites misrepresentation through all-out effort to create as much dramatic effect and rub as many sensitive emotional spots as possible is the so-called TV documentary. You will remember some of these—Harvest of Shame, Walk in My Shoes, The Battle of Newburgh, The Land, Hunger in America, et al.

What the average layman does not know is that the sponsor who finances one of these programs is not only refused permission to exercise any editorial function in connection with it, but he is not even allowed to see the script or preview the tape or film. His first sight of it is on his own screen at the time of broadcast.

I know a few of the men who have had the job of trying to clean up for sponsoring companies some of the wreckage left by these barrages of garbage. Philip Morris ran into such a blast of reaction to "Harvest of Shame," including speeches on the Senate floor which detailed the misrepresentations, that it sent two investigators to retrace the commentator's steps and itinerary. Top officials of the company joined in the denunciation of CBS for the whole sorry performance.

When Westinghouse sponsored "The Land," Chet Huntley as commentator went so far off base that the farm director of our local NBC outlet came on the air immediately behind the program to contribute what quick correction he could. I have used these two examples both because they involved agriculture, with which I am associated, and because I subsequently discussed them and their results personally with promotion officials of the sponsoring companies.

The latest "documentary" affecting agriculture of course was "Hunger in America." It was followed by resounding speeches in Congress and by the network's flat refusal to grant the Secretary of Agriculture's public request for air time in which to reply.

Equally illustrative would be "The Battle of Newburgh." Here, among other things that happened, city officials drafted a telegram to the network, the chairman of FCC, and the congressmen and senators representing their area which said in part, "We charge that the program distorted the facts and purposely slanted its comments and portrayal to mislead the public. . . . It was edited and excised so as to present not a factual pictorial but a biased, prejudiced, and distorted portrayal."

The final television technique we can take space for is the allegedly impartial panel show or debate in which representatives of both sides of a question are brought together.

Here there is no serious problem in stacking the deck. It is merely a matter of inviting, for the side favored by the network, guests who are well informed, articulate, and as photogenic and dynamic as possible. For the other side, guests should be relatively shallow and clumsy of tongue. Obviously there must be some degree of subtlety, as the difference cannot be so great as to create suspicion on the part of the average viewer. The principle, however, is simplicity itself.

Newspapers, faced with this sort of savage scramble for audiences and attention, have sought to compete in the areas and to the extent that the weapons at their disposal would permit. Lacking sound, or movement, or general use of color, they have moved into exaggerated headlines, overwritten copy, and emphasis on dramatic or emotional angles where these are available.

The man who has a bullet or knife wound is "lying in a pool of blood." Even a few miscellaneous articles tossed in the direction of law officers are a "shower of bricks and bottles." And three rounds of shell fire aimed at a U.S. base in Vietnam, to quote our former Marine officer again, constitute "a murderous barrage." Above all there *must* be a dramatic headline for the top of the front page, whether any news of real significance has developed or not.

Most of the principles and practices of TV reporting have been adapted to print by the wire services and metropolitan press. Some months ago I sat for a full evening with a colored friend from Philadelphia who owns the world's largest Negro public relations agency. I asked him how much of a genuine following Rap Brown could depend on. His reply was, "Roughly 50 Negroes and 5,000 newspaper men."

Another friend—a management counselor who among other things is a former instructor in international relations at Harvard, professor of the same at Drake, trustee of Wellesley, and assistant to the director of the Office of Defense Mobilization—gave me several weeks ago some of his findings during a spring tour of Vietnam.

The daily briefings at which 200-350 correspondents assemble in Saigon are locally known as the "Five O'clock Follies," and my friend stated flatly that he found it easy in many instances to identify the bias and slant of a publication by the type of questions asked by its correspondents. He found other correspondents angered and frustrated by the difference between the factual reports they sent in and the colorful accounts created from them by their own editors. He visited three bases which are frequently used in datelines, and was told by officers that no reporter had ever been there.

Sins of omission can often be as great in news reporting as sins of commission. In the furor over mandatory gun registration following the death of Robert Kennedy, how often did you see reference to the fact that the assassination took place in a state with a strict gun control law, and that the revolver actually used was duly registered under it? Or where did you see reference to the fact that there were *fewer* gun murders in the U.S. in 1966, when the population was approaching 200 million, than in 1930, when it was 125 million?

In accounts of the Chicago disorders last August, there was so much reportorial agony over injury to 11 newsmen that 320 policemen requiring hospital treatment were practically forgotten. As Columnist Betty Beale put it, "Every time a newsmen was hurt, the screams of protest went around the world, but how much was said about the newsmen who taunted the police or tried to force action for the TV cameras?"

Photographs of course can be as misleading as type, sometimes more so. Because of experience in my younger days in both news photography and photoengraving, I have perhaps remained more susceptible than most to photo composition, to backgrounds, and to out-of-focus items as well as to the primary image in the picture. It is of course usually impossible to tell when an exaggerated and unrepresentative scene is being presented as the true story. However, careful watching will bring some interesting revelations.

Two quick examples come to mind. One is a riot scene in a northern city. Across three columns of space, bearing down upon the lens and the reader, is a group of Negro men as violent and vicious looking as you can imagine. Teeth are bared or mouths open in shouts. Faces are contorted. Hands either hold clubs or are clenched and threatening. One's first impulse is to wonder how the brave photographer got out alive. BUT, in the background and to the right—partly out of focus and standing along the curb—women and children are laughing as though at a comedy act. What kind of riot was this? And is it really much different from the fourteen ugly old women in New Orleans?

During the pre-convention campaigns this year the Washington Star carried a headline, "Youths Flock to McCarthy," followed by a paragraph about "a Pied Piper-like demonstration as he walked the two blocks to his house, with an army of youngsters fanned out 20 abreast behind him."

Accompanying the story was a three-column picture of this dramatic event. It showed, by my careful count, faces, arms, or the backs of heads of 19 people, one of whom was Senator McCarthy, one an elderly man looking out the window of a house, one an adult who appeared to be a manager or aide, and two adult photographers. This left 14 possible youths for the Pied Piper to lead, and abundant unoccupied space in the background behind them.

Harmless? Perhaps! But how does the American voter form an intelligent opinion of aspirants to the nation's highest office unless the press gives him responsible reports?

The answer is that the voter often doesn't, because the press often doesn't. It will doubtless never be known whether the

Goldwater-Johnson campaign of 1964 or the Nixon-Kennedy campaign of 1960 constituted the most flagrant example to date of slanted political reporting, but the Nixon-Kennedy affair is certainly the best documented. The situation became so outrageous that the newspaper with the nation's largest circulation (N.Y. Daily News) made the charge editorially that "reporters who are supposed to be objective turned into mass . . . propagandists. The whole disgraceful performance was bad journalism, bad ethics, and a breaking of faith with the readers."

A metropolitan editor on the West Coast (San Diego Union) prepared for presentation to the American Newspaper Publishers Association a 31-page documentation of brief direct quotes from UPI and AP dispatches, complete with city and date, as irrefutable evidence of the bias and prejudice which had been fed to the public under the cloak of news.

Of the continuing Washington political scene, a disgusted bureau chief of one of the nation's largest papers observes that members of the press have grown weary of the watchdog role and are yearning for identity with the First Estate, or ruling class. After commenting on the suspicion that reporters, in their zeal to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable, have gotten beyond their depth, he adds that "less kindly and more acid observers believe newspapermen are confusing the First Estate with the first profession."

We have omitted columnists from consideration here. The positions and prejudices of the principal ones are well known. Normally their writings appear on or adjacent to editorial pages, and are expected to reflect their own personal views.

Length also precludes anything more than a passing reference to the news magazines. Their audiences are much smaller, though more influential per person, than those of TV and newspapers. Their prejudices are well arranged, and are generally known to their readers. One can hardly imagine a news account with conservative emphasis in Newsweek, or an all-out liberal report in U.S. News, or a straightforward presentation of untinted fact in Time.

Across the board, the man or group with a sound, thoughtful, serious point of view finds it difficult or impossible to get

much public attention without gimmicks inappropriate to his position; and the point is approaching where general public judgment between what is real and what is not will be dangerously warped by practices which concentrate more heavily on the adrenal glands than on the brain cells.

I claimed earlier that the very people at whom the hysterics and histrionics of irresponsibility are directed are getting fed up. As evidence I have a growing file that reflects deep public concern as expressed by editors themselves, by professors of journalism, by officials of government agencies at various levels, and by members of both House and Senate.

Already I have referred to some of these. For any who still may have doubt, however:

—A nationally-syndicated columnist has recently written, "American parents and teachers ought to let the networks and publishers know they . . . are sick and tired of seeing and hearing nuts, cranks, fakes, professional pornographers, and extremists."

—In a published review of "The Media and the Assassinations," Christopher Emmet points to the "contagious effect which leads psychopaths or neurotics to imitate highly publicized acts of violence." "Surely," he says, "it must be obvious that this mood is stimulated by instant, worldwide, massive, and often morbid news coverage."

