THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

1888—Sixty-Fifth Anniversary Year—1953

THOMAS L. ROBINSON ..... Publisher
J. E. DOWD ..... General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH ..... Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT ..... Editor

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1953

Contradictions--At Home And Abroad

(The following is an excerpt from the central portion of an address by Eric Sevareid, CBS commentator, before the Charlotte Executives Club here Monday night. Edu., The News.)

IT IS my argument that we are living through a historic moment of transition, rapidly developing, and which started to break, at least in its obvious manifestations, only within the last year; and that this is true in every consequential field from the American domestic political parties and the American economy and government, to European re-adjustment, Soviet world policy and world military strategy.

Consider a few of the familiar molds that are breaking in front of our eyes, and the conflicting implications that therefore confront us:

In domestic politics, the technique of success has changed. The public methods of the advertising man are replacing the private methods of the back-room boys. The system of the local leader, favors, pledges and personal obligations, is dying out, replaced by a system of mass suggestion. The machinery of mass circulation is taking over from the old political machine of interlocking personal acquaintance.

This tends to shrink away small personal contacts, and may be tending to make big corruptions easier, especially the corruption of truth, for mass production of anything, from tractors to ideas, must tend always to oversimplify the parts.

DEMOCRATIC LOSSES

The Democratic party, which presided over the greatest period of prosperity the country has known, has suddenly lost strength in one of its traditional bases of support, by reason of that prosperity, for millions of laborers have acquired savings, moved to the suburbs, bought their own homes, have become as concerned with taxes as with wages and have thus identified themselves with the great middle-class, as what has happened in England since the war.

The same party has suddenly lost much of its northern big city base in the great immigrant groups, chiefly Irish and Italian; simply because, in the passage of time, they have become economically and psychologically absorbed into this melting pot and no longer have such a sense of special identity, with special needs of protection.

The same party, which gave the green light to the establishment of big labor has suffered losses of independent labor, partly because labor has become so big, so strong that its members no longer feel unsafe.

The traditional roots of this party in the South have been torn and trampled, not, perhaps so much because of old issues of states rights as because of the new, rapid growth of a business middle-class in these years of southern industrialization — a class repeating the social experience of Midwestern cities thirty years ago, and instinctively finding its allegiance in conservatism, feeling a practical kinship with like-minded persons in distant states.

REPUBLICAN TRENDS

We have seen the Republican party, historically the chief repository of American isolationism, pretty well win its showdown with the isolationists. We have seen this party, a more or less guardian of the civil supremacy and suspicious of the military, reach far out from the current of civilian statesmanship and put its fate into the hands of a professional soldier, who rose to fame in association with a Democratic party regime and became the military architect of a foreign alliance repugnant to many within his own party.

We saw this leader win, last year, the most savage and bitter struggle imaginable against the old guard, the conservatives of his party and we have seen him immediately give them concession after concession until their party power is now again very great.

We witnessed the remarkable phenomenon of this leader, throwing all his immense prestige behind every party candidate, without exception, and yet fail to bring into the Congress more than the barest majority of his party; we have seen a man win with the overpowering majority of six million votes, and have seen in the same election, his party in the House, where all districts were at stake, win a total of votes less than that of the minority party.

We are today seeing the minority party, historically strongest in the Midwest, historically the champion of the midwest farmer, running into its first serious trouble anywhere else but among the midwest farmers.

ANOTHER CONTRADICTION

In Chicago the other day, I saw the defeated Presidential candidate, a man who, judging by the crushing scope of his defeat, should now be as forgotten and finished as Alf Landon in 1937. But I saw a man whose daily incoming mail is almost as great as that of the President himself; a man besieged with hundreds of speaking invitations from every corner of our land, and as he discovered to his own astonishment, a man who has become a legend figure, who has fired imaginations in every corner of the free world, to a greater extent, apparently, even than the President.

All this, I can put together, but I cannot add it up. Anyone who can say today what all these scrambled inconsistencies mean for our political party future would be clairvoyant, indeed.

CONDUCT OF GOVERNMENT

When we try to apply this same kind of bird's-eye view to the present conduct of government in Washington we can immediately see several lines of action which do seem consistent and comprehensible; these have mostly to do with the housekeeping aspect of government—increasing its operating efficiency, clearing away accumulated dead wood, installing less tired minds, reducing running costs, increasing the integrity of ethics and probity, simplifying and clarifying the relationships in the great jungle of agences and bureaus. All this, I think, has been pretty logical and sensible.

