

1st
Mar. 3,
1953.

Written by:
John O. Vallban
Johannesburg, Michigan

The Glass Curtain

When Navy recruit X, ^{paid his cab fare and} entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative, ^{as was the} that the ^{non-descript individual} street-cleaner in front of the place ~~also was~~, or that the ^{non-descript individual} ~~man~~ washing windows on the left by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top - ^{military} secret data was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy to whom he ^{shortly} ~~had~~ delivered this data were arrested, a few minutes later, it was ~~not~~ learned that the naval recruit had delivered to the ^{Russian} spy the following intelligence: That the U.S. Navy was developing a corps of Atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were ~~at~~ already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current ^{types} ~~types~~ of atomic bombs, that ^{these crews} they have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that ^{complete} components for atomic bombs are ^{probably} now being carried ^{our} at sea on ~~the~~ larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the ^{Russian} spy for their shenanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say ^{then} if one of our oldest and most respected news services ^{furnished} ~~published~~ this very same data ^{and it was published} on the front page of ^{of your favorite} a ~~good~~ ~~one~~ newspaper? Yet that is ^{dated from Washington,} just what happened recently and ^{repeatedly is quoted} ~~is~~ ^{is} the ~~article~~ ^{article} in its entirety:

The above article is ^{not unusual. It is} typical of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the ~~the~~ editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort ^{-- and military intelligence --} to our enemies, ~~yet~~ ^{still} one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news -- and possibly scoop each other -- they have ^{not} all too frequently ^{and} ~~unwisely~~ ^{been doing} just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy ~~could~~ ^{could} make some pretty shrewd guesses as to the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the ^{new} Eisenhower administration was reported as ~~learning~~ wanting ~~to~~ ^{to} curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were probably right, and if Ike's strategists ~~seem~~ to have seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a socialite charged with pimping being a pimp, again the howl went up -- but, ~~this time~~ without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge firmly well stuck to his guns.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted -- ~~except to~~ ^{unwittingly furnish} ~~aid and comfort~~ ^{intelligence} to the enemy. Is there not too damned much talk in the press

about our military plans and installations?
Yet who ^{is it that} smokes out and prints news of our
development of atomic submarines and planes?
The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic
artillery? The press. Of the fact that the
hydrogen bomb or some ~~sort~~ facsimile of
it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The
press.

If ^{any} ~~the~~ ^{intelligent} layman can draw such
shrewd conclusions from our press releases,
what about ^{spread and} our unreplaceable enemy trained
and straining to glean the slightest hint? May
not even ~~the~~ a description of the ~~form~~ of
the after-cloud of a nuclear explosion prove
of devastating significance to him?

Yes, certain segments of our press talk
constantly about the freedom of the press. Is it
not high time that sober heads among
them begin to take ^{out} more ^{on} about ^{on} their responsibilities
in this time of survival?

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

2nd Revision

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative [^] as was the street-cleaner in front of the place [^] or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy to whom he shortly delivered this data were arrested, a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered to the Russian spy the following ^{military} intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was ^{located} in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their ^{cloak and dagger} shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These

include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which ~~which~~ conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of ^{a flood of} news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd ^{assessments of} ~~guesses as to~~ the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were ^{doubtless} ~~probably~~ right, and if Ike's strategists ^{ever} ~~have~~ seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

in a morals case, When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a ^{young} socialite ~~charged with being a pimp,~~ ^{contributing to the debauchery of some cafe-waitress} again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns ^{and has} ^{single} ~~been~~ ^{sustained} by his supreme court.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much ^{lose} talk in the press about our military plans and in-

Insert A

Not only our strength but our weakness ^{is} ^{are} broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years ^{our country} we will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their garrulous old friend, ^{Informed} Mr. Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. ^{at times} There ^{is} something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff Mr. Spokesman ^{old?} ^{along with} and a few newspapers ^{waddled} along with him into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate ^{our people} we should be informed, and fast, so that ^{they} we can ^{intelligently} jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. ^{curiously} But, haven't our newspapers long since gone ^{it has a validity that can be abused. And} 'way past that in the strictly military field?