—The mayor of Detroit charges that his city's image has been badly damaged through "thoroughly unbalanced" coverage by the news media in their pursuit of sensationalism; and the President's Riot Commission sustains his charge with the report that, "We have found a significant imbalance between what actually happened . . . and what the newspaper, radio, and television coverage of the riots told us happened."

—Individual members of Congress have been increasing both the frequency and the intensity of their denunciations, putting into the Record such phrases as "hatchet job," "misleading the public," "endangering the economic life of a community," "snow job," et al.

—The FCC more and more is being pressed to impose standards or restrictions on the TV industry when licenses are re-

newed, and 49 congressmen have joined in sponsoring a demand that the Commission conduct an extensive study of the social impact of television violence.

—A report of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee has warned against "influences at work to corrupt and destroy this priceless possession" (the free press).

—The President has exhorted the broadcast industry concerning the way it presents daily news, with the warning that surely it would not want to wake up some morning to find America changed for the worst because of it.

—And sponsoring advertisers, those sources of the money that makes the mare go, have begun to worry. On this last point, for example, I have letters from promotion officials of two large corporations, one pointing out that the company was not renewing its option for a well-known network news report, and the other declaring that incidents created by a documentary it bought "have caused us to undergo an agonizing reappraisal of our role as a TV sponsor."

Two ultimate alternatives lie ahead as we proceed ever further with today's destructive, divisive, and still developing pattern. One is for the various segments of the press to look seriously at the warning signs about them, recognize the danger of what they are doing, and make changes from within. This is the preferable way, the sensible way, the American way.

It is also a difficult way. I have heard Peter Drucker, the internationally known management consultant, say that the concept that an industry needing rules and regulations can police itself is one of our nicer ideas but also one of our silliest.

It is highly desirable, nevertheless, that such an effort be undertaken, and that it be successful. The best possible time would be now. A more likely time, however, will be when one or more of the following occurs: (1) when audiences and readers become so incensed that viewer totals and subscriptions begin to decline; (2) when advertisers become so alarmed that they begin to make conscious and obvious selections of those shows and publications with the least risk of irresponsibility; (3) when media policy-makers are faced with legislation, executive rulings, or court decisions sufficiently drastic as to frighten them into repentance.

Whatever pressures and incentives are necessary, it is tremendously important to the whole concept of American freedom that the media police themselves.

The second alternative—and one that is sure unless the first proves effective—is government intervention. The initial attack obviously would be on television, and the weapons already are available through the powers of FCC. Behind that of course is the final threat of nationalization—a threat not difficult to envision in the light of the fact that there are 27 nations which have government TV networks exclusively, and that ours is the only one in all the world where networks are entirely in private hands.

The president of CBS News said in a speech to broadcasters last September, "Even more alarming, some government officials are responding to . . . this cry to diminish our freedom. Senator after senator, congressman after congressman, are calling for investigations, hearings, guidelines, legislation."

A former publisher of Winston-Salem has raised before an audience of newsmen and journalism students the question as to how newspapers can constantly endorse and advocate further government controls over the lives of the people, and then expect the government to keep its hands off freedom of the press. In his words, "either must inescapably lead to the other."

The Senate Internal Security committee report, cited earlier, points out that the undermining and destruction of a free press through vigorous and often ruthless activity are prime goals of subversives seeking to spread communist control. It then adds, on the basis of eyewitness testimony from 13 countries, that "a free press can be lost." Such a loss—repulsive as the thought may be—is the alternative to self-discipline.

What to do? How to go about it? This is the dilemma which irresponsibility has created for the thinking media man. Answer it he must, for no nation or people can remain free with a press that is not, and no press will remain permanently free which fails to fulfill the standards of responsibility the public expects of it.

"THE BIRTH OF SOME TALL TALES"

C. B. WEISS

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," January 16, 1969

Ole Bud, a modest braggart and a national truth-stretcher, worked on our farm. He wasn't very good at helping with the daily chores and he wasn't much at working in the fields, unless some one, especially my Father, was nearby.

He was about fifty years old and was not married. He seemed to enjoy spending his time with us growing boys, probably because we were better listeners than the grownups.

Ole Bud was a quarter Indian, and he looked it, with a coppery skin and almost straight hair. He said this happened when the Cherokees wintered in that area on their forced trek to Oklahoma.

He was always kind to animals and always kept two or three dogs and a horse. They weren't very good ones but he always said that they were the best and fastest hunting dogs in the world and the horse was never outrun on track or road.

There were two distinct phases to his story telling. When he first came to our farm, all of his stories were concerned with his own spectacular prowess of strength or skill, or they contained advice for us boys. An example of his skill, strength and unerring accuracy is probably best shown in his telling us that the ultimate test to determine the sharpness of the blade on a wheat cradle was to lay a sheep skin on the water and shave it with one stroke and not move it more than an inch.

A story with a rather direct lesson for us boys is as follows:

DE DEBBIL WILL GET YOU
IF YOU HUNTS ON SUNDAY

My brother and I loved to hunt rabbits and furthermore it was one way to make some spending money because we would clean and skin them and peddle them to people that lived in Cape for about twenty cents each. That was a lot of money in those days. Now we didn't have much time for hunting because of all the work to be done on a farm. After much begging

and pleading with our Dad, he said that if we went to church on Sunday morning, we could go hunting on Sunday afternoon. Thanksgiving was always a hunting day, as well as other winter Holidays, and of course any day after a fresh snow in winter. You could track that rabbit right to his nest.

We, of course, happily told Ole Bud and invited him to go with us because what he called his 'possum hound was in our opinion a good rabbit dog. But Ole Bud would not go with us.

"No sah, I's not goin' — Sunday is de Lord's day. I knows 'cause I went huntin' on Sunday jes once, and I ain't never goin' again—no sah! De fak is I's lucky to be heah—de Debbil mighty nigh got me!"

"When I wuz young, 'bout your age, I got that foolishmint into mah head 'bout doin' some huntin' on de Lord's day. I kep on axin' my daddy so much, jes lak you did, dat he finally said I could go—but dat I had better be careful or de Debbil would fin' me, an' git me. I paid no min' 'bout dat talk 'bout de Debbil."

"I got out my daddy's fine ole muzzle loadin' rifle—I didnen need no shot gun to kill *my* game. I poured in de powder an' rammed home de rifle ball, but bein' a safe hunter lak my daddy tole me, I didnen put on de firing cap, an' off I went for de woods. Man, was I happy—out huntin—dere warn't any Debbil aroun' lookin fer people dat didnen do anything worsen den huntin' on Sunday—dere couldn't be."

"I headed straight for a big ole black oak tree right on de edge of de big woods, 'cause dere was usually a squirrel or two way up in de branches crackin' acorns. I looked dat tree over real good and was feeling a little bad dat dere wasn' a thing in it. I thought 'bout the Debbil, but knowed that he didn't have anything to do wid squirrels not being dere. I was 'bout to leave when de movement of somethin' little cotched my eye— I allus see everything dat moves. I looked closer at dat thing dat moved and it was peerin' out of de top of dat big tree at me. Dat was the ugliest thing I ever did see—its hair stuck straight out like copper wires, with a face that looked lak it was haff cat and haff monkey, an' blazin' fiery red eyes 'bout de size of a quarter. I sho nuff wanted to kill an' get rid of dat ugly thing. I reached into my pocket for de firin' cap an' looked down to put it in de right place on de

firin' tube. Well, sah, when I look back up where dat thing had been, it was gone—no place 'round—an den I heard this hissin' nosie right 'bove my head. I took one look and pretty nigh jumped right outen skin! Dat ugly thing done moved lak a flash from de top of dat big tree to right in front of my face an' had growed to the size of a caff—still wid dat monkey-cat face and those straight stiff copper colored hairs and dose flamin' fiery eyes and dis time day wuz as big as a silver dollar! And wors' of all, it had two horns grown' out its head. I knowed immejet like dat dis was de Debbil—he *was* getting bigger whilst I was lookin' at him and he looked lak he was ready to jump on me! I didn't stay there no time at all. I yelled, throwed dat gun straight up in de air, jumped straight backwards, and lit out fer home as fas' as I could go. I ran right through briar thickets, knocked over a rail fence, two picket fences and busted down de front gate gettin' to de house."

"My clothes was near all tore off and I was plum outen breath and my daddy glanced up and sez, as though he knew all de time what happened, "I spect de Debbil 'bout cotched you."

"I was plum outa breff and I was so scared I couldn't talk. Finally de talkin' came back but I couldn't reckergnize my own squeaky voice. After a while, I tole him de whole story."

"Den he axed me "Whar dat gun?"

"Dat was de first time I had even thunk about dat gun since I saw dat awful brindle-haired, flamin'-eyed varmint, and I didn't know what to do because I sho nuff didnen want to go out there agin!"

"Mah daddy sez agin—"Whar dat GUN?"

