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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

Democracy, as a fundamental philosophy of govern-
ment, is being attacked over nearly all the world; it must
utilize every method of self-preservation or yield to the
conquest of the totalitarian. Democracy assumes that the
people are able to work successfully a cooperative program,
and to apply scientific thinking to the solution of their
problems.

Discussion is one of the methods by which this
program of democracy is carried on; discussion facilitates
democracy by (1) providing an atmosphere favorable to mental
activity, and (2) assisting individuals to develop social con-
sciousness. John Dewey has said that the improvement of pub-
lic discussion is the most important public business we have
on hand.

1 Quoted from McBurney, James A., and Hance, Kenneth G.: The Principles and Methods of Discussion. Harpers, 1939, p. 431, from a lecture delivered by Mr. Lyman Bryson, Professor of Adult Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, as a part of the Symposium in Public Speaking, Northwestern University, 1938.

The political technician can discover and weigh
facts, and tell how to achieve governmental success. But
the ultimate choices are still everybody's business, and
everybody is thus challenged to be the best citizen that his
capacity will allow by having to face these ultimate politi-
cal issues. Discussion is the medium by which we may do our part in formulating policies. Since early days men have devoted prolonged labor to the problem of persuasion - the rhetorician's problem of securing one's own way. But in a democracy the persuasive offering of one's own thought is only the first gesture in a drama in which every man's thought plays a part - a drama in which the characters are not persons, but ideas, and in which victory is not the triumph of a man, but the general attainment of truth. This is the attitude of discussion, and only in this atmosphere may ultimate judgments of political values be made; these judgments must be made by each person for himself.

The functioning of democracy depends upon popular participation; this participation can best be secured by the operation of principles which are peculiar to discussion: the process of reflective thinking, the method of science, socialized thinking and "team-work", and interest in the ideas of the times. Democracy, in order to survive, must be motivated by principles such as these; when discussion is promoted, democracy flourishes.

Many people have recognized this need for public discussion of pertinent questions, and are anxious to organize group meetings. Immediately they are confronted by the ques-

---

tions: "How shall we organize a group discussion? What do we do when we discuss? What are the methods of discussion?" If discussion is to facilitate the program of democracy, the people must have knowledge of discussion methods. Many books have been published which attempt to make available this knowledge.


This writer recognized the validity of these works; however, in supplement to them, this study attempts to analyze the methods employed by one of the leading groups in the discussion field.

Our problem, then, is: what are the methods employed by the American Forum of the Air? To what extent do they correspond to the methods presented by the above named theorists?
Are there any circumstances peculiar to the radio situation which influence the selection of methods used in this program?

**Background of the Problem**

The American Forum of the Air was chosen as the discussion program to be analyzed because of (1) its long period of popularity, and (2) its large number of listeners.

Theodore Granik originated a radio program in 1925 entitled "Law for the Layman," which was broadcast over WOR, New York City. Outstanding civic leaders, judges, legislators, and attorneys discussed legal questions in simple terms which the layman could understand. It was the first forum program of its kind, and was heard over station WOR until 1937, when that station became the key station of the Mutual Network in the East.

In 1937 Mr. Granik moved to Washington, D.C., to practice law; his interest in mass education was shown by his continuation of his program as a half-hour feature, this time over the Mutual Network. It soon attracted the interest of national personages, particularly the members of the House and Senate, and fan mail became so insistent on a longer program that in 1939 Mr. Granik formed the American Forum of the Air.

---

1 See Congressional Record, 76th Congress, Volume 86, May 2, 1940, p. 8304.

2 See Congressional Record, 77th Congress, Volume 87, March 27, 1941, p. 2318.
The program is a "sustaining educational feature" for which Grenik receives no compensation. He considers it his contribution to education and to the cause of freedom of speech. Many topics are suggested in the thousands of letters he receives from listeners throughout the country.

For further description of the origin and development of the American Forum of the Air see the Congressional Record, 76th Congress, Volume 87, May 2, 1940, p. 8304.

**Definition of Discussion**

Discussion is a much abused term which, to the average person, may suggest anything from informal conversation around the dinner-table to the heated debates on the floor of Congress. Those who use the term indiscriminately have stretched it to include any speaking situation involving two or more individuals.

Baird defines discussion as:

... the art of reflective thinking and communication, usually oral, by the members of a group, whose aim is the cooperative solution of a problem.


McBurney and Hance write:

Discussion (is) ... the cooperative deliberation of problems by persons thinking and conversing together in face-to-face or co-acting groups under the direction of a leader.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines discussion as:

Consideration of a question in open debate; argument for the sake of arriving at truth or clearing up difficulties.

The writer tentatively identifies discussion as group inter-communication for the cooperative solution of a problem.

However, discussion is defined, it can and should be distinguished from both conversation and debate. Elliot separates discussion from haphazard conversation on the basis of plan, procedure, and knowledge of the question.1

Debate is characterized both by (1) formal procedure and (2) intentional reasoning. Formal procedure includes time keeping, order of speaking, and other devices. It is true that in a symposium the speakers are usually presented in a pre-arranged order; however, their speeches are more than

---

simply "for" or "against." They present many different points of view. Intentional reasoning, the second characteristic of debate, proposes to swing a group toward a predetermined conclusion. McBurney and Hance tell us:

The intentional reasoner begins with a predetermined proposition to which he is committed either by desire or the nature of the circumstances, and seeks to secure the acceptance of this proposition. 1

1 McBurney, James, and Hance, K. G.: op. cit., p. 4.

Upon the relative importance of intentional reasoning these writers distinguish debate from discussion; discussion seeks to determine the solution of a problem through reflective thinking; debate employs intentional reasoning to win acceptance of a solution already arrived at. Discussion means first a search for common ground when participants unearth otherwise hidden agreement, and then proceed to locate the solution of their problem; debate seeks first of all to defend a pre-conceived position and then clash in argument.

The most valid dividing line between debate and discussion is the orientations debate and discussion give their participants; discussion and the cooperative solution of a problem require an attitude of respect and a desire for mutual understanding; debate usually stresses two sides of a proposition, compelling conflict, and thus drives "affirmative" and "negative" apart and almost inevitably exaggerates differences. The debater seeks to understand his
opponent's argument in order that he may refute it; the superior participant in discussion seeks to understand other points of view in order that he may re-examine and perhaps modify his own.

Of course, mutual respect and understanding does not imply that there is always agreement in discussion. McBurney and Hance argue that "without disagreement there is usually little point in discussion." Disagreement is a natural consequence of differences among individuals and complexities of world problems; as for the individual participants, except when the problem is new, freedom from pre-conceived ideas cannot be expected. In discussion these points of view may be very forcefully presented and ably defended; herein we find an element which is native to debate—in fact, some writers would call this element itself "debate." However, the important consideration is that in discussion the participant will have ideas concerning the problem and may have a possible solution in mind; but he has not arrived at any definite irretactible conclusion. Occasionally someone gets into a discussion who has preconceived opinions of how the problem should be solved and will not, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, alter his opinions; to him, then, the occasion is not a discussion but a debate.

Discussion may be represented as an area of felt
difficulty or "problem", which may be solved in a number of ways (or by proceeding in a number of directions) The discussers consider each of these paths and weigh in turn the various solutions, finally arriving at a conclusion of which one is the most desirable. This solution is diagnosed and validated, and a course of action in this direction is laid out.

Perhaps the following diagram will help to clarify our thinking on this point:

![Diagram](image)
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Fig. 1. Relative Areas of Discussion and Debate.

**Methods of Discussion**

What is meant by methods of discussion? The simplest definition of this would be to refer to those procedures which are necessary for the discussion to be presented. In order to have a discussion the following factors are necessary:
First, the type of discussion must be chosen. All discussions are not alike; there are panel-discussions, dialogue-discussions, symposia, forum-discussions, and other types of discussions. Obviously, one group of people cannot operate all of these types in one place at one time; a choice must be made.

Second, someone must be the organizer. People do not just meet and begin a discussion; someone with foresight must select a meeting time and place, contact members of the group (perhaps he will have to select them, and be there ready to start the ball rolling.) Usually these activities are performed by one person, who is called the leader.

Third, the group must agree on a topic; some specific problem must be selected as the center of thought for the discussion. Perhaps this may be done by the leader; at any rate, some particular method of selecting a topic must be in operation.

Fourth, the participants must be selected and they must fulfill their duties as part of the discussion. How are they chosen? What preparation do they make for the discussions? What do they do when they participate? These questions must be answered before the discussion may proceed; their consideration as one of the methods of discussion will be under the heading, Participation in Discussion.

Fifth, in order to solve a problem, as discussion aims do, some theoretical method of progress must be followed;
either there is systematic progression step by step toward the solution, or there is chaotic fumbling and digression and accidental progress when progressive steps in group-thinking are inadvertently discovered. In some cases no logical pattern of discussion is followed; in others it is considered the basic outline of procedure. Method of progression - the use or disregard of a logical pattern - constitutes one of the discussion methods, and as such will receive attention in this study.

In summary we find that the methods of discussion are as follows: (1) selection of the type of discussion, (2) leadership, (3) selection of the topic, (4) participation, and (5) progression.

These five items will be taken up in detail in the following chapters of this study; a survey of theory will be presented, and conclusions will be drawn from the analysis of twenty representative transcripts.

**Objectives and Limitations of Radio Discussion**

**Objectives.**

Radio discussion is, in general, similar to discussion as identified in the early part of this study. The objective of discussion, over the air or in the conference room, is the cooperative solution of a problem; the same methods
which lead to definition of terms, analysis of the problem, seeking of evidence, and arguments, weighing of solutions, and conclusion upon a course of action should be used in the studio program. However, in addition, radio discussion will attempt to inform and to stimulate interest in a passive and mildly interested listening audience. No distinctly different principles are involved; however, since discussion interests mainly "Those who are sufficiently well educated and socially conditioned to interest themselves in contemporary problems," a discussional program will be made to appeal to the radio audience. This group, largely accustomed to music, drama, and comedy, will be attracted best by diet that is pleasing to their mental palates. They will not be interested by dull pedagogical enumerations of facts. The introduction must be clear and present a problem that is of public concern. If a radio discussional program can hold scattered listeners who may dial in at any time, and stimulate their minds into reflective thinking, it will have succeeded in one of its objectives. Baird, in his book, Discussion: Principles and Types, in a chapter entitled, "Radio Discussion" says:

Your discussional aim on the air, as elsewhere, should be to further the cooperative solution of a problem. Since, however, your
time is limited, you will have to keep in mind other objectives as well. You will no doubt attempt to stimulate your group to further investigation of the question. If you can thus stir up interest in such problems as the tariff barriers between states, you have achieved worthy results ... Thus your major rhetorical aim will be to demonstrate reflective thinking and to encourage it in others; but your ancillary aims will be to interest, inform, and to stimulate. 1


No critical analysis of the American Forum of the Air can be adequate without first considering that it is a radio program. Thus it will have the dual objectives of a radio discussion. It will see cooperatively to solve a problem and will also at the same time attempt to stimulate interest in a passive or mildly attentive audience. Theodore Granik, in founding this program, desired to make the American ideal of free speech a reality by having nationally known leaders discuss issues of public interest over the air. He started out as director of a forum broadcast from a single station in New York. Public interest grew so insistent that the program has come to be aired over the Mutual Network consisting of 93 stations. 2


The Hooper rating of audience interest "fluctuates from week to week, but it is roughly around a five rating." 3

3See Appendix C., Correspondence with Mr. Granik, March 8,
Mr. Granik has recognized the objective of stimulation of public interest as a primary aim of radio discussion. He said in his introductory remarks on the broadcast of July 3, 1945:

While we do not believe that they (the issues) can be solved by one such discussion as we plan this evening, we do believe in bringing the entire dispute out into the open of a national forum in the true democratic manner. 1

---

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, Volume VII, Number 27, p. 3., July 3, 1945.

In his objective and stimulating interest of "the layman in public questions of the day", Mr. Granik has indeed been highly successful. Senator Arthur Capper, speaking in the United States Senate, said of him:

Mr. Granik's Forums are widely used as nuclei for local discussion groups. The program is a sounding board; it is an open discussion where the great national issues are threshed out, where every angle of a situation is freely opened to view. 2

---

2 Congressional Record, 77th Congress, First Session, Volume 87, March 27, 1941, p. 2613.

Congressman Celler had inserted in the Congressional Record:

The Forum has become such an established feature of American life and has attained such stature as a sounding board for public opinion that Mr. Granik has been called in as an unbiased advisor in legislative and policy questions. 3
The then Vice-president Truman wrote the following in a letter to Congress, February 26, 1945:

We know that we speak the sentiments of most of our colleagues in congratulating Theodore Granik on the seventeenth anniversary of his radio program, the American Forum of the Air. Mr. Granik's program, the oldest forum on the air, has been outstanding in its field; week in and week out it has presented to the American people discussions of vital concern to them in the finest American tradition of freedom of speech. For his splendid public service in conducting these programs without compensation for seventeen years, the American people and the many members of Congress who have participated on the forum owe Mr. Granik a debt of gratitude. The radio industry can be proud of this pioneer in the field of public service programs.1

Limitations.

Discussion over the air will have certain necessary limitations. The subject of discussion may be limited to conform with station policies; radio being of the nature of a public utility, must limit its program in accordance with public interest. Since time on the air is expensive, the discussion must move along rapidly. Speeches, if any,
(such as are used in a symposium) must be short; audience will seldom keep tuned in for a long speech, even if given well and by the President of the United States. Experience indicates that audiences prefer conversational dialogue rather than long speeches.\(^1\) Simplicity in presentation of material is an important limitation of the radio situation; detailed questions, complicated statistics, and enumeration of long items of history will be unacceptable and ineffective. Main ideas standing out boldly, with specific instances and simple illustrations will stimulate audience interest and aid reflective thinking on the problem at hand.

Mr. Granik, in selecting topics for discussion, must first of all meet the test of public interest. He said that his aim is first of all to keep his radio discussion current with the Congressional battles, or, if possible, even a bit in advance, so that the forum is frequently the starting point of Congressional debate the following week. Listeners and editors have commented on his talent for timeliness of subjects. Mr. Granik has been quoted in the New York Times:


---


timely subject comes up on the floor of either the Senate or the House, I immediately contact the proponents and opponents of the legislation and offer them the facilities to broadcast their views. 1


Since the length of time allotted this program on the air is only forty-five minutes, the length of speeches by the discussing members must be limited. The length of these speeches and the necessity for brevity are matters which will be dealt with later in this study, under the heading of evaluation of selection of type of discussion employed by the American Forum of the Air. Our concern here is a recognition of the limitations of time in producing a radio broadcast. Obviously a typical national problem can hardly be covered in detail in so brief a span.

Another limitation is the effect of the radio-situation on the discussers. Although there is, to be sure, a studio audience, the presence of a microphone may produce in some a form of stage-fright. There may be distractions in the studio: the engineer may signal that a speaker is not near enough to the microphone; or perhaps he may be told that he is too loud and "blasts the mike." The speakers' contact with the radio audience is imaginary, and he may become con-
scious of the fact that at any time he may be "tuned out." This tends to rob the speaker of the usual visible cues so meaningful to the speechmaker. This problem will be discussed at greater length in our analysis of the participation of the discussing members of the American Forum of the Air.

One other limitation having direct effect on the participation aspect of discussion is the peculiar character of the radio audience. The radio audience is universal; listeners may be of all sexes, ages, creeds, and occupations. Listening is usually done by individuals or small intimate groups; this requires that the speaker be informal, "conversational", and more or less intimate. The radio listener can easily tune off at any time and is apt to be more subject to distraction. The speaker-listener situation is more personal than other situations, and loses the audience-psycho logical atmosphere found in most other public speaking situations. "Radio listeners do not like to have speeches made at them; they prefer to be talked with."  

1 Monroe, Alan: op. cit., p. 443.

In summary, radio discussion has the same objective of any other discussion - the cooperative solution of a problem; but in addition radio discussion will attempt to stimulate interest in a passive listening audience. The limitations peculiar to the radio situation are conformity to station policies in relation to subject selection, inadequacy of
time, necessity for short speeches, and avoidance of complicated subject material. These objectives and limitations should be given consideration in the analysis of the discussion methods of the American Forum of the Air.

Method of Analysis

As a basis for the analysis of the discussion methods employed by the American Forum of the Air, pertinent sections of discussion theory were compared and summarized. A definition of discussion was given, and the methods of discussion were listed and explained. A letter was written to Theodore Granik, the founder and director of the American Forum of the Air, requesting a description of certain techniques employed. Transcripts of representative programs were obtained (the programs dating from July 1, 1945 to January 1, 1946; Volume VII, Numbers 27 to 49). These were analyzed with particular attention to the following: type of discussion, leadership, topics, progression and participation. A clearer conception of the method of analysis may be obtained by comparing the sample transcript of the American Forum of the Air contained in the Appendix with pertinent sections of the body of this study.
CHAPTER II

SELECTION OF THE TYPE OF DISCUSSION

The success and value of a discussion depend partly on the type of procedure used. In the selection of a type, careful consideration should be given to the nature of the topic, the membership and attitudes of the group, the available leadership, and the object of the program.

Based on a report of the Committee on Nomenclature in the Field of Discussion of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, a book by J. V. Garland and Charles F. Phillips, entitled, Discussion Methods Explained and Illustrated, has attempted to present a clear-cut statement of the procedures of the various types of discussion. 1 This work supports the theory of authorities in this area. The types of formal discussion listed are:

1. The Panel Discussion. A panel is a small discussion group, made up usually of a chairman and four to eight members, which conducts a discussion among its own members as a prelude to a discussion in which the audience takes a part; the members of the panel sit about a table facing the audience, with the chairman sitting in the center. There are no set speeches, no set order of speaking; the subject is developed by the give and take of conversation, with members

---

speaking at will and without formal recognition of the chairman. McBurney and Hance have the chairman present the subject for consideration and point out the relation of the panel and the audience to it.\(^1\) After the main aspects of the problem are explored by the panel, the audience is invited to take part, either by asking questions or making statements. Summaries, restatements, questions, etc., may be used by the chairman to indicate progress and preserve unity. Two points need to be emphasized:

The members of the panel are supposed to use the problem-solving method to develop among themselves the pattern of reflective thinking...The audience is permitted to direct questions at the panel only after a definite pattern of ideas has been developed.\(^2\)

Analyzing the features of the panel discussion, one finds that it would be best suited to a situation which has these things:

a. Adequate leadership.

b. A problem to be solved.

c. Participants who have a mutual respect and desire to employ reflective thinking.

2. *Open Forum Discussion.* The forum method of discussion consists usually of a lecture followed by a brief discussion period. Forums are classified into the following:

\(^1\) McBurney, James, and Hance, K.G.: *op. cit.*, p. 289.

\(^2\) McBurney, James, and Hance, K.G.: *ibid*, p. 289.
fairly distinct types: (1) the lecture-question type, in which the audience participation is limited to asking questions orally from the floor after obtaining recognition from the chairman; (2) the lecture-contribution type, in which the members of the audience may either question the speaker or make brief statements. A modification of the type dispenses with the opening lecture, substituting for it the dialogue method of presenting material for the discussion; this method has been called the forum-dialogue method. The forum type is best suited for the following situation:

a. One person, a specialist, possesses knowledge superior to that of the group.

b. Members of the group desire to be enlightened.

3. The Symposium. This consists of a set program of prepared speeches followed by audience discussion. The chairman announces the topic and presents the speakers; during the discussion period he performs the usual duties of a discussion leader. (cf. supra., p.10.). The audience participation may be limited to asking questions, or both questions and contributions may be permitted. A symposium would be best suited to a situation where the following elements occur:

a. A number of qualified speakers are available.

b. The group desires these speakers to present their points of view.

c. The audience desires to question the speakers in order to clarify vague points or secure additional infor-
nation, or desires to express attitudes and opinions.

Garland and Phillips also include debate as a type of formal discussion; however, they are careful to state that it differs from other types of discussion in that "the method of debate is the method of argument."¹

¹ Garland and Phillips, op. cit., p. 239.

Judson and Judson say:

The present attitude toward debate seems to have shifted to an acceptance of debate by most discussion leaders. There still remain two schools of thought, however. One group would use debate as a device to stimulate and start discussion. The other group would follow discussion with debate.²


The point to be noticed here is that in this statement Judson and Judson distinguish debate and discussion.

Is debate a discussion type? Most of the authorities on discussion theory draw a sharp distinction between the two. (supra, p. 7.)

Informal discussion is mentioned by McBurney and Hance, also Baird, who says we engage in informal discussion whenever your small group, either by design or chance, merges into a common body (homogeneous group) for the orderly reflection on some problem of mutual concern.³

³ Baird, A. Craig: op. cit., p. 186.

Many combinations of the above discussion types are
The main combinations of established types are the following:

1. The Lecture-Panel Discussion. In this combination the lecture is followed by a panel, which leads in turn to audience participation. This is perhaps the most widely used combination.

2. The Lecture-Commentator Discussion. This combination enjoys its chief popularity which scholarly groups. In practice it means a prepared formal speech followed by a shorter one by a "discussion leader", and then by questions and comments by other members of the group. There may be more than one leading speaker and more than one commentator in the same meeting.

3. The Lecture-Round-Table Discussion. Instead of the formal discussion for the entire group in the same auditorium, in this procedure the group divides into smaller sections, each meeting in a separate room with its own leader. The lecturer may then visit each group in turn, briefly, or the groups may proceed with the discussion without the presence of the speaker. The method has some following among conventions and conferences.

4. Question-Lecture Discussion. In this combination an informal discussion precedes the formal presentation; a period of time is allotted for questions to be raised orally before the formal speech is made. Several forum leaders associated with the Federal Forum Project have experimented with a question and answer period preceding a half-hour formal
statement by the forum leader. Following the initial discus-
sion, the formal speech can be readily adapted to the phases
of the subject in which the audience indicates an interest.
The usual forum follows the main presentation.

In summary, the type to be employed is selected by the
leader or by the group, and is selected in relation to the
abilities and background of those who will discuss, and the
interests and attitudes of the audience. The best known
types of formal discussion are known as the panel, open forum,
and the symposium. Informal discussion takes place when the
panel meets and is conducted without the presence of an audi-
ence. Debate is considered by some to be one of the types, but it differs from the others "in that the method of debate is argument," and the method of discussion is reflective

1 Garland and Phillips: op. cit., p. 239.

thinking. In addition to the use of any single type, there have been developed a few combinations which seem to enjoy some popularity; some of these are known as lecture-panel discussion, lecture-commentator, lecture-round-table, and question-lecture discussion.

Analysis of Selection of Type of Discussion.

The type of discussion to be employed may be sel-
et by the leader or by the group; the selection should be made with careful consideration of the nature of the topic and the ability of the members of the group. What type of
The American Forum of the Air was founded by Theodore Granik in response to many requests from listeners who had been anxious to see their legislators and public officials in action and ask them a question or two. Mr. Granik selected the symposium as the type of discussion to be employed.1 He himself became the leader of the group, and each week selects the participants who will appear on the program.

Is the American Forum of the Air a true discussional program? It is referred to broadly as discussion, but has evidence of the debate point of view:

First, in the introductory statements of the participants, they are usually aligned on "sides" in their points of view. In nearly every case, there are four speakers, two on each side, and each by their introductory statement tell which side they favor. For example, Dr. E. J. McCormick, on the August 28, 1946, program of the American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" made the following statement at the beginning of the program:

I am opposed to compulsory Federal sickness insurance because I realize that under such a system the medical profession in the United States, which has come to lead the world in therapeutic knowledge and progress and in surgical technique, will in a very short time, under political control, give up its leader-

---

ship and be forced into a mediocre position.¹

¹ Transcript, American Forum of the Air. "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?", Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945, p. 3.

On the program of September 4, 1946, "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to the States?" the following introductory statements were made:

Mr. Padway: Congressman Dingell and I favor passage of the Kilgore Bill for federal unemployment compensation aid...

Congressman Short:...I am opposed to federal interference with the strictly local problems of the states, and doubly opposed to this proposition.²


These are clear indications that the speakers are biased in their attempt at finding the solution to the problem. They have evidently arrived at a definite conclusion before they gather around the discussion table, and to this extent exhibit a typical debate attitude of mind.

Second: the summaries at the end of the programs are at times given as rebuttals; the participants exhibit this point of view. In the broadcast of July 17, 1945, "Should We Adopt the Proposed New Federal Industrial Relations Act?" Frank Fenton had started his summary, when Donald Richberg broke in with the following: "In other words, this is a new argument."¹
This is essentially a debater’s point of view toward rebuttal.

Third: the participants consider themselves as being on “sides.” On the broadcast of July 10, 1945, “Are We in Danger of Losing Freedom of Expression?” the following statements were made:

Moderator: I have to ask Mr. Ernest to sum up for his side.

Wilbur Forrest: All right, I think we win the argument.

Fourth: Mr. Granik considers that the participants are already divided in their opinions on the question involved before the discussion has actually commenced. In every case examined after he had introduced the participants and they had given their introductory speeches, he made the following statement:

There we have the issues and the sides clearly drawn.

And in his requesting the participants for their summary of the evening’s discussion, he in most cases asked two of the four participants to summarize, making statements similar to the following example:
Gentlemen, we pause briefly for summation of the arguments advanced this evening. Congressman Biemiller, will you sum up for your side?¹

¹Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 13.

Mr. Granik uses the two terms, debate and discussion, interchangeably, making no distinction between the two. An example of this is in his introduction of the broadcast of October 23, 1946, "Should the Federal Government Support Federal Housing Projects?" Mr. Granik refers to his program as debate:

This evening we bring you a debate on the subject of housing.

In the same introductory statement about two hundred words further (after he has given a statement of the issues involved in this question) he says:

So that you may hear all sides of this issue, we have invited four experts in the housing field to be our guests on this evening's program.²


Correspondence with Mr. Granik indicates that he desires the participants to be divided fundamentally. On March 8, 1946, his assistant stated:

We attempt to present the vital issue of the week and the men and women who affect the decisions. Sometimes it is very difficult getting authorities who disagree with each other fundamentally so that we can present a clear-cut debate.'
See Appendix C, Correspondence with Mr. Granik, March 8, 1946.

The basis for Granik's point of view is his objective of stimulation of public interest as a primary aim of radio discussion; this aim can be achieved to some extent by the "fireworks" of verbal clash and argument. He feels that this is necessary, for even though the issue may be vital, unless the participants are alive and spontaneous, audience acceptance suffers.

As we have already noted, (supra, p. 7.) there is some disagreement among authorities as to method of differentiation between discussion and debate; however, even those who class debate as a form of discussion are careful also to state that it differs from other types of discussion in that "the method of debate is the method of argument."²

²Garland and Phillips, op. cit., p. 239.

True discussion would have as its objective the solution of a problem through reflective thinking. Discussion first would search for agreement and an attitude of respect and mutual understanding. The participants show that they have pre-conceived notions of how the problem should be solved and will not in spite of all evidence to the contrary, alter their opinions; to this extent, the American Forum of the Air is not a discussonal program, but a debate. The program is a debate in an informal situation with a set of rules which
happen to be in common with a symposium; the participants
give one minute speeches presenting their points of view, and
then the program is informal and all members may enter into
the speaking at will.

In summary, evidence indicates that the American
Forum of the Air is not a true discussional situation. It
contains these elements of debate: (1) the participants are
admittedly aligned on "sides" in their points of view; (2)
the participants approach the program with a priori conclusion
formed in their thinking (this is evidenced by their one-minute
introductory speeches giving their points of view) and (3) the
leader exhibits a desire for verbal clash and opposition rather
than a desire for cooperative inquiry into the problem. This
program exhibits the attitude of debate in an informal situa-
tion which resembles a symposium, in that the participants
give one minute speeches prior to freely presenting arguments
in support of their a priori conclusions. The debate element
is desired by Granik as an aid in achieving his stated objec-
tive of stimulation of public interest in important questions
of national concern. This objective is justifiable as a
primary aim of a radio program of this type.
CHAPTER III
LEADERSHIP IN DISCUSSION

What are the requirements and duties of a leader in a discussion? McBurney and Hance outline his functions:

We believe that the effective discussion leader is not a dictator or even an instructor, but a guide who is trying to arrange conditions so that each conferee can do his best in creative thinking and contributing... The leader should permit the maximum of freedom, but should make his influence felt as a sympathetic guide when the discussion demands. The leader asks discerning, thought-provoking questions and leads the discussion positively by occasional creative questions and suggestions. The leader is a positive, stimulating force in the group situation; he is not a dominating factor nor is he a mere figurehead or nonentity. The functions of the leader are:

1. To secure the process of reflective thinking.
2. To secure the most cooperative type of participation.
3. To provide for the introduction of information.
4. To keep the discussion clear and orderly.
5. To handle conflict creatively.

