

## May 31, 1947

Don Hollenbeck's first broadcast established the format, focus, and voice of *CBS Views the Press*. The program's voice was that of an authoritative, fair, no-nonsense skeptic. The voice's toughness may have owed a debt to a suggestion by Hollenbeck's boss, Edward R. Murrow, to send a first draft of the broadcast's script to *Herald Tribune* columnist John Crosby for his comment. Crosby, a friend to both Hollenbeck and Murrow, recommended Hollenbeck give the broadcast a harder edge. Hollenbeck did so, describing the critical coverage by New York papers of welfare families' temporary residence in hotels as a "newspaper lynching party." Hollenbeck's focus over the two and a half years of his *CBS Views the Press* was on media abuse of the vulnerable and defenseless. He returned to the hotel relief story a dozen times. The first broadcast also established the program's usual format: a main story followed by several brief laurels and darts. Reaction to Hollenbeck's program ranged from rave reviews to a Red-baiting rebuke. Writers for *PM*, the *Herald Tribune*, and other newspapers praised the program's courage and discretion. A trade magazine quoted Keats Speed, executive editor of the *Sun*, as saying, "Several newspapers follow the Communist line, so why shouldn't a radio station?"<sup>1</sup>

THE GREAT INK-LETTING which resulted from the disclosure that a number of New York City families on relief had been housed in hotels has abated some, after having for about a week resembled a kind of newspaper lynching party. The immediate victims were 37 families, representing about 120 persons, who had been housed in hotel rooms by the city's Department of Welfare on the ground that it had been unable to provide adequate shelter for them elsewhere.

1. "CBS Station in New York Starts Criticism of Press," *Editor & Publisher*, June 7, 1947, 11.

May 31, 1947

The lynching was a success—if you can call a lynching a success. The families have been hustled from their hotel rooms; at first they were put into condemned tenements and the city lodging houses, of which more later. All in all, it was about as sorry an exhibition as the press—or a section of it—is capable of putting on. It began in the *World-Telegram*, under circumstances in themselves extremely interesting and which will be discussed later. The stories told how some relief families were being supported in what was made to sound like the lap of luxury, living in what were described as midtown, Herald Square, and Murray Hill hotels and apparently drawing checks of fantastic proportions every month. The story was quickly taken up by every newspaper in town, from one point of view or another. It was one of those things which couldn't be ignored. It even got into vaudeville: Jack Benny opened his stage show at the Roxy, and one of his jokes was that he was being treated so handsomely at the Sherry-Netherland Hotel that people thought he was on relief.

In the *News*, Danton Walker wrote, and I quote, “New York's current charity scandal at least helps explain the shortage of hotel rooms, according to the Broadway wags.” Those Broadway wags are never at a loss for a wisecrack. All is grist for their mills—even misery. And the impression of some extremely fancy living by the relief clients was what you might have gained by reading the accounts in just one section of the press. The *Sun*, for instance, took the story to its heart after the *World-Telegram's* disclosure and really went to town, closely followed by the *Journal-American*. The *Sun* did several stories on the situation. One of them, written by Charles Wyer, quoted several unidentified persons—unidentified because Mr. Wyer wrote that they were so close to the city's relief picture that their names could not be used for obvious reasons. But Mr. Wyer went on to quote his anonymous informants as saying, among other things, that the Welfare Department has made public assistance far more attractive to thousands of persons than jobs. Also—and this is a grave accusation—that it is almost a

May 31, 1947

general rule, according to anonymous information obtained by the *Sun*, to give out money to those who ask for it, sometimes two hundred dollars at a clip, and ask questions afterward. Another story in the *Sun*, this time by Phelps Adams of the newspaper's Washington bureau, referred to "scores" of families being lodged in midtown hotels, complete with maid service. This maid service touch, by the way, appeared to fascinate the *Sun* staff.

In three stories within two days, it was carefully pointed out that the relief clients were getting maid service; the impression was that most hotels don't supply it to their guests. Other writers of these relief stories seemed impressed by the fact that the relief guests had radios in their rooms. The unuttered question was, what are THESE kinds of people doing with maid service and radios? The *Journal-American* was a little slower getting started than the *Sun* was, but when it did, it also referred to the Welfare Department's policy of handing out large sums of money first and asking questions afterward. Not even anonymous authorities were called in to back up the *Journal-American's* statement, but the wording of its story was strikingly similar to that of the *Sun's* account the evening before.

