LETTERS TO THE SCIENCE EDITOR

ON HUCKSTERING

YOUR ARTICLE, "THE BUSINESS OF GIVING," on December 2, 1961, certainly contradicts the objectivity and accuracy expected of *Saturday Review* and implied in your title as "Science" Editor. . . .

Your presentation of the charity concept of the haves and have-nots as a basis for all philanthropy suggests little acquaintance with modern health and welfare principles and practices. Particularly in the health fields, but not exclusively so, do we know that every person, rich or poor, has an investment and a responsibility to participate in the conquest of the diseases and social problems afflicting mankind. Our Heart Association does not seek money from the wealthy to care for the poor victims of heart disease, but rather engages the money, energy and talent of millions of American volunteers in combating a major public health epidemic.

Your lack of objectivity and your publicity huckster techniques are not worthy of the treatment of the important subject of the purpose and effectiveness of voluntary agency functioning in the United States. I cite your mixing of the subject of multiplicity of campaigns with the subject of agency reporting responsibility. I cite your lengthy exposition of one controversial situation (Lavin vs. Wallace) in conjunction with the Hamlin Report as though this case was the general practice found by Hamlin's investigations. I cite your juxtaposition of words in, for example, "The wide discrepancy (between the national claims, and the local realities in Los Angeles) arises principally from differences in allocation of costs between fund raising and public education," to imply fraudulent or dishonest reporting.

Thirdly, there is a curious bias in your article in the way you cite the major health agencies as the examples or culprits for all problems you describe. Under the heading 'The Case of the Missing \$58,000,000" reference was made to Hamlin's question about the reports of fifty-six national agencies, but the nine Los Angeles health agencies are listed in the same box and breath. Incidentally, the figures you cite for Los Angeles are not correct since in the instance of the Heart Association, the Social Service Department adds much of our public education costs into fund raising. You did not quote Hamlin for example: "Voluntary agencies-that participate in federated campaigns, for instance, frequently state their fund raising costs (as that of the united fund or community chest) to be less than five percent. . . . Furthermore, united funds and community chests do not generally include, as fund raising expenses, the cost of the time spent in these activities by member agency personnel."

Lastly, your unequivocal citation of Hamlin's two major recommendations for uniform accounting principles and a National Citizens Commission disregards the technical and fundamental questions involved. We in Los Angeles have had more experience than anyone in attempting to establish and use uniform accounting principles and it is not as simple as it sounds. Health and welfare agencies differ in purpose, functions and operations and are not easily subject to a predesigned theoretical mold. General Motors, Hoffman Electronics and the XYZ Title Company do not have the same products, operations, accounting or reporting. What is required is honesty and accuracy of accounting, not complete uniformity.

Hamlin's National Commission recommendations may serve some purpose, but has many dangers. Who gives such a group authority or competency to speak for or about hundreds and thousands of agencies? What is the responsibility of agency board of directors, national and local, relative to such a group? Is there the implication that local citizens cannot responsibly direct the policies of their own health and welfare agencies?

As a businessman and citizen interested in my community, I believe in voluntary effort at the local level to properly deal with community problems. I share with many other volunteers the responsibility for the program of the Heart Association in Los Angeles County. Our board of directors, committees, individual volunteers and staff are working together toward the conquest of heart diseases, and we are proud of the job we are doing.

EMERSON SPEAR,

Chairman, Board of Directors,

Los Angeles County Heart Assn. Los Angeles, Calif.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Prompted by Mr. Spear's criticism, SR's Science Editor has examined the Los Angeles situation more closely. He finds that Mr. Spear has correctly cited but incompletely described a detail that was not mentioned in Dr. Robert H. Hamlin's report for the Rockefeller Foundation ad hoc Committee on Voluntary Health and Welfare Agencies. This previously missing detail is that the Social Service Department of the Los Angeles city government is not willing to accept the Heart Association's definition of what constitute proper costs of fund raising. The city decided that what the Heart Association called "public education" actually was in many instances merely publicity intended to help stimulate giving.

In 1959, the year for which Mr. Spear says SR published an erroneous fund-raising cost figure, the Heart Association originally reported a fund raising cost of \$193,608 to the city. This figure was arrived at as the result of an action by the Los Angeles County Heart Association executive committee. The committee at the end of the fiscal year (6 June 1960) made an arbitrary shift of one-third of all fund raising costs to "public education" and a simultaneous shift of one-third of all "public education" costs to fund-raising. Since fund-raising costs were exceptionally high and public education costs relatively low, the effect of the double shift was to mark up "public education" and mark down fund-raising for public display purposes.