The qualities of a leader should be:

1. Knowledge of discussion.
2. Alertness of mind.
3. Ability to diagnose.
4. Objective attitude.
5. Knowledge of people.
7. Stimulating personality.
8. Sense of humor.
Baird makes the following statements:

What should be your special qualifications for leadership? Obviously you should (1) know your subject, (2) know discussion techniques; (3) understand the special requirements of the discussion occasion and of the special audience, both those on a panel and the larger participating audience in the forum, and (4) have tact, open-mindedness, enthusiasm, geniality and humor...What are some of the specific duties and procedures that may help you and the group to realize your aim in discussion? (1) To arrange for a planning board. (2) To make individual preparation. (3) To act as moderator or chairman. (4) To attend to physical arrangements. (5) To introduce the problem. (6) To help develop the discussion pattern...How, indeed, shall we test leadership? Observers interested in improving the technique of discussion will apply such questions as the following: (1) Does the leader know his subject? (2) Does he know the technique of discussion? (3) Does he know his group? (4) Is he tactful? (5) Is he open-minded? (6) Is he enthusiastic? (7) Is he genial? (8) Has he attempted to provide favorable physical conditions for the discussion? (9) Does he properly introduce the subject? (10) Does he follow through the discussion pattern with success? Does he, for example, see that terms are properly explained, that the analysis of goals, conditions as they are, representative solutions, and action step are adequately handled? (11) Does he know how to handle the questions? (12) Does he have skill in summing up, and in securing positive results?

Ellis' statements of the functions of a discussion leader may be summarized thus:
1. Supply data.
2. Summarize.
3. Insure cooperation of the group.

His discussion leader would have the following traits:
alertness, ability to analyze, ability to see relationships,
poise, self-control, patience, and a stimulating and radiant
personality.1


Garland and Phillips list the following functions:

1. Focus attention of group upon
certain points.
2. Follow pattern of discussion.
3. Keep discussion moving.
4. Maintain proper spirit of
discussion.
5. Present a general summary.2


Judson and Judson make the following statement:

Specific duties of the chairman:
2. Make an outline of the discussion.
3. Begin on time.
4. Welcome the group.
5. Introduce the topic.
7. Remain seated.
8. Prepare for emergencies.
9. Understand certain types of members.
10. Deal with questions and interruptions.
11. Watch the time.
12. Keep advancing toward the goal.

General qualifications of a chairman:
1. Sense of humor.
2. Open-mindedness.
3. Philosophical outlook.
4. Emotional control.3

3
Leigh presents the following information:

1. He is not a dictator.
2. He is not one who settles the problem for the group.
3. Does not try to sell his own ideas.
4. Sees that different points of view are presented.
5. Guides and summarizes the discussion.
6. Possesses the following personality traits: adequate background, fairness, open-mindedness, self-control, patience, power of acute analysis, sense of humor, directness, sincerity, sympathy.

The duties noted by Sheffield may be summarized in the following way:

1. Guide the discussion.
2. Prepare an outline based on factual material.
3. Get everyone to take part.
4. Analyze material presented.
5. Get members to analyze the problem.

Walser reiterates much of what the others have written, and may be summarized in these words:

Traits: open-mindedness, tact, self-control,
sincerity, sense of humor, ability to think straight.

Duties:
1. Get group acquainted.
2. Handle the oppositions.
3. Pause for reflection.
4. Summarize.
5. Clinch the results.¹


These theories are in agreement on the broader issues: (1) that the leader is to be a guide and organizer, not a dictator or merely a figurehead; and (2) that he must be prepared to lead the discussion in the paths of reflective thinking. Baird, McBurney and Hance, and Judson and Judson go into more detail; Sheffield, Elliott, Walser, Leigh, and Garland and Phillips express the same ideas in more concise manner. The seeming differences are in reality due to variety in choice of terminology; the viewpoint is essentially the same.

In summary, this survey reveals that a discussion leader's personality will embody the following traits: open-mindedness, tact, self-control, sincerity, sense of humor, adequate background, fairness, enthusiasm, congeniality, and alertness. Baird writes, "The study of personality, I agree, is never complete and at best is inadequate... for most of us, people are mysterious beings, and mysterious
the personality of a person by what he does — mainly by what he says. Let us assume that a discussion leader’s personality will be suitable if he can adequately perform the following functions:

1. Display ready knowledge of the subject.
2. Introduce the topic for discussion.
4. Develop the pattern of reflective thinking.
5. Summarize the main points.

Analysis of Leadership

Does the leader of the American Forum of the Air perform the following functions: (1) display ready knowledge of the subject, (2) introduce the topic, (3) secure cooperative participation, (4) develop pattern of reflective thinking, (5) summarize main points?

Ready Knowledge of the Subject.

Theodore Granik, the director and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, does not participate directly in the discussion. In the examination of twenty representative transcripts of the American Forum of the Air, no evidence was found that he joined in that part of the program. Three times he broke silence during these programs to help a par-
participant obtain an opportunity to get into the discussion
with remarks similar to this sample:

Mr. Lepsky, did you want to come in? ¹

¹ Transcription, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We
Solve the Troubles of the Near East?", Volume VII, Number
30, July 24, 1945, p. 6.

See also transcription, American Forum of the Air; "Do We
Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, Novem­
ber 6, 1945, page 9.

Introduction of the Subject.

Granik introduces the topic giving when necessary
a short history of the question. A good example of this
approach is the broadcast of July 24, 1945, "How Can We
Solve the Troubles of the Near East?" in which he gives the
following as part of his introduction of the program:

This evening we bring you an extremely
vital, timely subject of international
importance: How Can We Solve the Troubles
of the Near East? ...The Near East, with
its varied races, its mingling of new and
the very old, its treasure, its poverty,
and now its oil - has always been a trouble
spot for the expansion of European civili­
zation. In the very early days, trouble in
these lands bordering the Mediterranean
sprang from religious conflict. This part
of the world is the birthplace of three
great religions: Christianity, Mohammedanism,
Judaism. Racial and religious tension still
exist, but the impact of western civiliza­
tion is a much more potent reason for the
bubbling troubles. Nationalistic impulses,
ever present but latent for centuries, are
now beginning to assert themselves. The
civilization of the West and East, brought
into head-long contact by two world conflicts
in the past quarter century, must now be re­
solved. The extent to which they can be re­
solved on a mutually helpful basis will de­
terminate in a large measure whether the sim-
Another method of introduction which Granik employs is his capable summary of the relationship of the topic to world events and the radio audience. An example of this method is seen in the broadcast of November 13, 1945, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?". Mr. Granik said in his introductory remarks:

Good evening. After every war, psychological as well as physical readjustments become a vital part of any nation's reconversion to peace. During the war years we had to face many a problem on the domestic front - problems of juvenile delinquency, problems of entire families suddenly being uprooted and forced into strange environments, problems resulting from the heads of families marching off to war.

Some sociologists and educators tell us that the reaction to these upheavals will leave its mark permanently on the American family. Others, equally authoritative, tell us that the present chaos in family life is but a passing phase of the normal reaction to total war....

Beyond these problems, in which government is concerned, lie the deeper human problems of morals, family life and individual behavior. These are the responsibility of the home, the school, and the church, and it is for them that our participants are spokesmen.

From discussions on important international subjects and vital government, management, and labor problems, the Forum quite appropriately turns its attention this week to the physical, mental and moral well-being of the people of America, for only if we have a
strong, healthy, and sound nation can all other problems be met and solved.  

Sometimes the introduction by Mr. Granik sets forth the issues; and example of his technique may be seen in the broadcast of August 7, 1945, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?" Mr. Granik states the issues thus:

Already the issues are being outlines; groups are beginning to assert themselves and the world of tomorrow is taking shape. Must that world have periods of economic depression? That is the question which every American, in uniform or civilian clothes, has been asking.

Some experts predict a period of tremendous prosperity in the immediate post-war future, to last until the pent-up buying energy of people who have been starved for civilian luxuries is finally exhausted - and then the boom will burst and we will again hit the economic bottom of the early 1930's. They say we have always had depressions and booms; therefore, we will continue having them in our society.

Others say we don't have to have depressions. If government plans wisely with industry, they claim we should be able to maintain our economy on an even keel.

Does this necessarily mean a planned economy? That phrase has not been accepted too kindly by American Business. To many, it smacks of regimentation, of a form of government alien to our own.

This evening we pose the question "What Can We Do To Combat Depression?" With Europe going socialist or even a little further to the left, we hear talk on all sides of America being the last remaining haven of capitalism. On our ability to answer correctly the question of this evening depends the maintenance of our economic system.
Just how can we combat depressions?
Can it be done by lowering taxes and giving
industry a free hand? Can it be done by gov­
ernment going into business as a stabilizer?
Can it be done by huge government expenditures?1

A good example of an introduction with contrasted arguments stated at the outset is to be found in the program of August 28, 1945, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?":

The main point of contention between the two opposing factions seems to be on the use of the words "compulsion" and "Federal". Senator Wagner claims that the measure is not compulsory, that complete freedom is offered to everyone with regard to such medical services as he may give or receive. The American Medical Association on the other hand, points out that compulsion is inherent in the very nature of the bill because a patient must choose a doctor from among the physicians or among the groups of physicians in the community who agree to go into the insurance system.

While opponents of the bill claim that Federal control of the sickness insurance system cannot work, its sponsors argue that without Federal cooperation the system would be ineffective.2

It may be said, after an examination of the introductions to representative programs of the American Forum of the Air, that Mr. Granik shows to a reasonable extent, the

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?", Volume VII, Number 32, August 7, 1945, p. 2.

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?", Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945, p. 2.
"alertness of mind", "ability to diagnose", "objective attitude" and "personal preparation of the subject" as recommended by McBurney and Hance. He exhibits open-mindedness and enthusiasm as prescribed for the discussion leader by Baird. Besides those traits already noted, he has shown "ability to analyze and ability to see relationships" suggested by Elliott.

In his introduction of the topics, Mr. Granik makes an effort to be impartial; he measures what he says about the pro and con arguments line by line, being careful to give the same number of quotations, the same number of phrases pro and con, purposefully being impartial in every respect.

For the most part, the participants in the American Forum of the Air are left to their own devices if they
desire to pursue a solution of the problem. Mr. Granik makes no overt attempt to secure cooperative participation. The fact that he is present no doubt exerts a modifying influence. Three times only, in twenty representative programs, Mr. Granik interposed so that a neglected member could break into a lively situation. For the rest of the discussion periods the participating members proceeded unhindered, unguided, and uncoordinated by the leader.

Development of Pattern of Reflective Thinking.

Mr. Granik makes no effort to point out issues, emphasize agreements, or in any way develop the steps of the logical pattern of discussion, except as in his introduction of the subject (Supra). In an examination of twenty representative transcripts there was no evidence of an attempt to guide the group in any way, except to announce "our time is up" at the end of the hour.

Summary of Points of Discussion.

As a leader, Mr. Granik does not attempt to summarize the points. This is done by the participants at the end of the program.

To summarize, the leader of the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik, does not participate in the program except to briefly introduce the topic, but exhibits a ready knowledge of the subject in his introductory speeches. He gives, when pertinent, a short history of the topic, states the issues and their relation to world events and the radio
audience, and shows marked ability to diagnose a problem. His presence doubtless exerts a modifying influence, but he makes no overt effort during the broadcast to secure cooperative inquiry. There is no evidence that he attempts to develop a logical pattern of reflective thinking. The summarization is left to the individual participants of the group.
CHAPTER IV
SELECTION OF THE TOPIC

In general, three types of problems may call for discussion; problems of fact, problems of value, and problems of policy — this last is the most usual and probably the most valuable. It should be noted that problems of policy are closely related to those of fact and value; policy judgments are premised on factual and evaluative judgments. The selection of a topic relies in part on the nature and function of the participants, the choice will be based on a consideration of the audience — their interests and attitudes.

McBurney and Hance advise that first of all the group is determined to whom the discussion will be presented, then the following specifications are to be observed:

1. Topic shall meet interests of group.
2. Topic should be within the capacities of the group.
3. Topic should be chosen with consideration of the knowledge of the group.
4. Topic should be chosen with consideration of the purposes of the group.
5. Consider the preference of the group.
6. Topic should delimit the area to be discussed.1

1 McBurney and Hance, op. cit., p. 51-57.

Baird gives a longer list of requirements:

1. Controversial subject.
2. A complete statement.
3. An impartial question.
5. Capable of solution.
6. Either a question of fact or policy.
7. Adapted to the participants.
8. An important question.
9. Timely.
10. Limited.
11. Unambiguous in wording.
12. Worded only tentatively.
13. Should show unity with the series if it is part of a series of discussion.


Judson and Judson state that the selection of a topic may be done by the audience ahead of time or the committee members may select the topic. Their requirements are:

1. A good topic must be a vital problem.
2. A good topic must be timely.
3. A good topic is manageable (limited).

Judson and Judson, op. cit., p. 38.

The differences among the statements of these authorities are mainly due to different terminology of the same concepts; in general they agree that a good topic for discussion will be:

1. In the form of an impartial question.
2. Adapted to the group.
3. Vitally important at the time of discussion.
4. Limited to suit the situation.

Analysis of Selection of the Topics.

In theory, the topics for discussion should be (1) in the form of an impartial question, (2) adapted to the group, (3) vitally important at the time of discussion,
and (4) limited to suit the situation. Do the topics discussed on the American Forum of the Air meet these requirements?

Statement as an Impartial Question.

An examination of twenty representative transcripts of the American Forum of the Air (July 24 to December 17, 1945) reveals that with two exceptions each of the topics is stated in the form of a question.

1 See Appendix B for a list of the subjects discussed during this period.

The first of the exceptions referred to above occurred on July 31, 1945, when the topic was simply stated, "Veterans and Jobs." In his introduction of the topic chairman Granik posed the following questions:

Can we guarantee that every returning veteran will get his job back when he is discharged from the service? What if the old jobs no longer exist? What is new skills are required? And what if his place...has been taken by an older man, a veteran of the First World War, a family man with children to support?

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Veterans and Jobs.", Volume VII, Number 31, July 31, 1945, p. 2.

The wording of the topic in the form of a simple title may be explained in this instance by the fact that the question was familiar to many Americans; a debate had been in progress for months between spokesmen for labor and the Director of Selective Service, who was charged with returning men to their jobs.
The second exception noted above is in the broadcast of November 20, 1945, when the topic was worded as a resolution exactly as in a formal debate, "Resolved: That every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24." The program of this particular evening was a special broadcast known as an "Annual Students' Program" presented in cooperation with Scholastic Magazines and the National University Extension Association. The topic was selected by a vote of students throughout the country, and the participants were chosen by teachers of speech and debating coaches.  


On one occasion (of the twenty examined) the usual custom of presenting "both sides of a vital issue" was set aside, and in its place was heard: "Ten Mayors Report on Jobs," (September 11, 1945). This program consisted of a cross-country tour by radio of America's ten largest cities, with the mayor of each presenting a report of his city in transition from war to peace. The questions, if it had been impartially worded, might have been, "How Will America Face the Possibility of Mass Unemployment while her Plants are Reconvertion?"

Occasionally the question is one of fact. For example, on October 2, 1945, Mr. Granik stated:
It is our national policy to return servicemen to civilian life as quickly as possible and practical. There is no disagreement on that score. What has caused disagreement particularly among our lawmakers here in Washington has been the effectiveness of the machinery established by the army to carry out that national policy...we pose the question: "Are We Demobilizing Effectively? 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We demobilizing Effectively?", Volume VII, Number 39, October 2, 1945, p. 2.

It may be shown that Mr. Granik makes a point of making the questions impartial. In support of this statement Senator Arthur Capper in the Congressional Record reports:

Mr. Granik goes to great lengths in his efforts to make the forum absolutely fair to all sides, in view of the subjects. He checks with the leaders of both parties in the Senate and House concerning the proposed subject. 2

2 Congressional Record, 77th Congress, First Session, Volume 87, p. 2613, Speech made on the floor of the Senate, March 27, 1941, by Hon. Arthur Capper, of Kansas.

It is evident from this investigation that the topics are properly worded in the form of an impartial question with the reasonable exception of an occasional special program (two of the twenty examined.)

Adaptation to the Participants.

Are the topics selected on the American Forum of the Air suitably adapted to both the people participating
in the broadcast and the radio audience? In consideration of this question it should be pointed out that Mr. Granik, who selects these participants, has the entire population of the nation from which to choose. It may safely be assumed that the popularity of this program and the size and interest of Mr. Granik's listening audience would appeal to any public spirited person whom he might approach. Having such a wide selection of capable participants from which to pick, the American Forum of the Air may be expected to present topics which are well adapted to both the speakers and the radio audience.

The participants vary from one program to another; in the course of a few weeks the participants may include congressmen, capitalists, military experts, merchants, architects, engineers, social workers, business administrators, educators. Such a wide selection of speakers represents a cross-section of national interests; topics properly suited to such speakers and interests are broad and involved.

For example, on July 24, 1945, the topic, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?" was discussed. On the answer to this question hinged the peace of the future and raised this issue: How effective is the United Nation's Organization? This topic was discussed by five men representing all groups affected directly by the problems of the Near East: (1) Sir Wilhmott Lewis, Washington correspondent of the London "Times", a distinguished English journalist and student of international affairs; (2) Louis Lipsky, spokes-
man for Zionism, a member of the Executive Committee for the Jewish Agency for Palestine and chairman of the Executive Committee of the American-Jewish Conference; (3) Salloum Mokarzel, president of the Lebanon League of Progress, chairman of the Lebanese National Committee, and editor of "Al-Hoda", the Arabic language daily newspaper; (4) Dr. John Hazam, student of the Arab nationalist movements, and Professor of History at the College of the City of New York; (5) Leon Brasseur, formerly French Consul in Iran, in 1940 assistant to the French General de Gaulle, and at the time of this discussion Secretary-General of the French Press and Information Service.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?", Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945, p. 4-5.

The topic, "Veterans and Jobs", broadcast on July 31, 1945, raised these issues: Can every returning veteran be sure he will get his old job back when he is discharged from the service? Will it matter if new skills are required? What will be done if his old job no longer exists? How much "seniority" will he lose because of his war-time service? This subject was presented by (1) M. H. Hedges, Director of Research, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, American Federation of Labor; (2) Omar B. Ketchun, National Legislative Representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and commentator on the weekly Veterans' Reporter radio program; (3) Ted F. Silvey, chairman of the Reconver-
sion Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organization, and (4) Major General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service and charged with the responsibility of returning veterans back to their jobs.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Veterans and Jobs", Volume VII, Number 31, July 31, 1945, p. 3.

"How Can We Avoid Another Depression" the topic for August 7, 1945, raised the question; Must the world of tomorrow have periods of economic depression? The evaluation of the effectiveness of a planned economy naturally follows. What is the best method of combating depression? Can it be done by lowering taxes and giving industry a free hand? How much should the government spend? These issues were appropriately discussed by (1) George Terborgh, the Research Director of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, a former economist with the Federal Reserve Board, a Brookings graduate and author of the recent book, "The Bogey of Economic Maturity"; (2) Robert R. Nathan, the Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, former chairman of the Planning Committee of the War Production Board; (3) Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, Director of the Economic Research Department, United States Chamber of Commerce, a Professor of Economics on leave from the University of Minnesota, and editor of the American Economic Security Magazine; (4) Leon Henderson, former administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and presently Chief Economist for the Research Institute of America.
Aired on August 21, 1946, the question, "Should Congress Pass the Full Employment Bill?", presented this issue: will the Full Employment Bill provide a government spending spree which would provide jobs for everyone at the expense of a ruined national economy? Sponsors of the bill argued that it would make cooperation between industry and the government a keynote of economic prosperity; the opposition claimed that the bill would throttle private industry. The participants on this American Forum of the Air program were (1) James Carey, a spokesman of labor, the Secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; (2) James L. Wick, editor of Prentice Hall's Washington Letter; (3) Leon Keyserling, general counsel of the National Housing Agency; and John Scoville, noted economist and lecturer.

On August 28, 1945, the topic "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" was chosen by Mr. Granik. Awaiting action of Congress was the Murray-Wagner-Dingell Bill, which dealt with prepaid health insurance. The American Medical Association had challenged the operative technique of the bill as a long step towards federal control which would result in the evils of socialized medicine. The
leaders of organized labor contended that the bill would lead to a healthier nation, the basis upon which our prosperity rests. To discuss this measure, Mr. Granik selected (1) Nelson Cruikshank, the Director of Social Insurance Activities for the American Federation of Labor; (2) Dr. Edward A. McCracken, chairman of the American Medical Association Council on Medical Service; (3) Dr. Ernst Boas, chairman of the Physicians' Forum, another large medical group which had declared itself a favor of the bill; and (4) Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the "Journal of the American Medical Association."\(^1\)

\(^1\)Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?", Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945, p. 2-3.

The topic, "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to States?" was broadcast on September 4, 1945. Organized labor had been demanding federal action on proposed legislation which would provide for federal jobless aid. Labor leaders maintained that the closing of a plant in one part of the country would cause economic disturbances in another, and that therefore unemployment was a national problem and must be treated as such. For the most part, state governments opposed federal assistance, claiming that their own unemployment compensation setups worked more effectively because each state had its own problems.\(^2\) The main

\(^2\)Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should The Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to
The issue was: can the states handle the problem without assistance? To discuss this question, the American Forum of the Air presented (1) Joseph Padway, a spokesman for Labor, the general counsel of the American Federation of Labor, (2) Stanley Rector, chairman of the Legislative Committee, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies; (3) Congressman John Dingell, Democratic Representative from Michigan, one of the authors of a Congressional bill which would establish federal supplementation for state social security, and (4) Congressman Dewey Short of Missouri, member of House of Representatives for a continuous period of twenty years, and opposed to unemployment aid.

An unusual type of program was presented by the American Forum of the Air on September 11, 1945, "Ten Mayors
Report on Jobs." The Mayors of America's ten largest cities discussed the problems of reconversion, unemployment, taxes, and new products. Each mayor was in a position to be familiar with the latest information in his city concerning jobs, reconversion and business trends. The program was a radio tour around the nation, jumping from city to city across the United States; first to speak was Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York City, president of the Mayor's Association.

Switching to Chicago, America's second largest city, Mr. Granik presented Edward J. Kelly. Next in the order of their appearance were Bernard Samuels of Philadelphia; Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., Mayor of the Motor city of Detroit; Fletcher Bowron, Mayor of Los Angeles, Thomas A. Burke of Cleveland, Ohio; Theodore R. McKeldin of Baltimore; A. P. Kaufmann of St. Louis; John E. Kerrigan, Mayor of Boston; and Mayor Cornelius B. Sculley, of Pittsburgh. An analysis of these reports was given by Mutual Network's news Commentator, Gabriel Heater, speaking from New York City.

---


The American Forum of the Air presented the topic, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?" on September 18, 1945. Controls during the war had been many and varied; which of those controls could now be abolished? Should any be retained? Three points of view were favored by governmental groups: (1)
wipe out all legislative regulation and revert to the rule of competition, the law of supply and demand, the system of private enterprise. (2) Cautiously remove controls as it becomes evident that no danger will result, and keep essential controls throughout the reconversion period. (3) Keep government control and regulation in certain fields as a permanent fixture, for war has proved we need such government assistance if we are to achieve full employment and prosperity for all. These views were considered and discussed by four Congressional Representatives. (1) Dr. A. L. Miller, Republican Representative from Nebraska, formerly a physician and surgeon, Fellow the American College of Surgery, and Nebraska State Health Director (1941-1942), (2) Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin, Democratic member of the House Committee on Appropriations; (3) Jerry Voorhis, of California member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies which Exceed their Authority and member of the House Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; and (4) John W. Murphy, Democratic Representative.
Four members of Congress were invited to discuss this question, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?" September 25, 1945. The issues involved were: How much should the United States loan to her former ally? Should it be an outright gift, as had been suggested by some Congressman? Before we loan money should we make the British eliminate certain practices which were detrimental to our international trading plans, such as cartels, the sterling bloc arrangements and empire preference in trade? These views were discussed by (1) the Congresswoman from Connecticut, Democratic Representative Chase Going Woodhouse, member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and formerly

1 Congressional Directory, ibid, p. 233.


4 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 39, September 25, 1945, p. 3-4.

5 Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 234.
Professor of Economics, Smith College (1918-1925), Connecticut College (1934-45) Summer Teacher at Columbia University and the University of Iowa, Consultant for the National Register of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, War Manpower Commission and member of the National Occupational Conference American Sociological Society;\(^1\) (2) Republican Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart, of California, member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and holder of six consecutive terms in office in the House of Representatives;\(^2\) (3) Democratic Representative from New York, Emanuel Celler, ranking member of the House Committee on Judiciary, organizer of the Brooklyn National Bank (1917), chairman of the Board of Brooklyn National Corporation (1923) and member of Congress since 1923; and (4) Representative Roy O. Woodruff of Michigan, Republican member of Congress for twenty-six years,\(^4\) and member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.\(^5\)

On October 2, 1945, the topic, "Are We Demobilizing..."
Effectively?" was broadcast by the American Forum of the Air. It was the national policy to return servicemen to civilian life as quickly as practical; there was no disagreement on that point. The question was just how effective was the machinery established by the army to carry out that national policy. Mr. Granik invited two members of the House Military Affairs Committee to defend army procedure against the attacks of two of their colleagues who claimed the army was not doing the job it should and could. This topic was dis-

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?", Volume VII, Number 39, October 2, 1945, p. 3-4.

...ussed by (1) Republican Representative Howard H. Buffett, a comparatively newcomer to Congress (1943) from Nebraska; 2


(2) Congressman Chet Holifield, Democratic Representative from California, who was a member of the House Military Affairs Committee and had just returned from an inspection tour of American separation centers; (3) Representative J. Edgar Chenowith, Republican from Colorado, member of the House Committee on Education; 4 and (4) John J. Sprakman, Demo-
tic Representative from Alabama, member of the House Military
Affairs Committee and member of the Select Committee on Post-
War Military Policy, who had at one time served with the

1 Congressional Directory, ibid., p. 232.

Student Army Training Corps (1918) and was a Lieutenant-
Colonel in the United States Army Reserve Corps.


The topic, "Should Congress Establish a Missouri
Valley Authority?" was discussed October 9, 1945. The Ten-
nessee Valley Authority, Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee Dam
had been the result of a new concept of developing electric
power, irrigation facilities and flood control by the Federal
Government. Proposals to continue this program gave rise to a

3 great national debate. The issues involved were broad.

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress
Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?", Volume VII, Number
40, October 9, 1945, p. 2.

Electric power companies asked why municipal and non-profit
cooperative power distributors should receive preference in
the sale of Federal power produced by such projects, claiming
that private enterprise was suffering as a result of Govern-
ment being in business in competition against its own citizens.
Another issue was: could anyone else except the Federal Gov-
ernment handle such a large project? Would there be huge
amounts of waste of public funds? Would there be political discrimination in the purchased land, labor, and engineering equipment? Would this program lead to an Atlantic Seaboard Authority, an Ohio Basin Authority, a Great Lakes Authority, and eventual governmental domination of the industry? To discuss this question Mr. Granik invited (1) Republican Representative Wesley D. Ewart, a new Congressman from Montana, elected by the people of his district mainly for his stand on this question (opposition to a Missouri Valley Authority)\(^1\),

\(^1\) Transcript, *American Forum of the Air*, ibid., p. 2.

a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House of Representatives and a member of the House Committee on Public Lands; (2) Judge Leif Erickson, also from Montana, Chairman of the Regional Committee for the Missouri Valley Authority, formerly a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Montana;\(^2\) (3) Will M. Whittington, Democratic Representative from Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control;\(^3\) and (4) Glen H. Taylor, Senator from Idaho, a state which had acquired much experience with governmental flood control projects.\(^4\)

\(^2\) *Congressional Directory*, op. cit., p. 219.

\(^3\) Transcript, *American Forum of the Air*, op. cit., p. 3.