But when we look above and beyond this, even allowing for the fact that a wholly new set of men require time to orient themselves to their power, another set of basic contradictions and conflicts immediately rise into view.

The unexpected has come, first of all, in the person of the President himself has taken to his own role as the Chief Executive. Millions voted for him because they wanted an especially strong and forceful hand at the helm. Yet he made it clear, in word and deed, that he has no wish to be a strong president, but wishes instead to halt the trend of a generation toward executive government.

Millions of Americans look to him, caring little about his lieutenants and what they may do, while he looks to his lieutenants more than any president in recent times. Millions expected, I think, that he would take the initiative

ERIC SEVAREID

in hewing out a new line of domestic and foreign policy, yet his whole approach is that of a presiding officer, a kind of chairman of the board, smoothing over, compromising the conflicts of ideas and operations among the executives of the company.

His political party swayed through to a majority only by reason of his coat-tails; his every whim could be party law; and yet he is taking the view that party matters should be left to others; this is in direct contradiction to the experience of the last 20 years, in which the only successful presidents were presidents who firmly directed their political party.

EMPHASIZES PARTY UNITY

In his relations with Congress, and in spite of most painful injuries the extreme right-wing of his own party has done, he has proceeded on the assumption that party unity is all important; again ignoring, so it seems to me, the historic truth that the governing rule for pushing through almost any policy line has been party coalition in Congress, shifting constantly, of course, but always nourished and attended to.

Men and women of all walks of our life voted for the President, and he has indeed conceived himself as the President of all; yet he has filled the government more exclusively with men from one particular level of life—large business—than the two preceding administrations were filled from labor, the intellectuals, business or anything else.

People were tired, I thought, of partisanship last year, and politically, they thought of Eisenhower as a national unity candidate. And yet, so far as I can measure it, there is less bi-partisanship in the posts of his administration than there was in Truman's; less bi-partisanship even in the conduct of foreign policy, which, previously, the supposed lack of it was a primary Republican complaint.

MAY BE RIGHT

Now, I am not contending that all this is wrong or that it cannot succeed; this may yet turn out to be a highly successful administration, and if it should, then all these methods can be called as right as any other. What I am saying is that most of all this is contradictory of expectations, and, since we can only measure against past experience, puzzling to many who observe it, and completely unsettling of any firm prediction.

When we look at the great lines of American policy as they affect other parts of the world, we again see some strange developments, not all of them disturbing, by any means, but many of them strangely contradictory of what might have been expected.

The new men were to be more aggressively positive in dealing with world communism than the old administration, which, we were told, was too soft toward communism. And yet in response to an undoubted public yearning that the stalemated Korean War be ended, the new men have signed a truce which the previous leadership probably would not have signed, as much too advantageous to the Reds.

It was the honest belief of the new administrators that previous foreign policy had been made up as we went along, from crisis to crisis; that there was no consistent policy for the long pull; and that, except perhaps for the sudden, blind plunge into Korea in 1950, we have probably seen no bigger example of ad hoc diplomacy than laying on of the forthcoming Korean Peace Conference, which is also a stab in the dark, with hardly a shred of confidence in Washington that it can succeed.

It was the argument of the new men, last year, that containment of Communist imperialism was not enough, that we must actively, aggressively help the satellite peoples to roll Soviet power back into Russia itself, where it belongs. But the other day, the Secretary of State, the chief exponent of last year's argument, publicly assured the Russians that the United States is not in the business of exporting revolts and rebellions.

We are not only not proceeding beyond containment, we are reducing the pressures of our containment operations, themselves. The scale of direct economic aid to most areas of freedom has been reduced; except in Indochina, the rate of military assistance to foreign allies and friends has been throttled down; in some areas, the plans for the point-four, technical aid to improve human living conditions and thus reduce the temptations of Communism, this too, is being cut back. The American-directed attempt to keep West-East trade away from the Communist areas is slowly giving way, and the progress toward reducing American tariff restrictions as a partial substitute outlet for our foreign surpluses seems to be, momentarily, on dead center.