Both the *Sun* and the *Journal* hinted at Communist conniving in the affair, and both papers referred to Communists occupying key positions in the Welfare Department. This phase the *Journal* hit hard and in red ink. Another paragraph in a *Sun* story said, to quote part of it, "Relief is doled out to refugees landing here from day to day from foreign ports and to Puerto Ricans who flock to New York in large numbers, armed with the knowledge that the city of New York is generous to a fault, perhaps, to those in need." Mr. [Edward E.] Rhatigan, the commissioner of welfare, had to straighten the *Sun* out on that one. He explained that in the past three years, 2,005 repatriated Americans had been cared for by the Welfare Department and that the city had been reimbursed for its expense by the federal government.

Almost lost sight of in the storm and strife over the story was

May 31, 1947

the fact that the great majority of the 233,000 persons on New York City's relief rolls get \$1.31 a day, broken down as follows: 65¢ for food, 21¢ for clothes, 22¢ for rent, 23¢ for other needs. Well, the upshot of it all was that the families were removed from their hotel rooms with maid service and radio, but at first, the press showed little interest in finding out where they'd gone beyond the bare statement that they'd been moved. Albert Deutsch of *PM* followed through, though. He learned that the families had been moved to condemned tenements and to the city's two municipal lodging houses. Perhaps prophetically, the *Times* had printed a story about how people live in these lodging houses—printed it at the height of the furor. Its reporter quoted Joseph Mannix, the director, as saying, "People are not supposed to stay here long. We take care of the homeless, but this place isn't a substitute for a permanent home."

The pictures accompanying Mr. Deutsch's article make that remark quite an example of understatement. To go back for a moment to those interesting circumstances under which the story got started. In his *Mirror* column one day, Walter Winchell addressed an aside to Mayor O'Dwyer, which read, "Do you know who is behind the current exposé to embarrass the city administration? Is he the jurist who asked you to get his wife a city job?" Next day, the *Mirror* itself told a little more in its news columns—it said that most of the relief cases involved in the hotel story had appeared before Justice James V. Mulholland in domestic relations court, because children and domestic difficulties were involved. The *Mirror* story went on to say that last fall Mayor O'Dwyer had refused to appoint Justice Mulholland's wife to the Board of Education. But it still wasn't plain how the *World-Telegram* had been first with the stories. *PM* said that a *Telegram* reporter, Walter MacDonald, is a friend of Justice Mulholland, and since reporters are not permitted to be present at proceedings in Children's Court, the inference is that Justice Mulholland gave his friend Reporter MacDonald a scoop. We've been trying to confirm this, but Mr.

May 31, 1947

MacDonald is out of town, according to the *Telegram's* city desk, and can't be reached. Justice Mulholland is also unavailable for comment, but his wife said she was pretty sure he wouldn't want to say anything. The *Sun* said its information came from letters and telephone calls from employees of the Department of Welfare, but no names are used in its published accounts, naturally.

As the story dragged on, some other journalistic curiosities were produced. For instance, a number of private welfare agencies came to the defense of the Welfare Department, but this fact was ignored by the *Journal*, the *Telegram*, the *News*, and the *Mirror*. The *Times*, *Tribune*, and *Sun* gave it little prominence, and only the *Post* and *PM* thought it worthy of extensive treatment. Also, when Commissioner Rhatigan went on the air with his defense, the *News* and *Mirror* ignored it entirely. Of course, it's possible that the story appeared in one or two editions and was then dropped out, but it seems hardly likely that in a case of such continuing interest as the hotel relief story that this would have occurred. Mr. Rhatigan took the hide off the newspapers which had whooped up the story. He referred to two New York evening newspapers—NOT by name—and asked bitterly about the campaign they seemed to think so worthy of the great traditions of Greeley and Pulitzer. The *Sun* replied that this was just the old precept that, in the absence of a case, the best tactics for the defense are to abuse the lawyer for the plaintiff. But the *Telegram* showed that you can make every knock a boost, if you try. In reporting his speech, the *Telegram's* first paragraph said, in part, to quote it, "Welfare Commissioner Rhatigan declared that recent publicity on the high cost of relief had dramatically spotlighted the rising load of destitution in the city."