"So I tole him."

"He say, "Git dat gun."

I sez, "I git it tomorrow."

He waited and said real final like, "Go git dat GUN NOW."

And to me it was plum final like when he added, "And doan come home wifout it!"

"I slowly headed towards that big black oak, takin' my time

fixen de gate and fences I had busted down. All de time I was telling myself dat dis wasn't de Debbil, but all de time knowin' it was. I was hoping dat blazin' eyed rascal would mebbe git tired of waitin' fer me. I kept glancin' at dat tree every now and then, even when I was too far way to see anything. When I was gettin' closer I couldn't keep my eyes offen it. I was trying to be brave-like but I knowed that if something had moved in dat tree, I would have took off agin like I did de first time."

"I got closer and closer, and nothin' did I see. I finally got to de tree and my knees was knockin' so that they sounded like a hongry wood pecker working on a hollow tree. I was sho nuff scaired!"

"Dat gun warn't no place to be found. I looked and looked, kicking up de leaves all around but I couldn't find it. And den de sun was goin down and it started gettin' dark and I 'membered what my daddy said—"Doan cum home wifout dat gun!"

"I decided dat I would set the leaves on fire under de tree and I could mebbe find it. I was scared of de dark, I was scared of de Debbil, but I was scarer of my daddy. I was slowly burnin' de leaves in a circle and lookin' real close for it and I happened to notice some powder fizzin' and sparkin.' Wow, I jumped straight up as high as I could and dat gun shot dat rifle ball smack dab where my feet had been. De Debbil had done missed me agin!"

"I wasn't never going to give him de third chance—you all knows dat de third time is a charm. Dat is the last time I ever hunted on de Lord's day. You *should not* do it either."

We did hunt on Sunday afternoons after church, but both of us often thought about ole Bud and the Devil that almost got him—or was he telling us this story to try to make better boys of us? He hunted with us on other days but never on Sunday!

The second phase of Ole Bud's story telling was the result of some trickery on his part.

There was an apple orchard on our farm that furnished the apples for a gathering of the relatives to make apple butter for each of the families represented. About every fourth or fifth

year apple cider was made that ended up as the supply of vinegar for the whole community.

On this particular cider making year Ole Bud sidled up to my father and told him that if he would add a half bushel of shelled corn to that cider it would make the best vinegar anyone had ever tasted. This sounded logical, even though Dad was always skeptical about anything ole Bud told him. But it was done, and that cider turned to a rich exhilarating hard cider and never did turn to vinegar.

It wasn't long after that we found Ole Bud liked hard cider, and on rainy days when we couldn't work outdoors, he would reward us with a story if we gave him enough hard cider to stoke up the fires of his volatile imagination. The following is one of his stories.

OLE BLUE, DE FASTES' FOX HOUN' DAT EVER LIVED

I had many good dawgs in my life but there is one—only one—dat was de mostes' dawg of 'em all. I thinks in my own min' dat he was the greates' dawg dat ever lived on the face of dis earth.

Even as a puppie he was de fastes' one of all his brothers and sisters. He was de fust one to reach his Mommie when she stretched out in a meanin'ful way in some res'ful place and all of 'em knew she was ready for 'em to have a meal. And when she used her dog sense and knew it was time for 'em to get out and make their own livin', she weaned 'em. Ole Blue was the one dat was there fust to get his share of anything I throwed out for 'em to eat.

Ole Blue was de fust one to learn to hunt and it peered like he jus' loved to run after wild game. Those lazy brothers and sisters of his just laid aroun' de yard so long as some one gave 'em enough to keep their bellies full.

He had de keenes' nose your ever did see—I believes he could foller a trail dat was a week old even though it went through a brier patch as thick as de hairs on his own back! And fast—WOOIE—and he kept on gettin' faster as he growed up. He could catch any bobbin' cotton tail dat got up before him—dat rabbit didn' have a chanct. It got to be no fun takin'

him rabbit huntin'—not unless he was hongry, or I was. Dere were times though dat I took him out just to show some of my doubtin' friends how fast he was.

Since catchin' rabbits was so easy for this four-legged hunk of greased lightnin', I set myself to thinkin' 'bout how to teach Ole Blue to trail and chase a fox. Now here is a varmint that can really sell out and is sly and cunnin' and sneaky to boot. I had all this worriment for nuttin' 'cause Ole Blue changed to huntin' foxes just like he was borned doin' it. I could call him offen a rabbit trail any time and den he would hunt nothin' but foxes. An' to speak de actual fack, he made life barely tollable for all those pore ole foxes aroun' these parts. In fack, it was hard to believe dat he caught mos' of 'em. My hard-wukkin' neighbors dat was raisin' chickens to hep feed their chilluns was mighty glad of dat. They liked me and Ole Blue, but 'specially Ole Blue.

An' it goes without sayin' dat people all aroun' hearded about Ole Blue and what a fas' dawg he was and then dey would bring their sorry houn' over for a fox race. He beat 'em all, and did it real easy like. He made 'em all look lead-footed. Of course we could call Ole Blue off fore he caught de fox he was chasin' or there wouldn' have been any lef' around to chase. He beat every dawg in de county. It got so no one would go huntin' with me cause they knowed my dawg would always be ahead of theirs in any race.

When you is the bestes' everybody is tryin' to beat you, or mebbe even tie you. So it was not surprisin' dat a lots a dawg men were looking for a dawg dat could win a race from Ole Blue. Pretty soon talk started goin' aroun' 'bout some feller and his fas' dawg way over in de next county. They was all hopeful dat here was a dawg could take Ole Blue. I let it be knownst to all dat me and Ole Blue was ready to race 'em any time, any place. Purty soon I found out dat there was trully a feller in the next county dat did think he had a fas' runnin' dawg, cause he sent word to me dat he would race his dawg against Ole Blue any time we was ready. I sent word to him dat de earlies' time he picked wouldn' be soon enuff for me and Ole Blue.

You aint never hearded so much talk goin' on 'bout a dawg race—dey was even doin' a lot of bettin', and a lot of these

folks couldn' afford to—but they figgered dat bettin' on Ole Blue was as sure as de sun risin'.

There was also much argumints goin' on 'bout where the race was to be made. Me and Ole Blue stayed plum clear of all dis talk — we would race any dawg any time any place. Finally a whiskered ole hunter spoke up and allowed as to how they had a fox in his parts that was the fastes' slyes' trickies' varmint on four legs dat he had done ever see'd. I said dat was de kind of fox. Ole Blue wanted mos' of all to get after, cause he would have him runnin' for his life in no time at all and to save his own hide that ole fox would have to use every trick he knowded. De owner of the other dawg allowed as to how this would be a good fox to chase. So de time was set and we brought our dawgs to the woods where dis fas' tricky fox hung aroun'. Dat other feller had a mighty good lookin' dawg—deep chested and big hams for hin' legs, made for good runnin'. But I knowed Ole Blue could take him whenever he got good an ready, and he looked up at me liked he knowed he could too.

We brought both dawgs together so they would know each other. Dis other dawg was all bristled up and walkin' aroun' stiff-legged, not bein' a bit friendly, sorta sniffin' aroun' to get Ole Blue's smell. Ole Blue paid him no min', he jes' looked out over de hills, actin' as effen this dawg was just another no good houn'.

We took our leadin' ropes off both dawgs at de same time an' both of 'em went about de business of findin' dat fox trail. Both were tryin' their hardes', sniffin' an' snuffin' in every place a fox may have had a handerin' to have been. I had hoped Ole Blue would find the trail first an' give out dat long trailin' bark of his, dat was his way to tellin' me dat he had foun' it. But of all de things dat should happen, dey both bayed at de same time—both at the very same time!!! An' dat is how de race started—neck an' neck. An' it went on an' on—Ole Blue's beautiful ear-pleasin' "A-OOU" flowed gentle like over the hills an' hollers, an' dat other dawg's short ear-stabbin' chop—"YOW-YOW" seemed to make de leaves quiver. There wasn' a one man in de whole excited bunch of hunters dat was listenin' dat could tell which dawg was ahead — we strained until our ears mighty nigh fell off. I always claimed Ole Blue was ahead an' of course de other feller claimed his

was, but both of us knowed dat neither one was sure dat he was tellin' de truth.

Dat chase went on for three or four hours and still we couldn' tell which dawg was winnin' de race. Down one ridge, cross a holler, an' down another ridge—dey stayed in hearin' distance all de time. We jes couldn' tell which dawg was really in front. We all knew we had to see 'em with our own eyeballs 'fore we would know for sure which dawg was leadin'. So we put out our camp fire an' was real quiet like and was hopin' maybe dat fox would come down de ridge we was on. Sho nuff, in about half an hour we heard 'em comin', jes like we had hoped, right down our ridge. Now we would see 'em.