The pattern of six years American policy toward Europe is beginning to break up and change, the pattern of Soviet policy toward Europe, at least for the immediate future, has already changed considerably; all around, the big powers and their associates are groping for a new set of relationships . . .

When we look at the trees of this European political forest, we see a Britain no longer on the verge of bankruptcy, thanks in good part to more generosity, and of a Britain in a very considerable anti-American mood; we see the Low Countries and the Scandinavian countries doing well, as before, and Western Germany headed cool, as before. We see France, our ancient friend, considerably anti-American; France, the West's most vital military power on the Continent, militarily feeble; France, fiercely democratic, on the verge of failure in the conduct of democratic government.

We see Germany traditionally unemployed, perhaps the most enthusiastic democracy in Europe; Germany, our ancient enemy, perhaps more pro-American than any continental country; Germany, whose ultimate aims we have held under suspicion for 50 years, rapidly replacing France as our first ally on the continent; Germany, wr-devastated as no other country, economically thriving above nearly all other nations in Europe.

We see Italy, which conducted an extremely stable democratic government for seven years, to everyone's surprise considering the moral erosion of Fascism's 20 years, now suddenly thrown into the parliamentary chaos that characterizes France. We see Yugoslavia, exponent of the Communism we fear and hate, now just about single-handedly keeping military ally on the continent. And we see the satellite countries, while completely in the military grip of Moscow, psychologically out of control, presenting an ever more desperate problem for the Russians.

Standing off and looking at the whole forest, we see a Western Europe that is, on the whole, much stronger economically, and militarily, yet politically and psychologically tired; tired of the strain of the cold war, tired of forced measures. A Europe, saved once by American military intervention, saved again by American economic intervention, today increasingly impatient with America, suspicious about American leadership, almost equating American activity with Soviet aggression and almost ready to say a plague on both your houses, to the two colossi.

What has happened? Has the six-year American policy of containment and rescue, under Truman, been a failure, as right-wing Republicans would have us believe? Has Soviet policy undergone a basic change, giving up all further hope of world rule for communism, as European Socialists would have us believe? Has the Eisenhower administration abdicated American world leadership and the spectacle of McCarthyism frightened off Europe, as so many Democrats would have us believe?

I do not believe any one of these explanations is the real and complete explanation, and I am inclined to believe that we would have reached essentially this same phase of events, even if the Republicans had not been elected, even if Stalin had not left the scene, even if McCarthy had never been heard of. We may not have reached it quite so quickly and sharply, but we would have reached it just the same.

OF CHAPEL HILL AND COMMIES IN THE 30'S

WHEN the state papers gave a ride this week to testimony about communist activities in Chapel Hill in the middle and late 30's, it stirred memories and sent us to the dusty office files.

A good deal of the story was laid out there—not in all the precise detail that the Welker subcommittee reported. Some of the names were missing. There was little about the Abernathy's bookstore, though hundreds of Tar Heels who passed through the University in those years will remember that the place was a hangout for wild-eyed reformers who browsed through literature that, if not communist, was certainly radical by the standards of those days. But the names of Alton Lawrence, Arnold Williams, Prof. Eston E. Ericson and others appeared, and it was spread upon the record that strange goings-on were afoot.

It was during those days that Charlotte's David Clark was waging his one-man campaign against communists at the University—though Mr. Clark didn't limit his attacks to Reds. Any professor or any student who deviated even slightly from the textile publisher's own tight definition of Americanism got coals heaped upon his head.

There was a big fuss when Professor Ericson had lunch with the Negro Communist Candidate Ford in Durham. Dr. Frank P. Graham, then president of the University, while admitting Ericson's "indiscretion" in an interview with THE NEWS, defended him against those who would have his scalp. And this newspaper said editorially:

"Therefore, thoroughly resentful of the bad taste and the exhibitions of the professor who went where he had no business to go, who has rendered the University and the cause of racial understanding a notable disservice, who is certain, even if this business is smoothed over, to break out again in another place—thoroughly resentful of these things, we say, we believe we will string along nevertheless on the side of tolerance. The other side is sure to be so well represented."