Another civic matter with which the press has concerned itself extensively the past week has been the transit situation—the dispute between the transport workers union and the city's Board of Transportation over a proposed schedule alteration. The result was a slowdown of service on the Independent subway line, a

May 31, 1947

slowdown which later was or was not called off, depending on which newspaper you read. But the most interesting journalistic event of the affair was the performance of the *New York Daily News* in its editions of last Thursday. In the first edition, the *News* printed a story on page 3, quoting William Jerome Daly, secretary of the Board of Transportation, as saying that if the board obtained proof of a deliberate slowdown in subway service, eight hundred motormen, conductors, and platform men responsible for the slowdown might be fired under the recently enacted state law which bans strikes by public employees. The story was written by William Price and Jack Turcott, and along with the account, a picture of Mr. Daly was printed. Mr. Daly saw this first edition—it appears on the streets between eight and nine o'clock in the evening—and Mr. Daly got cross. He called the *News* and demanded a withdrawal of the story and of his picture. The point being, he had never made any statement such as the *News* had attributed to him. So presumably, various things happened in the city room of the *New York Daily News*, and we next see the three-star edition of the paper, which is published several hours later. The page-one headline is the same, “800 Quill men may lose jobs; board acts to prove slowdown plot,” but there is a difference in the story on page 3. Mr. Daly's name has disappeared; his picture has vanished, and in its place is one of Representative Thomas of New Jersey hunting Reds. Otherwise, the *News's* story is the same; the only difference is that an unidentified board official is quoted as saying what the *News* had earlier attributed to Mr. Daly. This board official—NOT named—is pretty hard to locate and seems to be crossing himself up; the *Times* and *Mirror* of the same day quote him as denying that *any* firings were contemplated.

And now we come to a real journalistic mystery: *PM* and the *Daily Worker* also printed the statement attributed to Mr. Daly by the *News*, but where they got the story seems difficult to find out. *PM* said it came from the Associated Press, which disclaims all knowledge of it, so the suspicion must remain that *PM* lifted

May 31, 1947

its story from the early edition of the *News* and, since its final edition goes to press much earlier, had no chance to change it. We've called the *Daily Worker* four times about their piece, but so far, they haven't told us where it came from.

One story of high finance and journalism that has been ignored by most of the press is the announcement that Winston Churchill's memoirs will be published serially in America in the *New York Times* and *Life* magazine for an amount of money said by the *Times* to be in excess of one million dollars. That million is only for the American rights; Mr. Churchill's memoirs will also appear in England, Australia, and South Africa and will later be republished in book form to the extent of five volumes, all of which will make Mr. Churchill one of the highest-paid writers of his time.

And the trade paper of journalism, *Editor & Publisher*, tells a story which shows the former prime minister to be a pretty sharp businessman as well as a prolific writer. Mr. Churchill, the story says, would contract to write an article of certain length but demand proofs to correct. When he returned those proofs, the corrections would make his article somewhat longer, and a bill for the extra wordage would be sent to the publisher. Less-prominent toilers in the vineyards of journalism seldom are able to be so exacting, but some of them turn in some fine work for a lot less money. Among them should be mentioned Robert S. Bird of the *Herald Tribune*. Mr. Bird was sent by his newspaper to report the recent lynch trial at Greenville, South Carolina, and the CBS newsroom staff is in general agreement that Mr. Bird's dispatches were the best which appeared in the New York press. Mr. Bird did a particularly excellent job of reporting the reactions of the community to the national attention which the story of the trial commanded.

We all liked, too, Billy Rose's column in *PM* last Tuesday—a short story, really, about a war correspondent trying to convert from war to peace and the contrast between his former glamor-

May 31, 1947

ous status as a big shot and his attempt to write an acceptable story about the auto show.

Most of us didn't like a comment by Westbrook Pegler in the *Journal-American* Thursday. In the course of his article, Mr. Pegler referred to Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, the labor leaders, with a slur on their use of the English language—"dialect union-eers," he called them. Mr. Pegler's column was a sentimental recall of the days when newspaper men were figures of greater stature than they are today, which could be: they probably wouldn't find it amusing to comment on an immigrant's accent.

One of the things which most concerns anyone in the business of reporting news is accuracy; the conscientious reporter's main concern is that names are correct and facts straight. Naturally, that goes for broadcast as well as written news. This comes to mind because of the story of Clem McCarthy, who broadcast the Belmont Stakes for CBS earlier this afternoon. The story of Clem at the Preakness is pretty well known—how he inadvertently announced the wrong horse as the winner. But there's an amusing sequel to the story which puts an odd twist on it. Incidentally, Clem's colleagues among the sportswriters were most generous about his fumble, fully aware of the difficulty of identifying horses and jockeys half a mile away and trying to tell the world about it at the same time. Discussing it later, in his radio column in the *Times*, Jack Gould wrote that the error would have no ill effects on Clem's radio career, that he would report the Belmont Stakes for CBS on May 31—which Clem did correctly, we are happy to say. The only thing was that Mr. Gould had one of those lapses too; he said the error occurred at the Kentucky Derby. Writing and talking news are hazardous occupations indeed, but Clem and Mr. Gould would now appear to have finished in a dead heat, so far as slips of tongue and typewriter are concerned.