I could tell Ole Blue was pressin' dat fox mighty hard, but dad-burn it, it sounded like de other dawg was too!! On dey came right toward us—an we stood as still as a shitepoke on a creek bank when he is eye-ballin' a juicy bull frog — not a sound or move did we make—not a cough or a lim' crackin'!! An' dey kept comin' and comin' right toward us. Ahh how terrible pretty an' sweet dat "A-OOU" was, but dat "YOW-YOW" was right with it. On dey came, nearer an' nearer. My heart was poundin' like a sledge hammer drivin' a fence-post in solid rock—Ole Blue had to be in the lead—he jes had to be!!

I was de first one dat see'd dat big grey fox and he was really stretchin' out—you could hardly see his feets touch de groun'—he looked like a grey arrow flyin' down dat ridge. An' right behin' him was Ole Blue—so close dat de hairs on de end of dat big bushy fox's tail was touchin' Ole Blue's nose. And right behind Ole Blue was de other dawg, not two feets behind, but behin' him. Ole Blue won de race; he was de fastest' an' every body seen what I done saw!

An' right den it happened—dat cunnin' fox had one more trick lef' and he pulled it out right den! Just as Ole Blue was grabbin' to get ahold of dat fox tail, dat fox jumped sideways behin' a keen saplin' and Ole Blue cut right across to get him, so boun' to catch dat fox dat he didn' see that keen saplin' dat hit him right in the middle of his nose, right dead center!! You wouldn' believe it unless you had see'd it, but dat dawg was runnin' so fas' dat de saplin' split him right half into. I almos' died when I see'd those two halves fly apart. Here was

my fastest' an' onliest dawg split in two, layin' out on de groun'. I was of a min' to lay down an' die with him.

But I don' give up dat easy. I called for all de tow sacks dese hunters had been sittin' on, to use 'em as wrappin' for my dawg. I slapped his two halves together, as fas' as I could, cause I saw his stout heart was still beatin'! I used every tow sack they brung me to wrap him up tight. I picked up this bundle with Ole Blue some wheres inside, real gentle like, and headed out through de woods for home. Dat was de longest' and saddest' trip I done ever made. I didn' see how Ole Blue could live but I just had to try.

With arms dat seemed to be turnin' to lead, I finally got home and placed him real sorrowful like in his favorite spot 'hind de stove. He like dat place mos' of all—it was warm, an' he was near his master. But then I foun' out I had used so many sacks to put him together that I didn' know which end was which. So I poked food in both ends, and you know what? It was dissappearin' on one end, so he had to be eatin' it. Dat took a heavy load offen my heart an' min' cause I believed dat Ole Blue was livin', I didn' care if he would ever run again. I jest wanted him to live. De Good Lord had answered my prayers again. It 'peared like I would have Ole Blue with me some longer, glory be!! Dis went on real regular like for about a month, keepin' him warm and pokin' food into one end of dat bundle of sacks. An' den I figgered it was 'bout time to take off de wrappin', cause when I spoke to Ole Blue there was wrigglin' goin' on in dose sacks!!

But I waited a few more days to let all the healin' get done. I was never so shaky in all my borned days—maybe it would have been better to have buried him out in de woods right where he won his hardes' race. But I kept on unwrappin' and pretty soon I was down to de las' sack— and Ole Blue was wrigglin' up a storm by now, like he was glad to get out of all dat big bundle. I snatched off dat last sack and my heart almost fell clean through de floor—I had made the most terrible mistake I had ever done made—I had put Ole Blue together in de mos' awful way—two feets up an' two feets down!! He had done healed together dat way and there was no way of undoin' what I had done. But you know what — Ole Blue jumped up, two feets on de floor and two feets pointed to-

wards de ceilin'!! He was so glad to be out of those sacks an' glad to be alive, an' he was tryin' to tell me by lickin' my hands an' my face, an' jumpin' all around me an' de stove. I was happy to see dat he was alive but my heart was so heavy 'bout my mistake dat my eyes watered some—an' Ole Blue licked de tears away. He seemed to know somethin' I didn' know, an' sho nuff he did!!

Two feets up an' two feets down made no difference to dat great dawg at all. In fack, he was twice as good as he was before—he would run on two feets for a while, and when dey got tired, he would flip over an' run on de other two, and he was as fas' as he had ever been and could keep goin' twice as long!!!

Dr. John Farris read a paper before this group on Sept. 18, 1965. He advanced the idea in this paper, "Old Southern Humor and William Faulkner," that tall tales may have furnished ideas for themes that great writers used in some of their works.

I do not believe that any of Ole Bud's stories have been so honored, and futhermore there is the question as to whether they are original. I have discovered that some are not. Since Ole Bud couldn't read or write, he must have told us some stories that he heard some one else tell. Some, as far as I know were the results of his imagination. If so, Ole Bud takes on greater prestige with the passing years as one of those men that may have given birth to a Tall Tale or two.

"THE LESSONS OF HISTORY"

JOHN H. TODD

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," February 20, 1969

This paper began as a review of the 92-page essay by Will and Ariel Durant entitled "The Lessons of History". Rather than a critical review, it has developed into a series of summarizations, paraphrases and direct quotations, with a minimum of critical comment.

Since my high school days I have enjoyed the writings of Will Durant, his perceptive insights, his gentle criticism, his cheerful touches of wry humor, and his unfailing serenity of spirit. At the same time I have been, and still am, irritated by his occasional bad choice of words, his poor syntax, especially his persistent substitution of commas and semi-colons for periods, and his occasional misplacement of adjectives.

Dr. and Mrs. Durant spent 40 years writing their ten-volume "Story of Civilization". After it was finished they re-read it to appraise the possible need for revision. In the process, as they state in the preface, they "made notes of events and comments that might illuminate present affairs, future probabilities, the nature of man, and the conduct of states." This essay (or more accurately this group of essays) is the result.

It is written from the viewpoint of the philosopher—not the pragmatist. In their own words they offer it as "a survey of human experience, not a personal revelation." The dust jacket blurb describes it as "a survey of human history, full of dazzling insights into the nature of human experience, the evolution of civilization, the culture of man." It is illuminating, thoughtful and thought-provoking. It is warm, gentle, often witty, and sometimes wryly humorous.

Nearly every page induces an itch to return to some portion of their own ten-volume opus or to one of the works of Toynbee, Spengler, Voltaire, Spinoza, de Tocqueville, Lord Acton and others. As the late Lamar Fleming once characterized the essays of Lord Acton, "This is rich fare".

In the opening chapter entitled "Hesitations" the authors ask: "Is it possible that, after all, history has no sense, that

it teaches us nothing, and that the immense past was only the weary rehearsal of the mistakes that the future is destined to make on a larger stage and scale? At times we feel so, and a multitude of doubts assail our enterprise."

Under a wide range of headings, they undertake to seek "what history has to say about the nature, conduct, and prospects of man." They inject this comment: "It is a precarious enterprise, and only a fool would try to compress a hundred centuries into a hundred pages of hazardous conclusions. We proceed."

BIOLOGY

". . . The laws of biology are the fundamental lessons of history. We are subject to the processes and trials of evolution, to the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest to survive. If some of us seem to escape the strife or the trials it is because our group protects us; but that group itself must meet the tests of survival."

"The second biological lesson of history is that life is selection. . . . Since nature . . . has not read very carefully the American Declaration of Independence or the French Revolutionary Declaration of the Rights of Man, we are all born unfree and unequal.

". . . Freedom and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies, and when one prevails the other dies. Leave men free, and their natural inequalities will multiply almost geometrically, as in England and America in the nineteenth century under laissez-faire. To check the growth of inequality, liberty must be sacrificed, as in Russia after 1917. Even when repressed, inequality grows. Only the man who is below the average in economic ability desires equality. Those who are conscious of superior ability desire freedom; and in the end superior ability has its way. Utopias of equality are biologically doomed, and the best that the amiable philosopher can hope for is an approximate equality of legal justice and educational opportunity."

ECONOMICS

In the chapter on "Economics" this theme is further developed with some rather startling implications:

"Since practical ability differs from person to person, the majority of such abilities, in nearly all societies, is gathered in a minority of men. The concentration of wealth is a natural result of this concentration of ability, and regularly recurs in history. The rate of concentration (other factors being equal) varies with the economic freedom permitted by morals and the laws. Despotism may for a time retard the concentration; democracy, allowing the most liberty, accelerates it. The relative equality of Americans before 1776 has been overwhelmed by a thousand forms of physical, mental, and economic differentiation, so that the gap between the wealthiest and the poorest is now greater than at any time since Imperial plutocratic Rome. In progressive societies the concentration may reach a point where the strength of number in the many poor rivals the strength of ability in the few rich; then the unstable equilibrium generates a critical situation, which history has diversely met by legislation redistributing wealth or by revolution distributing poverty." A number of examples are given.

