

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Aid for American Films

WILLIAM FADIMAN is to be commended for not allowing his position as an active member of the film industry to inhibit his assessment of its artistic values in his article, "Should American Films Be Subsidized?" [SR, Aug. 5].

Mr. Fadiman lists a number of "differences which effectually prevent the American film from achieving the deserved supremacy of the foreign films we admire." Cost seems to be the principal factor.

Censorship in various forms, Fadiman says, hamstring Hollywood in many ways. . . . But doesn't the success of foreign films in the United States suggest that "the candor that other nations sanction" is sanctioned by American theatergoers, too? Once again, isn't it the high costs of Hollywood film production, more than anything else, that increase the penalties for taking a stand and risking offending someone?

Fadiman mentions several sources from which the subsidies could come: theater-owners, the newly-formed American Film Institute, the American film industry itself, and the government—though he wisely doubts the efficacy of government grants. But there is no reason to assume that the theater-owners and the film industry would allow film arts to assert themselves any more freely than the government would.

The American Film Institute is our last hope, but it promises to be a good one. Why not, therefore, entrust the Institute with subsidies from theater-owners and the industry itself, with neither strings attached nor accounts to render?

ROBERT EMMETT DOLAN.

New York, N.Y.

DOES MR. FADIMAN really think that subsidization would improve the quality of motion pictures? In more than one instance, Hollywood has turned out films of exciting, penetrating, and provoking content—some of them on comparatively miserly budgets, one has read. The people responsible for them relied on their heads and their hearts, not on their bankrolls.

Mr. Fadiman gives the best solution near the end of his article—to wit: Let the film industry subsidize itself.

JACK HUGHES.

Kalamazoo, Mich.

NBC Dissents

IN HIS REVIEW of the TV special, *Khrushchev in Exile—His Opinions and Revelations* [TV AND RADIO, Aug. 5], Robert Lewis Shayon questioned the integrity of NBC News. Apparently, he failed to notice the credits following the program which documented in great detail most of the sources for the visual material—not all, but most.

One major source was withheld at his [Mr. Khrushchev's] request. Perhaps that was the source Mr. Shayon was questioning when he said: "NBC News has been less than candid in explaining how it came by the film and sound tapes showing the former Soviet Premier in retirement."

SR/September 2, 1967



"I've worked my way from poverty to being \$63,000 in debt."

With that sentence he has set a precedent. Does a reliable, established news organization have to reveal all its sources? If so, he missed the lead for his column.

Further, NBC News had no way of knowing if the Russians knew what was being filmed, and positively had no way of knowing if the Russians knew it was being done for NBC. NBC News made no "inference" about any of these elements. Mr. Shayon did. In fairness, he might have stated these two points: 1) NBC News did not ask permission of anybody to film or sound-tape Khrushchev; 2) nor did it ask anybody's permission in Russia to take out its material.

NBC News resents deeply the implication of deception and collusion.

JOSEPH DERBY,
Director, News Publicity,
National Broadcasting Company.
New York, N.Y.

Dolci's Silent Search

I THANK DANILO DOLCI for this expression of his credo as put forth in his article, "Tools for a New World" [SR, July 29]: "Every morning, before daylight has effaced the stars, I continue to search in silence, before plunging into active occupations: I know that to accept being lost in the complexity of this world . . . means to die a little." May more of us use the power of thought which is latent in us to "search in silence" to try to avoid "being lost in the complexity of this world" and thus not "to die a little" every day.

(MRS.) MILDRED CLAPP.

Mecker, Colo.

Re: Re-sensitization

REGARDING N.C.'S EDITORIAL, "Research and Re-sensitization" [SR, Aug. 5], the ultimate

immorality of war and violence cannot be questioned by civilized men. The horrors of biological and germ warfare, napalm, and nuclear explosions should force mankind to forego so suicidal a way of "settling" disputes.

These weapons are an inseparable part of war itself, which sires them. Experience teaches us that as long as wars endure, all nations will try to outdo each other in potential destructiveness—each in the interest of its own security. Obviously, then, the substitution by general agreement of rule by international law, backed by sanctions against the legally determined offender, must be our goal. It is inevitable—if mankind can but survive our current insanities.

L. D. GALLOWAY.

Yucaipa, Calif.

N.C.'S EDITORIAL might well have been titled "Research and Religion." For, in our eagerness to get on with research, religion and ethics have been scrapped.

The people of the United States like to think we are a Christian nation. But when we kill and burn innocent women and children with napalm bombs, we are telling the world that we are a nation of barbarians.

J. ERNEST BRYANT.

Searsport, Me.

N.C. CLEARLY points up the age-old, unanswerable conflict between the realist and the idealist. They are both correct and they are both wrong. Had the democratic nations listened to the idealists in the late 1930s, we would all be dead or in slave labor camps. At the same time, to follow the practical policy of outdoing the other side in weapons research can lead to suicide for both sides. There is no honest answer.

CHAPIN F. WARNER.

Whately, Mass.