\(^4\) *Congressional Directory*, op. cit., p. 254.
Mr. Granik selected for October 16, 1945, the topic, "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?" Since the dramatic blasting of Hiroshima, controversy had raged in America over disposition of the secret of the atom bomb. Various proposals had been made in Congress to control the bomb domestically and internationally. Should we keep the secret in the interests of national defense? Should we share our weapon with the world, wisely winning the confidence of the other nations before they found the formula for themselves? Should we favor establishment within the new United Nations Organization of an international board, using the control of the atomic bomb as the biggest single force in maintaining world peace? Might not such a plan end in world destruction? These issues were considered on the American Forum of the Air by (1) Brian McMahon, the senior Senator from Connecticut, formerly Special Assistant to the United States Attorney-General (1933-1939). (2) Homer E. Capehart, Republican Senator from Indiana, member of the Senate Committees on Manufactures and Patents, former businessman and owner of the Capehart Engineering Co., President of the Packard Manufacturing Co.,

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, op. cit., p. 3.

2 Who's Who in America, op. cit., p. 1320.

3 Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 189.

"Should the Federal Government Support Public Housing Projects?" This topic was discussed on October 23, 1945, and involved these issues: Should the Federal Government subsidize low income groups to house the masses of people who do not enjoy good housing? What income levels should be given assistance, if at all? Can private industry do the job? Will the resources of the government, when thrown into public housing projects, drive private industry out of business? Will public housing, federally supported, be wasteful of the taxpayer's money? The following speakers were invited to participate in the discussion of these issues; (1) Philip M. Klutznick, Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority; (2) Senator Robert A. Taft, senior Senator from
Ohio, member of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and member of the Senate Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; (3) George L. Bliss, president of Railroad Federal Savings Association of New York; and (4) Joseph E. Merrion of Chicago, president of the National Association of Home Builders.

R. J. Thomas, a spokesman for labor in the automobile industry, president, United Automobile Workers, was one of the participants in the American Forum of the Air, on November 6, 1945. The other participants were (2) John Van Deventer, representing the steel management of "the Iron Age" one of the industry's outstanding trade journals; (3) David J. McDonald, a representative of labor in the steel industry, International Secretary-Treasurer of the United Steel Workers of America; and (4) George Romney, a representative of the automobile manufacturers, general manager of the Automobile Manufacturers Association.
The topic discussed by these gentlemen was "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?" The situation at the time was tense: the leaders of the United Automobile Workers Union had announced plans for an industry-wide strike unless their demands were granted, and the steel-workers planned such a step within two months. Their demands were higher wages, based on the need to meet the rise in the cost of living. The issues were broad. Were the demands excessive in view of the tremendous reconversion problems faced by industry? Would they jeopardize industry's ability to produce? How high had the cost of living actually risen? How soon and how easily could industry reconvert to a peace-time basis?

These issues were discussed by representatives of steel management and automobile management, and spokesmen for labor in the steel industry and the automobile industry.2

The American Forum of the Air presented the topic, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?" on November 13, 1945. After each war, psychological readjustments, involving moral issues, become a vital part of any nation's reconversion to peace-time conditions. How could America strengthen her family life? How can the problems of juvenile delin-
frequency, uprooting of entire families, and loss of the male parent during the time of war be met? Would reaction to this social upheaval leave its mark permanently on the American family? Was America, indeed, facing a moral breakdown? What could the home, the school, and the church do to prevent such a breakdown? These issues were discussed by (1) Mrs. Bess N. Rosa of the Woman's College, University of North Carolina, and National Chairman, Social Hygiene Group, Congress of Parent-Teachers Association of America; (2) Mrs. Eleanor Fowler, Secretary-Treasurer, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the Congresses for Industrial Organization; (3) Mrs. Evelyn Millis Duvall, Executive Secretary, National Conference of Family Relations, United Council of Church Women; and (4) Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie, chairman of the National Women's Advisory Committee on Social Protection.  

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?", Volume VII, Number 44, November 13, 1945, p. 2.

A departure from the usual format of the American Forum of the Air was made on November 20, 1945, when the annual "Student's Program" was presented. The subject, "Resolved: That every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining the age 24", was debated by four students whose ages would make them directly affected by any decision of Congress on the subject. Two points of view were clear: on the one hand, there were those who believed in military
preparedness, who said, "In time of peace, prepare for war"; on the other hand opponents of this view claimed that technical and scientific developments in the art of war made military training unnecessary, and such a program would cause international friction and lead to another war.\footnote{Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Annual Student's Program - Peacetime Military Training," Volume VII, Number 45, November 20, 1945, p. 2.} The participants had been selected by teachers of speech and debating coaches; they were (1) Rod McPhee of Eau Claire High School, Eau Claire, Wisconsin; (2) Ann Kelly of Rockingham High School, Rockingham, North Carolina; (3) Franklin Reed, a freshman student in the University of Texas, Austin, Texas; and (4) Donald Marston of Lewiston High School, Lewiston, Maine.\footnote{"Highlights of National Broadcast on Compulsory Peacetime Military Training, November 20, 1945." Scholastic, 47:37. January 7, 1946, p. 37.}

On November 27, 1945, the topic, "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations?" was broadcast. The issues were broad and complex: To what extent should we participate in the new United Nations Organization? Should our delegate on the Security Council have the authority to vote for use of force without running to Congress for approval? Would such power infringe upon the authority of Congress to declare war? Would it in-
vest in one man a decision which the elected representatives of the people are empowered by the Constitution to make? Would such a program jeopardize our national sovereignty? Will the success of the United Nation's Organization depend upon each member of the Security Council having this power? If the American delegate had to come back to Congress for specific authorization each time the police force was needed, how effective would the new organization be?\(^1\) The participants on this program were (1) Warren J. Magnuson, Democratic Senator from Washington, one of the outstanding supporters of the Administration's foreign policy\(^2\) and member of the Senate.


The Administration's foreign policy in respect to this question was stated by Magnuson:

To keep the peace of the world, we must have an international police force strong enough to discipline any nation which threatens that peace. If our delegate had to come running back to Congress for authority to use that police power, in this atomic age, it would be obvious how ineffective any delayed disciplinary action would be.

(This quotation was taken from page three of the transcription.)

Naval Affairs Committee;\(^3\) (2) John T. Flynn, a newspaper man,

\(^3\) *Congressional Directory*, op. cit., p. 193.
nationally known for his opposition to the Administration's foreign policy, noted columnist for the "New Republic,"

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, op. cit., p. 3.

associate-editor of "Colliers" Magazine, formerly Adviser to the United States Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in Investigation of the Stock Exchange (1933-1934) past president of the New York Press Club, and author of Country Squire in the White House (1940); (3) James M. Tunnell, Senator from Delaware, and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and (4) Burton K. Wheeler, Senator from Montana, member of the United States Senate for twenty-three years, formerly Progressive candidate for Vice-President of the United States, (1924) and spoken of by Mr. Granik as:

One of the most articulate spokesmen in the nation in opposition to the present bill. 5


5 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, op. cit., p. 4.

The topic, "How Can We Keep Radio Free?" was presented on December 4, 1945. A review of the issues involved would include: is more control of broadcasting policies
needed? What kind of control would be most beneficial? Should the control be governmental or private? How is radio now controlled and operated? How can the present effectiveness of radio broadcasting be increased in the public interest? Of the four gentlemen who deliberated these issues, two were from the broadcasting industry, one from the legislative branch of the United States Government, and the other from a national political organization. They were (1) Elmer A. Benson, chairman of the Executive Council, National Citizen's Political Action Committee, formerly a United States Senator from Minnesota, and formerly Governor of that state; (2) Sydney M. Kaye, a lawyer familiar with radio interests, stations, and industry groups and general counsel for Broadcast Music Incorporated; (3) Clifford J. Durr, Commissioner of the Governmental agency formed by Congress for the purpose of regulating the radio industry, the Federal Communications Commission; and (4) A. D. Willard, executive vice-president of American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 3.
of the National Association of Broadcasters, a practical broadcaster with eighteen years of experience in radio management.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

Four members of the House of Representatives were invited to discuss the topic, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?" on December 11, 1946. One of the problems facing the country at the time of this broadcast was that of labor-management relations. The automobile industry was stalled and a steel strike had been ordered for January 14. Labor wanted higher wages; strikes were the method of obtaining the desired changes. What could be done about labor unrest? Could strikes be outlawed? What type of new legislation could be devised to curb labor? How could economic security be achieved in order to halt labor unrest? The participants invited by Mr. Granik to discuss this problem were four Congressmen "who felt strongly on the two sides of the question." 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 2.

They were (1) A. L. Miller, Republican Representative from Nebraska, a comparative newcomer to Congress (1945), formerly a physician and surgeon and Nebraska State Health Director (1941-1942); 3 (2) Andrew J. Blemiller, Democratic Represent-

tative from Wisconsin, member of the House (1943)\(^1\); (3) Clare E. Hoffman, Republican Representative of Michigan, member of the House Labor Committee;\(^2\) and (4) George E. Outland, Democratic Representative from California, formerly Director of New Haven Community College and Instructor at Yale University (1936–1937) before being sent to Congress.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 216.
\(^2\)Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 222.
\(^3\)Who’s Who in America, op. cit., p. 1611.

The last of the twenty representative programs analyzed for this study of the American Forum of the Air presented the same topic on December 18, 1945, that had been presented the week before: “Do We Need New Labor Legislation?” Labor-management difficulties were on the increase; the House had passed the Hobbs Bill (a so-called racketeering bill) which labor had fought, claiming it to be a threat to their rights.\(^4\) What type of legislation could be devised which would meet the need and not be considered vindictive by labor? Which type of legislation would most effectively halt the waves of strikes and work stoppages - punitive,

\(^4\)Transcript, American Forum of the Air, “Do We Need New Labor Legislation?”, Volume VII, Number 49, December 18, 1945, p. 3.
piece-meal proposals or overall curbing of labor's so-called "rights"? On the program which presented this question for the second time, appeared the following men: (1) Burke B. Hickenlooper, Republican Senator from Iowa, member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department,\(^1\) former Governor of the State of Iowa (1943) and holder of the J. D. degree from the University of Iowa (1922);\(^2\) (2) Kermit Eby, Director, Education and Research of the Congresses for Industrial Organization;\(^3\) (3) H. A. Smith, Republican Senator from New Jersey, member of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor\(^4\) and former member of the United States Council in Foreign Relations; and (4) Frank Fenton, Director of Organization of the American Federation of Labor.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 192.
\(^3\) Transcript, American Forum of the Air, op. cit., p. 4.
\(^4\) Congressional Directory, op. cit., p. 196.
\(^6\) Transcript, American Forum of the Air, op. cit., p. 4.

It may be said that the topics are suited to the interests and abilities of the speakers, or conversely, it could be stated that the speakers are chosen to suit the
topics; Mr. Granik selects both. There is a high degree of correlation between the two.

Timeliness.

A definite effort is made by Granik to select timely topics of importance to the American public. For example, the week of May 10, 1942, millions of motorists were put on gasoline rations; the week before, sugar was rationed. America was tightening her belt to produce and deliver more tanks, planes, and guns. Those weapons were needed, but they cost money - big money. The people would have to pay for them. At the same time civilian purchasing power had risen; employment opportunities had been increased. Almost everybody wanted more goods than there were goods to buy; goods had become more valuable than money. How could the "inflationary gap" be closed - the gap between increasing income and decreasing supply of civilian goods? How could the excess purchasing power be diverted to pay the cost of war? The House Ways and Means Committee was preparing a new tax bill: excess profits taxes, and increased income taxes were being considered; before the committee was a proposal calling for a general sales tax. Because of the direct effect on every American citizen, the American Forum of the Air discussed the topic, "Should Congress Enact a Federal Sales Tax?"1

Mr. Granik makes a further effort to select topics which are timely by checking with leaders of both parties in the Senate and the House on each program before he books it; Democratic and Republican Senators and Representatives suggest programs from time to time.¹

¹ Congressional Record 86: May 2, 1940, p. 8304-5.

Advance information on issues assuming vital importance is sought; as evidenced by an editorial in The New York Herald Tribune:

Mr. Granik keeps in constant touch with the chairman and ranking members of important House and Senate Committees, many of whom let him know in advance what bills are up for consideration in their committees and when they may be expected to reach the floor. He says his aim is to keep his radio debate simultaneous with the Congressional battles, or if possible, even a bit in advance, so that the forum is frequently a preview of the biggest congressional debate of the following week.²

² New York Herald Tribune, January 26, 1941.

In an interview with R. W. Stewart for the New York Times, Mr. Granik made the following statement concerning his effort to obtain timely topics:

In booking programs for the forum, I try to get those topics which are "hot" in the news; I watch the Congressional debates, and if a timely subject comes up on the floor of either the Senate or the House, I immediately contact the proponents and opponents of the legislation and offer them facilities to broadcast their views.¹

¹
Editors and radio listeners have recognized that his topics are timely:

The forum topics and speakers are announced only a few days before broadcast time. Listeners and editors frequently comment on his (Mr. Granik's) talent for keeping "on top of the news." On occasion he has changed the topic and line-up of the forum the night before the broadcast because of some sudden and important development on the capital newsfront.2

---


On one occasion the House of Representatives was debating the question as that discussed by the American Forum of the Air during the time the broadcast was in progress.

An examination of twenty representative programs reveals that in each case the topics chosen were timely. For example, on July 24, 1945, this topic was discussed: "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?"4

---

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have a Permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee?", Volume VII, Number 27, July 3, 1945, p. 4.

4 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?", Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945, p. 2.

It was reported that President Truman would discuss this question with General De Gaulle of France immediately after
the then current Potsdam Conference; national impulses, latent but ever-present, were beginning to assert themselves.\(^1\)

\(^1\) *New York Times*, October 8, 1945, p. 1.

The settlement of the problems of the aspirations of the Jews, a resurgence of Pan-Arabism, the life-line of the British Empire, and France's colonial aspirations would provide an acid test of the effectiveness of the new United Nations Organization. Upon the settlement of this problem hinged the immediate peace of the Near East.\(^2\)

\(^2\) *Time*, Volume 46, Number 4, July 34, 1945, p. 34.

The topic, "Veterans and Jobs" was presented on July 31, 1945. A debate on this question had been in progress for two months between spokesmen for labor and the Director of Selective Service, who was also charged with returning men to their jobs; servicemen were being returned to civilian life in ever increasing numbers, until, at the time of this discussion, labor was claiming that action was needed to maintain the seniority system in the face of opposition of returning veterans. The floor under wages had begun to buckle.\(^4\) Labor was eager to protect the seniority system.

How could a veteran fit into this program? Representative Rankin, speaking in the House, stated that he had received protests from every section of the country asking protection for the right to work without suffering for having served in the armed forces.¹ This problem would grow in importance as more servicemen were returned to civilian life.

"How Can We Avoid Another Depression?" This question was discussed on August 7, 1945.² The end of the war seemed near at hand; atomic power seemingly had made that end appear to be close. After the war, would a depression be inevitable? It is assumed that reconversion would bring economic problems—economic chaos, perhaps, if America did not plan for such an emergency. Groups and interests were beginning to assert themselves; the phrase "planned economy" was opposed by some, although nearly all people would be interested in combating depressions and their ill effects.³ With the coming of the end of the war, this problem would be projected into the immediate consideration of the American people.

Aired on August 21, 1945, was the topic, "Should

---

¹ Congressional Record, 79th Congress, Volume 91, Number 43, July 31, 1945, p. 7832. (Daily Edition.)

² Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?", Volume VII, Number 32, August 7, 1945, p. 2.

³ Time, Volume 46, Number 5, July 30, 1945, p. 23.
On the day of the discussion, Senate hearings were conducted before the Banking and Currency Committee on the Full Employment Bill, a bill which President Truman had called a "must" legislation. Briefly, this proposal would require the Federal Government to make an annual survey of the labor market with the purpose of directing governmental policy to facilitate private employment and, if necessary, provide public works to make jobs for the unemployed. This bill topped the list of proposals before Congress, which made up a five-point emergency peace-time program. An article in *Time* gave this information concerning the future need:

How many peace-time jobs will there be and how soon? After 18 months of research the Committee for Economic Development came out with an answer...there would be work for fifty-three and one-half million people in the first full year of production (1947). Six million would be left without jobs.

On August 28, 1946, The American Forum of the Air presented the topic "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sick-
At the time of this program the Wagner-Dingell Bill was before the United States Senate and awaiting action. This bill would provide prepaid health insurance or actual sickness insurance: a method of paying medical costs in advance. The American Medical Association had denounced the bill as operationally unsound, and had gone on record in opposition to socialized medicine with federal control. Social reforms are usually slow in becoming generally accepted, and even the actual need may be obscure; there was much debate over the need for this program of socialized medicine. Its avowed objective, the betterment of the health of the nation, would be a timely consideration in any period.

The topic, "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to the States?" was chosen for September 4, 1945. The President and his aides had outlined
a "must" list of legislative activity which they considered to be the important work of Congress in the immediate future. High on that list was a proposal for Federal supplementation of state unemployment compensation. For two weeks, committees of the House and Senate had been conducting hearings on provisions for federal jobless aid. Organized labor had been demanding federal action, claiming that unemployment, as a result of reconversion of war plants to peacetime production, was mounting, and would soon reach an unhealthy peak. Top bill on the Congressional agenda was the Kilgore Bill, designed to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under state laws.

An unusual procedure on September 11, 1945, brought reports by the mayors of America's ten largest cities, concerning the topic, "Ten Mayors Report on Jobs." America was the possibility of mass unemployment while her war plants were being reconverted to peacetime industry. No
longer were military reports and battle strategy the talk of
the people for the war was over, and the problems of peace
were foremost. With the curtailment of war production, many
workers lost their jobs; how many were able to get another,
and how soon? Domestic peace and prosperity, the goals for
which the war had been fought and won, depended upon obtaining
a satisfactory answer to that question.

During the war many controls had been established by our
government - control over our entire industrial output of
products for both war and civilian consumption. We had con-
trols over our domestic life - rationing, travel restrictions,
wage and price ceilings. Now that the war was over and peace
had come to America, people were anxious to wipe out regula-
tion and revert to the old rules of competition, the law of
supply and demand - the system of private enterprise.

On September 14, 1945, Representative A. L. Miller
introduced into the House a resolution to terminate the
Second War Powers Act and lift the wartime controls and re-
store the old system. President Truman, in his first peace-

time message to Congress, called for relaxation of war con-
trols as quickly as possible, taking care to inject a warn-
ing note of caution. He proposed that war contracts be can-
celled and settled at once, so that peacetime production
could get under way.

Four Congressmen discussed "What Should We Do About
Loans to Britain?" on September 25, 1945. Our wartime ally
and new partner in the United Nations Organization had re-
quested financial help to aid her through a reconversion
period after the war. She had sent her top financial men
to Washington for a series of conferences which were at this
time in progress. Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, had
on the day of the broadcast, discussed the problem with
President Truman. In Congress many Representatives and
Senators had expressed their views.
The subject was important to Americans for the long-range implications of world trade and the prospects of successful operation of the new United Nations Organization.

On October 2, 1945, "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?" was the topic selected by Mr. Granik. A point system was the basis for the discharge of the armed forces; this policy had been worked out by consulting with servicemen themselves. Points were allowed for various activities during each man's service, including overseas time, battles engaged in, and number of dependents, and the total number of points needed for discharge was gradually being lowered.

Returning men from overseas presented the problems of shipping space and meeting our needs for an occupational policing job. How many and for how long was anybody's guess, but when General Douglas MacArthur said in Tokyo (September 30, 1945) that...
he could occupy and police Japan with a mere 200,000 troops in six months, a bitter controversy over demobilization arose.\(^1\)


Congressmen had been bombarded with mail demanding that men be sent home at once. Reacting to these complaints, Congress called upon Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall to explain Army demobilization policy.\(^2\)

\(^2\) Time. Volume 46, Number 18, October 29, 1945, pp. 28-29.

The topic "Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?" was broadcast on October 9, 1945. About 1935 there came upon the American scene a new concept for the development of national resources on a regional scale; this concept, to develop irrigation facilities, electric power, and flood control by the Federal Government, resulted in the Tennessee Valley Authority and two huge projects in the West—Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee Dam. To develop the resources of the Tennessee Valley, a government corporation was established, known technically as an authority. At the

\(^3\) Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?", Volume VII, Number 40, October 9, 1945, p. 2.

time of this discussion broadcast, proposals were before Con-
gress to continue this program of developing national re-
sources by the organization of a Missouri Valley Authority,
and the House was holding committee hearings on the proposed
1 legislation.

1 Congressional Record, 79th Congress, Volume 91, Number
158, September 11, 1945, p. A4122 (Daily Edition.)

Mr. Granik chose "Should We Internationalize the
Atomic Bomb?" for the topic to be discussed on October 16,
1945. Controversy had raged in this country over disposi-
2 tion of this secret, ever since the first bomb on Hiroshima
had blasted in the "Atomic Age." Those who favored sharing
the secret said that it was only a question of time before
other nations found it out, as we had done; they favored es-
3 tablishment within the new United Nations Organization of an
international control board. It seemed possible that the


new weapon might become the greatest single force for world
peace. Congress had received various proposals to control
the bomb domestically and resolutions concerning control of
1 its international use; hearings were currently in progress
to establish a federal policy for atomic control.

"Should the Federal Government Support Public Housing Projects?" This was the topic for discussion on October 23, 1945. Labor had asked for governmental assistance to help private industry house the masses of people who did not enjoy good housing. It was claimed that only by use of a federal subsidy would people of low incomes be properly housed. This program would be limited to assist those families which private industry cannot adequately serve, and would provide better homes for those who could not afford what was then on the market. Several housing bills were then in committee and would soon be brought out for action.

The problem "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and
Organized labor had by the outbreak of the war attained a position of importance and power on the American industrial scene. The situation at the time of this discussion was tense: the constituency of the United Automobile Workers had given their leaders, by an overwhelming vote, the right to call industry-wide strike unless their wages were raised. The steelworkers planned a similar strike for January of 1946. Higher wages, it was claimed, were needed to meet the rise in the cost of living. The auto and steel industries were highly organized on a mass basis, and the two fields were considered leaders in American industry; nation-wide strikes could spread to all workers. Representative D. S. Carlson, of Kansas, speaking in the House of Representatives, had sounded a warning note on October 12, 1945:

The people must have some rights in this controversy. The time has arrived for Congressional action on the strike situation. In fact, the time for action is past due.\footnote{Congressional Record, 79th Congress, Volume 91, Number 181, October 12, 1945, p. 9884 (Daily Edition.)}
Three weeks later, on the day prior to this broadcast, a conference of labor and management leaders had convened at Washington, at the invitation of President Truman, to devise a way to settle their differences. Their decisions would determine how effectively the nation could convert to peacetime harmony.


The American Forum of the Air presented this topic on November 13, 1945: "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?" Mr. Granik justified his selection of this topic thus:

After every war, psychological, as well as physical, readjustments become a vital part of any nation's reconversion to peace. During the war years we had to face many a problem on the domestic front - problems of juvenile delinquency, problems of entire families being uprooted and forced into strange environments, problems resulting from the heads of families marching off to war. ... From discussions on important international subjects and vital government, management and labor problems, the Forum quite appropriately turns its attention this week to the physical, mental and moral well-being of the people of America, for only if we have a strong, healthy and sound nation can all other problems be met and solved.

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Facing
The National Women's Advisory Committee on Social Protection had been meeting in Washington to discuss social disease and related problems of delinquency, advising the Social Protection Division of the Federal Security Agency in its programs to aid communities in their fight against these dangers to society. The following quotation from Time gives a brief review of the moral trend:

Crime is on the increase, the F.B.I. reported. In the first six months of 1945 (compared to the same period last year) murder and homicide has risen 4.3%; rape 9%; robbery 10%; aggravated assault 11.5%; burglary 12.1%. 2

A special program - the "Annual Students' Program" - presented on November 20, 1945, a debate on this question: "Resolved: That every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24." The subject was selected by a vote of students throughout the country conducted by Scholastic
It was essentially the same proposal which President Truman had recommended in his message to Congress on October 23, 1945, and which that body at the time of this broadcast, had under consideration. The question had been selected for the National High School debate topic, 1945-1946.

The basic problem was to provide this country with a sufficient number of trained men to cover our large commitments in the Western Hemisphere, in the Pacific, in the Atlantic, and potentially in Europe and Asia. To cover these commitments a large navy and a small professional army were needed; but these commitments could be made permanent and real only if a reserve force were ready at all times to support them in a possible war.

On November 27, 1945, this problem was considered: "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force
for the United Nations?" The day before, Senator Donnell,

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Con-
gress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the
United Nations?", Volume VII, Number 46, November 27, 1945,

the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had
introduced a bill into the United States Senate, supplement-
ing our recent approval of the United Nation's Charter with
specific legislations to make our participation effective.
This bill would give to our delegate on the Security Council
the power to vote for the use of force whenever needed, with-
out coming back to Congress for specific authorization. The
measure was the result of months of planning; it was the
climax to our entry into the United Nations Organization.

Senate ratification of the United Nation's Charter (June 1945)
was a significant decision, but it was this bill which would
actually make possible our participation in the U.N.O. Upon

the answer to the question of the evening hung the possible
success or failure of the newest effort toward achieving world
peace.

Time, Volume 91, Number 21, November 19, 1945, pp. 23-24.
The topic discussed on December 4, 1945, was "How Can We Keep Radio Free?" When radio was young (about 1920) America decided that the new industry would be allowed to develop as private enterprise. It should be recognized that it had the public's interest at heart, but the stations and systems had been privately owned and operated. Other nations had made different decisions: in Britain, for example, radio is government owned and operated; revenue for operation comes from a tax on each receiver. It was important to consider the effectiveness of our system of control, and compare it with that of other nations.

It is assumed that freedom of speech is an important objective at any time. There is no available evidence that it was, on the week of this broadcast, any more pertinent than at any other time, except that a week prior to this discussion, Jack Poppele, President of the Television Broadcasting Association, had announced that "television was now ready for the American Public." The Federal Communications
Commission had begun to allocate stations; television was on the horizon. Federal policy in relation would apply to the new industry.

1 Time, ibid., p. 89.

The "vital issue of the week" of December 11, 1945, as selected by Mr. Granik, was "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?" He defended his choice thus:

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 3.

The most vital issue facing the country today is labor-management relations. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach warned yesterday that our entire reconversion process is endangered. With the automobile industry stalled, a strike ordered in steel for January 14th, and the rest of the industry waiting for results, the outlook is bleak, indeed.

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 3.

As workers struck or threatened to strike, Congress had responded with the proposal of bills to curb and control labor activities. At the time of this broadcast there was before Congress several proposals dealing with labor relations, one supported by President Truman. This measure would have provided for a fact-finding body to investigate the cause of the labor disturbance. The President's proposal came after
a labor-management conference had met at his invitation in Washington and produced a set of resolutions. The conference had not been successful, for labor was still striking for higher wages. Economic insecurity was the acknowledged basis for the wave of labor unrest. As the second week of the General Motors strike wore along, feelings were growing more bitter; the strike was spreading to other plants and threatened to affect affiliated industries.

The last of the twenty programs examined for this study presented the same topic considered a week earlier, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?" (December 18, 1945)

During that week the House of Representatives had passed the Hobbs Bill, the so-called "Anti-racketeering Act." This bill (H.R.:32) was considered to be vindictive by labor leaders; they claimed it was a threat to their "rights."
That bill was at this time before the Senate for considera-
tion. Also during that week, Secretary of Labor Schwellen-
bach had appeared before the Senate Education and Labor Com-
mittee to urge passage of this bill.1 More than one-hundred

1 Congressional Record, 79th Congress, Volume 91, Num-
ber 221, December 13, 1945, p. 12121 (Daily Edition.)

witnesses had requested time to testify before the Senate
committee; this was an indication of the importance and
tenseness of the labor situation throughout the country,
reflected in Washington by demands for immediate Congres-
sional action.

2 Time, Volume 46, Number 25, December 17, 1945, pp. 17-18.

From the examination of the contemporary events
of national interest at the time of these broadcasts, it is
evident that their selection was timely.

Are the Topics Limited to Suit the Situation?

It is difficult to determine an answer to this
question for an examination of representative American Forum
of the Air transcripts reveals that the participants do not
agree on any solutions to the problems which they discuss.

First, the participants do not pursue a logical
pattern to its conclusion. Authorities agree that the logi-
cal pattern of discussion need not be followed to its ultim-
ate conclusion for value to be derived from the discussion
period; any steps completed mark advancement. Thoroughness of treatment rather than completion of the pattern is to be considered the measure of success. (Cf. supra., p. 46.) The questions are possible of solution, and because they are not disposed of does not indicate that they are unsuitable for discussion.

Second, it is obvious that such complex questions as those presented on these broadcasts will seldom be completely disposed of in a forty-five minute period, even if the logical pattern were rigidly followed; the questions are too complicated and involve issues too broad to be settled by a brief survey.