Here are four of them:

(1) In the Athens of 594 B.C., Solon, as supreme Archon, a businessman of aristocratic lineage, devaluated the currency, thereby easing the burden of all debtors (though he himself was a creditor): he reduced all personal debts, and ended imprisonment for debt; he canceled arrears for taxes and mortgage interest; he established a graduated income tax that made the rich pay at a rate twelve times that required of the poor; he reorganized the courts on a more popular basis; and he arranged that the sons of those who had died in war for Athens should be brought up and educated at the government's expense. The rich protested that his measures were outright confiscation; the radicals complained that he had not redivided the land; but within a generation almost all agreed that his reforms had saved Athens from revolution.

(2) Some 250 years later a similar development occurred in Athens, which was terminated by the conquest of Philip of Macedon in 338 B.C.

(3) Conquests in the last centuries before Christ created a similar situation in Rome which was resolved by the dictatorship of Octavius. The resulting Pax Romana lasted for 210 years.

(4) "The government of the United States, in 1933-52 and 1960-65, followed Solon's peaceful methods, and accomplished a moderate and pacifying redistribution; perhaps someone had studied history. The upper classes in America cursed, complied, and resumed the concentration of wealth."

"We conclude that the concentration of wealth is natural and inevitable, and is periodically alleviated by violent or peaceable partial redistribution. In this view all economic history is the slow heartbeat of the social organism, a vast systole and diastole of concentrating wealth and compulsive recirculation."

At this moment in history it seems to me that the great systolic surge of wealth accumulation is proceeding with great momentum, and at the same time its diastolic counterpart on a rather wide scale is trying to assert itself as a continuation of its most recent pulse or as an out-of-phase new pulse, with the result that we may be in some danger of experiencing a state of "fillibration" such as occurred during the period between the death of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 180 and the final sack of Rome in A.D. 476, when the gigantic economic pulse was virtually suspended.

RACE

The Durants assert that, where the conquering whites (as in Asia, Africa, the United States and Canada) did not intermarry with the dark-skinned people they had conquered, they maintained their racial superiority; but that, where the conquering whites intermarried with the darker skinned people (as in Latin America), their racial superiority declined or disappeared. They make this specific comment: "Only those who are themselves the product of such enfeebling mixtures talk of equality of races, or think that 'all men are brothers'. All strong characters and peoples are race conscious, and are instinctively averse to marriage outside their own racial group."

Having made that partial concession, they point out the contrary evidence of the Chinese civilization of 2000 years ago, the civilizations of the Mayans, Toltecs, Aztecs and Incas in Central and South America, the Dravidic builders of southern India and the Kmers in what is now known as Cambodia.

(They might also have mentioned the Moors and the Persians.)

They finally conclude that "History is color blind, and can develop a civilization (in any favorable environment) under almost any skin."

They suggest that, out of its heterogeneous background, America may develop a new homogeneous type, with its own language, literature, and characteristic arts. Indeed they comment that: "... Already these are visibly or raucously on their way."

Perhaps they were anticipating our recent troubles in the streets and on the campuses when they observed that "Racial antipathies have some roots in ethnic origin, but they are also generated, perhaps predominantly, by differences of acquired culture—of language, dress, habits, morals, or religion. There is no cure for such antipathies except a broadened education."

CHARACTER

The authors necessarily appraise character in terms of conduct. Known history, they say, shows little alteration in the conduct of mankind—that means and instrumentalities change, but that motives and ends remain the same—"to act or rest, to acquire or give, to fight or retreat, to seek association or privacy, to mate or reject, to offer or resent parental care." Nor do they see any difference in impulses between the poor and the rich—only differences of opportunity or skill to implement impulses.

They recognize what they call the "initiative individual", the great man, the hero, the genius, but insist that he is not the god Carlyle described—that rather he grows out of his own time and land, and is the product and symbol of events as well as their agent and voice; that, without some situation requiring a new response, his new ideas would be untimely and impracticable.

When the initiative man and his new ideas are in phase with the times, his ideas and works take fire—like Churchill whose eloquence was worth a thousand regiments, Napoleon, whose strategy and tactics won battles and campaigns and

established new states—Mohammed whose wise and inspiring words aroused a poor and disadvantaged people to unpremeditated ambitions and surprising powers.

The Durants believe that, while intellect certainly is a vital force in history, it can also be a dissolvent and destructive power—that out of each hundred new ideas, ninety-nine or more will probably be inferior to the traditional responses which they propose to replace.

They assert that “No one man, however brilliant or well-informed, can come in one lifetime to such fullness of understanding as to safely judge and dismiss the customs or institutions of his society, for these are the wisdom of generations after centuries of experiment in the laboratory of history.” They summarize in these words:

“So the conservative who resists change is as valuable as the radical who proposes it, perhaps as much more valuable as roots are more vital than grafts. It is good that new ideas should be heard, for the sake of the few that can be used; but it is also good that new ideas should be compelled to go through the mill of objection, opposition, and contumely; this is the trial heat which innovations must survive before being allowed to enter the human race. It is good that the old should resist the young, and that the young should prod the old; out of this tension, as out of the strife of the sexes and the classes, comes a creative tensile strength, a stimulated development, a secret and basic unity of movement of the whole.”

MORALS

The authors aptly define morals as “the rules by which a society exhorts (as laws are the rules by which it seeks to compel) its members and associations to behavior consistent with its order, security, and growth.”

For the purpose of appraising different and changing moral codes, they divide economic history into three stages—hunting, agriculture and industry. In the hunting stage a man had to be ready to chase, to fight and kill. The test of survival was then (as it still is between states) the ability to kill. Since the death rate among men presumably was higher than among women, some men had to take care of several women. During

that stage, pugnacity, brutality, greed and sexual readiness were advantages in the struggle for existence. The authors suggest that “probably every vice was once a virtue—i.e., a quality making for the survival of the individual, the family, or the group. Man’s sins may be the relics of his rise rather than the stigmata of his fall.”

In the agricultural stage all this was changed. Monogamy was demanded by the approximate numerical equality of the sexes. Children were an economic asset. Industriousness became more vital than bravery; regularity and thrift more profitable than violence; peace more victorious than war. “On the farm the family was the unit of production under the discipline of the father and the seasons, and paternal authority had a firm economic base.” A normal male matured early both in mind and in self-support. At fifteen all he needed was land, a plow and a willing arm. He married early, almost as soon as nature wishes. As for young women, chastity was indispensable, for its loss might bring unprotected motherhood. For fifteen hundred years this stern agricultural moral code maintained itself in Christian Europe and in its white colonies. It produced some of the strongest characters in history.

Another great change came with the Industrial Revolution. Men, women and children left the home, the family and their authority and unity to work as individuals, individually paid.

Economic maturity, (i. e. the capacity to support a family) came much later than before. Children no longer were economic assets; hence marriage was delayed. “The city offered every discouragement to marriage, but it provided every stimulus and facility for sex.” The authority of the father and mother lost its economic base. A rebellious youth was no longer constrained by the surveillance of the village. He could hide his sins in the protective anonymity of the city crowd.

In our time, as in the times of Socrates and Augustus, war adds greatly to the forces making for moral laxity.

Though noting these retrogressive developments, the Durants do not see the world going to hell in the traditional handbasket. They remind us that sin, vice and corruption have flourished in every age. They remind us that history as usually written is quite different from history as usually lived—

that the historians (like the news reporters) record the exceptional because it is interesting—because it is exceptional; but that, “Behind the red facade of war and politics, misfortune and poverty, adultery and divorce, murder and suicide, were millions of orderly homes, devoted marriages, men and women kindly and affectionate, troubled and happy with children. Even in recorded history we find so many instances of goodness, even of nobility, that we can forgive, though not forget, the sins.”

They conclude that “We cannot be sure that the moral laxity of our times is a herald of decay, rather than a painful or delightful transition between a moral code that has lost its agricultural basis and another that our industrial civilization has yet to forge into social order and normality.”

They cheerfully comment that history assures us that civilizations decay in a quite leisurely fashion; that for 250 years after moral weakening began in Greece, Hellenic civilization continued to produce masterpieces of literature and art; that, while Roman morals began to decay soon after the conquered Greeks passed into Italy in 146 B. C., Rome continued to have great statesmen, philosophers, poets, and artists until the death of Marcus Aurelius in A. D. 180; that politically Rome was at its lowest ebb when Caesar came in 60 B. C., but it did not quite succumb to the barbarians until A. D. 465. “May we take as long to fall as did Imperial Rome!”

They suggest the possibility that moral discipline may be restored as a result of military training required by the challenges of war; that individualism will diminish as geographical protection ceases; that sexual license may cure itself through its own excesses; that our unmoored children may live to see order and modesty become fashionable; and that clothing may become more stimulating than nudity.

Meanwhile (they conclude) “Much of our moral freedom is good; it is pleasant to be relieved of theological terrors, to enjoy without qualm the pleasures that harm neither others nor ourselves, and to feel the tang of the open air upon our liberated flesh.”