^{point} ^{again} It may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, ^{as indeed some of them appear to have done.} The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. In the international ^{lawless} jungle in which we must henceforth ^{dwell, careless} live, ^{careless} tablebearers are as bad as tale-makers.

~~Space~~ ~~Space~~
↑ ↓
(How back to -- "If it be true, its")

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

Of all the Of the detailed results of recent nuclear tests on civilian installations! The press -- along with a splendid

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a nuclear explosion prove of great significance to him? -- *a tiny electronic gadget* *the photographs as a* *be the revealing clue for him to perfect one of his own diabolic devices?*

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. *Does our press fail to* It must grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that bare survival demands we get and stay powerful and smart. *Lord forgive us, that must* *never franchise* Freedom of the press must ~~not~~ become a ticket to embark upon mass suicide.

Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing ~~down~~ the whole structure *vital* *downs* with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its ^{grave} new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms. *It, the press, must learn that silence* ~~SILENCE~~ *can not*

only be golden -- it scars also **SURVIVAL**. *the difference between survival and chaos.*

press from television and radio. (Pete Smith)

installations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press. Of the detailed results of recent Nevada tests on civilian installations? The press--along with a splendid assist from television and radio.

Not only our strength but our weaknesses are broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years our country will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their leaky and garrulous old friend, Mr. Informed Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. At times there seems something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff old Mr. Spokesman--along with a few ~~wadded~~ newspapers--into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate our people should be informed, and fast, so that they can intelligently jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one curiously hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. But it has a validity that can be abused. And haven't our newspapers long since gone 'way past that point in the ~~strictly~~ military field?

Again it may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, as indeed some of them appear to have ~~come~~. The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. In the lawless international jungle in which we ~~must henceforth~~ ^{now} dwell, ~~careless~~ ^{can be as dangerous as} talebearers are ~~as bad as~~ ^{careless} talemakers.

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of a ~~tiny~~ new electronic gadget prove of great significance to him?--be the one

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a nuclear explosion prove of great significance to him?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. It must grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that bare survival demands we get and stay powerful and smart. Freedom of the press must not become a ticket to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing down the whole structure with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms.

Of the detailed results of recent
Nevada tests on civilian metastatosis?

The press -- with a splendid
assist from television and radio.

There is ~~also~~ ^{something almost} pathological in their
compulsion to confess...

Not only our strength but our weakness is
broadcast for all to hear. A committee of
scientists makes a ^{lengthy} confidential report to the
government that, ^{among other things,} in two years we will be a
~~flat-footed~~ ^{sitting duck} for atomic attack. Then, ~~through~~
via their garrulous old friend, Mr. Spokesman, the
press tells all in newspapers tell all. Is
it not ^{just about} time to stuff Mr. Spokesman and
a few newspapers along with him -- ^{into} the
widening ~~leak~~ ⁱⁿ dike of security?

It may be argued
One may answer that it is the genius of
Democracy to wash ~~its~~ ^{its} dirty linen in public;
~~that~~ ^{and,} more specifically, ^{that} if our military ^{we}
preparations are inadequate ~~all of us~~ ^{we} should
~~know~~ ^{be informed, and fast,} (thus) ~~so~~ ^{so} that we can ~~just~~ ^{just} our brass out
of ~~their~~ ^{its} ~~conspiracy~~ ^{outrick} complacency. It is a ^{persuasive} good argument,
and one does ~~no~~ hard to ~~answer~~ ^{rebut}.
Surely it is ^a valid ^{one} in ~~the~~ ^{the} political ^{and other} fields.
But haven't ~~we~~ ^{we} our newspapers gone 'way
past that in the ^{stricter} military field? Can't some
other way be found to ~~just~~ ^{just} our brass

It may be argued that many of these
releases came from official government
sources. The answer to that one is that to
the extent that it is true, then a plague
upon both their houses. Tale bearers in
the international jungle in which we must
henceforth live, Talebearers are as bad as Talemakers.

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints ^{detailed} news of our development
of atomic ^{- powered} submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic
artillery? ^{complete with photographs?} The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile
of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

^{it be true that}
If any intelligent layman can draw ^{some pretty} shrewd conclusions from our press
^{then} releases, what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to
glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a
nuclear explosion prove of ^{great} devastating significance to him?

