

cipline.

Perhaps, then, a more incisive view of such men is given by James Aubrey in one of the early pages of Friendly's book. Aubrey was the network's noble savage so long as his barbarisms were of profit, but, once the law of averages caught up with this ruthless brainstormer so that he could only produce thousand-year-old eggs, Metternich Paley and Talleyrand Stanton were quick to demand the parvenue's head. The interesting thing is that Aubrey seemed so aware of this all along. At one point, when he and Friendly were at loggerheads, Aubrey confessed: ". . . You and I are always going to be at each other's throats. They say to me, 'Take your soiled little hands, get the ratings, and make as much money as you can'; they say to you, 'Take your lily-white hands, do your best, go the high road, and get us prestige.'"

It is a pity that Friendly was never able to perceive the wisdom in Aubrey's incisive analysis. Believing himself to be high-minded, he made the error of believing in Paley's and Stanton's declarations that they were also high-minded, but, when push came to shove, Stanton and Paley were idealistically committed only to corporate profits. Mr. Friendly's account of his dealings with these two Dickensian freebooters is, consequently, a declaration of innocence betrayed, lacking even the cynicism of the violated. Friendly still seems to believe that Paley would have liked to act differently, simply because Mr. Paley has let it be known to some that this is so. Odd that liberals like Friendly should have such great trust in men of affairs like Paley because they hang pictures on their walls when they put so little trust in the mass of men.

Upon leaving CBS, Mr. Friendly immediately accepted a position as Ford Foundation consultant to the nation's foremost "project uplift"—the sagging cause of educational television. Ford makes millions polluting TV with its advertisements for new cars and its subsidy of an appropriately puerile fare for such programs, and then it deals out a tiny slice of all this to ETV to do something about the mess. What more per-

fect example of the Aubrey vision of right hand and left hand operating with perfect integrity! If Mr. Friendly and his principal colleague on the project, Mr. Bundy, have their way, ETV may have the resources to compete with commercial television, but what do such hirelings to power and elitism hope that it accomplishes?

Some indication may be gleaned from what Friendly thought might be accomplished by broadcasting the Vietnamese hearings: "I believed, for my part, that healthy debates by responsible leaders could build national understanding of the President's position, and that the spectacle of Congressional leaders debating the war was far better than the epidemic of one-sided teach-ins and hostile demonstrations that had filled the void in the absence of a national debate. In my opinion, responsible debates and the subsequent Senate hearings actually de-escalated the demonstrations and draft-card burnings that so embarrassed the Administration."

Whether or not one accepts Friendly's analysis of the events, I think it is important to understand that this is the view of a man who essentially sees the function of educational television as an instrument of governmental policy. Therefore, for those reasonable Americans who do not condone this country's criminal behavior in Viet Nam, it may be prudent to question whether the encouragement of men like Friendly and Bundy to establish their hegemony over ETV is truly within the public interest.

Much the best part of Friendly's book, as I indicated earlier, attempts to describe his collaboration with Edward Murrow during the production of *See it Now*, *CBS Reports* etc. Mostly, this is a loving and respectful portrait of an uncommon man beset by *gonuvs*. Murrow may not have been the resident sage he has been eulogized as (by Mr. Paley again, for one, who found himself so embarrassed by some of Murrow's documentaries that he plainly wasn't that sorry when the series had to end), but he was a man of decency and earnestness and a reasonable contempt for sham. It was because his sense of public order and decency was offended that

he went after Senator McCarthy in that famed telecast, but he was not in such violent disagreement with what McCarthy was capitalizing on that he and Friendly did not feel it necessary to administer their own loyalty scrutiny of the staff of *See it Now* on the evening before the broadcast, hoping, thereby, to anticipate a smear.

In short, Murrow then—like Friendly today—was a liberal whose essential criticism of his culture was that the wrong men were doing the right jobs. But to criticize so is not to criticize at all, when faced with the growth of irresponsible and opportunistic corporate powers such as CBS who see themselves as extensions of government, with allies in Congress, the regulatory agencies, the White House itself.

Obviously, CBS would have preferred to paddle Friendly and Murrow if it paid them to do so. As this book makes inadvertently clear, the trouble with television today is not that brigands like Stanton and Paley have their hands tied, but that they are such believers in only one kind of power—the dollar—that anybody who sets out to reform them must be prepared to reform the whole system which gives them power to begin with. Otherwise he is nothing but a well-intentioned hypocrite.

We Give To Conquer

ASHER BRYNES

W. W. Norton, \$4.50

VICTOR F. FERKISS

Foreign aid is in trouble, or so it would seem. Not only is Congress most grudging about appropriating money, but the executive branch is increasingly loath to ask for it. The public remains apathetic—accepting foreign aid at best as a necessary evil, while such public support as exists is generated by a small if influential minority of religious and political humanitarians backstopped by interested suppliers and exporters. The much-touted balance of payments problem has not improved the situation, while a new specter has arisen in the depletion of America's food stockpile, the disposition of which abroad was a major prop of our