RELIGION

“Does history support a belief in God? If by God we mean, not the creative vitality of nature, but a supreme being intelligent and benevolent; the answer must be a reluctant negative

“If history supports any theology this would be a dualism like the Zoroastrian or Manichaen: A good spirit and an evil spirit battling for control of the universe and men’s souls These faiths and Christianity (which is essentially Manichaen) assured their followers that the good spirit would win in the end; but of this consummation history offers no guarantee. Nature and history do not agree with our conceptions of good and bad; they define good as that which survives, and bad as that which goes under; and the universe has no prejudice in favor of Christ as against Genghis Khan.”

Nevertheless, “Even the skeptical historian develops a humble respect for religion since he sees it functioning, and seemingly indispensable, in every land and age.”

“History has justified the Church in the belief that the masses of mankind desire a religion rich in miracle, mystery and myth.”

“One lesson of history is that religion has many lives, and a habit of resurrection. How often in the past have God and religion died and been reborn!”

“Puritanism and paganism—the repression and expression of the senses and desires—alternate in mutual reaction in history. Generally religion and puritanism prevail in periods when the laws are feeble and morals must bear the burden of maintaining social order;—skepticism and paganism (other factors being equal) progress as the rising power of law and government permits the decline of the church, the family, and morality without basically endangering the stability of the state.”

The agnostic Renan, in 1866, concluded that religion is necessary to morality. The Durants confirm that conclusion with the statement that “There is no significant example in history, before our time, of a society successfully maintaining moral life without the aid of religion.” As to the future of

religion, they conclude that "as long as there is poverty there will be gods."

GOVERNMENT

Monarchy, the authors suggest, is the most natural, and therefore the most frequent form of government. They mention the greatness of the Pax Romana established by Augustus, and the disgraceful episodes under Caligula, Nero, and Domitian—again contrasted with the beneficent reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.

They conclude that, on balance, the record for monarchy is only "middling".

They give scant credit to revolutions, and maintain that the achievements of revolution would have come about without it through the gradual compulsion of economic developments. "Violent revolutions do not so much redistribute wealth as to destroy it."

Concerning democracy, they give very little credit to Greece and Rome, but much to the United States. "All deductions having been made, democracy has done less harm and more good, than any other form of government."

They conclude: "If equality of educational opportunity can be established, democracy will be real and justified." Men cannot be equal but their access to education and opportunity can be made more nearly equal.

They believe that today democracy is more sound than ever before. Yet they warn that "If our economy of freedom fails to distribute wealth as ably as it has created it, the road to dictatorship will be open to any man who can persuasively promise security to all; and a martial government, under whatever charming phrases, will engulf the democratic world."

SOCIALISM

The authors say that "The struggle of socialism against capitalism is part of the historic rhythm in the concentration and dispersion of wealth." In other words, they equate capitalism with the accumulation of wealth by the minority of su-

perior people, and socialism with the (voluntary or enforced) redistribution of wealth.

They concede that: "In free enterprise the spur of competition and the zeal and zest of ownership arouse the productiveness and inventiveness of men; nearly every economic ability sooner or later finds its niche and reward in the shuffle of talents and the natural selection of skills; and a basic democracy rules the process insofar as most of the articles to be produced, and the services to be rendered, are determined by public demand rather than by governmental decree. Meanwhile competition compels the capitalist to exhaustive labor, and his products to ever-rising excellence."

They suggest that capitalistic free enterprise historically has been undermined "by abuses of industrial mastery, price manipulation, business chicanery, and irresponsible wealth," and that such abuses provoke protests in the form of socialistic experiments. They cite some fifteen examples, beginning in Sumeria about 2100 B.C., recurring in Babylonia, Egypt, Rome, three times in China, twice in South America, three times in Germany, and ending with the current socialism of Soviet Russia.

They suggest that socialism also has built-in weaknesses, which may constitute the seeds of its destruction (or abandonment). First, high taxes, laid upon everyone to finance a swelling band of governmental employees. Second the conscription of males to repel invasions. Third, corruption in the bureaucracy. Droughts, floods and successful invasions have also been contributing factors.

They foresee, and confidently predict an accommodation or fusion of capitalism and socialism. They observe that: "Year by year the role of Western governments in the economy rises, the share of the private sector declines. Capitalism retains the stimulus of private property, free enterprise, and competition, and produces a rich supply of goods; high taxation, falling heavily upon the upper classes, enables the government to provide for a self-limited population unprecedented services in education, health, and recreation. The fear of capitalism has compelled capitalism to widen freedom, and the fear of socialism has compelled capitalism to increase

equality. East is West and West is East, and soon the twain will meet."

One is compelled to agree that, in the Western world at least, for several decades we have been visibly moving toward such a synthesis of capitalism and socialism. The Durants do not predict that a stable equilibrium will be achieved; but they express no fear of the possible failure to achieve one. Is such a stable equilibrium probable? or possible? The answer probably depends in large part on whether populations increase, stabilize or decline; on whether or not effective birth control is established among the great masses of the relatively inferior and ineffectual peoples of the world. Perhaps the answer is "the pill." I wonder what Malthus (if he were here) would say about the pill? The answer also depends in part on the effectiveness of scientific land-use throughout the world. It depends in great part on the extent of continued increase in and the effectiveness of educational opportunities (vocational as well as otherwise) for all people.

WAR

In the last 3,421 years of recorded history only 268 have been free of war. (This is less than 8%.)

"Peace is an unstable equilibrium, which can be preserved only by acknowledged supremacy or equal power."

"In the military interpretation of history, war is the final arbiter, and is accepted as natural and necessary by all but cowards and simpletons."

"Every philosopher, if he knows history, will admit that a long peace may fatally weaken the martial muscles of a nation."

One modern war, while it would promote science and technology, could destroy the constructive labor of centuries.

Only the victory of Charles Martel at Tours (732) kept France and Spain from becoming Mohammedan. What would have happened to our classic heritage if force of arms had not afforded protection from the invasions of the Mongols and Tatars?

The authors recognize the hot and cold war conflicts between communist and free nations, and the very real danger that communism may encircle and overcome the free nations by subversion (and force if necessary).

They believe that, while an all-out preventive war with communism would produce unparalleled destruction, it would actually cost less loss of life than would be suffered in defense of our homeland, and leave America free to live its own life in security and freedom.

Yet they boggle over this conclusion, and insist that somewhere, sometime, we must find a way to apply the golden rule in international affairs. They make some suggestions of how to go about it (but without much conviction).

They reluctantly admit that, if the lessons of history tell us anything in this context, it is that "a world order will not come by a gentlemen's agreement, but through so decisive a victory by one of the great powers that it will be able to dictate and enforce international law, as Rome did from Augustus to Aurelius." The authors give the last word to "the general" (i.e. the pragmatist), with this comment: "Such interludes of widespread peace are unnatural and exceptional; they will soon be ended by changes in the distribution of military power."

GROWTH AND DECAY

The authors assert that whether a civilization continues to grow, or disintegrates, depends upon whether and how new challenges are met, and that this "depends upon the presence or absence of initiative and of creative individuals with clarity of mind and energy of will, capable of effective responses to new situations. . . . In any case a challenge successfully met (as by the United States in 1917, 1933 and 1941), if it does not exhaust the victor (like England in 1945), raises the temper and level of a nation, and makes it able to meet further challenges."

Decay is the result of failure to respond adequately to new challenges. In the past such unmet challenges have included failure of water supply, exhaustion of the soil, replacement of free labor with slaves, changes in the instruments or routes of trade, a mounting burden of taxes, loss of foreign

markets and materials, excess of imports over exports, and "the concentration of wealth (which) may disrupt the nation in class or race war." The concentration of population and poverty in great cities may compel a government to choose between enfeebling the economy with a dole and running the risk of riot and revolution."

The spread of education destroys the credence of theologies. In the modern world, as in ancient Greece, "analytical thought (has) dissolved the religion that had buttressed the moral code. An age of weary skepticism and epicureanism followed the triumph of rationalism over mythology in the last century *before* Christianity and follows a similar victory today in the *first century after* Christianity."

The Durants accept this appraisal with philosophical equanimity. They observe that, while nations do, civilizations do not die *quite*; that, to the extent of the development of education, the seeds of the old civilization manage to survive, and, like a portion of yeast from an old batch, grow and flourish in the development of a new civilization. For example, they remind us that Homer and the other Greek poets and philosophers are read by more people today than ever in their own land and time, and state that "This selective survival of creative minds is the most real and beneficent of immortalities."

IS PROGRESS REAL?

Under this heading the Durants present a Gatling gun succession of questions. They say, since history records no substantial change in the nature of man, all technological advances must be written off as merely new means of achieving old ends. . . . The acquisition of goods, the overcoming of competition, the fighting of wars, and the pursuit of one sex by the other (or by the same).

Science, they say, is neutral. It will kill as readily as heal. It will destroy more readily (and more rapidly and completely) than it can build.

They sigh: "Sometimes we feel the middle ages and the Renaissance, which stressed mythology and art rather than sci-

ence and power, may have been wiser than we, who repeatedly enlarge our instrumentalities without improving our purposes."