An analysis of the topics of twenty representative programs indicates that the answers to such broad and complex questions would require more consideration than was possible within the time limits of the American Forum of the Air. For example, three of the twenty programs selected

*For a complete list of the twenty topics, with the volume and number of the transcript, see Appendix B, p. 245.*

for examination in this study dealt with the question of unemployment. These were "Veterans and Jobs" (July 31, 1945); "Should Congress Pass the Full Employment Bill?" (August 31, 1945); and "Ten Mayors Report on Jobs" (September 11, 1945). The issues involved were: how can sixty million jobs be provided? Will the returning veterans have to take a cut
in "seniority" for serving in the armed forces? What will be done if his old job no longer exists? How would a system of federally sponsored public works affect the national economy? What other method of providing jobs would be superior to such a governmental spending program?

The problem of strikes, labor-management relations, was the subject for discussion on three of the twenty selected programs: "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?" (November 6, 1945); and "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?" (discussed twice: November 11, 1945, and November 18, 1945). Issues of this broad question were: How could labor be compensated for a rise in the cost of living without starting a feared spiral of inflation? How much compensation would be sufficient? How soon and at what price could industry reconvert their plants to peacetime production? Were the demands of labor excessive? If so, how could labor leaders be persuaded of this fact? Could strikes be outlawed? What type of new legislation could be devised to curb them? What might be done if labor should consider such legislation vindictive (as was evident from their disapproval of the Hobbs Bill)?

Four of the twenty topics examined were concerned with elements of our foreign policy: "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?" (July 24, 1945); "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?" (September 25, 1945); "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?" (October 16, 1945); and
"Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations?" The fundamental objective of our foreign policy was to support a system by which world peace could be insured. Would the new United Nations Organization provide such a system? How could the menace of atomic energy in warfare be met? What plan could be devised for providing the new U.N.O. with machinery to control the atom bomb? Would such power in the hands of the Security Council be a positive force for world peace? Would the atomic bomb be the right weapon to put into the hands of an international police force? How could such a plan solve the troubles of the world: for example, those in the Near East? How friendly should we be with England? With Russia? How much money should we loan to them, under what conditions? The fundamental issues of our foreign policy were raised by these topics on Mr. Granik's programs.

Of the twenty programs examined, four raised issues concerning America's reconversion policy after the war's end: "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?" (August 7, 1945); "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?" (October 2, 1945); and "Peace-time Military Training", (November 20, 1945). The issues raised were: How could reconversion to peacetime living be most quickly and effectively achieved and maintained? How might reconversion be attained without having a depression similar to those of the past? How could inflation and its resultant economic crash be avoided? How would abolition of
war-time controls affect this picture? Could reconversion be speeded by bringing the veterans home more quickly? How could world peace be maintained after reconversion was a fact? What system of securing a peacetime army would most commensurate with our permanent peacetime policy?

"Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?" (October 9, 1945) and "Should the Federal Government Support Public Housing Projects?" (October 23, 1945) concerned the question of the authority and responsibility of government to provide internal improvements for the public welfare. How would these programs affect private enterprise? Would there be huge amounts of waste of federal funds in connection with such huge expenditure programs? What responsibility did the government have to provide such programs, if private industry were unable to meet the need? What income levels, if any should be subsidized to meet this need?

The four other programs of the twenty examined were concerned with sociological problems: (1) "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" (August 28, 1945); would such a measure result in the evils of federal control? How could the benefits of a healthier nation be achieved without accepting the dangers of socialism? What were the evils of federal control and the dangers of socialism? Could any other method be devised which would result with healthier people in our nation? (2) "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to States?" (September 4,
1945). It was assumed that some unemployment compensation was necessary; how much should be the minimum? Could the states handle the problem without the assistance of the national government? Could unemployment be treated as a problem of the separate states? Due to the fact that the closing of a plant in one part of the country would cause economic disturbance in another, perhaps leading to a nation-wide industrial struggle, was it not the place of the national government to deal with the problems of unemployment compensation? (3) "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?" (November 13, 1945). How could America meet the problems of juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and lack of social responsibility? How could reconversion be achieved, if it were to involve psychological readjustments, moral problems, and social relations? Would reaction to the social upheaval of the war years leave its mark permanently on the American family? How could America avoid a partial or complete moral breakdown? What could be done by the home, the church, and the school? (4) "How Can We Keep Radio Free?" (December 4, 1945). It is assumed the freedom of speech is generally desirable; how could this freedom be preserved? Was private control of radio the best method for achieving the desired results? How much federal control was necessary? Would such federal control lead to totalitarianism? How can the present effectiveness of radio broadcasting be increased in the public interest?
From this analysis of the issues involved in twenty representative programs, it is evident that the questions considered on the American Forum of the Air would seldom be settled within the limits of a forty-five minute broadcast.

This statement may suggest that the topics are too broad for the purposes of this program and that they should be further limited; however, this is not the conclusion of this writer. One objective of the radio program is to create public interest in important questions of the day. (supra. p. 11.) The complex and debatable problems discussed on the American Forum of the Air are well suited to attract the attention of a mildly interested, little-concerned, partially apathetic scattering of radio listeners. In consideration of this purpose of a radio program, it may be concluded that the topics are satisfactorily chosen to suit the radio situation.

In summary, examination of twenty representative programs of the American Forum of the Air reveals that the topics presented are in the form of an impartial question, except for two exceptions. A high correlation exists between the selection of the participants and the selection of the topics, both of which are chosen by Mr. Granik; the topics are chosen with special attention to their adaptation to the interests of the radio audience, and importance at the time of discussion. They are broad in scope and involve many issues, but are well adapted to the radio audience.
CHAPTER V

PROGRESSION IN DISCUSSION

By progression is meant use, if any, of the logical pattern of discussion. Since radio discussion requires group participation without the occurrence of "dead spots", it is desirable that the discussion progress smoothly toward the solution of the problem. Conflicts of opinion and personality clashes must not be allowed to cause digression; some authorities advocate that this be done by following a pre-arranged outline which is based on the logical pattern of discussion. There is no inflexible outline which a discussion must follow; however, if no pattern at all guides the group thinking, the chairman may soon lose control, the goals of the procedure be forgotten, and the untamed members of the group may proceed in all directions at once.

Several authorities' statements of the logical pattern follows:

Judson and Judson suggest:

...(1) understanding what the problem is, (2) search for probable solutions, (3) elimination or combinations to give the best solution. 1

---

1 Judson and Judson, op. cit., p. 17.

Sheffield offers these four questions to be the basis of the pattern:

(1) What situation have we here? (2) What possibilities of attitude and action does
it show? (3) What help ... can we get from added facts and reconsidered feelings? (4) What decision can we reach as to satisfying action? 1

1 Sheffield: op. cit., p. 17.

McBurney and Hance outline the logical pattern in this way:

(1) Defining and limiting the problem, (2) analyzing the problem, (3) suggestion of solutions, (4) reasoned development of the proposed solutions, (5) further verifications. 2

2 McBurney, James, and Hance, Kenneth: op. cit., p. 11.

Baird prefers this outline:

(1) Explanation of the terms or institutions involved in the problem, (2) an exposition of the goals or aims to be considered in any solution of the problem, (3) an analysis of the situation giving rise to the problem, (4) a weighing in turn of the representative solutions as proposed by different groups, (5) a complete diagnosis and validation of that solution a arrived at by the group, (6) a statement of any course of action to be carried out or sponsored by the group. 3

3 Baird, A. Craig: op. cit., p. 56.

Elliott presents a complicated outline which contains as its major elements:

(1) The situation and its problem. (2) What to do? (Examination of possibilities, exploration of differences of fact, discussions of differences of points of view, and reaching a decision.) (3) How to do it? 1
The major difference among these logical pattern descriptions is merely a varying degree of complexity; their agreement is virtually complete on (1) definition, (2) analysis, (3) hypothesis, (4) reasoned selection of the best solution. Baird, Elliott, and Sheffield add an action step; Baird also includes an exposition of goals, while Elliott wants point of difference and agreement analyzed. All of these patterns are based on John Dewey's analysis of reflective thinking the the first edition of How We Think, published in 1910. Leigh's comment is typical:

Years ago John Dewey described how we think in a little book by that name. Those writing on the subject since have found little change in the formulae he devised. 2

Dewey's outline of reflective thinking included:
(1) A felt difficulty. (2) Its location and definition. (3) Suggestion of possible solutions. (4) Examination and comparison of these tentative outcomes. (5) Further observations and experiment leading to its acceptance or rejection. (6) Final verification of that hypothesis regarded as most tenable. 3
But Dewey analyzed individual reflective thinking.

How can we justify the application of the individual reflective thinking pattern to group discussion? To do this we must accept these assumptions: (1) Discussion is reflective thinking. (See page 5 of this study.) Most authorities agree that reflective thinking is the method of discussion. (2) Reflective thinking (and therefore discussion) has a method of progression. This does not mean a rigid set of rules which leaders and participants must salaam and obey, but an orderly, systematic progression of group thinking. To insist that discussion has no theoretical method of progression is to deny that it is reflective thinking.

The goal of discussion may be either insight or solution of the problem, or decision upon a course of action after the solution has been reached; if no decision is required, then the final steps of selection and verification are unnecessary. If lack of time prevents completion of the logical pattern, discussion may still be profitable. Baird writes:

> Each phase completed marks an advance. ... a discussion, because of its exploratory character, presents a completed unit at any stage of progression.  

1 Baird, A. Craig: op. cit., p. 59.

He expresses the belief that thoroughness of treatment rather than completion of the pattern is the measure of success. Authorities agree upon the danger of rigid and formal procedure; straight-jacketing group thinking may stifle the com-
municative spark. McBurney and Hance emphasize flexibility and decry attempts to stereotype discussion procedure, adding about their own logical pattern:

The sequence ... is not an infallible guide to the order of their appearance in discussion, nor should it be thought that these steps always appear as wholly distinct and separate entities. 1

Some of these steps may not be discernible whatever; some of them may be taken for granted and omitted completely.

Dewey supports this opinion:

The phases ... (may) not follow one another in a set order... The elaboration of hypotheses does not wait until the problem has been defined and adequate hypotheses arrived at; it may come in at any intermediate time. 2

Baird refers to his logical pattern as a "suggestive outline" rather than a "rigid yardstick." 3

Analysis of Method of Progression

Do the participants on the American Forum of the Air follow a logical outline of reflective thinking? In theory, they should roughly follow these steps: (1) statement of the problem; (2) analysis of the problem, (3)

weighing of the reasoned development of proposed solutions, (4) diagnosis of group solution, and (5) verification of that solution leading to a course of action. (see supra, p. 5)

Statement of the Problem.

In each of the twenty transcripts examined, the problem was stated by the moderator. Immediately after the announcer identified the program and the network, he introduced Mr. Granik, who then stated the problem, and in some cases analyzed the issues or, when pertinent, reviewed the background of the question. After this, in each of the twenty cases studied, the modifier introduced each of the participants, who responded with a one-minute speech.

2 For an example of the format followed by the American Forum of the Air, see Appendix A, Transcript of the American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Keep Radio Free?", Volume VII, Number 47, December 4, 1945.

The questions were stated exactly as they are listed in Appendix B, p. 245, with four exceptions. The problem for "Veterans and Jobs" (July 31, 1945) was stated:

Can we guarantee that every returning veteran will get his old job back when he is discharged from the service? 3

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Veterans and
For the program "Ten Mayors Report on Jobs", (September 11, 1945) the following statement was made:

Facing Congress today is the possibility of mass unemployment while our war plants reconvert. 1


For "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?" (November 6, 1945) Mr. Granik asked:

How can the United Steel Workers (CIO) and the United Automobile Workers of the C.I.O. get together with steel and auto management? 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?", Volume VII, Number 43, November 6, 1945, p. 3.

The problem of "Peacetime Military Training" (November 20, 1945) was stated by Mr. Granik in the form of a resolution:

Resolved: That every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24. 3


In eight of the twenty transcripts examined, the question was not actually a statement of the basic question
involved, but a request for approval or disapproval of a solution which had been proposed. In each of these cases, the proposed solution was, at the time of the broadcast, in the form of a bill under consideration by Congress. A list of these eight topics and the basic problem concerned is as follows: "Should Congress Pass the Full Employment Bill?" (How can the unemployed make a living during the period of reconversion? August 21, 1945; "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" (How can we improve the health of the people of the nation? August 28, 1945; "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to States?" (How can the unemployed people maintain a satisfactory standard of living during the reconversion from wartime to peacetime production?) September 4, 1945; "Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?" (How can America best develop her national resources for electric power and irrigation?) October 9, 1945; "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?" (What should we do with the secret of the atomic bomb?) October 16, 1945; "Should the Federal Government Support Public Housing Projects? (How can we secure better housing conditions for those who cannot afford what is now on the market?) October 23, 1945; "Resolved: That every able-bodied male citizen of the United States should have one year of full-time military training before attaining age 24" (How can the United States be made secure from military aggression?) November 20, 1945; "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations? (How can the United
States best give full cooperation to a world police force?)

November 27, 1945.

The fact that some of the questions considered on these broadcasts were actually considerations of proposed solutions to problems, instead of a consideration of the basic problems themselves, may appear to be insignificant. However, adherence to a logical pattern of discussion would require a statement of the problem before the proposal of the various solutions. The method of proposal of a solution first, then proof of a need, is the method of debate, and not discussion.

Analysis of the Problem.

In each of the twenty programs examined, except one, an analysis of the problem was given by the moderator. In his introductory remarks, Mr. Granik gave an analysis of the issues or a statement of the general aspects of the problem, and in some of the transcripts showed how the current situation demanded action. Sixteen of the problems were further analyzed by the participants. An examination of twenty transcripts showed that the problems were analyzed in the following manner.

On July 24, 1945, Granik gave the broad implications of the problem, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?"

On the answer to this question hinges the peace of the future and the acid test of
effectiveness for the United Nations Organization. The Near East, with its varied races, its mingling of the new and the very old, its treasure, its poverty, and now its oil - has always been a trouble spot for the expansion of European civilization. The civilization of the West and the East, brought into head-long contact by two world conflicts in the past quarter century, must now be resolved. The extent to which they can be resolved on a mutually helpful basis will determine in large measure whether the simmering volcano will explode and throw the world into chaos again. Two European powers are deeply affected: Great Britain and France. Britain's lifeline of Empire is dependent on peace in this area. France's entire colonial world hinges on decisions made here. There may be other European powers who will play or who are now playing a role in this drama. Affected also are the aspirations of millions of Jews who have been promised a national home in this land. These aspirations and lifestliness of empire are now being played against a resurgence of nationalism, a Pan-Arabism, that must collide unless some peaceful solution is discovered. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?", Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945, p. 3.

Additional analysis of this problem was made by the participants at intervals during the program:

Sir Willmott Lewis: You speak of nationalism and imperialism ... imperialism ... is above and beyond regionalism. It includes regionalism, and, as far as it can, federates them. Isn't it more exact to speak of the contest today, as we saw it in San Francisco and as we see it now as between regionalism and universalism. 1
1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.

Salloum Mokarzel: ...a lot of foreign capital is coming into the country, but how will that affect the political status of the country? ...Is money going in as a commercial or economic investment, and is political influence going to follow it? How will that affect the status of the different countries involved? 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 7.

Leon Brasseur: May I ask a question? ...What about the relations between the Arab states or federation with the western world - America, France, England? Do you think the Near East states can live alone, without help from the outside? 3

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 11.

Granik pointed out the issues involved in the problem; Can we guarantee that every returning veteran will get his old job back when he is discharged from the service?

What if the old job no longer exists? What if his (the veteran's) place in the plant or on the line has been taken by an older man, a veteran of the First World War, a family man with children to support? ... The picture is further complicated by the great number of young servicemen who will be returning to the labor market without any previous experience, youngsters who were taken out of schools and colleges before they had completed their education and who will now come back into industry as new employer. Shall they have seniority in a job based on their service record? 1
In this program, the participants further analyzed the problem thus:

M. H. Hedges: The issue ... is not one of what we do but of how we do it. That is what this debate is about: How are we going to do the thing properly for the returned veteran and for the civilian worker?

Omar B. Ketchum: Mr. Hedges.... in the event we do not have full employment, that management and government are unable to provide full employment, where is the veteran going to be unless he is given an opportunity to break into the field of restricted employment which union labor through seniority regulations has thrown around a certain percentage of the jobs in this nation....

Ted F. Silvey: We would like to ask you whether you want to throw other people out of work in order to give veterans of this war jobs. Do you want the veterans of the last war to be discharged in order to have jobs for the new men? 2

M. H. Hedges: Do you take position, then, that the way to effect this thing is to break down the controls and the protective measure that have been built up over 50 years in American Industry, in order to get the soldiers back on the jobs? What is going to protect them if the union regulations are broken down? 3
"How Can We Avoid Another Depression?" (August 7, 1945.) In his analysis of this problem, Granik shows that the current situation demands action and points out some of the issues involved:

If the Japanese War should end tomorrow, would a depression be inevitable? In various agencies of government, reconversion has become the problem of the immediate future. Already the issues are being outlined; groups are beginning to assert themselves and the world of tomorrow is taking shape. Must that world have periods of economic depression? That is the question which every American, in uniform or civilian clothes, has been asking...

If government plans wisely with industry, they (experts) claim we should be able to maintain our economy on an even keel. Does this necessarily mean a planned economy?... Just how can we combat depressions? Can it be done by lowering taxes and giving industry a free hand? Can it be done by government going into business as a stabilizer? Can it be done by huge government expenditures? 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?", Volume VII, Number 32, August 7, 1945, p. 2.

On August 21, 1945, the moderator of the American Forum of the Air showed the need for a solution to the basic problem; how can the unemployed maintain a satisfactory standard of living during the period of reconversion? The question considered on this program was actually a consideration of one solution to this basic problem. Therefore, the analysis of the problem was brief; the moderator was mainly
concerned with introducing the proposed solution: Should Congress pass the Full Employment Bill?

The transition from a wartime economy to peace presents many difficulties. Industrialists have their problems with war contract terminations and raw materials for new products in short supply. Labor, too, has many problems. With the ending of war production many workers will lose their jobs. The question that confronts them is simply, how soon can they get another? 1

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress Pass the Full Employment Bill?", Volume VII, Number 33, August 21, 1945, p. 3.

There was found no evidence in the transcript of this broadcast that the participants made any important contribution toward an analysis of the basic problem; they were interested in presenting their points of view on the proposal, "Should Congress Pass the Full Employment Bill?"

Almost no analysis was made of the problem on August 23, 1945. Granik made a brief statement of the situation giving rise to the problem: How can we improve the health of the nation? He then outlined arguments for and against the proposed solutions: "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?"

The coming session of Congress will see many domestic legislative proposals. Chief among these will be an attempt to expand and liberalize the Social Security program. Now before Congress and awaiting action is the so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill,
which deals with prepaid health insurance, the subject of our discussion this evening. Health insurance, or actually sickness insurance, is a method of paying medical costs in advance. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?", Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945, p. 2.

An examination of the transcript for this discussion revealed that the participants were concerned with assertions and arguments for and against the proposal, "Should the Federal Government Give Supplemental Unemployment Aid to States?" and made no further analysis of the basic problem involved.

On September 4, 1945, Granik gave a brief statement of the need for a solution to this problem: how can the unemployed maintain a satisfactory standard of living during reconversion from wartime to peacetime industry? The question for discussion on this particular program was a consideration of a proposed solution: should the federal government give supplemental unemployment aid to states? After this brief statement, Mr. Granik gave arguments for and against the proposed solution:

For two weeks, committees of the House and Senate have been conducting hearings on bills which would provide for federal jobless aid. Organized labor has been demanding federal action, claiming that unemployment, as a result of reconversion of war plants to peace production, is mounting, and will soon reach an unhealthy peak. 1
One of the participants made a statement which further contributed to the analysis of this problem:

Joseph A. Padway: Don't forget ... there are thirteen million wage-earners now who are not covered (by the present unemployment compensation system.) There are two and a half million workers employed by small employers that do not get benefits because there are not seven or more accompanying employees - that is, there has to be eight before they get compensation. And then there are a hundred or more thousand maritime workers. There are three million federal workers who are not covered.

The program broadcast on September 11, 1945, did not profess to approximate a discussion situation, but was a series of reports from the mayors of America's ten largest cities, giving a summary of the labor-reconversion situation in their particular cities.

On the broadcast of September 18, 1945, Granik stated the problem, and then briefly reviewed the situation which had given rise to it:
Should we remove wartime controls? The question we pose this evening has a direct effect on reconversion, on employment, and the future prosperity of the nation.... What controls that they (Congress) established before and during the war should be now abolished? Should any be retained? ... Now that the war is over and peace has come to the world once again, should we wipe out all regulation and control and revert to the rule of competition, the law of supply and demand, the system of private enterprise? 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?", Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945, p. 2.

The participants further analyzed the problem throughout the discussion program thus:

A. L. Miller: You say you will remove certain wartime controls. Just which ones would you remove and which ones would you keep? ...

Frank B. Keefe: ... There seems to be a unanimity of opinion all over the country....that wartime controls that do impede or interfere with speedy reconversion should be removed immediately ... It seems to me there isn't very much to discuss unless you want to get down to specific controls... 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?", Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945, p. 4.

A. L. Miller: ...who is going to decide when controls are to be removed? ...

Frank B. Keefe: ...it seems to me that we ought to get this discussion into some definite channel. You are talking about the removal of OPA controls, which fall into two classes: first, price controls, and rationing. If you talk about rationing, I think
you have almost unanimity of agreement that all rationing controls except upon a very few scarce items should be immediately sus­pended... The evidence that that is the correct method of approach is indicated because almost everything except a few items have been taken off rationing. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.

Frank B. Keefe: Now, then, we get into this question of price control. That is the other phase, and it seems to me we ought to discuss that just a little bit - the question of price control. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 6.

Jerry Voorhis: There is one thing we have to remember, I think, in this picture, and that is, first you have an increasing number of men coming back from the war to face the necessity of getting back into civilian life and catching hold. You also have, for the people who have carried on war production work through the war, a reduction in take-home pay. We cannot per­mit a high, drastic increase of price to con­front either of those two groups of people. 3

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 10.

"What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?" In analyzing this problem on September 25, 1945, Granik gave a rather elaborate description of the circumstances which created the problem, and very briefly three issues involved:

Our wartime ally and partner in the United Nations, says she needs financial help from us to help her through a reconversion period and back on her economic feet. She has sent
her top financial men to Washington for a series of talks. The conferences are now in progress here in the Capital. Late this afternoon, the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, discussed the problem at length with President Truman. A decision is expected soon ... The issues that face us are not only how much we should loan or give, but whether we should help at all. Britain says that aid is essential in order to maintain a proper standard of living and get her industry back in peacetime production to build up her export trade, the life-blood of her empire. If we help her regain that trade, what about our own export trade? Some point to certain practices of the British which are detrimental to our international trading plans, such as cartels, the sterling bloc arrangements, and empire preference in trade. Before we loan money, should we make the British eliminate these practices? 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 38, September 25, 1945, p. 3.

Further exposition of the problem was made during the course of the program by the participants:

Roy O. Woodruff: ... He (Lord Keynes, a British loan delegate) announced that the British delegation wanted financial aid from the United States, and in addition thereto a liberal American trade and tariff also; in other words, the gentleman would not be satisfied with getting American pants, but proposes to get our shirts also...

C. G. Woodhouse: If we are going to have peace, we must have multilateral trade. If we don't give aid to Great Britain, her only alternative course is to strengthen the sterling bloc, to have more economic preference, to have more controls. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.
Emanuel Cellar: ... we must not forget that England has always been our best customer. For example, England took an average of 40 per cent of all our exports during the prewar years and she will continue to be our best customer, and we must give some consideration to our customers. 1

Roy O. Woodruff: ... don't you think it would be a good idea to sort of give back to the loan business and find out what sorts of loans we are going to send them, gifts, or what it is going to be? 2

Granik gave a brief statement of the cause for consideration of the problem, are we demobilizing effectively? (October 2, 1945) Recent events had brought the question to public attention, and an analysis of the problem necessarily called for a review of the current situation:

Congressmen have been bombarded with mail from their constituents complaining, demanding, requesting that their men be sent home immediately... From men in Army camps here in the country come stories of unwarranted delays, of sitting around doing nothing while waiting for discharge machinery to function ... Returning men from overseas presents several difficulties. First, there must be enough shipping available to transport the troops home. Second, we and our allies won the war; now we are committed to an occupation and policing job. Many G.I.'s will be required to insure the victory. How long that insurance must be maintained is anybody's guess ... It is our national policy to return servicemen to civilian life as quickly as possible and practical. There is no disagreement on that score. What has caused disagreement, particularly among our lawmakers here in Washington, has been the effectiveness of the
machinery established by the Army to carry out that national policy. 1

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?", Volume VII, Number 39, October 2, 1945, p. 2.

Some of the participants repeated or corroborated what had been said by Mr. Granik:

J. Edgar Chenowith: It seems very obvious that the point system was not designed to let men out of the Army. It was designed to keep men in the Army, and they are keeping them in just as long as public sentiment will permit and Congress lets this go on. The more pressure we put on, the more rapidly they discharge the men. 2

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 7.

H. Y. Buffett: Some Congressmen were over in England the other day and they found a hospital full of American doctors and nurses, and not a single patient. That is what one of our fellow Congressmen found; and then he found another place where they were trying to release doctors and they were so slow at it they had a number of doctors as patients themselves. 3

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 8.

J. Edgar Chenowith: ... we read in the paper today where the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations just came back from Europe and made a report to the President of the United States, and this among other things, is what they reported: "The War Department is losing prestige among American troops abroad because of the apparent lag in demobilization. 4

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 9.
The topic, "Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?" (October 9, 1945) was not actually a statement of a problem; it was a consideration of a proposed solution. Granik assumed that the basic problem (how can American best develop her natural resources for electric power and irrigation) was understood by the radio audience, and after a brief description of the situation, proceeded to review arguments for and against the proposed solution. His brief history of the question was:

More than a decade ago a new concept for the development of the national resources of the country on a regional scale came upon the American scene ... To develop the resources of the Tennessee Valley, a government corporation was established, known technically as an authority. This agency developed electric power, aided navigation, manufactured fertilizer, and built flood control facilities in the lands fed by the Tennessee River. Now there are proposals to continue the development of our resources with a string of other valley authorities throughout the country. 1

Further analysis of this problem was made by the participants during the course of the discussion:

Representative W. A. D'Ewart: Judge Erickson, we don't want to debate with you on the question of whether we are going to have this improvement of our land and water resources. We are agreed we all want that. The question is how it will be done. Will it be done by three dictators appointed by President, who may not even be citizens of the
United States under the law; or will it be done by people who will cooperate and work with our state and local interests out there? ... We don't quarrel with you, Senator Taylor, on the Tennessee Valley. We quarrel with you on how it will be done in the Missouri Valley. 1

Senator Glen H. Taylor: ... You talk about divided authority. That is what we now have with the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation tugging and hauling with each other, fighting like cats and dogs, and they have only stopped when the threat of a valley authority to kick them into line and make them get busy and do the job has come along. 2

Senator Glen H. Taylor: ... the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau have been in existence for forty years and one hundred years, respectively, ... but they haven't accomplished a great deal and I feel that an authority that could get busy and do a job, do an integrated job like the Tennessee Valley Authority and get it done so we can start enjoying the benefits, is what we need. 3

Judge Leif Erickson: ... You know the Missouri drops from 13,000 to 2,000 feet in that state. (Montana)

Representative W. M. Whittington: I also know that for the most part the Missouri River ... has two problem, and I know you haven't got any water power along that river from Sioux City to its mouth ... your problem there is flood control, and we want to keep that in mind.
Judge Leif Erickson: In the upper region we have the richest mineral development in the whole United States, lying there waiting for hydro-electric power to open it up. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., pp. 11-12.

On October 16, 1945, Mr. Granik stated that his subject was one of the possible solutions to the basic problem: What should we do with the secret of the atomic bomb? After recognizing this basic problem, he briefly described the world situation which created it:

Since the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, blasting in the Atomic Age, controversy has raged in this country over disposition of the secret we have uncovered. Tonight we bring you a discussion on the most important phase of the controversy...

In Congress at the present time are various proposals to control the bomb domestically and resolutions on its international use. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?", Volume VII, Number 41, October 16, 1945, p. 2.