~~Yes, certain segments of our press talk constantly about the freedom of the
press. Is it not high time that soberer heads among them begin to act more on
their responsibilities in this time of survival?~~

To the dubious but possible argument that these newspaper revelations may be calculated & simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and those whose adherents, Stalin and Gattwald, ^{shivered and} ~~for~~ died of ^{comfort} ~~fright~~)

deterrent

one wryly asks: Whose program? What anonymous, ^{and insidious} genius ever ^{persuaded} that notable Colonel Mc Cormick, to lie down so ^{amicably with anybody else?} agreeably with, say, the Monitor? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated ^{on our part} wouldn't complete silence prove infinitely more nerve-combining? And if there is

mid-west eccentric, →

any such program, which we doubt ^(at least among newspapers) is it necessary, for our press, ^{why} ^{at considerable} ^{expense} - go to ^{considerable pains to} supplement it by presenting our enemy with ^{a series of} carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our scientific horrors, ^{only to suggest or} to be weighed against ^{or} used to perfect his own?

the implications → Russian things being very big part of our own

the implications → Russian things being very big part of our own

To the dubious argument that these newspaper revelations may be calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to deter and scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald died of fright) one wryly asks: Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded our temperamental Colonel McCormicks to lie down meekly with anyone? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare easily? And in any case wouldn't complete silence on our part prove more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the mysterious Slavic fog of Russian silence a pretty big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to considerable pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our military-scientific horrors to be weighed against ^{and} used to perfect his own?

~~As possible~~
To the dubious but possible argument that these newspaper revelations may be calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological ~~deterrent~~ ^{deter and} program to scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald shivered and died of fright) one wryly asks: Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded that notable mid-West eccentric, ^{temperamental} Colonel McCormick, ^{with} to lie down so amicably with, say, the Monitor? Or with anybody else? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare ^{easy?} ^{And in any case wouldn't} complete silence on our part prove ^{mysterious Slavic fog of} infinitely more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the ^{pretty} mysterious Russian silence a big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to considerable pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our ^{military -} scientific horrors ^{to suggest new ones} only to suggest or be weighed against or used to perfect his own?

Regardless of who may be initially to blame ^{for} some of these
leaks, the bitter fact is that

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that when he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data to a Russian spy he was observed in the act by another F.B.I. man.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy were gathered in a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

Revision of 3/26/53.

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that ^{when} ~~one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data~~ ^{to a Russian spy he was observed by another} ~~was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.~~ ^{man.}

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy ^{in the act} ~~to whom he shortly delivered this data~~ ^{were gathered in} ~~were arrested,~~ a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered ~~to the Russian spy~~ the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordnance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative, as was the street-cleaner in front of the place, or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy to whom he shortly delivered this data were arrested, a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered to the Russian spy the following intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their shenanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These

include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd guesses as to the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were probably right, and if Ike's strategists ^{ever} ~~have~~ seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a ^{young} socialite ~~in a morals case,~~ charged with being a pimp, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much talk in the press about our military plans and in-

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints ^{detached} news of our development
of atomic submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic
artillery? ^{- powered} The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile
^{complete with photographs?}
of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

If ^{it be true that} any intelligent layman can draw ^{some pretty} such shrewd conclusions from our press
releases, ^{then} what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to
glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a
nuclear explosion prove of ^{great} devastating significance to him?

~~Yes, certain segments of our press talk constantly about the freedom of the
press. Is it not high time that soberer heads among them begin to act more on
their responsibilities in this time of survival?~~

New Last page.

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a nuclear explosion prove of great significance to him?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. It must grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that bare survival demands we get and stay powerful and smart. Freedom of the press must not become a ticket to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing down the whole structure with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today ^{gravely} consider its new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms.

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative, as was the street-cleaner in front of the place, or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy to whom he shortly delivered this data were arrested, a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered to the Russian spy the following intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their shenanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These

include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd guesses as to the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were probably right, and if Ike's strategists have seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a socialite charged with being a pimp, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much talk in the press about our military plans and in-

stallations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints news of our development of atomic submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press.

If any intelligent layman can draw such shrewd conclusions from our press releases, what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of the after-cloud of a nuclear explosion prove of devastating significance to him?