"We frolic in our emancipation from theology but have we developed a natural ethic—a moral code independent of religion—strong enough to keep our instincts of acquisition, pugnacity and sex from debasing our civilization into a mire of greed, crime and promiscuity?"

"Have we really outgrown intolerance, or merely transferred it from religious to national, ideological or racial hostilities?"

"Have our laws offered the criminal too much protection against society and the state? *Have we given ourselves more freedom than our intelligence can digest?* Are we nearing such moral and social disorder that frightened parents will run back to Mother Church and beg her to discipline their children, at whatever cost to intellectual liberty?" (Last fall a prominent atheist did exactly that.)

The authors define progress as "the increasing control of the environment by life." And they say "Our problem is whether the average man has increased his ability to control the conditions of life."

In all but the lowest strata of society, "thousands, millions have reached mental and moral levels rarely found among primitive men." The authors cite as "real" progress the improved tables of mortality for European and American whites, and say that "We should recognize our good fortune in living today and not yesterday—even under Augustus or Pericles."

They insist that "we should not be greatly disturbed by the probability that our civilization will die like any other," and remind us that every civilization has been enriched by those which came before it.

Since education is the transmission belt of civilization we are unquestionably progressing. Civilization is not inherited; it has to be learned and earned anew by each generation. "If education were interrupted for one century, civilization would die *completely*, and we would be savages again."

Our finest contemporary achievement is the unprecedented expenditure of wealth and toil in the provision of higher or

vocational education for all. "We have (say the authors) raised the level and average of knowledge beyond any age in history."

"The heritage that we can now more fully transmit is richer than ever before. It is richer than that of Pericles, for it includes all the Greek flowering that followed him; richer than Leonardo's, for it includes him and the Italian Renaissance; richer than Voltaire's, for it embraces all the French enlightenment and its ecumenical dissemination. If progress is real despite our whining, it is not because we are born any healthier, better, or wiser than infants were in the past, but *because we were born to a richer heritage, born on a higher level of that pedestal which the accumulation of knowledge and art raises as the ground and support of our being.* The heritage rises, and man rises in proportion as he receives it."

"History is, above all else, the creation and recording of that heritage; progress is its increasing abundance, preservation, transmission and use. To those of us who study history not merely as a warning reminder of man's follies and crimes, but also as an encouraging remembrance of generative souls, the past ceases to be a depressing chamber of horrors; it becomes a celestial city, a spacious country of the mind, wherein a thousand saints, statesmen, inventors, scientists, poets, artists, musicians, lovers, and philosophers still live and speak, teach and carve and sing. The historian will not mourn because he can see no meaning in human existence except that which man puts into it; let it be our pride that we ourselves may put meaning into our lives, and sometimes a significance that transcends death. If a man is fortunate he will, before he dies, gather up as much as he can of his civilized heritage and transmit it to his children. And to his final breath he will be grateful for this inexhaustible legacy, knowing that it is our nourishing mother and our lasting life."

AGRICULTURE 2000 A.D. OR SOONER

RUDI E. SCHEIDT

Read Before "THE EGYPTIANS," March 20, 1969

One might well imagine a group such as this, meeting about one hundred years ago at a time when over half of the United States labor force were farmers and being given the projection that in one hundred years only 5% would be engaged in agriculture. They would very likely conclude that those left in farming would use their monopoly powers to get far more than a proportionate share of power, influence and resources. They might even assume that the power, prestige and influence then held in their day by the more than 50% of American people who farmed would be held by the 5%, or at least that the 5% of the American population who had a monopoly on food production, the most basic of all activities, would be able to exploit their commanding position to overwhelming effect. What could have been further from the truth!! From this it is quite obvious not only that looking into the future is hazardous, but particularly looking into the future of agriculture can be treacherous indeed.

So you may ask why do you wish to tread the dangerous path attempting to speculate on the year 2000 A.D.? Not too long ago I was startled to read, both in United Nations and United States Government publications, that the world's population is expected to almost double in the next thirty years. Yes, almost double in the next thirty years. Skyrocketing population is expected to add a staggering one million more people per week. In Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener's book, *The Year 2000*, they projected a world population in the year 2000 of 6.4 billion people, compared to the 1965 population of 3.3 billion. The projected 6.4 billion is not based on present population trends, which if projected to 2000 would yield a population of 7.2 billion, but rather on adjusted population growth rates made by the United Nations which assume reductions in population growth rates everywhere except black Africa. Although in their book, Kahn and Wiener practically omitted all discussion of agriculture, probably no other segment of the world's activities will be so greatly affected by the doubling of the world's population in just thirty years.

A starving and naked man knows no God and no country. A hungry and unclothed people do not keep their treaties nor keep their peace. Nor will they stay within their boundaries. Without question, one of the most gripping problems of the next thirty years is the race for food and fiber. At worst it will rock the world to its very axis. At best it will require every ounce of resources the world can muster to feed and clothe six billion people in the year two thousand. What kind of farms must we have to do this job?

To find these answers, the Ford Motor Company called first upon its own technical people to project the forward movement of agriculture. Next, scientists from major fields were convened at Michigan State University. Then a team of farm specialists canvassed hundreds of other scientists and agri-business expert from many countries. Much of the following is drawn from the consensus of these scores of top authorities as they see the amazing world of agriculture ahead—Agriculture 2000!

The efficient farmer of the year two thousand is a super breed of farmer, possessing super skills and super tools. The heart of his operation is his control center equipped with a wide array of electronic wizardry. Closed circuit televisions keeps him in touch with every farm job. Weather forecasts, market analysis and other valuable information are beamed in daily from government offices, trade associations and private services. It comes on data telephones, three dimensional color television channels and direct microwave circuits. His receivers also make printed copies. Important farm articles are stored on electronic tape in a far-off information center. When he wants to read a story, it's transmitted into his office and printed immediately.

He has his own computer to calculate chemical formulas, least-cost feed ratios and other short-term decisions. For more complex problems, he electronically beams his questions to huge memory computers at an agricultural university or commercial source, and consults with the best farm management brains in the world in a matter of seconds. But this is only the beginning.

Why will a farmer need such brain power? Because in the year two thousand his farm is much bigger, and vastly

more complex. A million dollars or more may be invested in the farm. That's three times or more today's commercial farm average. He grosses a half million dollars or more per year. The farmer of two thousand invests less of his own capital and borrows more. He operates under permanent debt, and keeps it at a fixed level. He hires men at the going rate of five to eight dollars an hour or more, plus incentives. Some large factory farms hire dozens of men. Family farms are still highly competitive, aided by new credit systems and other adjustments. He incorporates to make financing and ownership transfer easier. Companies compete for his business by offering elaborate service packages—feed formulating, prescription fertilizing, engineering consulting, linear programming, equipment leasing, and many others somewhat more advanced than those offered to manufacturing industry today. But before we proceed any further, let us take a look to see what kind of society we will live in in the year 2000 A.D.

Daniel Bell, Chairman of the Commission of the Year 2000 of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, has dubbed it as being the era of the post-industrial society in the United States. It will be characterized as a learning society, distinguished by superior educational institutions and techniques. A smaller percentage of people will be engaged in business. Business activities in the post-industrial society will play a much less dominant role compared to today and the issues of finance, investment, production and distribution that have so long been dominant concerns will muchly diminish in interest. The production orientated activities and their power and influence will probably decline similar to the agricultural influence in the past one hundred years. Kahn and Wiener estimate that the gross national product in the year two thousand in the United States, in 1965 dollars, will reach three to four trillion dollars or perhaps five times as much as our gross national product today. The Economic Report of the President, dated January, 1966, estimates the average gross hourly earnings in 2000 A.D. to be between eleven and twelve dollars in the manufacturing and construction industries. They estimate, however, that the average gross hourly earnings in agriculture will only be five to six dollars an hour. Quite obviously, whereas the economy of the year two thousand as a whole may be in the post-industrial level, that of agriculture will, like today, be somewhat behind the economy as a whole.

But, on with Agriculture 2000 A.D.—an amazing story when one considers all of us remember the mule, the plow, the sharecroppers shack, and visualize that in the year two thousand crops and livestock the farmer produces are shipped in air conditioned trucks, monorail cars, or even by helicopter. He sells on contracts that spell out quantity, quality and price before he plants his seed or breeds his sows. Some produce may even be shipped on giant jets big enough to hold huge semi-trailers. His farm produces a wondrous variety of taste and nutrition sold in pushbutton supermarkets, or ordered directly from a homemaker's kitchen and includes such products as uncooked beef and poultry that need no refrigeration, thanks to atomic sterilization. He produces meats artificially made from soybeans and other vegetable protein, and milk from cows bred to supply specific nutrition.