Even the nonconformist campus newspaper, the *Daily Tar Heel*, found nothing good to say about Arnold Williams, who was described by Witness Crouch as "one of the leaders of the Communist group on the campus." An editorial in THE NEWS of Sept. 30, 1937, quotes the *Tar Heel* as saying:

"Arnold Williams, who is remembered on this campus for his introduction of communist theory into freshman English courses, has left the University for a position on the faculty of the Missouri School of Mines. Williams received his doctor of philosophy degree here and taught freshman English for several years. Many times he was scored for leading class discussions that were pro-communist in nature rather than devoting class time to the study of grammar."

And there was the public outcry when Dr. Graham put up bond for the 22-year-old Alton Lawrence, another person cited as a communist by Crouch, after he was arrested for trespass in a strike incident at High Point. The story got big play over the state (Lawrence was subsequently cleared) and THE NEWS concluded an editorial on the subject like this:

"It is true that our own assiduously cultivated liberalism withers somewhat before the blasts of the rampant Kid Socialist Lawrence, who seems determined either to upset the present order or to persuade others to do it for him, but he will be nonetheless ineffective for having been released from jail on Frank Graham's bond."

The depression was not over when these events took place at Chapel Hill. A good many young men who lived through the collapse of the American economic system were toying with new and radical ideas, and the communists, who never miss a good bet, were active not only in Chapel Hill but in many other American college towns.

Fortunately, steadier minds fought against the hysteria and witchhunting of a few professional critics of the University, and the University went serenely along its way. And so far as we can tell, no permanent damage was done to any of our institutions.

The Welker subcommittee report may serve some useful purpose in reminding Tar Heels—if indeed they need to be reminded again—that the party made an effort to establish itself in North Carolina in the middle and late 30's. But it is also useful to point out how miserably it failed. In 1948, Mary Price ran for governor on the Progressive Party ticket. All the communists, pinks, fellow travelers, socialists and whatnot put together gave her only 3,364 votes out of a total vote of 780,525.

If there are communists in Chapel Hill today, we don't know about them. Even the Juvenile Junius Scales, who used to send out party literature from a Chapel Hill mailing address, seems to have skittered for cover.

A GRAVER INJUSTICE THIS WOULD BE

IT HAS BEEN suggested by a Washington reporter that Judge John J. Parker's opinion upholding segregation in the Clarendon County (S. C.) case might be used as an argument against his appointment to the Supreme Court by those who are backing other candidates.

If the President gives any weight to such an argument, he will be doing Judge Parker an even graver injustice than that done by the U. S. Senate in 1930 when he was unfairly charged with being "anti-labor." For the Charlotte jurist has probably decided more cases helpful to U. S. Negroes than any other judge in the land.

Our files are not complete, but we can recall offhand the Richmond zoning ordinance case, in which Judge Parker held unconstitutional a Richmond ordinance forbidding Negroes to own property in white sections; the Norfolk school case, in which he reversed a lower court and held that Negro school teachers should get equal pay for equal work; the University of Virginia law school case, upholding the right of Negroes to admission.

And then there was the South Carolina case, first heard before Judge Waites Waring and later upheld by Judge Parker on appeal, that gave Negroes the right to participate in primary elections. There have been several decisions participated in by Judge Parker which forbade labor unions to discriminate against Negroes, and there was the case involving the Baltimore public library in which Judge Parker ruled out discrimination against Negroes in library instruction.

There probably were others. But those are enough to show that the Charlottean definitely does not approve the "unholy denial of equal rights," as one of our letter writers said the other day.

What else could any honest jurist have done in the Clarendon County case?

In the Louisiana school case over a quarter of a century ago, the U. S. Supreme Court said unequivocally that segregation in public schools does not violate the constitution if equal facilities are afforded. That is the law, and any lower court judge would be presumptuous indeed to overrule a Supreme Court decision by such men as Chief Justice Taft and Justices Holmes, Stone and Brandeis.

It would be a real tragedy to deny advancement to a distinguished judge merely because he has refused to change the law.

WHAT IS THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME?

UNLIKE many public lecturers who seem to know all the answers, CBS commentator Eric Sevareid spoke with refreshing and disarming honesty and candor to the Charlotte Executives Club Monday night. He admitted very frankly that "I have never known a time in these postwar years when I felt so uncertain as to just where we are, to say nothing of where we are going."

And then, in a long section of his address which is reprinted elsewhere on this page today, he showed how completely scrambled are the facts upon which Americans must base their ideas, how events of the past year have violated traditions and upset expectations.