Additional analysis of the problem was made by the participants thus:

Homer E. Capehart: We have the so-called United Nations and we had a meeting in London that lasted for about three weeks between the Foreign Secretaries of the three major powers, and during those three weeks they were unable to agree on anything, at least according to the newspapers. Now tell me how the 50-odd nations of the world are going to agree on how to handle the atomic bomb.
Norman Cousins: Senator Capehart,
I agree with your diagnosis. I am not sure
I agree with your prescription or prognosis.
I agree with you the world is slipping back
into war again, and we have here the greatest
weapon ever developed by man, the atomic bomb.
What are we going to do with it? Can we wait
for war to come, or can we act now and set up
the only agency that can control it, and that
means government. How long can we wait....?

William B. Ziff: Do you think you
are going to have a world to wait for if you
are going to give away these weapons? ...

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.

Homer E. Capehart: If we inter-
nationalize the atomic bomb, who will control
it, and will it be developed for use for war
or will it be developed for commercial or
civilian uses? If for war, when would its
use be justified and under what circumstances
would it be used? ....

William B. Ziff: I would like to
know what it is you are suggesting and arguing.
Are you suggesting we should or should not give
the secret of the atomic bomb away right now;
and if you are not suggesting that are you sug-
gest that we should wait until a world govern-
ment is established before we let them be the
dustodians of this secret. 2

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.

Senator Brien McMahon: ... In my
opinion, the issue is here and now: Are we
going to do what we can to avert another war,
or are we going on to sign our own death
warrant ....

Homer E. Capehart: Senator McMahon,
why don't you answer the question I asked a
minute ago: who will control it and will it
be developed for uses of war or be developed
for commercial or civilian uses. ....how can
you turn something over to an organization
until you know exactly what that organization
is going to do when you turn it over. 1
William B. Ziff: Are we now arguing the question of a federal world government or are we arguing what we ought to do with the atomic bomb? 2

"Should the Federal Government Support Public Housing Projects?" Mr. Granik made no attempt to analyze the problem behind this question, but recognized it by stating that there was a clear indication that we are awake to the need for better housing conditions for those who cannot afford what is now on the market. 3

After this brief recognition of the basic problem, Granik presented arguments for and against the proposal, of federally supported housing projects. During the course of the program the participants further analyzed the problem thus:

Joseph E. Merrion: Senator Taft, aren't you overlooking and doesn't this discussion overlook the fact that there is a considerable inventory of housing already in this country? ... Why is it necessary to build new housing for the low-income groups? 4
Senator Robert A. Taft: ... and nobody will build new housing for people who have incomes of $1,000 and less. It simply is not an economic thing to do, and it is not done today. Why housing is different from other things is that the cost of houses is out of proportion to the income of the people. There are various reasons why that is. I hope very much that technological improvement may result in bringing down the cost of private housing to a point where a man can afford to buy a house just as he can afford to buy an automobile, but really today the people of this country are better able to buy automobiles than houses ... 1

George L. Bliss: ... Senator Taft just suggested that 80 per cent of the population should support, by subsidies, the remaining 20 per cent.

Senator Robert A. Taft: Not entirely. I say that in 20 per cent group a lot of things are going to have to be filled out. Of course, we long ago adopted the policy of educating them for nothing. We have always given them medical care for nothing. Every city that has a general hospital is giving medical care to 20 per cent. This is no change in the general policy of Government, in my opinion, basically. The housing problem requires the adoption of a particular technique because it is a peculiar and special problem, but the general principle is not different from what the Government has always assumed. 2

George L. Bliss: Mr. Klutznick, I think you have well developed that the basic problem is the ability of the American family to earn a sufficient amount of income to provide adequate food, clothing and shelter. That is the basic economic problem.

Senator Robert A. Taft: That is the basic problem, but in housing you add to it
another problem, the fact that the cost of housing is higher than the lower-income American family can afford to pay. You can't build houses today for a large percentage of the population at present costs. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.

On the program aired November 6, 1945, an analysis of the problem was made by Mr. Granik thus:

How can the United Steel Workers (CIO) and the United Automobile Workers of the CIO get together with steel and auto management? These two fields are barometers of American industry. Labor-management strife in either is felt quickly by millions throughout the country. At the present time the situation in both industries is tense. The rank and file of the UAW have given their leaders, by an overwhelming vote, the right to call an industry-wide strike unless their demands are granted. The steel workers plan such a step shortly. What are their demands? The struggle...is based on wages, whether the worker should receive a high wage to make up for... the rise in the cost of living. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Steel and Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?", Volume VII, Number 6, 1945, p. 3.

Further analysis of this problem was made by the participants during the course of the discussion program:

George Romney: The future peace of the world, the economic welfare of every American, and the successful reconstruction of Europe and Asia, depend on bringing American management and labor together on a basis that will perpetuate full opportunity for free management and free labor to produce goods and jobs in abundance. We must have cooperation by management and labor, and
labor means union leaders individually responsible to the workers they represent. But cooperation is a meaningless word until two questions are determined: First, cooperation to do what? and second, by what means?  

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

George Romney: ... Certainly we have to find a sound solution to the wage demands, and do it quickly. For years, every union demand backed by a strike threat has meant a gain. We must go to the fundamentals of the present situation. We must have a balanced, strengthened, modern national labor policy that makes unions subject to the same laws that apply to all others.  

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 6.

George Romney: I would like to get back to this basic question of how we are going to get management and labor together and what basis can we get them together on...  

George Romney: The real question we are forced with in the auto industry is how a union is organized on an industry-wide monopoly basis can bargain collectively with employers who are completely separate and are not permitted to arrive at joint policies - and I am glad that they are not permitted to do so - and still retain a competitive enterprise system. I submit that the primary thing needed in our economy is a renewed realization that the workers of a particular company and the management of that company are members of the same team and they will go forward or backward depending on the extent of their teamwork without regard to their outside loyalty.  

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.
In his analysis of the problem, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?" Granik briefly describes the wartime factors which have led to its development:

During the war years we had to face many a problem on the domestic front - problems of juvenile delinquency, problems of entire families suddenly being uprooted and forced into strange environments, problems resulting from the heads of families marching off to war ... Beyond these problems, in which the government is concerned, lie the deeper human problems of morals, family life, and individual behavior. These are the responsibility of the home, the school, and the church, and it is for them that our participants tonight are spokesmen ... The Forum quite appropriately turns its attention to the physical, mental and moral well-being of the people of America, for only if we have a strong, healthy and sound nation, can all other problems be met and solved.

---

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?", Volume VII, Number 44, November 13, 1945, p. 2.

This problem was further analyzed by the participants in the discussion program thus:

Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie: First of all, in watching the rising curve of incidence of venereal disease in the armed forces and the civilian population, we can't help but see that the situation is becoming extremely grave. For instance, we know that it has increased 1,000 per cent in the Pacific Theater since the close of the war in that area; we know it has increased 400 per cent in the European Theater since the close of the war; and we realize that we have here in America an absolutely parallel line of increasing incidence of venereal disease among our civilian population.

One of the most disturbing elements, of course, is the fact that this steep rise is
noted particularly among our young people, and we see that if we are going to protect the coming generations in America, we certainly are going to have to take evidence of this. 1

Mrs. Bess N. Rosa: Mrs. Ritchie, you implied ... that this moral breakdown that you predict is partly preventable. What do you think can be done about it, then? 2

Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie: Now, Mrs. Rosa, will you tell us what those difficulties are:.... Mrs. Bess N. Rosa: Young people with no active part in family activities ... you know, they used to have work to do, and a place around the home for their hobbies and fun, and a little family living together. This pleasure philosophy exaggeration of romance and happiness as ends in themselves. That was the thing that Mrs. Duvall mentioned a while ago. Exaggerated entertainment patterns, with little concern for effect on those being entertained. People moving about a great deal so that you get so you are not so well known, so that you come in conflict with other standards that are new standards to you. Delayed marriage, marriage and wives' contribution to marriage. Those are all quarrelsome things, don't you think? 3

The "Annual Student's Program", November 20, 1945, presented a debate on the subject, "Peacetime Military Training." Mr. Granik stated the question in the form of a resolution, and the first affirmative speaker analyzed the problem
by showing a need for the proposal:

We the Affirmative base our case for universal military training on national security. We maintain the need for military training lies in the fact that we have been unprepared in our last three wars and we cannot afford to be caught again. Twice in a single generation the United States has become involved in global wars. In both of these recent wars we were given time to prepare ... We must now face, realistically the fact that weapons available now and in the future make geography no barrier to an attack on the United States first. We must reckon with the probability that any future aggressor will strike first against the nation which twice in our time has spelled the difference in the outcome of world-wide warfare ... It is obvious that another war will start with a lightning attack to take us unaware, and we must have forces ready for immediate mobilization. 1

Further analysis of the problem was made by the other affirmative speaker, Franklin Reed:

... After the war is over the world will find itself in a balance of power ... This future condition will create another great need ... There is a need for the United States to contribute her forces to set the inevitable balance of power in favor of the peace-loving nations. If we do not do this, the results may well be catastrophic to civilization itself ... Realizing now that cooperation is failing as a hope for restoring peace, and realizing that a balance of power is to follow the peace treaty, we must understand still another phase of the need for preparedness. If organization fails - and its failure is quite possible - then we must have military preparedness to bring about

---

an organized balance of power, since the condition most certain to lead to war is an unorganized balance. We must use our power as the nucleus of a force dedicated to the peace-loving nations; we must use our economic standing to bring the peaceful nations to a common ground so that we may have an organized balance against the aggressor nations. This phase of the need for preparedness is essential for peace if organization should fail...

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

This analysis of the problem was recognized by the first negative speaker:

Donald Marston: It is evident so far that we all here agree that we must be prepared to defend our country in the best way possible. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.

In the broadcast of November 27, 1945, "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations?", Mr. Granik recognized that the problem was how the United States could best cooperate with a world police force; the question posed was a consideration of two proposed solutions of the basic problem; he gave a description of the solution - a bill to authorize America's delegate to decide when to use force placed at the disposal of the United Nations. The Analysis of the problem was made by the participants thus:

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: ....
To keep the peace of the world, we must have
an international police force strong enough to discipline any nation which threatens that peace. If our delegate had to come running back to Congress for authority to use that police power, in this atomic age, it would be obvious how ineffective any delayed disciplinary action would be. We must cooperate with the other nations of the world in this respect, as we said we would ....

Senator James M. Tunnell: When we join the United Nations Organization to seek peace, we then decide to use force, if necessary, in order to preserve peace. Either some person or organization must make this decision. The whole world must know whether each nation is to make the decision to use force, or whether the United Nations Organization, or some branch of it, has that power. Unless there is some force, or unless it is known that this force will be used, the United Nations Organization will have no moral influence in keeping peace. We ourselves want to know whether in case the necessity arises we are to have the aid of the United Nations Organization, or whether we shall be in such a position that we must maintain a force able to defend ourselves against any enemy which might attack us. If this organization is to be effective from our standpoint, we must have aid, as well as be prepared to give aid in the future. The organization must be able to function quickly, firmly, and with certainty. Otherwise it would have no influence in settling without force. Let us either make the United Nations Organization effective, or withdraw from it.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations?", Volume VII, Number 46, November 27, 1945, p. 3.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: ... Now, of all times in this world, is the time for the United Nations Organization to be effective if it can be effective, and I think
the only way it can be effective is for us to implement the contract that we made at San Francisco, to say to them that the United States will give its ratio share to the other countries of the world to stop these things that you complain about. 1

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: May I ask a question, Mr. Flynn? Again, even agreeing with what you say are the facts as they are today, don't you think that we have to carry out the contract we made at San Francisco? If we fall down, what will it do to the morale of all the other people you are talking about? ... We have to implement this thing. 2

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: .... Surely one thinks the United States Charter is perfect; no one thinks the organization is, but I think that just like the colonies did, like this country did, 162 years ago, we started out with some form of organization, with maybe three or four of the big states trying to dominate, but we ended up with a pretty perfect Constitution that has worked all those years. The only hope again I say, is to implement the contract we made to try to make it work. 3

Analysis of the problem, how can we keep radio free, was made by Mr. Granik thus:

We made an important decision in this country way back when radio was young. We decided that radio would be allowed to develop as private enterprise in the public interest.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 5.
2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 9.
3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.
That last is an important phase. It is going
to be the heart of our program this evening.
Other nations made different decisions. In
Britain for example, radio is government owned
and operated, revenue for operating comes from
a tax on every radio receiver. This is true in
many other countries. Some use both systems:
government owned facilities ... Our subject will
raise the issue of how radio is now controlled
and operated, and how it should be controlled
and operated, what the function or advertising
agencies, broadcasters, advertisers, Government,
and the public should be. Our discussion will
also involve necessarily the effectiveness of
the present system of radio and how that ef­
f ectiveness can be increased in the public in­
terest. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We
Keep Radio Free?", Volume VII, Number 47, December 4, 1945,
p. 3.

Further analysis was made by the participants during the
course of the program:

Clifford J. Durr: From the outset
we should try to understand what we are talk­
ing about when we speak of freedom. Freedom
for whom? Freedom from what? Our traditional
fear of any governmental restraints upon our
freedom is a healthy one, but unfortunately it
is often used to distract attention from other
restraints which are far more effective and
far more immediate than any restraints of Govern­
ment. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

Clifford J. Durr: Mr. Granik,
freedom, of course, is a relative term. We
can't all of us have freedom to do just as
we please, because in the end that would
mean infringing on the freedom of others to
do as they please. I think in this country
we probably achieve this balance which brings about freedom better than the other countries of the world. But I don't think that means that radio in this country is as free as it should be. I do think we have the freedom from government restraints, we have only such government restraints as are necessary to protect the public's interest. But I think there are economic concentrations and advertising excesses which do leave much to be desired if we are to have a true radio.

Elmer A. Benson: Mr. Willard, we are all opposed to government censorship of what goes on the air, but I wonder what should be done about private censorship, the very simple fact that most of the choice network time is controlled by a handful of men in a dozen or less advertising agencies. What control should we have over their determination of what the public should or should not hear? 1

Sydney M. Kaye: ...There is no doubt in my mind that the listener in this country achieves a better choice than he can elsewhere. My question to you would be: How other than by the close responsiveness between broadcaster and listener, between the dependence of broadcaster on listener could we achieve a better choice of programs?

Clifford J. Durr: ... in the case of each of the four national networks, you will find that about 50 per cent of the revenue comes from not more than ten national advertisers.

Now, ... do you think that a similar concentration in the sources of revenue for a newspaper would be conducive to freedom of the press? 2

Clifford J. Durr: While we are on this subject, do you consider the freedom of radio as requiring the freedom for artistic...
talent as well as freedom of expression, and do you think that radio is providing an outlet for the talent of this country? 1

Clifford J. Durr: ... "while you are looking for that, let me ask another question to make sure we know what you are arguing about. Are you complaining, Mr. Kaye, that we have too much government control? What are we talking about in that respect?" 2

A brief description of the current situation was given by Mr. Granik as an exposition of the problem, do we need new labor legislation:

The most vital issue facing the country today is labor-management relations. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach warned yesterday that our entire reconversion process is endangered. With the automobile industry stalled, a strike ordered in steel for January 14th, and the rest of industry waiting for results, the outlook is bleak, indeed. Labor is striking, and threatening to strike, for higher wages. Economic insecurity is the acknowledged base for the present wave of labor unrest. 3

The participants also analyzed the problem in the discussion part of the program:

Representative Andrew J. Biemiller: Mr. Granik, you were correct in saying a few moments ago that the great wave of unrest among the working people of this country is due to economic insecurity. Workers are fearful be-
cause they see their take-home pay cut, unemployment staring them in the face, governmental inaction on the major problems confronting them. On the other hand, they see great profits being amassed by large corporations. The current labor-management difficulties will be solved when these basic issues are met, not before.

Representative Clare E. Hoffman:...

We all admit that the reconversion program which was well started on its way must be continued if the people of America are to be supplied with the necessities of life, and we know that that program is being seriously delayed by labor disputes and strikes.

Representative George E. Outland:

Mr. Granik, in my judgment the term "new labor legislation" must be interpreted very broadly, indeed. The basic factors underlying contemporary industrial unrest go far deeper than laws governing strikes. They lie primarily in the fears of the future and the uncertainty of the working people of America as to what that future holds.

The desire for economic security which all of us have is being manifested in an attempt on the part of organized labor to gain such security through higher living standards brought about through collective bargaining. Legislation which would really lessen industrial strife would be that type of legislation embodied in the Full Employment Bill, the extension of unemployment compensation, the Fair Employment Practice Act, and increased minimum wages. I think that ill-considered and hasty piecemeal bills enacted in the spirit of emotionalism, aimed to hit at organized labor - measures such as the Smith-Connally Bill - have always failed of their end and always will. We must go far deeper than this if we are to solve the problems of industrial strife. 1

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 3.

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 3.
at the problems of industrial unrest, we are going to have to get back to the point I mentioned a moment ago, namely Why do people strike? Simply because they like it? Not at all. Because they are fearful of the future.

Representative A. L. Miller: The topic tonight is, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?" I think we should keep in mind that Washington just recently had a strike tying up the transportation system. Recently I tried to call out West and found I couldn't use the telephone because a strike was on. Twelve Midwestern States are tied up in the truck strikes. The city of Twelve Midwestern States are tied up in the truck strikes. The city of Omaha has 1200 carloads of freight waiting to be lifted. In Denver, Colorado, the situation is worse. I would like to ask you or Mr. Biemiller what type of legislation you think would take care of the situation. Who gets hurt in these strikes besides the individuals who are out of a job? Of course it is the public. What legislation, if any, do you suggest might take care of that situation?

Representative Andrew J. Biemiller: I will be glad to pick that up, Dr. Miller. I am not at all sure there is any kind of legislation that is going to solve the problem of labor-management relationships. We have got to recognize that labor-management relationships are basically a problem in human relations, and until human beings find a medium of sitting down together and solving their problems, we aren't going to get any place.

—Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

Representative A. L. Miller: I think Mr. Outland and Mr. Biemiller, we are losing sight of really the individual who is affected by strikes. I am not as concerned about the fellow who goes out on strike as I am about what it does to the individual, the private individual, the little fellow at home, the fellow who isn't on strike. I am concerned also about the fellow who is on strike who doesn't want to strike and his meal ticket is cut off. He doesn't have bread
and butter. We are faced here with a steel strike. The comments in the paper indicate that it will affect 40 per cent of the people of the United States. If we are going to let strikes of that nature come on, that tie up reconversion, where the public gets into the tangle, into the squeeze, the public is the one that gets hurt, as well as the individual who doesn't get any pay check when he goes out on strike. What is the remedy for that? How can that be corrected? 1

---

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.

The last problem of the twenty considered in this study was the same as the one presented a week earlier, do we need new labor legislation? Mr. Granik gave a brief description of pertinent events which made the problem important at this time:

Since our broadcast of last week, the House has passed the Hobbs Bill, the so-called anti-racketeering bill, which labor has fought, claiming it to be a threat to the right of organized labor. That bill now comes before the Senate for action. During the week since we spoke to you last, the President's fact-finding proposal to deal with labor-management difficulties has also come up for discussion on Capitol Hill. Secretary of Labor Schweltenbach appeared before the Senate Education and Labor Committee to urge passage of this bill before Congress recesses for the holidays. Most Washington observers believe this to be impossible since more than one hundred witnesses have requested time to testify on the bill. This is an indication of the importance and the tenseness of the labor situation throughout the country, reflected here in Washington by the demands of various Congressmen for immediate legislation compelling labor and management to settle their differences. ...we believe that all of you have a stake in the present labor-management controversy, and it is for this reason
we are bringing you for two consecutive weeks the opinions of all authorities so that you may have a better understanding of the most vital issue of the day. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 49, December 18, 1945, p. 3.

The problem was further analyzed by the participants on the program:

Senator H. A. Smith: ... We are dealing with explosive human problems. The worker and his family - his food, clothing and shelter, the opportunity for himself, his wife and his children, his place in our complex society - all are and should be matters on a plane beyond the reach of restrictive or disciplinary legislation. What we need now is light, not heat. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 4.

Senator H. A. Smith: ... But there are certain other issues that come into this, if I might ask a question. You implied a little while ago that there were certain issues in this strike situation that you would like to see brought up. For example, the point has been made in some of the public discussions that they ought to consider profits and prices. ... this may be getting away from legislation, but do you believe in a profit-sharing system in the whole industrial setup and, if so, would labor be willing to take the losses in the depressed years as well as to take the profits in the good years? 3

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.
In the examination of twenty representative transcripts of the American Forum of the Air there is evidence that eight of the twenty topics were not actually basic problems, but proposals of solutions of problems; the method of statement of resolution first; and then establishment of a need (analysis of the problem) is the format of debate, rather than discussion.

Mr. Granik, in each of his introductory speeches except one, briefly analyzed the problem; in this case he discussed the arguments for and against the proposed solution, and apparently assumed that the problem was familiar to his listeners. There is evidence that the main purpose of his introductory speeches was justification of his choice of a topic by showing its relation to current events. Thus the analysis of the problem was incidental, and very brief.

Further analysis of the problem was made by the participants at intervals during the program in sixteen of the twenty transcripts examined. This analysis was haphazard, and occurred at irregular intervals (not necessarily near the beginning of the discussion.)

The analysis of the problem, as evidenced in these examinations, was generally haphazard and incidental,
and did not occur in the manner of a discussion group intelli­
gently following a logical outline of progression in methodically attacking a problem.

Weighing of Reasoned Development of Proposed Solutions.

In each of the twenty transcripts examined evidence was found to show that the participants did weigh the reasoned development of proposed solutions. In eight of the transcripts, (supra, p. 114) the topic for discussion was one of the proposed solutions, and was given more considera­tion than other proposals; in each of the twenty transcripts two or more proposals were considered. Arguments for and against these proposals used five types of reasoning: inferences from analogy, causation, authority, and reasoning by deduction and induction.

Examples of reasoned development which are representative of the type and quality of reasoning found throughout the programs have been selected. These brief examples are herewith submitted.

The problem considered in the first of these transcripts (July 24, 1946) was, how can we solve the troubles of the Near East. An example of reasoning by inference from causation was selected:

Mr. Lipsky: We simply ask that a little notch ... be regarded as a Jewish home.

Dr. Hazam: This 'little notch' ...
happens to be a notch that connects the Arab world ... To give up this so-called 'little notch' would cause a barrier to be established between these two major Arabic forces and nations. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?", Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945, p. 6.

An example of inference from analogy was selected as a representative example of reasoned development of the proposal, that the veterans should be given seniority for armed forces experience:

Mr. Silvey: ... the Veterans of foreign wars got Congressman Knutson of Minnesota to introduce a provision to convey the idea that a veteran shall use his period of time in service for new hire purposes. I wish, Homer, you would ask Congressman Knutson how many votes handicap he will give a returning veteran in his congressional district to have on the morning of election day to help that veteran get his job as Congressman. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Veterans and Jobs.", Volume VII, Number 31, July 31, 1945, p. 10.

An example of causal reasoning was selected as representative of the type found in the discussion of the problems, how can we avoid another depression:

Mr. Nathan: ... The main thing is to see that there is an opportunity for business to employ people, an opportunity for business to provide jobs, and that opportunity must come through an assurance that there will be a market for them to sell their goods.
That is why when we come back to a consideration of whether or not there is going to be a depression. I think over and over again we must come back to the realization that in order to have prosperity in the United States we are going definitely to have to have a high level of consumption. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?", Volume VII, Number 32, August 7, 1945, p. 11.

In discussing the proposal to give the President certain powers as outlined in the Full Employment Bill, James L. Wick gives a representative example of inductive reasoning:

Mr. Wick: I'll tell a story of the powers that we give to a President in wartime which we certainly do not want him to have in peacetime. In July, 1942, the Maritime Commission suddenly cancelled a contract that Higgins in New Orleans had for Liberty ships. New Orleans was shocked because its war business was vanishing. But Higgins was a personal friend of President Roosevelt's and when Roosevelt visited New Orleans about three months afterwards, he told him the story. Roosevelt immediately wired the war agencies in Washington, "Find something for Higgins,"

Within three weeks, Higgins who had been making ships and never had made planes, got orders for $130,000,000 worth of planes. Since he couldn't make planes in his factories, he got an allocation from the Defense Plant Corporation of $50,000,000 to convert his shipyards into a plane factory. In other words, Mr. Radio Listener, if your city had been smiled upon by the President, your city might have gotten those millions of dollars' worth of business.

In peacetime do we want the President or his agents to have that much power over the people? 1
Inference from facts backed by a well-known authority was used in arguing for a program of compulsory federal sickness insurance:

Mr. Cruikshank: ... I have a note here from Dr. John Peters, who is professor of medicine at Yale University School of Medicine. He has had a long and distinguished career. He says just on this subject - and I quote him:

'The people, aware of the need for more and better medical care, looked to the medical profession to help them devise a national health program that would insure service of high quality. The leaders of the American Medical Association, however (I am still quoting), have consistently obstructed the institution of a national health program with arguments that suggest greater concern about methods of payment than about the quality of service.' 2

In the discussion of the proposal to have the Federal Government give supplemental unemployment aid to the states, an example of deductive reasoning was chosen:

Congressman Short: It isn't the amount of money that we object to so much as the principle that is involved ... the bad psychological effect that it will have upon the worker by placing a premium upon indolence rather than upon diligence and industry. 1
The program, "Ten Mayors Report on Jobs," broadcast September 11, 1945, was not a discussion program, and even though evidences of reasoning were found, they are not pertinent to our investigation of evidences of the use of a logical discussion pattern.

"Should We Remove Wartime Controls?" In support of this proposal, Representative John W. Murphy used inference from facts quoted from a well-known authority:

I want to give the answer of a great American, the President of the United States, on peacetime control of prices. I am now reading from the President's address: "We must keep in mind the experience of the period immediately after the first World War. After a lull of a few months following the Armistice of 1918, prices turned upward, scrambling for inventories started, and prices soon got completely out of hand."

Deductive reasoning was selected as a type of reasoning typical of that used on the program, "What Should We do about Loans to Britain?" An example of this type of reasoned development of a proposed solution was:

Congressman Cellar: The United States must help Great Britain out of her present economic embarrassment. Great
Britain was our outer bastion of defense against the Axis. She held the fort until we were ready. She well nigh impoverished herself in the process. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 38, September 25, 1945, p. 4.

Reasoned development of the proposal to continue the demobilization program now in effect was made by Representative J. J. Sparkman through the use of inference from facts based on authority:

General Henry told our committee not so long ago that no boys with as many as 85 points in this country were left in after September 30. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?", Volume VII, Number 39, October 2, 1945, p. 4.

"Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?" Proof of the validity of this proposal was made by Judge Leif Erickson by citing two instances and drawing a general conclusion (method of induction):

Judge Erickson: Let me ask - you and I come from the same State, Congressman. The Reclamation Bureau has been working since 1902. During that time they have managed to get water on 550,000 acres in the Basin. ... At the rate they are going, it will take them 384 years to get the job done.

Contrast that with the speed with which the Tennessee Valley Authority had done down there. ... 3

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress Establish a Missouri Valley Authority?", Volume VII,
Another example of inductive reasoning may be considered a representative example of the types of arguments used in developing the proposal, should we internationalize the atomic bomb?

Mr. Norman Cousins: All I ask is that we realize that other nations are smart ... Therefore we should act on that assumption and prepare for the time when they will have bombs. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?", Volume VII, Number 41, October 16, 1945, p. 5.

In support of a proposal to have the Federal Government support public housing projects, an example of inference from facts supported by authority was selected:

Joseph E. Merrion: May I say, Mr. Klutznick, that Mr. Ihlder, the representative of your agency here in Washington, has made the statement before the Burton Committee that the occupation of public housing in the city of Washington was limited to 25 per cent of people who are on relief rolls. 2


Discussing the proposal to increase the wage scale of steel and auto workers, John H. Van Deventer presented a dilemma, an example of the few that were found in the twenty transcripts. This argumentative device went unanswered by
Mr. Van Deventer: ...some concerns in our industry could afford to absorb increased wages from existing profits, and there are others that couldn't. There appear to be palliatives - I won't call them remedies. One is to ask the government for tax rebates to establish the allowable profits. This in effect is taxpayers' subsidy of increased wages. The other recourse is to appeal to the OPA for higher prices. If the latter are granted, I would like to know what suggestion you have that would enable such producers to sell at the higher prices in a competitive market.


An example of inference from causation in support of the proposal to provide more jobs as one answer to the problem of moral breakdown:

Mrs. Eleanor Fowler: If you don't have enough food to eat ... it certainly puts tremendous pressure in people who have, shall we say, weak moral standards, and there are such people.