## June 14, 1947

In a half-dozen programs, Hollenbeck criticized discriminatory coverage by the press. He was influenced by Margaret “Peg” Halsey, a next-door neighbor and close friend, who wrote *Color Blind: A White Woman Looks at the Negro* (1946). In fighting discrimination, Halsey wrote, “The main thing is to select something that is in line with your own personality and something that falls within the framework of your life.”<sup>1</sup> Hollenbeck resigned from his racially discriminatory fraternity, Phi Kappa Psi. He squelched racist comments by CBS associates. He devoted *CBS Views the Press* broadcasts to applauding exemplary reporting. He suggested that Ray Sprigle, a white reporter who darkly tanned his skin and traveled four thousand miles through the Deep South as a black man, deserved a second Pulitzer Prize for his twenty-one-part series, “In the Land of Jim Crow.” Hollenbeck also celebrated a prize-winning series by the *New York Post*'s Ted Poston, said to be the only black reporter working at a New York metropolitan daily. And, as this broadcast indicates, Hollenbeck blasted Jim Crow journalism.

JIM CROW IS A JOURNALIST, as we learn from reading the daily press. Jim Crow is a journalist, not only in the section of our country where the law gives him full sanction but right here in New York City, where it does NOT. Jim Crow has one drinking fountain for whites, another for Negroes, the front of the bus for whites, the rear for Negroes. It also has one code of ethics for writing about white people and another for Negro people. During the past week we've had a good opportunity to note some examples of Jim Crowism in the daily newspapers, but before we comment on them, a little background may be helpful.

1. Margaret Halsey, *Color Blind: A White Woman Looks at the Negro* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946), 150.

June 14, 1947

About ten years ago, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People asked the press associations and the major newspapers of the nation to consider for possible adoption an order in force on the *New York Post*: that color or race shall NOT be used in describing anyone connected with a crime unless color or race is an essential part of the story. Typical of many replies was that received from the *New York Herald Tribune* which read, and I quote it: "It is our policy now in the treatment of news not to emphasize the color or race of a man involved in a crime. All our editors know this, and our reporters and copyreaders. Color and race are put into our stories only when essential. We endeavor to enforce this policy at all times."

Almost all the editors who replied made the reservation that when designation of race or color seemed essential to clarity, they would then designate race or color. One thing that NAACP request did stop pretty largely was the designation of race or color in headlines. It also helped a lot to reduce racial discrimination in news stories themselves, but it hasn't helped enough, as our examination of some evidence shows now. Last Monday morning, page 3 of the *Daily News* was quite a spectacle. All but six lines of type were devoted to crime news and pictures.

Most prominent on this page was the story of the sixty-nine-year-old Brooklyn minister who rescued his wife from an attacker, who was later quickly caught by the police. The opening paragraph of the *Daily News* story, in heavy type, identified the accused man as a Negro—not by a name, which he has as we all have, but simply by his color. The same identification was used three more times in the body of the story; apparently the writers and editors who worked on this story felt it was essential to clarity to repeat this point.

A similar performance was turned in by the *Journal-American*, which used the word "Negro" three times. The *Mirror* used it once, in the opening paragraph; so did the *Sun*. In the *Times* and *Herald Tribune*, the identification was made once, well down

June 14, 1947

in their stories, and the *Tribune* used it only on direct quotation from the pastor.

To their credit, the *World-Telegram*, the *Post*, and *PM* did not once describe the accused attacker in terms of his color. The point made by the NAACP in its letter to newspaper editors was that repeated usage of color designation had aroused in the public mind a belief that the Negro is more addicted to crime than any other group, and to quote the letter, “a belief which impartial studies have revealed is not the case.”

It seems scarcely necessary to point out that other groups and nationalities aren't marked for specific mention, and as the NAACP asks, quote, “Is it too much to ask that the single exception which not all, but many, newspapers make of singling out Negroes for designation in headlines and text of crime stories be done away with?”