Yes, certain segments of our press talk constantly about the freedom of the press. Is it not high time that soberer heads among them begin to act more on their responsibilities in this time of survival?

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that when he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data to a Russian spy he was observed in the act by another F.B.I. man.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy were gathered in a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

Insert to "The Glass Curtain" (P. 3)

To the dubious argument that these newspaper revelations may be calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to deter and scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald died of fright) one wryly asks: Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded our temperamental Colonel McCormicks to lie down meekly with anyone? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare easily? And in any case wouldn't complete silence on our part prove more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the mysterious Slavic fog of Russian silence a pretty big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to considerable pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our military-scientific horrors to be weighed against ~~of~~ ^{and} used to perfect his own?

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that when he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data to a Russian spy he was observed in the act by another F.B.I. man.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy were gathered in a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had ^{conveyed} ~~delivered~~ the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordnance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of a flood of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd assessments of the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were doubtless right, and if Ike's strategists ever seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a young socialite in a morals case, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns and has since been sustained by his supreme court.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much loose talk in the press about our military plans and

To the ^{possible} ~~dubious~~ ^{Invent A} argument that these newspaper revelations ^{are} ~~may be~~ calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to deter and scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald died of fright) one wryly asks: Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded our temperamental Colonel McCormicks to lie down meekly with anyone? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare easily? And in any case wouldn't complete silence on our part prove more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the mysterious Slavic fog of Russian silence a pretty big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to ~~considerable~~ ^{such} pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints ^{microscopic} of our ^{additional} military-scientific horrors to be weighed against ^{and} ~~or~~ used to perfect his own?

installations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press. Of the detailed results of recent Nevada tests on civilian installations? The press--along with a splendid assist from television and radio.

Not only our strength but our weaknesses are broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years our country will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their leaky and garrulous old friend, Mr. Informed Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. At times there seems something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff old Mr. Spokesman--along with a few newspapers--into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate our people should be informed, and fast, so that they can intelligently jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one curiously hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. But it has a validity that can be abused. And haven't our newspapers long since gone 'way past that point in the military field?

Again it may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, as indeed some of them appear to have. The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. *Regardless of who may be initially to blame for some of these leaks, the* ~~In~~ the lawless international jungle in which we now dwell, talebearers can be as dangerous as talemakers. *(Take Inert A)*

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of a new electronic gadget prove of great significance to him?--be the one

revealing clue for him to perfect one of his own diabolic devices?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. Does our press fail to grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that, Lord forgive us, bare survival demands we must get and stay powerful and smart? In the Atomic Age freedom of the press must never become a franchise to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this vital difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing the whole structure down with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its grave new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms. It, the press, must learn that silence cannot only be golden--it ^{may} ~~can~~ also mean the difference between survival and chaos.

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

New

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that when he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data to a Russian spy he was observed in the act by another F.B.I. man.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy were gathered in a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had conveyed the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of a flood of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd assessments of the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were doubtless right, and if Ike's strategists ever seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a young socialite in a morals case, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns and has since been sustained by his supreme court.

This business of press consorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much loose talk in the press about our military plans and

installations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press. Of the detailed results of recent Nevada tests on civilian installations? The press--along with a splendid assist from television and radio.

Not only our strength but our weaknesses are broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years our country will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their leaky and garrulous old friend, Mr. Informed Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. At times there seems something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff old Mr. Spokesman--along with a few newspapers--into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate our people should be informed, and fast, so that they can intelligently jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one curiously hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. But it has a validity that can be abused. And haven't our newspapers long since gone 'way past that point in the military field?

Again it may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, as indeed some of them appear to have. The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. Regardless of who may be initially to blame for some of these leaks, the bitter fact is that in the lawless international jungle in which we now dwell, tale-bearers can be as dangerous as talemakers.

To the possible argument that these newspaper revelations are calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to deter and scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald died of fright) one wryly asks:

Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded our temperamental Colonel McCormicks to lie down meekly with anyone? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare easily? And in any case wouldn't complete silence on our part prove more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the mysterious Slavic fog of Russian silence a pretty big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to such pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our military-scientific horrors to be weighed against and used to perfect his own?