2

In the "Annual Student's Program", in support of the proposal to have compulsory peacetime military training an example of deductive reasoning was selected as representative of the many argumentative devices found in this transcript:

Rod McPhee: Even since the world began, men have been trying to get away from the fact of the infantrymen. When the knight in armor came into use, it was felt he was invincible. When bombs were first dropped
from airplanes, civilized men said the end of civilization had come, nothing could be done, nothing could withstand this, and therefore any future wars would result in catastrophe to the world.

After the last war we had many new developments. During the last war the tank was invented and it was thought it would do away with infantrymen, and yet a defense has been effected. A defense has been effected for every offensive weapon, and there is no reason to believe that one will be effected in this instance. 1

An example of deductive reasoning was selected from the discussion of the proposal that our delegate to the United Nations Organization should be given power to decide when to use force (instead of Congress having this authority):

Senator Warren Magnuson: ...Coming back to Congress, the distinguished Senator from Montana today made a very eloquent and brilliant speech, about four hours. If we come back to Congress on all these questions, if I make a speech of four hours, if Senator Tunnell makes one (and some of our other distinguished colleagues even go longer than that), I am afraid that by that time there will be a lot of atomic bombs dropped around the world and we won't know what happened to us. 2

Reasoning by inference from facts supported by authority was selected for illustration; it was used in support of the proposal that the Government should limit

---


2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force for the United Nations?", Volume VII, Number 46, November 27, 1945, p. 5.
business in radio:

Clifford J. Durr: ... This is a statement made by one of your profession, the president of one of our large national networks. He said before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in a hearing a year ago; "The argument is now advanced that business control of broadcasting operations has nothing to do with program control. This is to forget that he who controls the pocketbook controls the man. Business control means complete control and there is no use of arguing to the contrary." 1


An illustration of inference from analogy was selected as representative of the reasoning used in support of a proposal for new labor legislation:

Clare E. Hoffman: If you were sick, Mr. Outland, and the doctor prescribed a remedy and you refused to take it, he would prescribe another if you were that stubborn, so when Congress refused to accept these bills which I introduced - and I am sure you are in favor of them - you wouldn't deny a man the right to join or the right not to join a union, would you? 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 5.

The last example selected as representative of the types of reasoned development of proposed solutions was an illustration of inference from facts supported by authority:
Frank Fenton: I put on record a statement from Business Week. "The carry-back will perhaps prove an even downier cushion for the steel industry in 1946 than for the automobile manufacturers. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 49, December 18, 1945, p. 10.

Evidence has been submitted to support the statement that there was reasoned development of proposed solutions; discussion methods theoretically require a weighing of this reasoned development. This implies that the participants should judge the relative value of the various proposals as the arguments for and against their adoption are advanced, with the purpose of arriving at a group decision as to which proposal was most desirable. No evidence was found that this was done in the twenty representative transcripts examined. In each case the program ended with the participants expressing belief in the same solutions which they proposed when the program commenced.

After examination of twenty representative transcripts, it was apparent to this writer that much of the time the participants spent in making unsupported assertions, digressing, quibbling over terms, and personal bickering. A number of examples of these undesirable elements are reproduced here.

Examples of unsupported assertions are:
Representative Jerry Voorhis: I do not think there is any justification for a price ceiling that isn't effectively enforced in wartime or any other time. I certainly believe that we have laid down clearly here what the principle ought to be, that is, for the removal of these controls just as fast as production takes the place thereof. 1

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?", Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945, p. 8.

Representative John W. Murphy: I am trying to answer you in the same vein. We have had very few business failures in this war. It is easy for you to say there are hundreds failing. I know of none.

Representative Frank B. Keefe: I did not say they were failing. I said they weren't going into production.

Representative John W. Murphy: I think OPA to this date has done a pretty good job. 2

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.

Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart: England would have been defeated without the United States and the United States would not have been defeated without England. We would have had a harder war but we would have won. 3

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 38, September 25, 1945, p. 7.

Mrs. Eleanor Fowler: ... I think that there are a great many forces at work in this country which want to cut out the funds from those things first of all, and I think that that pattern of cutting down services will lead in the direction of moral
breakdown because I think that those services are very important. ... I think during the war the young people made a terrific contribution in actually going to their city fathers in many places and demanding teen age canteens, and so on. 1

1 Transcript, *American Forum of the Air*, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown In America?", Volume VII, Number 44, November 13, 1945, p. 11.

... I would like to ask you, if this Charter got to functioning, what would be done the first thing about the Indonesians? What would the United Nations do about them?

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: Nothing is being done about it.

John T. Flynn: Yes, something is being done in the conditions by the leading members of the Security Council of the United Nations Charter, and I would like to know what would be done if the Charter got to functioning. They would simply summon the Indonesians before them and say, "If you don't quit fighting and lie down and be nice, good little boys and go back to the Dutch or maybe the English, we will just have to blow you out the world, that is all." 2


Many illustrations of digression could be cited; a few examples are:

Representative Chase Going Woodhouse: Congressman Gearhart, I wonder why you make such a difference between American immigrants sending dollars to foreign countries and the people as a whole as represented by their gov-
ernment lending those dollars?

Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart: Because the money is going that way and by the different methods by which wealth flows across the boundaries into Europe, the amount is sufficient in total to pay for all that they buy in the United States.

Representative Chase Going Woodhouse: I wasn't questioning that. I was asking you what was the difference in your mind between immigrants sending the dollar and other people sending the dollar.

Congressman Gearhart: It doesn't make any difference who sends the dollar; the result is the thing that is important. The dollar gets there and it becomes dollar credit for the purchase of American goods as soon as it arrives.

Representative Emanuel Celler: We are getting far afield. We are 'way off the subject, I think. Our question is aid to Britain or no aid.

---

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 38, September 26, 1945, pp. 9-10.

Senator Brien McMahon: What would you propose to do tonight if the four or five biggest nations in the world were possessed of bombs that would blow the world to pieces - at least blow our part of the world to pieces?

William B. Ziff: I would propose to pray.

Norman Cousins: Then you had better start praying.

Senator McMahon: I am going to say you are right, we had better start praying.

---

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?", Volume VII, Number 41, October 16, 1945, p. 12.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: Mr. Flynn, I am sorry we got off on the atomic question. Isn't the question here -
Senator Burton K. Wheeler: You are the one that got us off on it.

Senator Magnuson: That is why I apologize for getting off on it. Isn't the question here - and ....whether or not we are going to believe in the possibilities?

Senator Wheeler: The great part of the people, the internationalists themselves, and I didn't quote anybody but an internationalist today or an interventionist before the war, including Dorothy Thompson and all the rest of them.

Senator Magnuson: I didn't ask who you were quoting.

Senator Wheeler: But I quoted them....

Senator Magnuson: May I ask this. I didn't quote the Senator or ask him whether he was quoting. May I ask, if we are for the United Nations Charter, aren't we tonight trying to discuss here, in the most intelligent way we can, the best mechanics by which to make the United Nations Charter effective, if it is possible to be made effective? I

Quibbling over terms could have been avoided by simple agreements made early in the discussion. Much time was wasted in this manner; a few examples will serve to illustrate the point:

Sir Willmott Lewis: What do you mean by an "independent state"? Is Panama an independent state?

Salloum Mokarzel: Panama is an independent state.

Sir Willmott: That is fine. Suppose that Panama used its independence to adopt a policy which was disagreeable to the United States. What would happen? ....Here is going to be an independent Lebanon, and suppose Lebanon used its independence in a
manner which was disagreeable, we will say, to Syria, to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia, and all the rest. What would then happen to Lebanon?

Mr. Mokarzel: That is accusing Lebanon of something.

Sir Willmott: (interposing): No, no, no.

Mr. Mokarzel: Oh, yes.

Sir Willmott: I was not accusing Panama, and I am not accusing Lebanon. ...

Mr. Mokarzel: Panama is only a baby among independent nations. ...

Sir Willmott: It depends entirely on what you mean by "independent."

Mr. Mokarzel: You take me back to the time of the Romans and the Greeks, and you don't want to count the past 2,000 years, which are the immediate past.

Dr. John Hazam: What is the point of this? 1

Mrs. Eleanor Fowler: ... Unless we are able to achieve full employment so that all who want and need to work, including every veteran, can get jobs at wages adequate for a decent living standard, we most certainly face moral breakdown....

Mrs. Evelyn Millis Duvall: It is true, of course, that this war has accelerated changes already taking place in courtship, marriage, family life and the inter-relationships of sexes. These changes, though rapid and disrupting, do not necessarily mean "breakdown." 2

Representative George E. Outland: ....You both voted for the Smith-Connally Bill. You both voted for the Hobbs Bill.

Representative Clare E. Hoffman: Right! And I would do it again tomorrow, wouldn't you?
Mr. Outland: I would not.
Mr. Hoffman: You are in favor of racketeering, huh?
Mr. Outland: That is a typical example of the way that words are misused to try to give the wrong impression to the American people. ... 1


Examples of personal bickering, name-calling and unnecessary sarcasm were frequent; a few have been included here:

Dr. E. J. McCormick: Dr. Boas, could I ask you a question? I hope you won't be offended. I read somewhere that you were affiliated with some 12 or 13 communistic organizations. Is that true?
Dr. Ernest P. Boas: No, it is not true. 2

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?", Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945, p. 7.

Mr. Joseph E. Padway: I have heard that argument before, too.
Mr. Stanley Rector: I would like to throw a few facts into this argument.
Mr. Padway: I would like to hear a fact or two, Rector. It would be somewhat unique to get a fact from you.
Mr. Redor: See how you handle this one ... 3


Representative John Dingell: ... that is not going to be any inducement to
stay away from his work. It may be in Swampeast, Missouri, but it certainly isn't going to be in Detroit. Our people are going to look for jobs.

Representative Dewey Short: Congressman Dingell, I once represented Swampeast, Missouri, but now I represent the Ozark Hills, down where we want to be left alone to live our own lives in our own way.

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 10.

Representative Roy W. Woodruff: Let me continue just a moment. This British economist insults the intelligence of the American people when he proposes or even suggests a long-term interest-free loan. ...For cool assumption, supercilious argument, and weird economic figuring, it would be very difficult to beat John M. Keynes and Harold Laski.

Representative Emanuel Celler: Name calling isn't going to help us any, but don't lay any flattering unction to your soul, nor can Lord Keynes lay any flattering unction to his soul, nor Lord Halifax lay any flattering unction to his soul that we are going to part with any cash and charge no interest thereof.

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?", Volume VII, Number 38, September 25, 1945, pp. 10-11.

Representative Emanuel Celler: Mrs. Woodhouse, before he offers an alternative, may I just make this comment. I thought, Bud, that isolationism was dead and was defeated during the last campaign. You speak like an avowed isolationist, that we shouldn't out of our largess help any of these nations abroad.

Transcript, American Forum of the Air, ibid., p. 12.

Representative H. H. Buffett: Mr. Holifield, why is the Navy going to take 40 to 60 — I don't know the exact figure; we
don't get these figures as you do.
Representative Chet Holifield:
You would be better informed if you did
get some of them. 1

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We De-
mobilizing Effectively?", Volume VII, Number 39, October 2,
1945, p. 12.

George Romney: ... I submit that
if we are going to have collective bargaining
work and unions and management brought together
on an effective working basis, the management
of a company must deal with union representa-
tives responsible, equally responsible, for
the same area of activity.

R. J. Thomas: ... I think you are
invading a territory there that simply is
none of your business when you start telling
unions how they should function. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Steel and
Autos - How Can Labor and Management Get Together?", Vol-
ume VII, Number 43, November 6, 1945, p. 12.

Senator Burton K. Wheeler: ....
Senator Tunnell, let me say that all the
facts, as I pointed out on the floor of the
Senate today, point -
Senator James M. Tunnell: I lis-
tened for three or four hours.
Senator Burton K. Wheeler: You
didn't listen half of that time. You only
listened a very short time and then ran out.
You got tired.
Senator Tunnell: It seemed long. 3

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress
or Our Delegate Decide When to Use Force For the United Na-
tions?", Volume VII, Number 46, November 27, 1945, p. 6.

Representative George E. Outland:
Ted, may I have a word here? Mr. Hoffman,
you were talking a few moments ago about the
problem of your wife nagging you -
Representative Clare E. Hoffman:
(interposing): No, I wasn't talking about my wife. I didn't pick that kind of wife. I had better sense than that and I got a better woman than that. I said there were unfortunate individuals - maybe you know some of them, I don't. Maybe you have a personal acquaintance them, but I haven't. But there are such women in the world, I have been told.

Mr. Outland: I have no means of knowing. ... 1

---

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Do We Need New Labor Legislation?", Volume VII, Number 48, December 11, 1945, p. 10.

Some of these undesirable elements may be attributable to the attitude of the participants. Mr. Granik's secretary has stated in personal correspondence with this writer that the participants are selected in consideration of their stand upon a proposed solution to the problem which is being "discussed." In this fashion an honest ef-

---

2 See Appendix C, Personal Correspondence.

fort is made to obtain two speakers on "each side" of a question so there will be verbal clash. Personal remarks, sarcastic "cracks" and name-calling are then the order of the day. No evidence was found in twenty transcripts that an effort was made, either on the part of Mr. Granik or the participants, to bring the group into that attitude of cooperative inquiry and harmonization of personalities which is the basic requirement for the cooperative solution of a
problem. The participants on the American Forum of the Air programs do not, in general, approach the program with an open-minded attitude of inquiry and spirit of genuine cooperation; their objective, as revealed in representative transcripts, is the avowed defense of preconceived notions and judgments, with the purpose, in most cases, of exploiting this opportunity for promulgation of their individual ideas and interests.

**Diagnosis of Group Solution:**

No evidence was found that the American Forum of the Air programs advanced to this step in the logical pattern of discussion. At no point was a group consensus apparent. There was haphazard agreement of two or three individuals concerning definition of terms, and verification of certain facts. Examples of such agreement are as follows:

Robert Nathan: ... it seems to me the government has a very, very fundamental responsibility to see to it that job opportunities are available reasonably soon after anybody loses a job, and if private industry doesn't do it, I think government must.

Leon Henderson: I certainly tend to agree with Bob, and I would like to ask Terborgh and Schmidt, which do they think is worse, some kind of undertaking on the part of government for reasonably full employment or avoiding all the trouble that comes with, say, ten million people unemployed?  

Transcript, *American Forum of the Air*, "How Can We Avoid Another Depression?", Volume VII, Number 32, August 7,
Representative Dewey Short: Unless industry can hire the lower-paid workers to carry on, industry will have no production and will have no employment.

Representative John Dingell: And industry will have no production unless the worker can buy that production.

Congressman Short: I agree with you. 1


Representative Frank B. Keefe:... There seems to be a unanimity of opinion all over the country ... that wartime controls that do impede or interfere with speedy reconversion should be removed immediately ... It seems to me there isn't very much to discuss unless you want to get down to specific controls. ...

Representative Jerry Voorhis: That is right. 2

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?", Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945, p. 4.

Mrs. Eleanor Fowler: Isn't that full employment again?

Mrs. Evelyn Willis Duvall: It is that and a good many other things, too, Mrs. Fowler. I don't like to see us with just a panacea. I agree with you on full employment and I want good housing, but I don't think even that, even if we could get everything we are asking for, would answer our full ques-

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?", Volume VII, Number 44, November 13, 1945, p. 11.
John T. Flynn: How much United States would you have had if it had started like that? ...  

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: Let me say that I entirely agree with the distinguished author, Mr. Flynn ... Surely no one thinks the United Nations Charter is perfect; no one thinks the organization is, but I think that, just like the colonies did, like this country did, 162 years ago, we started out with some form of organization, with maybe three or four of the big states trying to dominate, but we ended up with a pretty perfect Constitution that has worked all those years.

The only hope, again I say, is to implement this United Nations Charter, to implement the contract we made to try to make it work. 1

---


These minor evidences of agreement were too few and the points agreed upon were too insignificant for them to be called a group solution.

Verification of the Group Solution Leading to a Course of Action.

No evidence was found in the examination of twenty representative transcripts that this step was achieved.

In summary, evidence was found to show that the programs of the American Forum of the Air roughly follow the first three steps of the logical discussion pattern, but do so haphazardly and ineffectively. The statement of the problem was made by Mr. Granik. He made brief introductory
analyses of the problem and further analysis was made inci-
cidentally by the participants at irregular intervals dur-
ing the discussion. Weighing of the reasoned development
of proposed solutions was attempted; development of pro-
posals was argued pro and con, but there was no evaluation
of the sum total of argument with the objective of compar-
ing the proposals and concluding a group solution of the
problem. No evidence was found that the last two steps of
the progression pattern were reached. There was no diagno-
sis of a group solution, and no verification of that solu-
tion leading to action. Evidence of undesirable elements,
(digressions, unsupported assertions, personal bickering
and name-calling) showed that the participants do not, in
general, approach the program with an attitude of open-
minded inquiry necessary to the cooperative solution of a
problem. Rather, they exhibit an attitude of debate, pro-
pounding preconceived opinions and defending individual
ideas. The logical pattern of discussion consequently re-
ceives scant attention in these programs.
CHAPTER VI
PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSION

Discussion does not dispense with reasoning and expert knowledge; at one point or another in its course a question before the group calls for information that must have as its source some authority who has made a special study or had special experiences. The method of participation in discussion refers to the obtaining, arranging, and presenting of this material along with statements of reason or conjecture.

What are the qualities necessary for effective participation in discussion? Baird makes the following statement:

To further the techniques that you will employ in discussion you may ask yourself such questions as the following:

1. Have you framed with sufficient directness and concreteness the question for discussion?
2. Have you read the representative sources on the subject?
3. Have you taken notes systematically?
4. Have you prepared a satisfactory individual outline?
5. Have you cooperated in the preparation of a satisfactory group outline?
6. Have you entered the discussion with a proper discusional attitude?
7. Have you an open mind? Tact?
Enthusiasm? Humor? Cooperativeness?
8. Have you cooperated with the chairman and your colleagues in the explanation of terms?
9. Have you cooperated in the development of the logical pattern of definition of terms, analysis of the problem, statement of goals or standards of value, weighing of various con-
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closures and possible lines of general and specific action?

10. Have you observed the principles of sound evidence? Of deductive and inductive logic?

11. Have you cooperated in seeing that all the representative points of view are given full consideration?

12. Have you cooperated by asking pertinent questions?

13. Have you attempted to cooperate with the chairman and your colleagues in securing major agreements and in minimizing minor differences?

14. Have you cooperated in preventing unnecessary digression?

15. Have you cooperated with the chairman and your colleagues in providing summaries, in pointing the way to the next phase of the problem, and in indicating that the moment has arrived for the formulation of an integrated solution?

16. Have you used a varied vocabulary?

17. Has your voice been clear and pleasing, free from undue loudness, undue softness, and other objectionable qualities?

18. Has your speech been direct, communicative, sincere?

19. Have you been a good listener?

---

1Baird, A. Craig: op. cit., pp. 117-118.

McBurney and Hance list the following desirable attitudes and behavior:

1. Consider the common good.
2. Assume your share of responsibility.
3. Think before speaking, but do not think too long.
4. Contribute objectively; do not make the issues personal.
5. Listen to understand.
6. Use understandable and meaningful speech.
7. Use direct and communicative speech.
8. Use animated and sincere speech.
9. Use reflective thinking processes.
10. Give facts as well as conclusions.\(^1\)

Various other authors give admonitions and suggestions which are included in the above lists.

**Analysis of Participation**

In theory, the participants in a discussion should demonstrate the following: (1) knowledge of the subject, (2) awareness of the principles of reasoning, (3) an attitude of cooperative inquiry, and (4) effective oral contribution of ideas. Do the participants presented on the American Forum of the Air meet these requirements?

**Knowledge of the Subject.**

Are the participants on the American Forum of the Air programs familiar with the subjects they discuss? Mr. Granik selects the participants, and from personal correspondence with his secretary (See Appendix C, Personal Correspondence) this writer has learned that the ability and background of the participants, in relation to the field to be discussed, is given prime consideration. Mr. Granik has almost his pick of the entire talent of the nation from which to choose; it may be assumed that the popularity of his program and the size and interest of Mr. Granik's radio audience would appeal to any public spirited person he might select. With such a
wide range of capable people from which to pick, Mr. Granik
could be expected to secure participants who are thoroughly
familiar with their subjects.

The participants are chosen from the recognized
leaders of the nation, men and women who affect the de­
cisions made upon important questions of the day - people
who are experts in the area being discussed. A look at the
participating discussers for the twenty representative tran­
scripts analyzed as a basis of inquiry in this study, con­
sidered in relation to the concurrent list of topics dis­
cussed, substantiates this statement. A detailed description
of the twenty topics, with an equally detailed description
of the background and positions of the individual participants
in each of these twenty transcripts, has been given in the
part of this study called "Selection of the Topics."

Briefly reviewing the background and position of
the participants gives evidence of their familiarity with
the subject; they were Congressmen speaking about current
proposed legislation, labor leaders considering labor needs,
social workers attacking current social problems, govern­
ment officials reviewing governmental policies, physicians
discussing governmental policies in relation to medicine,
mayors reporting on employment conditions within their juris­
diction, high school students debating the national high
school debate topic, and industrialists discussing government
policies referring to business.

In each case preparation for the program was made by the participants. Each participant prepared a one-


1See Personal Correspondence, Appendix C.


minute speech which was ready before the program went on the air, and in these speeches the participants briefly gave their point of view upon the topic.

In examination of twenty representative transcripts, evidence may be shown to indicate that each of the participants was reasonably familiar with the subject. Here are some representative examples of such evidence:

Salloum Morarzel: ...there is no doubt that regionalism has come into being, because the Arabs have formed a bloc, and I believe that the great powers of the world are encouraging that regionalism. Lebanon, being a part of that region which falls in the category of the Arab bloc, approves of the idea of the formation of the Arab League and has joined with it, with one exception: that it does not want to form an integral part in it that would tie its hands down and reduce it to a state where it would lose its independence and its entity.2

2Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?" Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945. p. 5.

Major General Lewis B. Hershey:.... I contend that you can still have a seniority system and bend it a little bit to take care of the veterans. I think you are going to have to, or you will damage irreparably the seniority system.

Ted F. Silvey: ... We feel in the labor
unions that the veterans will find their job protection in union seniority and that to bend it is to break it, and to break it means the veterans will have no protection, especially in the second and succeeding years when they get back, when perhaps some of the emotional excitement about the veterans will have died, and they will really need protection.

The idea of seniority is that a workman by constant application to a job through many years of his life develops an inner property right, the application of which is just both to the long-time employee and the short-time employee. Along with seniority there goes a number of things. It isn't only a place on the roster to determine what days a man will work. It has to do with the rate of wages, with the vacation rights of the employee, with whether he will work day or night shifts, with his promotion rights with a bonus at the end of the year and a large number of other very definite property rights. We want the veteran to have these things.1

1 Transcription, American Forum of the Air, "Veterans and Jobs." Volume VII, Number 31, July 31, 1945. p. 5.

George Terborgh: ... the failure of the building industry to revive in the second half of the 30's was perhaps the most characteristic feature of that era, and it was in no small degree attributable, I believe, to the fact that we raised building costs by more than a third during the four years of 1933 to 1937. We killed off the recovery of housing construction by a mistaken policy as to costs in the building field. The NRA did part of it. The great boom of '36 to '37, the organizing boom of that period, did the rest of it.2


Dr. Morris Fishbein: ... I am in constant communication with the leaders of the British Medical Association, and I have in my
briefcase at present a statement from a member of the Governing Board of the British Medical Association, who says they are very rapidly nearing now in Great Britain a point at which the medical profession will have to discontinue its attempts to obtain from the British Government anything resembling a system that would enable them to provide a high quality of medical service.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945. p. 8.

Mr. Joseph A. Padway: Look, Mr. Rector, talking about percentages, 77 per cent and 20 per cent don't mean anything. Let's talk facts. Let me give you the facts. For instance, the very maximum, no matter if a man earned $100 a week and was unemployed, if he was unemployed for the whole year after working half a year, he would get in Utah $210, in New Mexico $240, in Oregon $360, in Wyoming $500, in Arkansas $240, in Oklahoma $360, in Iowa $324. That is a maximum. They don't get those maximums. They get about half of that.\(^2\)


Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth: ... General Edwards appeared before your committee on August 28 and he set up here the number of men that they were going to have on July 1 of next year, 2,500,000. ... It is a well defined pattern here. ...Here it is: New York, 375,000; Pacific, 830,000; only MacArthur says he needs 200,000; he was going to have united in the United States Reserve, 200,000; operating personnel, 485,000; and here is a good one, he was going to have in the non-operating group, which he calls the pipeline, 500,000 men, which makes a total of 2,500,000. Do you mean to tell me that
that wasn't premeditated ... 1


Mr. George L. Bliss: ... surveys of public housing projects ... reveal, first, that the people of the lowest incomes are not accepted as tenants in the public housing projects and, therefore, the very people that you have insisted should be helped are not being helped in the public housing projects; and, secondly, that families of $2,000, $2,500, and $3,000 income are living in public housing projects today. 2


From the evidence presented, this writer has drawn the following conclusion: the speakers are chosen for their knowledge and understanding of the topic in question, and they exhibit a reasonably desirable amount of knowledge of the subjects.

Awareness of the Principles of Reasoning.

Examination of twenty representative transcripts showed some evidence that the participants on the American Forum of the Air, in general, are aware of the principles of reasoning. As is usually the case in such programs, clear-cut examples of syllogistic reasoning are few indeed; propositions are complex, and often are based on assumptions of probability. Difficulty may be experienced in adhering
to rigid classifications for the purpose of obtaining clear-cut examples. Each argument should be considered as a part of a complex fabric of experience. Many of the inferences are probable rather than certain, and are significant only because they help in reaching conclusions.  


With these limitations in mind, an examination of the use of the principles of reasoning may be made.

Deductive and inductive reasoning, reasoning by inference from analogy to causation, inference from facts supported by authority, and refutation of arguments are those elements of reasoning which should be exhibited by the participants.  


Examples of deductive reasoning are:

Representative Emanuel Celler: The United States must help Great Britain out of her present economic embarrassment. Great Britain was our outer bastion of defense against the Axis. She held the fort until we were ready.
She well nigh impoverished herself in the process ...

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "What Should We Do About Loans to Britain?" Volume VII, Number 38, September 25, 1945. p. 4.

Representative Dewey Short: It isn't the amount of money that we object to so much as the principle that is involved here, the bad psychological effect that it will have upon the worker by placing a premium upon indolence rather than upon diligence and industry.


Representative Jerry Voorhis: ... There are a good many critical scarcities which have been brought about by the war, which are still with us, and it seems to me that the reason I would answer your question in the negative as to all controls, is because it would be unjust to expose the rest of the nation to the inordinate economic power which those in favored positions would have if all these controls were suddenly removed.

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?" Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945. p. 3.

The assertion that the participants used inductive reasoning is supported by these examples:

Leon Keyserling: It seems to me that the main obstacle to full employment in the past has been the absence of a program. The full obstacle to full employment has been the substitution of name calling and division for unity and agreement. In 1932, when unemployment had
mounted to about 17 or 18 million, it wasn't because there was no demand throughout the country. Millions of people lived in slums, millions of people were suffering from malnutrition, and from poor medical care and from inadequate clothing, and there was no great program of government regulation or vast new areas of legislation because that was before the so-called New Deal had come in. And still we had all these evils and the basic reason we had them was because there was no nation-wide, rounded program needed in terms of our integrated economy.1


Mr. Nelson Cruikshank: ... The whole thing boils down to the matter of the method of payment, not the method of medical practice.

I should ask Dr. McCormick whether he thinks the medical care and service now being given to the members of the armed forces have lowered as a result of the fact that physicians are not paid directly by the patients.

Dr. McCormick: No. The armed forces are getting very good medical attention, and it is given to them by civilian doctors, about 60,000 of them, who at great sacrifice gave up their practices, left their homes and their families - none of them drafted, all volunteers - to go into foreign fields and to give these boys the medical care that they needed.2


Reasoning by inference from analogy appeared many times in the twenty transcripts examined; representative examples are:

Ted F. Silvey: Let's take in the field of business. Suppose a man goes into the Navy. He has pharmacist's training and he is
a pharmacist's mate in the Navy, and he wants to run a drug store when he comes out. He goes to a man who has already established a very successful drug business on some corner and says, "I want your drug store business."  


Judge Leif Erickson: The Tennessee Valley Authority has proven the success of the single plan, single agency idea and it should be applied to the Missouri Valley...

Responsibility for this situation lies in the fact that there has been no over-all approach to the problems of river development. We need a Missouri Valley Authority.  

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress Establish A Missouri Valley Authority?" Volume VII, Number 40, October 9, 1945. p. 3.