That letter was written ten years ago. It (and perhaps the consciences of editors) have succeeded in getting most of the Jim Crowism out of the headlines, but there are still some jobs to be done. That fact is all too apparent in an example or two of the reporting turned in by some of the press associations, as well. Early this month, a tornado struck down South, and a number of people were killed. I quote now the opening sentence of an Associated Press dispatch of June 3, under a Pine Bluff, Arkansas, dateline: “A Negro whose automobile was plucked from the highway and flung into a cotton field by Sunday's tornado died today of his injuries, bringing the official death toll of the storm to thirty-five.” That man who was killed by the storm had a name, as we all do, and the Associated Press is usually most reliable about getting names. In this case, the victim's color alone seemed to be enough identification.

Or another Associated Press dispatch of a few days earlier, from Raleigh, North Carolina, in which Godwin Bush, who escaped from a lynch mob, was described as “almost illiterate.” Perhaps he hadn't been given the same opportunities for education as

June 14, 1947

the Associated Press reporter. Incidentally, this reference to the young man's illiteracy was printed in both the *Times* and *Herald Tribune*, which are usually more scrupulous about such things. The fact of Godwin Bush's literacy was no more pertinent to the story than would have been the fact of his left-handedness, if he had been left-handed. As used, it was simply a slur. But that would appear to have been a case of momentary forgetfulness on the copy desk; both the *Times* and *Herald Tribune* are to be commended for their general policy on race relations. George Streater of the *Times*, for instance, has been going around the country studying the problem in terms of housing and employment.

The *Tribune* recently had an excellent series of articles by Robert J. Donovan on the Negro struggle for education in Texas. The *Post*, *PM*, and the *Daily Worker* also deal extensively with stories of this type, but they confine their reports mostly to the New York area. When our CBS newsroom staff talked over this matter of Jim Crow in journalism, one member asked, "But if you leave out the color identification in a crime story, aren't you guilty of suppressing legitimate news?" The answer to that one was, "Are other persons so identified? White? Anglo-Saxon? Jewish, Danish, French, whatever? Not so you could notice it."

It was interesting this week to note the performance of the newspapers in their treatment of the CIO rally calling for a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill. The preliminary story in the *World-Telegram* on the day of the rally turned up an example of an extremely interesting journalistic device. One sentence read as follows, and I quote it: "Reports that fines would be imposed on any member not attending the rally were scoffed at by CIO spokesmen." Okay, reports by whom? It is certainly common practice in journalism to cite these rather vague reports; sometimes, where sources of information cannot be quoted, the practice is justified, if used with care and integrity. But when, as in this case, a report is set up like a straw man—no hint of a source given—only to be knocked down by a denial, the practice is something else again. The point

June 14, 1947

the *World-Telegram* apparently wanted to make remained in the reader's mind: it had been reported that union members who stayed away from the rally would be fined.

The denial got lost in the shuffle, even though that denial was repeated by CIO officials. It might as well have been a report that the paraders were going to march backward that was denied so far as any facts were concerned. Reports of the attendance at the rally also got a reportorial kicking around: Joseph Curran of the CIO, who superintended arrangements for the parade, was quoted by the *Daily News* as estimating that anywhere from 70,000 to 115,000 were in the line of march. The United Press wire, which serves radio stations, that evening guessed 140,000, and that's the figure WCBS used to inform its listeners. Much later, the United Press cut the figure to 60,000. That was the estimate by police, which is usually taken as official, although in this case, maybe Mayor O'Dwyer might have been happier if his police guessers hadn't trimmed it so sharply; the mayor was a prime mover in the rally and anxious for it to be a success. But no matter how many people were involved in it, there wasn't a line about the rally in next morning's *Mirror*, and somebody on the *News* betrayed a faulty ear for music when, in the paper's first edition, he wrote that there was sporadic singing of the "Communist Internationale." In later editions of the paper the title was changed to "Solidarity Forever," which is a good old American union song.

Readers of the *Journal-American* undoubtedly were impressed the other day by a full-page picture story—impressed first of all, perhaps, because the picture story was printed sideways on the page. If they turned the page around to study it, they saw pictures of two New York housing developments, one public, the other private.