Within the framework of these contradictions, however, he voiced several broad opinions—or guesses—about the future turn of events.

Russia, he said, has abandoned its scheme of direct aggression or internal seizures, because the rearming of the free world has left no soft and safe targets, and the risks are now too great. Stalin failed to neutralize Europe and to envelop Japan via Korea, and found he had to reckon with U. S. rearmament.

Europe, too, has slowed down its rearmament because the Russian threat seems to have diminished, because Europe now has minimum defenses, and because Europe is better off economically.

And finally, America has slowed down its defense programs—because of the change in Russian tactics, because Americans are tired of rescuing and subsidizing the rest of the world, because they are tired of being disliked by other peoples.

"The world seems to have reached a kind of seventh inning stretch in this game of cold war," Sevareid continued, as he forecast that Russia and America would continue to grow stronger, with Europe developing as a buffer between them.

And the end of cold war? The speaker saw two broad alternatives:

1. Depression and collapse of the U. S. economic system, in which case "we would lose (the world) into communism or into working agreements with communism."

2. The internal collapse of "the Bolshevik apparatus and dictatorship in Soviet Russia."

Of the two, he voiced the belief that the second is "bound to occur one day, if only we can prevent the first from intervening."

It was, on the whole a very gloomy report from a young man who has seen much of the world's military, political and social troubles of the past 20 years. He could, of course, have ended on a note of hope and confidence that would have sent his audience away feeling happier. But he doesn't see it that way, and he would have been untrue to his profession to say so.

One sure way to conserve food is to tell a youngster a certain dish is good for him.—*Arkansas Gazette.*

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Progress Slow On Deporting Undesirables

WASHINGTON

THOUGH Democrat Jim McGranery is ex-attorney general and Republican Herbert Brownell is attorney general, they remain good friends. And when Brownell moved into the Justice Department for six months, he invited McGranery, the man he succeeded, to lunch.

Most of the top lawyers in the new Republican Justice Department were at the lunch and, as it closed, Brownell turned to McGranery and said:

"Jim, this is our six-month birthday. Have you any advice for us?"

"No," replied McGranery, "I don't think I have any advice—even on your six-month birthday. But the period of gestation is nine months. And if you'll invite me back in another three months, I'll tell you whether the baby has a father."

Eight months have now passed as of this writing, and the time is not yet for ex-Attorney General McGranery to come back and pronounce judgment on the work of his old department. However, here is one phase he might start looking into.

While Brownell, on the whole, is operating one of the best departments in the Eisenhower administration, some of the corruption cleanups promised by the Republicans haven't been mowing at anywhere near the pace promised.

One of the most important, the deportation of gangsters and underworld characters illegally residing in the United States, has been especially slow. Though McGranery listed 1,325 criminals and underworld leaders illegally in this country, only two have been deported in the eight months that have passed since Jan. 20.

The Justice Department explains that 20 gangsters are almost ready to be deported; also, that it takes time to prepare the papers and hear various appeals. A considerable number of subversives have been added to McGranery's list, it is also stated.

Nevertheless, two criminals deported out of 133 in eight months seems like awfully slow work.

NOTE—The most important man to watch will be Frankie Costello and what happens to him. Costello has more political pull in both political parties than almost anyone else in New York City.

Searching For Secretary

IKE and his scouts have contacted about everyone on the labor front looking for a good man to take Martin Durkin's place as secretary of labor.

Chief Scout is Vice President Nixon, who used the opportunity to make a little political hay with certain labor people. Obviously you don't make enemies when you call up a labor leader or a Congressman who's not been too enthusiastic about Nixon in the past and ask him how he would like to be secretary of labor.

Among those contacted have been Ray Le Haney, able head of the Teamsters Union in Los Angeles, and, Congressman Sam McConnell of Philadelphia. Le Haney is secretary-treasurer of the AFL Union Label & Service Trades and a comer in labor ranks. But he's too forthright a labor man to be accepted into the Eisenhower cabinet, and Nixon must have known it.

Congressman McConnell is a middle-of-the-road, fair-minded banker who would make an excellent secretary of labor, but whose exit from the House Labor Committee of which he is chairman would be a bad blow to labor.