Representative Clare E. Hoffman: If you were sick Mr. Outland, and the doctor prescribed a remedy and you refused to take it, he would prescribe another if you were that stubborn, so when the Congress refused to accept these bills which I introduced - and I am sure you are in favor of them - you wouldn't deny a man the right to join or the right not to join a union, would you?  


Use of reasoning by inference from causal relation was less than the use of the other types of reasoning; two representative examples are:

Robert Nathan: ... When we come back to a consideration of whether or not there is going
to be a depression ... we must come back to
the realization that in order to have prosperity
in the United States we are going definitely to
have to have a high level of consumption.1

Norman Cousins: ... All I ask is that
we realize that other nations are smart ... and
keeping the secret to ourselves doesn't stop
other nations from developing the bomb. There­
fore, we should act on the assumption and pre­
pare for the time when they will have bombs.2

Inference from facts supported by authority oc­
curred frequently in the twenty transcripts; two examples
are:

Representative John W. Murphy: I
want to give the answer of a great American, the
President of the United States, on peacetime
control of prices. I am now reading from the
President's address:
"We must keep in mind the experience
of the period immediately after the first World
War. After a lull of a few months following the
Armistice of 1918, prices turned upward, scramb­
ing for inventories started, and prices soon got
completely out of hand. We found ourselves in
one of the worst inflations in our history,...3

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We
Avoid Another Depression?" Volume VII, Number 32, August
7, 1945. p. 11.

2 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We
Internationalize the Atomic Bomb?" Volume VII, Number 41,
October 16, 1945. p. 5.

3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We
Remove Wartime Controls?" Volume VII, Number 37, Septem­
Representative J. Sparkman: ...
General Henry told our committee not so long ago that no boys with as many as 85 points in this country were left in after September 30.1

Examples of refutation of argument are:

Dr. Ernst P. Boas: ... Dr. McCormick's reference to English insurance practice is not pertinent because in England up to the present the insurance system is very inadequate, and actually the British Medical Association is working hard to expand the benefits of the medical insurance system to approximate something such as proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill.2

The Governor hasn't quoted statistics there, and with respect to taxes, the situation in the Missouri Valley is entirely different from the situation in the Tennessee Valley.3

There are also indications in each of the twenty transcripts that the principles of reasoning are at times neglected. In some cases, the participants became heated in defending a point of view and allowed emotionalism to gain control; vindictive remarks, invectives, and evasion

1 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Demobilizing Effectively?" Volume VII, Number 39, October 2, 1945. p. 4.


3 Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should Congress Establish A Missouri Valley Authority?" Volume VII, Number 40, October 9, 1945. p. 11.
of the issue were the results. Examples of these are:

Mr. Joseph A. Padway: I have heard that argument before, too.

Mr. Stanley Rector: I would like to throw a few facts into this argument.

Mr. Padway: I would like to hear a fact or two, Rector. It would be somewhat unique to get a fact from you.

Mr. Rector: See how you handle this one.

...1


Senator Burton K. Wheeler: ... Senator Tunnell, let me say that all the facts, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate today, point -

Senator James M. Tunnell: I listened for three or four hours.

Senator Wheeler: You didn't listen half of that time. You only listened a very short time and then ran out. You got tired.

Senator Tunnell: It seemed long.2


Representative George E. Outland: Ted, may I have a word here? Mr. Hoffman, you were talking a few moments ago about the problem of your wife nagging you -

Representative Clare E. Hoffman (interposing): No. I wasn't talking about my wife. I didn't pick that kind of wife. I had better sense than that and I got a better woman than that. I said there were unfortunate individuals - maybe you know some of them, I don't. Maybe you have a personal acquaintance with them, I haven't. But there are such women in the world, I am told.

Mr. Outland: I have no means of know-ing1
Digressions were numerous, for no effort was made by the leader or any participant to keep the group within the channels of a logical pattern of discussion. Three examples of digression are the following:

Omar B. Ketchum: I would like to comment on that briefly....Let's see if we can get a point of agreement on this. Do you agree that service generally in the armed forces - not isolated cases or special services - is more restrictive of individual liberty, less remunerative, and more hazardous than general work in essential civilian war industry?

Major General Lewis B. Hershey: I think this argument is typical of a country that fiddles while Rome burns. We have the handicapped veteran and .... What are we doing? We are arguing the philosophy of whether or not a veteran has preference. The Congress has given it to him. If we don't like it, why don't we repeal it?

Congressman Gearhart: It doesn't make any difference who sends the dollar; the result is the thing that is important. The dollar gets there and it becomes dollar credit for the purchase of American goods as soon as it arrives.

Congressman Celler: We are getting far afield. We are 'way off the subject, I think. Our question is to aid Britain or not aid ...


Senator Warren G. Magnuson: Mr. Flynn, I am sorry we got off on this atomic question. Isn't the question here -

Senator Burton K. Wheeler: You are the one who got us off on it.

Senator Magnuson: That is why I apologize for getting off on it. Isn't the question here ... whether or not we are going to believe in the possibilities?¹


Unsupported assertions were frequent; some of these were apparently based on pure assumption, and some on limited sources of information. Three examples are:

Representative John W. Murphy: We have had very few business failures in this war. It is easy for you to say there are hundreds failing. I know of none.²

²Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Remove Wartime Controls?" Volume VII, Number 37, September 18, 1945. p. 12.

Mrs. Eleanor Fowler: ... I think that there are a great many forces at work in this country which want to cut out the funds from those things first of all, and I think that the pattern of cutting down services will lead in the direction of moral breakdown because I think that those services are very important.³

³Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "Are We Facing a Moral Breakdown in America?" Volume VII, Number 44, November 13, 1945. p. 11.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson: If we draw
ourselves back into the shell again, the world will be at war in another 20 years.¹


After consideration of the evidences of uses of argumentative devices similar to the example given, this writer has concluded that the participants, in general, showed awareness of the principles of reasoning; however, there were also evidences that during the course of the programs, the participants at times digressed from the methods of logical argument and in the heat of defending a point of view forgot logic for emotionalism, and committed the fallacies of evading the issue and begging the question.

Attitude of Cooperative Inquiry.

After an examination of twenty representative transcripts, this writer has concluded that there is little evidence to show that the participants on the American Forum of the Air programs exhibit an attitude of cooperative inquiry. They do, to be sure, answer each other's questions, respond to one another's remarks in a dignified manner, and, in general, exhibit an attitude of good-natured respect for each other's opinions.

However, they do not, in general, achieve and maintain the spirit of genuine cooperation necessary to the
group solution of a problem. They do not, apparently, recognize that the results of the discussion should be an achievement, not for the individual alone, but for the entire group and its interest. They do not seek first for common ground and then proceed to locate the solution of their problem; in general, they seek first of all to defend a preconceived position and then clash in argument.

The participants, in general, exhibit an attitude of an *a priori* conclusion, a definite solution which they seek to defend rather than propose for group consideration. They start with a preconceived notion of how the problem should be solved, and seek to swing the group toward that conclusion, evidencing the attitude of debate described by McBurney and Hance:

The intentional reasoner begins with a pre-determined proposition to which he is committed, either by desire or the nature of the circumstances, and seeks to secure the acceptance of this proposition.¹

¹McBurney, James, and Hance, Kenneth: *op. cit.*, p. 4.

Mr. Granik desires that the participants be opinionated in their attitude toward the question before the program begins. Correspondence indicates that he wants them to be divided fundamentally; on March 8, 1946, his assistant wrote the following statement to this writer:

We attempt to present the vital issue of the
week and the men and women who affect the decisions. Sometimes it is very difficult getting authorities who disagree with each other fundamentally so that we can present a clear-cut debate.¹

¹See Appendix C, Correspondence with Mr. Granik, March 8, 1945.

The participants are, in general divided in orientation from the very beginning of the period; they usually stress two "sides" of a proposition, thus driving the two "sides" further apart and exaggerating differences. At the beginning of the program, the participants each give a one-minute speech, in which they indicate their point of view and tell what proposition they will seek to defend. Included here are some representative selections illustrating this point:

Louis Lipsky: My stand will be very simply and briefly stated. The Jewish people favor the opening of Palestine to mass Jewish immigration and the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth in accordance with promises made to the Jewish people and approved by the nations of the world following the last World War.

Salloum Mokarzel: We believe that no lasting solution of the difficulty can be hoped for unless based on complete independence of Lebanon.²

²Transcript, American Forum of the Air, "How Can We Solve the Troubles of the Near East?" Volume VII, Number 30, July 24, 1945. p. 4.

Dr. E. J. McCormick: I am opposed to compulsory Federal sickness insurance because
I realize that under such a system the medical profession in the United States ... will in a very short time, ... be forced into a mediocre position.¹

¹ Transcrip, American Forum of the Air, "Should We Have Compulsory Federal Sickness Insurance?" Volume VII, Number 34, August 28, 1945. p. 3.

I am opposed to federal interference with the strictly local problems of the states, and doubly opposed to this proposition.²


Senator Burton K. Wheeler: I am opposed to giving power to any delegate to the United Nations Security Council to vote to send American boys into war to maintain the status quo of a peace treaty before we even know what the peace treaty is going to maintain. Secondly, I am opposed to giving power to any delegate appointed by the President to the Security Council of a world organization to put American boys into war to put down aggression ... I am further opposed to surrendering the war-making powers of this country to any one man, at any time, but particularly at such a time as described by one of our great combat Generals now in Europe, who said recently, "My friends, we fought the Revolutionary War to establish the rights of man. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves. We fought this war to lose for humanity what we won in the other two wars."³


Even the most naive observer would easily realize that Senator Wheeler is "opposed" and has definitely formed
an *a priori* conclusion concerning the question to be dis-
cussed.

Following the initial one-minute speeches, in each of the twenty representative programs examined for this study, Mr. Granik made a statement similar to this:

*There we have the issues and the sides are clearly drawn.*

Mr. Granik is correct. The participants on the American Forum of the Air exhibit an attitude appropriate for debate; they do not, in general, show an attitude of cooperative inquiry.

**Effective Oral Delivery.**

Obviously, very little can be ascertained concerning the delivery of the participants by an examination of twenty transcripts. To analyze this division of participation, the writer listened to ten broadcasts of the American Forum of the Air. It is impossible to treat with thoroughness the broad subjects of voice, articulation, and pronunciation within the narrow limits of this paper; but a brief consideration of the elements of delivery may here be allowed. Keeping in mind such items as clear and pleasant voice, correct pronunciation and effective articulation, this writer concluded that most of the speakers heard on ten representative programs evidenced effective oral delivery.

The oral ability of the participants was considered
Much research and study go into the actual selection of the speakers. The selection is extremely important because even though the issue may be exciting and vital, if we don't have articulate experts, the program falls short of its purpose.1

1See Appendix C, Correspondence, March 8, 1946.

In summary, analysis of representative transcripts reveals that the participants on the American Forum of the Air programs are reasonably familiar with the subjects being considered. In each case a certain amount of preparation had been made for the discussion; a one-minute speech had been prepared which, for each speaker, summarized a point of view on the topic. The background of the participants indicates familiarity with the subject; they were chosen from the recognized leaders of the nation and are called experts in the areas being discussed. Evidences of awareness of the principles of reasoning were found, but there were also indications that at times these were neglected. Along with examples of deductive and inductive reasoning, reasoning by inference from analogy, causation and facts supported by authority, were found digressions, invectives, vindicative remarks, unsupported assertions and name-calling. There was little evidence found to show that the participants exhibit an attitude of cooperative inquiry. They seem to gener-
ally have an attitude of good-natured respect for opposing opinions, but they do not achieve and maintain the spirit of genuine cooperation necessary to the group solution of a problem. They do not seek first for common ground and then proceed to locate the solution of a problem; in general, they seek first of all to defend a preconceived position and then clash in argument. Correspondence with Mr. Granik indicates that he wants the participants to be opinionated on a topic to be discussed, thus bringing to his program an element of clash resulting in a clear-cut debate situation. Evidence obtained by listening to representative broadcasts indicates that the oral delivery of the participants generally is suited to radio speaking; oral ability is considered necessary by Mr. Granik when he proceeds to select the participants for his programs. Much research and study of this ability precede an invitation to appear on the American Forum of the Air.
CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

The problem of this study is: what are the discussion methods employed by the American Forum of the Air? To what extent do they correspond to the methods recommended by theorists? What circumstances influence the choice of methods of discussion in a radio program in general and in this discussion program in particular?

Nature of the Problem:

Democracy assumes that the people are able to work successfully a cooperative program and apply scientific thinking to the solution of their problems. Discussion is one of the methods by which this program of democracy is carried on; discussion facilitates democracy by (1) providing an atmosphere favorable to mental activity, and (2) assisting individuals to develop social consciousness. Discussion is the method by which the average citizen may do his part in formulating policies. Democracy, in order to survive, must be motivated by principles of participation; when discussion is promoted, democracy flourishes.

If this program is to be put into operation, people must have knowledge of discussion methods; how will they proceed to organize a group discussion? How do they
get started? What are the methods best suited to facilitate discus­sional aims? What is being done in the field? Many books have been published which attempt to make this knowledge available (supra, p. 4.) This writer recognizes the validity of these works; however, in supplement to them, this study attempts to analyze the methods employed by one of the leading programs in the discussion field.

Background of the Problem:

The American Forum of the Air was chosen as the program to be analyzed because of the long period of its popularity and the large number of listeners. In 1925 Theodore Granik originated a radio program entitled, "Law for the Layman." Outstanding civic leaders discussed legal questions. This program was changed into the "American Forum of the Air" in 1937, and was broadcast from Washington, D. C., over the Mutual Network; nationally recognized leaders were invited to discuss public questions of the day. The Hooper rating of audience interest fluctuates, but is roughly around a five rating. The program has been called a sounding board where great national issues are freely opened to view. Congressmen have eulogized the benefits of this radio program and its leader, Theodore Granik, and the then Vice-president Truman wrote a letter of commendation which was read on the floor of the Congress. Thousands of
letters have been sent in by listeners throughout the country (Supra, p. 11).

**Definition of Discussion:**

This writer identifies discussion as oral group inter-communication for the cooperative solution of a problem. It differs from conversation in that conversation is not planned; discussion primarily is planned to solve a problem. Knowledge of the question is thus vitally essential; in conversation, knowledge is desirable, but not necessary - conversation may be merely an exchange of ignorances.

Discussion is differentiated from debate by the relative importance of intentional reasoning. Debate proposes to swing a group toward a pre-determined conclusion; it employs intentional reasoning to win acceptance of an a priori solution. Discussion means first a search for common ground, a clear statement of the problem, and consideration of all possible solutions. Discussion requires an attitude of cooperative inquiry and a desire for mutual understanding; no definite, irretractible conclusion has been reached (Supra, p. 9).

**Methods of Discussion:**

The methods of discussion are those procedures which are necessary for the discussion to be arranged. Briefly, they will include: (1) choosing a type of discus-
sion, (2) organization of the group and selection of a
time and place by a leader, (3) agreement on the topic to
be discussed, (4) systematic progression step-by-step to­
ward the solution and (5) effective participation by the
members of the group.

Objectives and Limitations of Radio Discussion:

Radio discussion has the same objective as any
other discussion: the cooperative solution of a problem;
in addition, radio discussion attempts to stimulate inter­
est in a passive listening audience. The limitations pe­
culiar to the radio situation are: conformity to station
policies; inadequacy of time; necessity for simple, short
speeches; avoidance of complicated subject material. These
objectives and limitations must be considered in the analy­
sis of the discussion methods of the American Forum of the
Air.

Method of Analysis:

As a basis for the analysis, pertinent sections
of discussion theory were compared and summarized. In this
manner the methods of discussion were listed and explained.

Transcripts of twenty representative broadcasts
of the American Forum of the Air were obtained (volume VII,
numbers 30 through 49, dating from July 24, 1945, through
December 18, 1945.) These were analyzed with particular
attention to (1) type of discussion, (2) leadership, (3) topics discussed, (4) progression, and (5) participation. Personal correspondence with Mr. Granik's secretary gave brief descriptions of certain techniques employed. Evidence was collected dealing with the five main divisions of the methods of discussion, and conclusions were drawn concerning the methods employed by the American Forum of the Air.

The Analysis

The analysis of the discussion methods of the American Forum of the Air was made by examination of twenty representative transcripts; pertinent sections of discussion theory were compared and summarized. The pattern of discussion methods thus created was used to evaluate the methods of the American Forum of the Air.

Selection of the Type of Discussion:

The type of discussion to be employed may be selected by the leader or by the group; it should be selected in relation to the ability and background of the participants, the interests and attitudes of the audience, and the nature of the topics. The best known types of formal discussion are the panel, open-forum, and the symposium (Supra, p. 20).

In the analysis of twenty representative transcripts, some evidence indicated that the American Forum of
the Air is not a true discusssional situation, but contains these elements of debate: (1) the participants are admittedly aligned on "sides" in their points of view, (2) the participants exhibit an a priori conclusion and show almost no desire to cooperatively solve the problem, and (3) the leader exhibits a desire for verbal clash and opposition rather than a desire for cooperative inquiry into the problem. This program exhibits an attitude of debate in an informal situation which superficially resembles a symposium: the participants give one minute speeches, after which the program is made informal and the participants freely present argument and refutation in support of a priori conclusions. The debate attitude is desired by Granik as an aid in achieving his stated objective of stimulation of public interest in important questions of national concern. This objective is justifiable as a primary aim of a radio program of this type.

Leadership:

The method of leadership theoretically should be that of a general master of ceremonies and unobtrusive guide. Without losing either the spirit of inquiry or the desire for presenting ideas, the leader should open, direct, mark the progress of, and summarize the discussion. His procedure in doing this may vary somewhat with the type of discussion, but in general his function is uniform. He should
have the personality and preparation which will enable him to do the following things: (1) demonstrate knowledge of the subject, (2) introduce the topic for discussion, (3) secure cooperative participation, (4) develop the pattern of reflective thinking, and (5) summarize the main points.

Analysis of transcripts shows that the leader of the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik, does not participate in the program, but exhibits knowledge of the subject in his introduction of the topic. He gives, when pertinent, a short history of the problem, states the issues and their relation to world events and the radio audience, and shows marked ability to introduce a problem.

**Progression:**

There is no inflexible outline which discussion must follow; however, if no pattern at all guides the group thinking, the chairman may soon lose control and the untamed members of the group may proceed in all directions at once. The authorities generally agree that discussion should logically follow the pattern of reflective thinking as outlined by John Dewey; however, a successful discussion may close before all the steps are completed and it may omit or transpose the order of some of the steps.

Evidence in the twenty representative transcripts indicated that the first three steps of the progression pattern were roughly followed, haphazardly and inaffectionately.
The statement of the problem was made by Mr. Granik. Analysis of the problem was made briefly by him and further analysis was made incidentally by the participants at irregular intervals during the discussion. Weighing of the reasoned development of proposed solutions was attempted; development of proposals was argued pro and con, but there was no evaluation of the sum total of argument with the objective of comparing the proposals and concluding a group solution of the problem. No evidence was found that the last two steps of the progression pattern were reached; there was no diagnosis of a group solution leading to action. Evidence of undesirable elements (digressions, unsupported assertions, personal bickering and name-calling) showed that the participants did not, in general, approach the discussion table with an attitude of open-minded inquiry necessary to the cooperative solution of a problem; rather, they exhibited an attitude of debate, propounding preconceived opinions and defending individual ideas. The logical pattern of discussion consequently received scant attention.

**Participation:**

In discussion, effective participation is linked inseparably with leadership, the topic, and progression; analysis of participation must consider the other three. For this reason, there may be an overlapping of ideas, but,
in general, authorities agree that the elements of suitable participation include (1) knowledge of the subject, (2) awareness of the principles of reasoning, (3) an attitude of cooperative inquiry, and (4) effective oral delivery.

Speakers on the American Forum of the Air are, as evidenced by analysis of representative programs and consideration of their background and professional attainments, chosen for their knowledge and understanding of the topic, and they exhibit a reasonably desirable amount of knowledge of the subjects discussed. Evidences of awareness of the principles of reasoning were found, but there were also indications that at times the participants digressed from the methods of logical argument and in the heat of defending a point of view forgot logic for emotionalism. There was little evidence found to show that the participants exhibited an attitude of cooperative inquiry; they show good-natured respect for opposing opinions, but do not achieve and maintain the spirit of genuine cooperation necessary to the group solution of a problem. They do not seek first for common ground and then proceed to locate the solution of their problem; in general, they seek first to defend a pre-conceived position and then clash in argument. Evidence obtained by listening to representative broadcasts indicated that the oral delivery of the participants was suited to radio speaking; oral ability is consid-
Conclusions

Evidence found in the analysis of twenty representative American Forum of the Air broadcasts and related sources indicated bases for these conclusions:

(1) The American Forum of the Air is not a true discussion program; the attitude of debate is evidenced by the apparent alignment of the participants on "sides", by their a priori conclusion as the best solution of the problem, and by Mr. Granik's stated desire for opposition rather than cooperative inquiry into the problem. This program is actually a debate in an informal situation which superficially resembles a symposium.

(2) Theodore Granik, leader and moderator of the program, exhibits knowledge of the subject in his brief introduction of the topic, but does not otherwise participate in the program. He does not attempt to secure cooperative inquiry, develop a pattern of progression, nor summarize.

(3) The topics are selected with appropriate consideration of the participants' abilities and backgrounds and with contemplation of the interests of the radio audience; evidence shows that these topics are timely and important.

(4) The logical pattern of progression receives scant attention; after statement and analysis of the problem...
reasoned development of solutions is attempted. This step is haphazard and ineffectively done, and no evidence was found that there was any evaluation of the sum total of argument with the objective of comparing the proposals and concluding a group solution of the problem. Evidences of digression and emotionalism were found.

(5) Participants on the American Forum of the Air generally show a reasonably desirable amount of knowledge of the subject and exhibit effective oral delivery. They do not have the desired attitude of cooperative inquiry, and only at times do they indicate an awareness of the principles of reasoning. This factor may be accounted for in part by their propensity for debate instead of discussion.

(6) Throughout the analysis of this program there has been noted a propensity for debate rather than discussion; this attitude is fostered by Mr. Granik, and is the goal of his stated objective of stimulating interest in the radio audience concerning important problems of national or international significance. Such a motive is commensurate with the objectives of this type of radio program.
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APPENDICES.
APPENDIX A

Sample transcript of the American Forum of the Air, Volume VIII, Number 19, May 21, 1946.
"Are Communism And Democracy Mutually Antagonistic?"

REPRESENTATIVE CLARE BOOTH LUCE
Connecticut
WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN
Noted Author and Lecturer
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
Chairman, Communist Party, U.S.A.
DR. HARRY F. WARD
Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary
Announcer: Can we get along with Russia? Does communism endanger our security? "Are Communism and Democracy Mutually Antagonistic?" Once again the vital issue of the week discussed on your American Forum of the Air! [Applause.]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the Shoreham Hotel in your nation's capital, Mutual proudly presents America's pioneer public service radio program, The American Forum of the Air, founded eighteen years ago by Theodore Granik, attorney and moderator. The Forum presents every Tuesday night at this time the vital issue of the week, both sides of that issue, and the men and women who affect the decisions!

And now here is your chairman, Theodore Granik.

Chairman Granik: Good evening. Perhaps the most basic and vital issue confronting our country and the world today is the solution of the problem: How can we live on peaceful terms with the Soviet Union?

Before the war, the western democratic nations mistrusted Russia in varying degrees. During the war against Fascism and Nazism, Russia was our ally. Cooperation between our armed forces and our governments reached a high state of perfection. Since the war, relations have gradually come to such a point that the Peace Conference in Paris has just ended with little accomplished.

It is important that every American, for the future security of the nation, understand what the issues are. The Russian form of government is communist. There has been considerable argument in this country as to the merits and demerits of communism. This evening we hope to clarify some of the definitions. In a much smaller world than our ancestors dreamed possible, for mutual security we must understand our neighbors.

There are many in this country and elsewhere who maintain that communism and democracy are mutually antagonistic, that the two forms of government and, in fact, the two governments, cannot live peacefully in the world until one or both changes its philosophy of operation. Those who believe that communism and democracy are not antagonistic to each other argue that communism is the only true form of democracy and that what we call democracy in the United States is actually unequal capitalism.

This evening we have invited four of the leading authorities on this subject to debate the question: "Are Communism and Democracy Mutually Antagonistic?"

And now here are the authorities.

First, the distinguished Congresswoman from Connecticut, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce. Mrs. Luce.

Mrs. Luce: Mr. Moderator, I believe that communism and our American form of democracy are mutually antagonistic for the reasons that Mr. William Z. Foster himself, who sits opposite me, gave when he testified before a congressional committee investigating communist propaganda in the Third Session of the 75th Congress. The average American believes in God and is loyal to his country, but Mr. Foster believes that a belief in God and loyalty to the American flag are wholly opposed to communism.

May I read Mr. Foster's sworn testimony before this congressional committee?

"The Chairman: Mr. Foster, does your Party advocate the destruction of religious belief?"
"Mr. Foster: Our Party considers religion to be the opiate of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers.

'The Chairman: To be a member of the Communist Party, do you have to be an atheist?

'Mr. Foster: Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and when he joins the Party he will soon get rid of them.

'The Chairman: Well, can members of the Communist Party in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious belief?

'Mr. Foster: My opinion is that a member of the Party in the Soviet Union who would be married in the church wouldn't be of any value to the Communist Party.

'The Chairman: Would he be put out of the Party?

'Mr. Foster: Eventually.

'The Chairman: Would it not be the same in this country?

'Mr. Foster: As I have stated before, workers who would be so imbued with religious superstition that they would be married in a church would be of no value to the Communist Party.'"

And now for loyalty to our country.

'The Chairman: If I understand you, Mr. Foster, the workers of America look on the Soviet flag as their flag.

'Mr. Foster: The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the Red flag.

'The Chairman: Mr. Foster, do you owe allegiance to the American flag? Does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

'Mr. Foster: I stated very clearly that the Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class and we owe no allegiance to them.

'The Chairman: Well, that answers the question.'"

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Moderator, Mr. Foster has also answered the question as to whether our democracy and communism are mutually antagonistic.

Chairman Granik: Thank you, Mrs. Luce. Next, the recently elected Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., William Z. Foster. Mr. Foster.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Moderator, communism, far from being antagonistic to democracy, is the most profounding democratic social movement in the world. This is proved by the basic principles of communism, by the progressive, anti-fascist programs and struggles of the communist parties in all countries. Above all, it is proved by the socialist democracy and the anti-fascist foreign policies of the U.S.S.R. The communist movement, and the trade unions and other popular forces working with it, are the major bulwark of world democracy. The danger to world democracy and peace comes primarily from the monopolies in the United States. The economic royalists, with their predominant influence in shaping American foreign policy and their imperialist determination to rule the world, are
together with their British junior partners, a malignant threat to democracy in the United States and throughout the world. American monopolistic forces are the basic cause of the present highly dangerous tension in the United Nations, and they must be curbed by the American people.

Chairman Granik: Thank you, Mr. Foster. Next, the well-known lecturer and author, William Henry Chamberlin. Mr. Chamberlin.

Mr. Chamberlin: I understand by communism, not some abstract theoretical idea, but the political, economic, and social system that is actually functioning in the Soviet Union. Communism, thus defined, and democracy are entirely incompatible. Democracy is based on the free man and the moral order. Communism is based on the supposedly infallible leader and one-party dictatorship and recognizes no morality but expediency. In a democratic society people work as they please, vote as they please, speak as they please, write as they please. Invariable features of the totalitarian state, whether of the communist or fascist type, are: so-called elections with only one list of candidates to vote for, regimented and gagged press and radio, executions and arrests without trial, and slave-labor concentration camps. Democracy stands for habeas corpus; communism for habeas cadaver.

Democracy recognizes the eternal truth of Lord Acton's statement: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." It surrounds the exercise of government power with proper checks, balances and safeguards. In such acts of Soviet communism as the man-made famine of 1932-1933, which doomed millions of peasants to death, the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the mass deportations to slave labor from Poland, the Baltic States and other countries which the Red Army occupied in this war, you see the fearful moral corruption which absolute power inevitably brings. Communism, if one can believe the writings of its acknowledged leaders, Lenin and Stalin, is out for world domination, to be achieved by a mixture of subversive propaganda and military force. Democracy is content to work by example and persuasion. The difference between democracy and communism is the difference between day and night, between civilization and barbarism.

Chairman Granik: Thank you, Mr. Chamberlin. And now, the Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, Dr. Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward.