By the year two thousand yields will zoom from eighty bushels per acre corn to five hundred bushel corn, from two bale per acre cotton to ten bale cotton, and farmers will harvest three hundred bushel wheat, one hundred seventy-five bushel soybeans, thirty ton forage, and thirty thousand pounds of milk per cow, and one thousand pounds of beef at ten months of age. Such amazing yields won't come overnight, but ideas on test today will be widespread on farms a decade from now. They are the forerunners for the fantastic farms of tomorrow. Double-cropping may be possible in many areas, thus even doubling these yields for many crops.

Here is how today's research will develop in the next few years to set the stage for the year two thousand.

A few years from now, chemical growth regulators will protect crops like citrus from temperatures twenty or thirty degrees below zero. These chemicals already are pumping new vigor into soybean yields by causing more blossoms to mature. Many seeds will soon come coated with a mix of fertilizers and chemicals, so you don't have to apply each separately. The idea is used now with sugar beets.

By 1980, one hundred fifty horsepower diesels will be old hat. Some monsters will be double or triple that size and may run continuously. Planters covering a width of forty feet or more in one sweep across a field will whiz along at ten to twenty miles per hour. They'll be self-propelled or powered

by a tractor designed especially for implement carrying. Some highly sophisticated equipment will run without an operator by 1980. We already have a machine that travels along vegetable rows picking ripe produce by radio impulse. Scientists also are on the verge of releasing hormones that allow a mother to produce twice as many lambs, or pigs or calves. Another gadget today bounces high frequency sound waves through a steer's flesh. Echoes tell the exact shape and weight of every meat cut. Soon farmers will use it to select their breeding stock.

Corn fields in the year two thousand will turn out whopping yields of five hundred bushels or more per acre. Plants shaped like pine trees will lap up extra sun's energy, and ears may be attached near the top for easier harvesting. Hybridization will turn out stiff strawed wheat, long fibered cotton, and forage with more blossoms. A farmer may plant high protein corn varieties for humans, high energy corn for cattle, and high oil corn for processing industries. He will grow a pair of crops in the time it takes to grow one today, thanks to short season hybrids. A corn hybrid on test right now matures in less than ten weeks, compared to the normal seventeen or eighteen weeks. He may grow two varieties of cotton also, one for high oil content and another for the fiber industry. Breeders will bombard crops with radioactive rays to come up with more desirable traits. And there will be some entirely new crops by crossing germ plasms from conventional crops.

A farmer will prepare the soil and plant these potent crops with powerful new machines. Tractors of the year two thousand will be powered by electric drive, fuel cells or efficient storage batteries.

Many machines will run without any operator at all. They may follow a field pattern stored on computer memory tapes, or be guided by wires buried in the field, or by sensing devices that guide a machine over patterned furrows. This driverless equipment might be observed on an electronic field map in the farm control center, much like radar follows a plane on a flight pattern.

Farmers may do some jobs from the air with a helicopter or hovercraft. Engineers have already built one machine that lifts off the ground by low air pressure to spray cranberry vines on rough ground. Yet another approach to field work might be a bridge-type tractor system. It combines farming on land

and farming from the air. All jobs are done by programmed machines traveling on a bridge that spans the field. They work in all kinds of weather. Two power units—possibly on line from a central farm power plant—run on roadbeds at either side of the field and support the bridge. Two implements travel the length of the bridge in opposite directions.

In the year two thousand, soil may be tilled in several ways. It's possible that machines won't even work the soil directly. They may fracture and condition it by ultrasonic waves instead. Another possibility is a machine that scoops up a ribbon of soil, conditions it, then lays the seed, fertilizer and chemicals in a perfectly prepared seedbed.

Some farmers may plant crops by shooting seed pellets directly into the soil by pneumatic injection. They could plant in off seasons using seeds coated with chemicals that hold them dormant until nature's time clock says grow. The idea would smooth out seasonal labor demands. Some of these machines will work around the clock, and seed, fertilizer and other supplies will be delivered right to the field by rail or by company trucks.

The farmer of two thousand will still contend with Mother Nature's whims but he'll lessen their sting. He'll control water needs by irrigating more. He might lay asphalt or other material under the top two feet of soil to hold water better. And some of his crops will have leaves bred especially to cut down evaporation. In bad drouths, he'll spray with chemicals that close the tiny leaf openings to greatly reduce evaporation.

He will fertilize much heavier than today, with nutrients coated with chemicals so a gradual flow is released over the season, or perhaps over several seasons. Fertilizing may be done only once every three or four years. He will also fertilize the air with carbon dioxide. With extremely high yields, carbon dioxide becomes a limiting factor. Plant breeders will also reshape leaf canopies to catch and hold more carbon dioxide from the air.

Insects and diseases will be spotted long before they gain a toehold. Space ships with remote sensing devices will circle the earth and report the condition of crops on a nationwide basis, according to the kind and amount of light the earth

reflects. The idea is in experimental stages now. When an insect infestation is detected, a farmer will spray with ultra low volumes of powerful chemicals at a fraction of an ounce per acre. Then he may match good bugs against bad bugs, use invisible light ray traps and other forms of biological control. He'll kill weeds with powerful chemicals, ultrasonic sound or perhaps radiation.

Growth regulators will give him power to make crops grow, mature and die on command. These manmade chemicals will have the same makeup as the natural hormones that regulate all plant growth. The computer will tell whether to speed up plant growth or maturity. This is calculated on the basis of market demand. A farmer will harvest some of his crops using machines equipped with electronic eyes and computerized fingers—the grandchildren of today's fruit and vegetable harvesters. They will pick, sort, and package crops right in the field. Other crops like cotton may be stripped by ultrasonic sound, then moved by vacuum air streams to a central processing plant.

Another possibility is a chain reaction cropping machine. It could harvest one crop, prepare the soil for the next one and plant in one trip over the field.

One of the most astonishing sights on the farming horizon will be huge plastic or glass domes, sprawling over ten acres or more of high value crops. Light, water, and nutrient uptake will be precisely controlled and plants protected from all pests. Photographic units in the dome will record minute plant growth, and a farmer will then dial the exact environment needed for maximum output.

One prediction scientists say is far out, but still possible, is to identify groups of animals by radiation signals. The signals would record how much feed and water each consumes, and this would be compared to weight change over a period of time. From this data, a farmer could figure the precise feed ration each animal needs.

Genetic formulas will unveil superior livestock by the year two thousand. And a farmer will be able to call his shots precisely—perhaps to the point of pre-ordering the exact number of males and females from his breeding herd.

Computer records and blood tests will show a farmer his best cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry. Today one steer puts on a pound of beef with ten pounds of feed. In 2000 A.D. only half that much feed will be required for the same gain.

Today good growers market a broiler in eight weeks on nine pounds of feed. By the year two thousand, it will only take four pounds of feed and five weeks of time, using highly purified rations readily converted to meat.

Top hog men who today need about three pounds of feed for one pound of pork will use just a half to a third that much in the year two thousand.

Beef animals will average close to twelve hundred pounds at one year of age, instead of the normal seven hundred fifty pounds today.

A farmer will ship some of his produce live, and he may process some right on the farm. Poultry men will clean eggs by ultrasonic waves and grade them by ultraviolet light. Dairy-men may have automatic heat sensing equipment that milks cows and pipes the milk directly to processing without being touched by human hands.

These new breeds, new feeds, new seeds, and new equipment paint a magnificent panorama of the food and fiber producing giants of the year two thousand. They are ripe with hope and promise for the entire world. But contrasted against this glittering picture of agriculture in the developed nations, the future of less fortunate countries is jolting. In Pakistan today, wheat yields are as low as they were in England in the fifteenth century. India's rice yields are no higher than Japan's ten centuries ago. So the elaborate food producing system of the year two thousand may have to be backstopped by still other production ideas. Some of these are, farming the seas with hybrid trout ranches fenced by sound waves; feeding human beings on algae—the green lake scum that produces one hundred fifty times more food per acre than a bumper crop of soybeans; harvesting deserts made to bloom by irrigation; and building vast microbe refineries to raise rich proteins from oil, as we now raise beef from grass. Man is working on these and other ideas now.

What will bring these changes about? Are they realistic? Practically all the above ideas are in the embryonic stages in our laboratories today. The improvements will be brought about (1) by the demands of the six billion people, (2) by not only the high cost of wages, but also by the lack of availability of labor in certain areas, (3) by the economic needs for improved farm income, and (4) by the competitive factor of synthetically produced food and fiber. What is the most serious danger of their not coming about? There are ominous signs today of agricultural research not being sufficiently funded and also not sufficiently guided and directed. Perhaps the greatest danger of all is that the present era of apparent surplus of food and fiber will leave us without the structure upon which to build for the challenge of the Year 2000.

**“ MEMPHIS METROPOLITAN AIRPORT
EXPANSION ”**

E. W. COOK, JR.

At the April 17, 1969 meeting of The Egyptians, Mr. E. W. Cook, Jr. gave an illustrated lecture with slides and maps entitled—

“Memphis Metropolitan Airport Expansion Covering the Acquisition and Expansion of the Memphis Airport from approximately 1932 to 1985.”