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of a new electronic gadget prove of great significance to him?--be the one revealing clue for him to perfect one of his own diabolic devices?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. Does our press fail to grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that, Lord forgive us, bare survival demands we must get and stay powerful and smart? In the Atomic Age freedom of the press must never become a franchise to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this vital difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing the whole structure down with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its grave new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms. It, the press, must learn that silence can not only be golden--it may also mean the difference between survival and chaos.

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that one of the two men to whom he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data was also an undercover man for the F.B.I.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy to whom he shortly delivered this data were arrested, a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had delivered to the Russian spy the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of a flood of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd assessments of the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were doubtless right, and if Ike's strategists ever seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a young socialite in a morals case, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns and has since been sustained by his supreme court.

This business of press censorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much loose talk in the press about our military plans and

installations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press. Of the detailed results of recent Nevada tests on civilian installations? The press--along with a splendid assist from television and radio.

Not only our strength but our weaknesses are broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years our country will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their leaky and garrulous old friend, Mr. Informed Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. At times there seems something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff old Mr. Spokesman--along with a few newspapers--into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate our people should be informed, and fast, so that they can intelligently jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one curiously hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. But it has a validity that can be abused. And haven't our newspapers long since gone 'way past that point in the military field?

Again it may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, as indeed some of them appear to have. The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. In the lawless international jungle in which we now dwell, talebearers can be as dangerous as talemakers.

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of a new electronic gadget prove of great significance to him?--be the one

revealing clue for him to perfect one of his own diabolic devices?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. Does our press fail to grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that, Lord forgive us, bare survival demands we must get and stay powerful and smart? In the Atomic Age freedom of the press must never become a franchise to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this vital difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing the whole structure down with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its grave new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms. It, the press, must learn that silence cannot only be golden--it ^{may} ~~can~~ also mean the difference between survival and chaos.

Written by:
John D. Voelker
Ishpeming, Michigan

THE GLASS CURTAIN

When Navy recruit X paid his cab fare and entered the old brownstone house just off Fourth Avenue he did not know that the cab driver was an F.B.I. operative--as was the street-cleaner in front of the place--or that the nondescript individual washing windows by the entrance was their leader. Nor was he to know that when he shortly thereafter delivered top-secret military data to a Russian spy he was observed in the act by another F.B.I. man.

When Navy recruit X and the Russian spy were gathered in a few minutes later, it was learned that the naval recruit had conveyed the following military intelligence: That the U. S. Navy was developing a corps of atomic bombardiers; that graduates of this course were already at sea with units of the fleet; that they were being trained at secret places, one of which was located in New Mexico; that they used precise duplicates of all current types of atomic bombs; that these crews have participated and continue to do so in tests at Nevada and Eniwetok; and that complete components for atomic bombs are probably now being carried at sea on our larger carriers.

If you were sitting on a jury trying Recruit X and the Russian spy for their cloak and dagger shennanigans you would probably feel inclined to give each of them 6 months in the electric chair. What would you say, then, if one of our oldest and most respected news services furnished this very same data and it was published on the front page of your favorite newspaper? Yet that is just what happened recently and the release, dated from Washington, is quoted in its entirety:

"The Navy is developing a corps of atomic bombardiers--fliers and ordinance experts trained in the high-level and secret schools of nuclear weapon use.

"Graduates of these courses already are at sea with the fleet or at naval air stations flying carrier-based aircraft presumably capable of delivering any current type of atomic bomb.

"Pentagon officials today would confirm only that such a program exists, but published reports and previous brief comments by other officials make it possible to say that:

"The Navy men receive their training in atomic warfare at the same joint armed forces schools used for Air Force crews. These include the New Mexico installations of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

"They use, as do Air Force crews, precise duplicates of atomic bombs complete in all details except the actual nuclear fission charge.

"Navy men participate in the joint task forces which conduct the experimental atomic explosions at Nevada and Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

"Reports that components for the atomic bomb are carried aboard some of the larger carriers, published last year, have gone without official denial."

The above article is not unusual. It is typical of a flood of news releases we have been reading ever since the cold war began. Yet the editors of our newspapers and news services would be aghast if they were accused of furnishing aid and comfort--and military intelligence--to our enemies. Still one wonders if, in their zeal to print all the news--and possibly scoop each other--they have not all too frequently--and innocently--been doing just that. Is it too much to say that an intelligent and reasonably informed grammar school boy could make some pretty shrewd assessments of the extent and course of our military preparations simply by reading our own newspapers?