Dr. Ward: Mr. Chairman, in principle there is no antagonism between communism and democracy. Communism regards democracy as an historic process which moves through three stages: capitalist, socialist, communist. It sees each as a higher form than the other, bringing more freedom and more equality to more people. In practice, Mr. Chamberlin, what we are now dealing with in the Soviet Union is not communism, but socialist democracy under communist leadership. The Soviet founders held that political guarantees of freedom and equal rights were ineffective as long as economic power was in the hands of the few. So, they got the people first to lay the foundations of economic democracy as the sure basis of more freedom and more equality. After the people had learned to share in the making and execution of the economic plans on which their lives and future depend, there came the Constitution of 1936 with its
unlimited democratic guarantees, and now the further decentralization of control through the "party and non-party bloc" in the recent election.

In this general course there is agreement with, not antagonism to, the equal, inalienable, rights of the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, for the people." It was this basic agreement, not merely the need for national preservation, which bound together the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union in the war. If the further development of the democratic way of life is now our aim, the unfolding of the Century of the Common Man can also become a joint enterprise. If our objective is to be the American Century, antagonism is bound to grow.

Chairman Granik: Thank you, Mrs. Luce and gentlemen. There we have the issues, and the sides are clearly drawn. Now, to start our discussion: Which is the danger to democracy, communism, or monopoly capitalism, Mr. Chamberlin?

Mr. Chamberlin: I think that term "monopoly capitalism" is very misleading, if it is applied to the system that prevails in America at the present time. In America one has a free play of economic forces, free enterprise, free trade unions, free farm organizations, and so on. Power, economic as well as political, under democracy is widely diffused, whereas under communism there is a terrific concentration of power in the hands of a few men. I would defy either Mr. Foster or Dr. Ward to show that any man or group of men in the United States could doom millions to starvation, as Stalin did by his agrarian policies in 1932 and 1933.

Mr. Foster: I would like to reply to Mrs. Luce's quotations. These were delivered many years ago, of course, and represented a sectarian period of development of our Party.

Mrs. Luce: Everybody knows that a communist can change his mind every three minutes, according to his Party line.

Chairman Granik: Will you let him finish, please? Go ahead, Mr. Foster.

Mr. Foster: I would like to state that communists learn as they go along.

I would like to ask Mrs. Luce whether she believes in this statement, which she wrote in 1930:

"Lying increases the creative faculties, expands the ego, lessens the friction of social contacts. It is only in lies, wholeheartedly and bravely told, that human nature attains, through words and speech and forebearance, the nobility, the romance, the idealism that, being what it is, it falls so short in fact and in deed."

Chairman Granik: Do you want to let her answer, Mr. Foster? Go ahead, Mrs. Luce.

Mrs. Luce: The article of which you speak was a parody and satire, clearly so marked, for Vanity Fair magazine, written in the year 1930 in a series of other satires; and if communists had a sense of humor (which they obviously haven't, or they would laugh themselves to death at themselves), they would have seen that that was a satire.

When it comes to bigger and better lying, you have got to go to the head of the communist state for that. I will give you the quote that Stalin
made to Hitler when he signed the Hitler-Stalin pact, saying, "Fascism is a matter of taste, Mr. Hitler, but our pact is signed in blood." Or, for that matter, Mr. Foster, for lying which is a high art, subterfuge, and all sorts of evasion, I will be very happy to supply you with a quotation from your own left wing communist magazine.

"It is necessary," says Mr. Lenin, "to be able to agree to any and every sacrifice and even, if need be, to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on communist work in them."

By the way, Mr. Foster, how are you doing?

Chairman Granik: I think Dr. Ward wants a word.

Dr. Ward: Regarding the first point that we are supposed to be discussing now, the test of any understanding of communism is whether democracy is regarded as a developing process. I would like to ask you whether you regard our capitalist democracy as the perfect, final form of the democratic way of life.

Mrs. Luce: Mr. Ward, our capitalist economy has many faults, many grave faults. I am the first to acknowledge them, and the first to say that we must improve it. But the fact that capitalism has faults does not prove that communism is virtuous; nor does it prove that communism is a cure, except as a guillotine might be called a cure for a case of dandruff.

Dr. Ward: The point is, what do you regard as the next historic stage in the development of democracy?

Mrs. Luce: As the next historic stage in the development of democracy—

Dr. Ward: That is it, the next historic stage.

Mrs. Luce: I am not talking of economic systems. There has been no—

Dr. Ward: But we are, you see. We are talking about—

Mrs. Luce: You can talk about anything you want.

Dr. Ward: So can Hitler.

Chairman Granik: I am sorry, Mr. Chamberlin wants a word.

Mrs. Luce: I am talking fundamentals.

Mr. Chamberlin: As a more or less prominent Christian, Dr. Ward, do you see any inconsistency between the ethical ideas of Christianity and such Soviet practices as executing people without trial and keeping millions of human beings in slavery in concentration camps?

Dr. Ward: Mr. Chamberlin, I should think those extravagant statements of yours by this time had become too hoary for any respectable man to use. Let's have some proofs, if you can give them. Now I will answer your question, sir. If you will read a little history, you will find that from the days of Roman Christianity, it has always been agreed that the ethical base of the communist ideal and the ethical base of early Christianity were the same.

Mr. Chamberlin: The actual answer—

Mr. Foster: I would like to reply. Mr. Chamberlin asked me a question, and I would like to reply to it, but before that, a word in answer to six
Mrs. Luce. Mrs. Luce may creep out of these statements that she made years ago——

Mrs. Luce: I am not creeping out of them.

Mr. Foster: ——but the communists believed the statements they made years ago and have changed their minds about them.

Mrs. Luce: O.K., what have you disagreed with Stalin about for the last five years, Mr. Foster?

Mr. Foster: I don't think Mrs. Luce is entitled to the floor the whole time, even if she is a woman. I should like to answer. Mr. Chamberlin asked a question, and I want to answer it. He says there is no monopoly capitalism in the United States.

Mrs. Luce: What would you do without monopoly capitalism in these arguments?

Mr. Foster: We would do very nicely without monopoly capitalism in these arguments, and that is what we are going to do eventually in the United States as well. This is the leading country of monopoly capitalism of the world. Not only that, but these economic royalists, whom President Roosevelt identified during the course of many years, are now dictating our foreign policy and are threatening to plunge the world into a new world war.

Mr. Chamberlin: I would merely like to say that anybody who, like Dr. Ward, implies that there have not been wholesale executions in Russia or that there is not slave labor on a gigantic scale must be a total ignoramus or a completely irresponsible falsifier of facts. You can read the Soviet papers, read Izvestia for 1933, and you will find there a statement in the Soviet press that 67,000 slave laborers were amnestied on just one project, the Baltic-White Sea Canal.

Very sympathetic visitors, like Wendell Willkie and Quentin Reynolds—everybody who has been in Russia and who isn't deaf, dumb and blind, especially dumb—knows that Russia rests on a slave labor of a type more inhumane than Negro slavery was in many parts of the South before the Emancipation Proclamation.

Dr. Ward: Mr. Chairman, I may be ignorant, but I am not so ignorant as not to know that neither you nor anybody else has any accurate facts about the number of people in the labor camps in the Soviet Union, and you ought to know in the beginning that the labor camps that you are talking about are constructive rehabilitation programs. [Laughter.] You people can laugh, but if you had talked, as I have, with people who come from those camps and whose whole lives have been rebuilt, you would know that Soviet penology is not the way you described it.

Now I want to ask Mr. Chamberlin——

Chairman Granik: I have a question directed to you, Dr. Ward. It is claimed that every American communist invariably sides with Russia against America on every disputed issue. Does this fact not indicate that they are not an independent party of the American working class, but the organized fifth column of a foreign power?

Dr. Ward: I am not concerned with what communists in this country do. I am discussing the relationship between democracy and communism on principle, and I want to ask Mr. Chamberlin a question. Mr. Chamberlin, why do those who call for a crusade against communism, from Hitler
to Dies and Rankin, make their immediate objective the destruction of
democracy or the prevention of its development, and why do you, if you
believe in democracy, help these people by your writings, thus to carry on
a campaign not against communism but against democracy?

MR. CHAMBERLIN: Because I think that Soviet communism is the great-
est threat to human liberty, democracy and civilization today.

DR. WARD: You want democracy destroyed here to save it over there?

MR. CHAMBERLIN: No.

MRS. LUCE: Mr. Chairman, may I now address a question to the rather
optimistic Dr. Ward? Dr. Ward, Lenin, in his pamphlet, entitled "Lenin
Speaks to Youth," said, "Our morality is entirely subordinated to the
interests of the class struggle. We don't believe in eternal morality, and
we expose all fables about morality."

Now, Dr. Ward, do you think that this belief, which you have referred
to as a high ethical principle, explains why, after 25 years of communist
education, the thing that the Soviet armies will be remembered for best by
the women of Europe is rape?

DR. WARD: You have not a shred of proof. Not one shred of proof can
anybody produce that there has been any more rape by the Soviet armies
than by the capitalist armies. So, where does your ethical principle go to
then, including, Mrs. Luce, your Catholic armies?

MR. FOSTER: I would like to answer about communists thinking the
same as the Soviet Union. Capitalists all over the world react the same
to political and economic questions; Catholics react the same; fascists re-
act the same; communists react the same, naturally, because they have the
same underlying basic principles.

I would like, Mr. Moderator, to call our discussion here back to some
more important things that are happening in the world today. One of
them is that American imperialism, with British imperialism as its junior
partner, is now carrying on an imperialist campaign designed to dominate
the world, and that this is the greatest menace there is confronting world
democracy and that communists all over the world are the most——

MRS. LUCE: Let's see who it is that believes——

MR. FOSTER: I have something to say to Mrs. Luce on this, and that
is that it was precisely Mr. Henry R. Luce who enunciated a call for world
domination by the United States several years ago with his American
Century. That is precisely what the American economic royalists are
now trying to put into effect, and that is why we have the world tension
at the present time.

MRS. LUCE: When it comes to this question of world domination, let
us refer to Stalin's own book, his own Mein Kampf. That, incidentally,
is being shipped from Russia in great packages and is being sold in an
excellent 25-cent edition, and you can buy it in practically any book shop
in the U. S. It is called Problems of Leninism. In there Stalin says, and
I quote: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to
exist for a long period side by side with the imperialist states. Ultimately
one or the other must conquer."

That "imperialist states" means us. I consider it nonsense of the
most egregious sort for anyone to try to pretend that the U. S. is out to
start a war with anybody. We don't want a war. We want to do every-
thing we can to avoid one. We have not asked for a dime of reparations.
We have not asked for a foot of territory. We have not taken a piece of loot. To call this an imperialist, aggressive country is just shabby nonsense. [Applause.]

Chairman Granik: Please hold the applause. You are taking the time of the speakers.

I want to ask a question, directed to Mrs. Luce, which was sent to us. The communists in every country gave all-out support to the war against fascism. Isn’t this a basic proof of their democratic objectives?

Mrs. Luce: This is definitely no proof of their basic objectives. They went to war with the Germans because the Germans attacked them, and before the Germans attacked them, they had a blood bond with the Germans. I would like to read you, if I can find it here, some of Stalin’s pronouncements on that subject. He said, before the war began, “It is our purpose to see the imperialist Great Britain and Germany bleed themselves white while we stand by and wait for the world revolution.”

Mr. Chamberlin: Might I put in a word about proof? It seems to me Mr. Foster and Dr. Ward are strong on generalities but very weak on concrete proof. About the behavior of the Russian troops, Congressman Gordon, of Illinois, went to Poland, and here is what he reported:

“Pillaging of the shops in the streets was going on most freely, and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill. There is no freedom of press in Poland.”

John Dos Passos, writing in Life, tells of the savagery of the Russian armies. The people in the working class districts felt that when the Russians came, they at least would be spared, but not at all. In the working class districts the troops were allowed to rape and loot and murder at will.

Mr. Foster: It is ridiculous to infer, as Mrs. Luce does, that the U.S.S.R. is organizing a world revolution. Capitalism in each country, by its own bankruptcy, gives birth to socialism. By World War I capitalism lost one-sixth of the world to socialism, the U.S.S.R. As a result of World War II, already several European countries, including Great Britain and France, have socialist-communist majorities, and the great colonial peoples, especially India and China, are on the march against imperialism. Let the American monopolists succeed in organizing World War III, and that will just about finish capitalism altogether.

Chairman Granik: I have a question here for Mr. Chamberlin. If there is mutual antagonism between communism and democracy, on what basis do you expect to organize peace and security?

Mr. Chamberlin: I think through a firm American policy in close understanding and agreement with other freedom-loving peoples. I would say that, with the best will in the world, it is very difficult to reach a cordial understanding with a government which practices such persistent and consistent bad faith as the Soviet Union has shown in violating its non-aggression treaties with Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States, in disregarding its pledged dates of evacuation in Iran and Manchuria, in ignoring the promise in the Yalta Agreement assuring free, unfettered elections in Poland. An experienced diplomat recently said that while in the Nuern-
berg trial Hitler was accused of violating 26 treaties, Stalin already has violated 29 and he is still going strong.

Dr. Ward: I have a question, but before that I want to point out that Mr. Chamberlin's stuff does not give a shred of proof of any sort, except the statements of descriptive writers, but he has trials enough in the American Zone and the British Zone and other zones of cases where you can get some facts to show what happens.

My question to him is this: Why do the people of the Soviet Union have and exercise the unrestricted right of recall of their elected representatives?

Mr. Chamberlin: I think that shows again the completely utopian nature of your whole view of the Soviet system. Actually, I would challenge you to show——

Dr. Ward: I will, Mr. Chamberlin, and then you will stop talking generalities here. In the recent war, five members of the municipal government of Leningrad were recalled by the people under their soviet rights. I have also another quotation here from a country district where two representatives were recalled for the same reason. Lenin, you may remember, said that the base of democracy was that the people shall have the unrestricted right to recall their representatives.

Mr. Chamberlin: If you can show five people from Leningrad and two from some other place, I am sure you would find 5,000 people's representatives arrested and shot by the OGPU, the secret police.

Mrs. Luce: Mr. Ward, don't you agree—I think all of us would agree—that one of the ways to settle this bitter controversy about what goes on inside Russia would be for Uncle Joe to let the iron curtain down and let us all go in and have one big, good look at it? The fact that he does not do so puts the burden of proof on him. What does he have there that he is ashamed of that he is afraid of a free press?

Dr. Ward: Mrs. Luce, I have lived enough in the Soviet Union to know that that iron curtain is in part a figment of Mr. Churchill's rhetoric and imagination and in part a necessity of the situation. It varies according to the outside world and what is happening. Mr. Duranty and Louis Fisher, in the time that I was there, and other people who were not propagandist reporters——

Mrs. Luce: You should hear Louis Fisher now.

Dr. Ward: I know Louis Fisher now, and I also know that he happened to be the man that I consulted because he had been so much around the Soviet Union and particular places of my study. He wasn't shut up in Moscow; nor was——

Mrs. Luce: Earl Browder wrote a book called——

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman——

Chairman Granik: Just a moment. I want to ask a question which is directed to you, Mr. Foster. In 1919, it is claimed, there were less than 5,000 political prisoners in all the Russians. Today, Soviet writers are said to admit there are a minimum of 10,000,000 political prisoners. What other government has ever imprisoned five to ten per cent of its whole population because they longed for freedom?

That is a question directed to you.
Mr. Foster: Just a lot of nonsense, and this is the kind of talk that promotes—

Mrs. Luce: Let's go in and have a look.

Mr. Foster: —a war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mrs. Luce: Let's go in and have a look.

Mr. Foster: I would like to reply to a misstatement of Mrs. Luce to the effect that we are not showing any imperialist tendencies. First of all, with our gigantic Navy—

Mrs. Luce: Whom do you mean by "our"?

Mr. Foster: The United States.

Mrs. Luce: Whom do you mean by "our"? Are you talking about Russia or the U. S. A.? I am just asking for clarification.

Dr. Ward: That is clear enough, Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Foster: We have a Navy twice as big as all the rest of the navies of the world put together, and an Air Force beyond comparison. We are dominating the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, and with air bases scattered all over the world we are in a position to bomb any nation in the world with atomic bombs, and are reactionaries are just trigger-happy enough with the atomic bomb to want to do it at the first occasion.

Mrs. Luce: Oh, oh!

Chairman Granik [addressing the audience]: Please hold your demonstration.

Mr. Foster: This is a lesson that the American people have to learn. I would like to read what Mr. Morgenthau has to say about American policy, the former Secretary of the Treasury.

"Two paths are open to us. One is the path of moral leadership. This path leads to peace and prosperity for all peoples. The other is the path of commercial advantage, business as usual."

Mrs. Luce: Mr. Foster, I have a question to ask you that you can take all the time you want to answer.

Mr. Foster: Please let me finish.

Chairman Granik: If you will make it brief.

Mr. Foster: I have two lines. "This path leads—" You don't want to hear this.

Chairman Granik: Go ahead, Mr. Foster. Complete your sentence.

Mrs. Luce: I know your Victrola records.

Mr. Foster: "This path leads to struggles for markets, imperialism, and war."

I submit that, on the basis of our actions to date, it looks as if we are following the second path, which is the path to war.

Chairman Granik: I have to give the mike to Mrs. Luce.

Mrs. Luce: We are the ones who have marched into Poland? We are the ones who marched into Europe? Mr. Foster, I have a question to ask you, and you can take all the time you want for this one. Have you ever at any time publicly since 1939 condemned, criticized, or found fault with anything that Stalin has enunciated from Moscow? Take all the time you want.
Mr. Foster: The Soviet policy is the correct policy, and why should I criticize it?

Mrs. Luce: Oh, dear! I wouldn't if I were you. Remember what happened to Trotsky.

Mr. Foster: It is a socialist country following a correct policy.

Mrs. Luce: Incidentally, speaking of Trotsky, do you approve of murder as an instrument of national policy?

Mr. Foster: First of all, I want to say that the way you put that question is a slander against the Soviet Union. It constitutes war mongering, and it is one of the most menacing manifestations in our country at the present time, the systematic slandering of an ally that gave 30 times as much in dead as we did in the war.

Mr. Chamberlin: I would like to put a question to Mr. Foster. Mr. Foster has doubtless seen the statement by Carlos Prestes, the Brazilian communist leader, that he would fight for Russia if Brazil and Russia came into conflict. Are we to draw from Mr. Foster's assumption that Russia is always right and America is always wrong, that he would be fighting on the Russian side if America and Russia ever came into conflict?

Mr. Foster: Whenever the policy of the United States is correct, the communists give it 100 per cent support, and there is nobody in the United States who were more loyal supporters of the war than the communists.

Mr. Chamberlin: Stalin's war.

Chairman Granik: I think Dr. Ward wants a word.

Dr. Ward: Mr. Chamberlin, why do the people of the Soviet Union have and exercise the unrestricted right of recall of their elected representatives?

Mr. Chamberlin: All political and civil liberties in the Soviet Union are a complete hoax and sham.

Dr. Ward: Is that so, now, Mr. Chamberlin——

Chairman Granik: Please, Dr. Ward. Let him answer the question.

Mr. Chamberlin: In the assembly of trained seals called the Supreme Soviet they have never had a single vote that was not unanimous. There never has been one word in the whole length and breadth of the Soviet Union published critical of Stalin. In the very minor cases where they have recalled people, it was usually someone whom Stalin wanted to get rid of, and there have been far more recalls, I assure you, Dr. Ward, by secret arrests. Whether you want to call it OGPU or Narkomivdel or NKVD, it is the same terrorist gang. Whatever name it may give itself, there have been far more recalls by its methods than by any other process.

Dr. Ward: That is a typical reply, Mr. Chamberlin, typical of your writings and typical of your speeches. It is an evasion and a distortion, and there is not a shred of fact. Now I will give you some facts. The war municipal government of Leningrad during the war recalled by public election, recalled by an election demanded by the people, five members of the municipal government. I have a letter here from a country school teacher explaining the situation in her village soviet and telling how the people themselves, when they found that some of their representatives were, as the old Russian proverb has it, “neither a candle for God nor a poker for the devil,” recalled them by popular election.
MRS. LUCE: May I ask—

MR. CHAMBERLIN: Let me come back here. I have a question I have long been pining to ask Dr. Ward. I get the impression from Dr. Ward’s writings that he thinks Russia, with its mass slave labor, its wholesale executions—

DR. WARD: More distortion.

MR. CHAMBERLIN: —is morally superior to America. How do you explain, Dr. Ward, that Americans had virtually 100 per cent loyalty to their government during the war while hundreds of thousands of Russians fought with the Germans during the war, and there are hundreds of thousands of millions of refugees from Soviet soil in Europe now who fear death rather than be repatriated to their country.

MRS. LUCE: They don’t like it there.

DR. WARD: None of your figures correspond, any more than your writings, to the facts, Mr. Chamberlin.

MR. CHAMBERLIN: Will you believe General Omar Bradley, who said 150,000 Russians were captured on the Western Front?

DR. WARD: He has never let me answer the first one yet. I have the answer for the first one. He charges me with believing that the Soviet Union is morally superior to the United States. He charged the Dean of Canterbury similarly, and although the Dean of Canterbury twice disavowed this position in his book, he and the Times both refused to correct the error. Now, Mr. Chamberlin, that is the kind of thing you have been putting over on the people of this country for a long time, distorting other people’s views.

MRS. LUCE: May I ask you a very simple question? In a congressional committee hearing a few weeks ago, a month or so ago, a misguided congressman called Wendell Willkie a communist, and Mr. Foster jumped to his feet and said at the top of his lungs that this was a smear. I want to ask you, would it be a smear if I called you a communist?

Chairman Granik: We pause—

DR. WARD: I would call it—

Chairman Granik: We must pause now for a summation of the arguments advanced this evening. Mrs. Luce, will you sum up, please?

MRS. LUCE: This has been a very turgid argument. The position of Mr. Foster and Dr. Ward seems to be that communism is a system that will bring us paradise on earth. Never in the world’s history have there been so many homeless and hungry and terror-stricken and enslaved people. Mr. Foster, I am afraid that your earthly paradise is receding faster and faster. If only you and all your communists had not deserted your Christian faith, you would at least have one consolation, which would be that your heavenly paradise is growing substantially closer.

But it does seem to me, as I said, that there is one way to settle all the disputes of the evening about how communism is really working in Russia, and that is for Stalin to lift the iron curtain and let’s all go and look at it and report our findings. The fact that he doesn’t puts the burden of proof upon him, and it puts the burden of proof on you and Mr. Foster.

The charge that Mr. Chamberlin and I have made tonight is that you are not as loyal to the United States as you are loyal to an anti-
religious economic system which in Europe has been characterized by torture to obtain confessions, executions without trial, falsification of the record, floggings, beatings, shooting slave labor, and the suppression of all minority and individual opinion. I would rather die than live under such a system and, incidentally, I think Dr. Ward would, too, though I am not sure. In any case, like many liberals of his ilk, Dr. Ward is a self-deluded man. He is fighting against our system of Christian democracy, a system which he does not in his heart wish to destroy, for a system that he could not bear to live under.

Chairman Granik: I am sorry, Mrs. Luce, your time has expired. Dr. Ward, will you sum up?

Dr. Ward: Yes, I will.

The difference between us is the difference between facts and distortions in viewing democracy as a historic process which has its imperfect stages. I have never found anybody in authority in the Soviet Union who did not ask me to see their bad things as well as their good things and to tell them honestly where they were wrong as well as where they were right. I have never held a utopian viewpoint. It is a developing proposition. It has its defects, but it is on the way to correction.

We have shown here from different approaches that, both in theory and in practice, communism is democracy, a process of democratic development, that the Soviet Union has a basically democratic regime. Its post-war foreign policy makes for democracy and peace.

Our opponents have indulged in reckless distortions and misrepresentations of communist policy. The logic of this position is war, a war which General Eisenhower has warned would be long and ruinous.

We have shown also that the danger to world democracy comes not from communism, but from American economic royalists and their British friends. It is American imperialist monopolies that today are a menace to everything democratic in our country and in the world. With their imperialist aggression and their control of our foreign policy, they become the mainstay of world reaction. To avoid a disastrous atomic war costing millions of American lives, the American people need to take their foreign policy away from the monopolists and—not place their whole reliance on Republicans and southern poll tax Democrats. Give it to the American people, Mrs. Luce, not the Republicans and southern poll tax Democrats who destroy democracy in the South and what they do to the Negro people—who refuse to enact Roosevelt's economic bill of rights. We need to return to Roosevelt's policy of world collaboration.

Mrs. Luce: He said Russia was a dictatorship as bloody as any other.

Dr. Ward: Mrs. Luce, if your manners are no better—

Mrs. Luce: A touch of communism seems to be coming over me.

Dr. Ward: We must compel the Truman Administration to restore Big Three unity, to drop the war-like Gestapo policy. World peace and democracy depend upon the American people getting control of their foreign policy.

Chairman Granik: I am sorry, our time is up. [Applause.]
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Correspondence
Mr. Theodore Granik  
c/o Radio Station W O L,  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Mr. Granik:

Your radio program, the American Forum of the Air, is the subject of a research study as part of the requirements for my Master of Arts degree in Speech at the State University of Iowa. The problem as defined in my thesis is: An evaluation of the methods of discussion employed by the American Forum of the Air.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would give me the following information:

1. Why is the symposium type of discussion used in preference to some other type?

2. How are the participants chosen?

3. Are the participants briefed before the actual broadcast? What are their instructions?

4. How are the topics (or questions for discussion) chosen?

5. What measure of radio-audience-interest has been made concerning this program?

6. Is thirty minutes considered ample time for purposes of your program?

Your discussion program is considered a significant contribution to education and to the cause of free speech in its fight against undemocratic muzzling, by presenting pros and cons of controversial problems of the day.

Respectfully,

Kim Giffin
Mr. Kim Giffin
214 East Jefferson Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Mr. Giffin:

Thank you for your very interesting and complimentary letter regarding the American Forum of the Air. I shall attempt to answer your questions in the order you outline.

1. Why is the symposium type of discussion used in preference to some other type?

We feel that when four outstanding authorities sit around a table for a radio discussion with a minimum of prepared material, the result is a much more interesting and enlightening program. Some of our speakers do "kick" a bit when they learn that their opening statement must be under one minute, but invariably after we are off the air they agree with us that they got much more into their spontaneous arguments than if they had spent hours preparing a written script. Needless to say this format also makes for better radio and better listener acceptance.

2. How are the participants chosen -- this question and question 4. How are the topics (or questions for discussion) chosen? -- can be considered as one.

We operate what amounts to a "city desk" here at the American Forum by keeping track of all the important hearings before Congress and Government Agencies. We cover the House, Senate and White House. The daily routine consists of checking the background of news stories in which basic issues are involved. At Congressional hearings we check the lists of witnesses pro and con. Senators and Representatives constantly call and tell us when an issue may become "hot". We attempt to present the vital issue of the week and the men and women who affect the decisions. Sometimes it is very difficult getting authorities who disagree with each other fundamentally so that we can present a clear cut debate. Much research and study go into the actual selection of the speakers. The selection is extremely important because even though the issue may be exciting and vital, if we don't have articulate experts, the program falls short of its purpose.
4. Are the participants briefed before the actual broadcast? What are their instructions?

Our normal procedure is simply this: We have dinner in a private dining room two hours before the broadcast. That is the first time all four participants are brought together under our sponsorship. Mr. Granik and I conduct a very casual, social discussion until about half an hour before we go on the air. Then we explain in detail the format (radio techniques, etc.). Mr. Granik reads his opening background statement; the participants respond with their statements. Then we select one question for Mr. Granik to ask which will get us into the heart of the discussion once we are on the air. These statements of the participants are received in our office some days before the broadcast so we know in advance in a general way just how the program will be shaped. We also ask the participants for ten questions which they wish to use themselves to ask their opponents. I keep several questions for the moderator's use during the course of the broadcast. Granik uses these questions whenever the discussion starts veering off the main course.

5. What measure of radio-audience-interest has been made concerning this program?

Our Hooper rating fluctuates. It is roughly around a five rating.

6. Is thirty minutes considered ample time for purposes of your program?

We are on the air for forty-five minutes, 9:30 to 10:15 PM, EST. We would prefer a full hour, however, sometime it is better to pack an interesting, lively discussion into a shorter time period than it would be to stretch for an additional fifteen, if the time were available.

I am enclosing a list of American Forum broadcasts for the past year. I hope you find them interesting and informative. You will get from the list an idea of what the vital issue of the week was each week during 1945.

If I can be of any further help, please let me know. I should like very much to see a copy of your article.

Sincerely,

/s/
Irvin P. Sulds

Encl.