The private job—Stuyvesant Town—was pretty well along, but the public one was still in the foundation stage. The headline accompanying the pictures pointed out that the private project

June 14, 1947

had been started in 1945—tenants will move in soon, it said. The public project was started in 1943—work barely started. Bureaucratic fumbling, it went on—here were two spectacular examples of private enterprise versus socialistic government planning. We collected a few facts on this matter, which are as follows: Excavation work on the private development began seven months before it did on the public one, and the latter will be ready for occupancy by November. Demolition, it is true, had been done on the government project in 1943, but the excavation for the private job had beat the government one by seven months. Another point the *Journal-American* didn't mention was that another public housing development—Eliot Houses—was started at the same time Stuyvesant Town was, and tenants are already living in Eliot Houses. Whatever the virtues of the arguments over public and private housing are, in these days when all kinds of housing are needed, it might not be a bad idea to report the complete facts on all efforts to relieve the shortage before drawing conclusions.

Better reporting was done through the week by Walter Arm of the *Herald Tribune* and Leon Edel of *PM*—both of them turned in good jobs of journalism on the Douglas Chandler treason trial in Boston. We liked Albion Ross's dispatches in the *Times*, analyzing the political situation in Austria, and, closer to home, Joseph Mackey's excellent story in the *Sun* on how some youthful gangs in New York got together and formed an organization patterned after the United Nations.

We liked Murray Robinson's series of articles in the *Telegram*—well-written and not-too-technical stories about how athletes get in condition after the winter layoff. Interesting and informative even to nonreaders of the sports pages. Mr. Robinson is one of the ablest members of an able staff on the *World-Telegram*, which, in the opinion of our news staff, does the best job in town with what are called feature stories—out-of-the-ordinary yarns about people, animals, or whatnot. They can make even the weather

June 14, 1947

forecast interesting, and a weather forecast is usually difficult to lift out of the routine. There's Arpad, for instance.

Arpad is the *World-Telegram's* bumptious, foppish weathercock, which has become well known to New Yorkers over a ten-year period. Three days a week there's a front-page cartoon of Arpad cutting some foolish dido or other and, along with it, a seemingly pointless little story, which eventually ends up with the weather prediction for the day. Close followers of Arpad know that cartoonist Bill Pause has been drawing the rooster for ten years, starting him out as a simple weather vane, with no interest in the fancy clothes Arpad has now. But few know much about the stories which accompany the drawings. They were started by H. Allen Smith, who gave the rooster his name, wrote the zany yarns for awhile, and then went on to become low man on a totem pole, and to other literary achievements. In the ten years Arpad has been assisting with the weather predictions, he has had eleven Boswells, the present ones being Mr. Robinson and Fred Cook. Mr. Robinson writes the stories twice a week, Mr. Cook does them once. Incidentally, the question of which came first, chicken or egg, has an answer in Arpad. Bill Pause does the drawings first, then the writers scramble their literary omelets later.

The *World-Telegram* has also been printing a very informative series of articles on conditions in New York City schools. The *Telegram* articles are being done by Walter MacDonald and Norton Mockridge, two of the newspaper's specialists in stories of this type involving investigation. Mr. MacDonald will be remembered as the author of the series of articles on "luxury relief," a series discussed earlier on this program. Mr. MacDonald has also been writing about relief again, but he has taken a new tack. When the state began its investigation into the administration of New York City relief, Mr. MacDonald pointed out that in anticipation of the hearings, the city's Department of Welfare has clamped down on "special services" to clients to the point where some needy and worthy cases are suffering hardship. Evidently, so far

June 14, 1947

as the *Telegram* is concerned, it's a case of darned if you do and darned if you don't.

But the most surprising change of pace in the relief story has been shown in the articles by William Wyer of the *Sun*. The stories by Mr. Wyer weren't far behind those of Mr. MacDonald in the original hullabaloo over so-called deluxe relief. In some respects his stories even went the *World-Telegram* one or two better. But this week there appeared in the *Sun* a series of articles by Mr. Wyer on the general subject of New York City relief—a thorough, carefully documented history of the matter since 1930. The series of four articles may well be preserved for their objective tone and factual slant. It does seem unusual that the same Mr. Wyer could have written them and the deluxe stories, too. One is forced to wonder that if he'd written the present series first, he might have handled the others in quite a different way.

In checking the newspapers this week, we almost missed an extremely interesting item in the *Sun*. Away back on page 21 of Wednesday's issue, there was a paragraph at the end of a story which said the state board making its investigation into the city relief situation would have a report ready by June 24. The story ended with this paragraph, and I quote it: "At the same time, it was announced that the Welfare Department was forced to place four other families, totaling sixteen persons, in hotel rooms because of the housing shortage."

Anybody want to get excited?