When the new Eisenhower administration was reported as wanting to curtail the presidential news conference, to a man the newspapers let out a howl that could be heard 'round the world. They were doubtless right, and if Ike's strategists ever seriously considered such a step, they seem to have dropped it with a thud.

When a New York judge recently barred newsmen from the trial of a young socialite in a morals case, again the howl went up--but, without dilating, this time there was much to be said on both sides, and the judge pretty well stuck to his guns and has since been sustained by his supreme court.

This business of press consorship, voluntary or otherwise, does not lend itself to dogma, but one wonders just what purpose is served by such articles as the one quoted--except to unwittingly furnish intelligence to the enemy. Is there not too damned much loose talk in the press about our military plans and

installations? Yet who is it that smokes out and prints detailed news of our development of atomic-powered submarines and planes? The press. Of our mobile pieces of atomic artillery, complete with photographs? The press. Of the fact that the hydrogen bomb or some facsimile of it was recently exploded near Eniwetok? The press. Of the detailed results of recent Nevada tests on civilian installations? The press--along with a splendid assist from television and radio.

Not only our strength but our weaknesses are broadcast for all to hear. A committee of scientists makes a highly confidential report to the government that, among other things, in two years our country will be a sitting duck for atomic attack. Then, via their leaky and garrulous old friend, Mr. Informed Spokesman, the newspapers tell all. At times there seems something almost pathological in their compulsion to confess... Is it not just about time to stuff old Mr. Spokesman--along with a few newspapers--into the widening leak in our dike of security?

It may be argued that it is the genius of democracy to wash its dirty linen in public; and, more specifically, that if our military preparations are inadequate our people should be informed, and fast, so that they can intelligently jolt our brass out of its ostrich complacency. It is a persuasive argument, and one curiously hard to rebut. Surely it is a valid one in political and kindred fields. But it has a validity that can be abused. And haven't our newspapers long since gone 'way past that point in the military field?

Again it may be argued that many of these releases came from official government sources, as indeed some of them appear to have. The answer to that one is that to the extent that it is true, then a plague upon both their houses. Regardless of who may be initially to blame for some of these leaks, the bitter fact is that in the lawless international jungle in which we now dwell, tale-bearers can be as dangerous as talemakers.

To the possible argument that these newspaper revelations are calculated simply to mislead or else are part of a subtly conceived psychological program to deter and scare the bejabbers out of the Russians (and whose adherents doubtless comfort themselves that Stalin and Gottwald died of fright) one wryly asks:

Whose program? What anonymous and unsung genius ever persuaded our temperamental Colonel McCormicks to lie down meekly with anyone? How, where or when have the Russians demonstrated that they scare easily? And in any case wouldn't complete silence on our part prove more nerve-wracking? (Isn't the mysterious Slavic fog of Russian silence a pretty big factor in our own jitters?) And if there is any such program, which we doubt (at least among newspapers), why is it necessary for our press to go to such pains to supplement it by presenting our enemy with a series of carefully engraved and calipered blueprints of our military-scientific horrors to be weighed against and used to perfect his own?

If it be true that any intelligent layman can draw some pretty shrewd conclusions from our press releases, then what about a shrewd and implacable enemy trained and straining to glean the slightest hint? May not even a description of a new electronic gadget prove of great significance to him?--be the one revealing clue for him to perfect one of his own diabolic devices?

One finds irony of planetary proportions in contemplating a press grown so "free" that it aids the very enemy that would enslave and destroy it. Does our press fail to grasp that from Hiroshima on all men must henceforth live in a climate of perpetual fear; that, Lord forgive us, bare survival demands we must get and stay powerful and smart? In the Atomic Age freedom of the press must never become a franchise to embark upon mass suicide. Thus all of us are "free" to jump off the Empire State Building, but with this vital difference--at least those that do do not risk bringing the whole structure down with them. That is why you and I not only dare to ask, but must ask, that our press today consider its grave new responsibilities along with its traditional freedoms. It, the press, must learn that silence can not only be golden--it may also mean the difference between survival and chaos.