'No Positive Loyalty'

A lot of State Department officials are being "allowed" to resign these days on the charge that they don't have enough "positive loyalty" to the new administration.

U. S. Ambassador to Russia Chip Bohlen is not among them. But following the arrest of Marshal Beria in Moscow, Bohlen was ordered back to Washington for consultation. The message from John Foster Dulles was so urgent that Bohlen took a tourist plane instead of sleeper ship, arrived in Washington exhausted and haggard.

To Bohlen's amazement, he had five minutes with Dulles, wasn't consulted on anything.

A few days later, at a cocktail party, Bohlen ran into Lord Salisbury, British delegate to the Big 3 conference of foreign ministers.

"How did you like the communique we issued, Mr. Ambassador?" Lord Salisbury asked Bohlen.

"I liked it all except the part on Russia," Bohlen replied.

"Well, why didn't you complain about it?" asked the British delegate.

"I was brought back for consultation," Bohlen said, "but no one consulted me."

A moment later, the somewhat irked ambassador was sought out by able, fast-thinking C. D. Jackson of the White House staff, also attending the reception.

"Tell me, Chip," Jackson asked, "why do you think the Russians knocked off Beria?"

"I guess," replied the ambassador, "he didn't have enough positive loyalty to the new administration."

Socrates On The Loop

(An Editorial From The Richmond News Leader)

FOR quite some time Socrates had been intending to seek out a few of his younger friends in the Athens on Lake Michigan where he was then residing, and that morning he set out in the hope of finding them in the market place. He had scarcely begun his search before he came across young Adlitus and his older comrade Trumanides; they were leaning a bit wearily against a corner of the Congress Hotel, but on seeing Socrates their bloodshot eyes lit up and they accosted him warmly. It developed that they had spent the night before in merriment at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, where they had banqueted with fellow Democrats. The session had been a long and smoky one, but they were highly pleased by their oratory and could not wait to boast of it to Socrates.

"What did you talk about?" asked Socrates, drawing them out.

"Why about the Republicans, of course," replied Trumanides, "especially about the current Republican administration."

"You denounced it, then?"

"It was never denounced more fervently," said Adlitus. "The Republican program will mean the ruin of the nation."

"That is indeed a sad state of affairs," observed Socrates. "To contribute to the ruin of the nation surely is the gravest of all political offenses."

"Surely."

"And those who contribute to the ruin of the nation are not to be trusted with high office?"

"Manifestly not."

"What did you say of the recent accomplishments of the Democratic party in the Congress?"

"Our position on that is perfectly clear," said Adlitus. "The Democrats have been the salvation of the President's program."

"Yes?"

"Oh, yes, indeed. Without Democratic votes the President never could have won an extension of the excess profits tax. His foreign aid bills would have failed miserably. Southern Democrats were especially valuable in enactment of the Tidelands bill. We were in great part responsible for the reorganization of the Federal Security Administration. Without Democratic support the President would have lost at every turn."

"Then the Democrats have contributed heavily to the program of the current Republican administration?"

"Beyond question," said Adlitus. "The record is fully documented in the Democrats' new magazine, Democratic Digest."

"But I believe you said the current Republican administration is bringing the country to ruin?"

"Yes."

"And that no person who contributes to the ruin of the nation is to be trusted with high office?"

"Therefore," said Socrates. "does it not follow that the Democrats are not to be trusted with high office?"

"Socrates," said Trumanides a bit testily, "it was very smoky in there last night and our heads hurt. You have led Adlitus into a trap that does not exist. What he intended to say was that we Democrats have helped only with the good things and opposed only the evil things."

"Then the Republican administration has done some good things?"

"It is entirely too early in the morning for this sort of discussion," said Adlitus unhappily. "Let us all repair to the Pump Room where maybe I can think of something funny to say. Have you heard the one about the two Irishmen?"

"I have," replied Socrates, as he forged along the Loop. "And besides, I would much rather discourse with you young gentlemen on the matter of deficit finance. It seems to me I detect a certain inconsistency in your views."

Hearing no reply, Socrates cast a glance over his shoulder and was not surprised to find that his companions had left him. Being a philosopher, he returned to Michigan Boulevard and whiled away the morning in talk with the pigeons, whose conversation, on the whole, he found to be considerably more lucid and informative than that of his young companions.