This adventure in bookkeeping was sufficiently removed from standard business accounting practice that the independent auditors who checked the Los Angeles County Heart Association books made special note of the transaction in their formal report. When the figures reached the Los Angeles Social Service Department, the financial juggle was disallowed. The city agency put all the fund raising costs back in the fund raising column and all the "public education" costs in the "public education" column. The result was that instead of the \$193,608 fund-raising cost originally reported by the Los Angeles County Heart Association, the fund raising cost finally reported to the people of Los Angeles was \$265,761.

The difference between the position of Mr. Spear and the position of Dr. Hamlin on this point is simple: Dr. Hamlin believes the people should judge such matters through their government; Mr. Spear says the government should accept the Heart Association's criteria.

Just as the American Cancer Society was able to claim that it met the performance standards of the National Information Bureau (see SR, Research, Jan. 6) when in fact the Bureau was not aware of a conflict of interest in management of the Massachusetts Division of the Society, so the unorthodox mathematics employed by the Los Angeles County Heart Association seems to have eluded the surveillance of an ad hoc committee which published a report in December 1961 on the affairs of the American Heart Association. In declaring that the Association's "financial activities will bear the fullest public scrutiny,' this committee left the impression that its words applied to local units of the Association throughout the country.

Among those familiar with voluntary health and welfare agency work, there is wide agreement that Mr. Rome Betts, executive director of the American Heart Association, is one of the most progressive men in his profession. They wonder, therefore, to what degree the ad hoc committee's appointment represented his thinking and to what extent the committee was inspired elsewhere. They question the emphasis that American Heart Association press releases have placed on the independent quality of the committee's makeup, since the committee of eight included a former president of the American Heart Association and two other members from institutions which receive research fellowship grants from the American Heart Association. The questioning undoubtedly would be muted if the report had been critical in tone, but its contents were essentially laudatory. Some quotations:

"The American Heart Association is a truly self-governing organization. . . . It reflects ... the belief in federalism which is characteristic of our people. . . . The Heart Association has exemplified most of the best characteristics of the voluntary agency in our society. . . . The American Heart Association has clearly come to occupy a unique position in American and world society. . . . The Association's lay participation, side-by-side with physicians in the community, may be unequalled among health groups. . . . It should not be classified as just another of a multiplicity of charitable causes. . . . The American Heart Association should remain free to reach its own conclusions . . . relying on the expert judgment of its elected, volunteer, and salaried leadership as to how it can best obtain the financial support it needs to advance its major causes.

MUSIC TO MY EARS



AMBLING through the recollections roused in one not-too-extensive memory by mention of "A Midsummer Night's Dream," images recur not only from a stage presentation or two, the Max Reinĥardt-William Dieterle film and the jazz version with Louis Armstrong and Butterfly McQueen, but also from the relatively recent Old Vic production with Robert Helpmann and Moira Shearer which utilized the Mendelssohn music. Ranged against them, the New York City Ballet's new production in the City Center may be de-scribed as not at all a bad "Dream," but, also not the best Balanchine.

That is, of course, only if you think -as I do-of George Balanchine as a man whose creative impulse can create clarity from confusion and touch with the quicksilver of movement the least promising of situations. In common with any choreographer who would elect to make an eveninglength ballet of the immediately available, nay the inescapable materials, Balanchine faces a double dilemma: the excess of action in the Shakespeare text over the amount of music created by Mendelssohn for use incidental to it. What Balanchine found elsewhere in the Mendelssohn literature serves some subordinate purposes reasonably well. But not well enough to sustain the detailed parallels to that text (Acts II, III, and IV) which are crowded into the hour-plus first act of the ballet.

I would have preferred, sooner, the procedure he adopted in Act II, where the letter of the text (the Pyramus-Thisbe episode) is discarded in favor of a divertissement wholly suitable to the balletic idiom. Even though Jacques d'Amboise was unable to partner Violette Verdy because of an injury (his place was taken by Conrad Ludlow), this lengthy embellishment to the wedding at the court of Theseus had a substance and style which make it a likely recurrent on its own in the future. Like the action, the music (a string symphony No. 9 of Mendelssohn's precocious teens) had nothing to do with "A Midsummer Night's Dream," but it suited the circumstances perfectly.

In the earlier act, during which the main happenings in the enchanted forest are depicted, Balanchine was bound, through the circumstance that much of Mendelssohn's impulse was magnetized by the fairies (in the overture and the famous scherzo) to deal generously – overgenerously, in my view-with Titania and her court. At Melissa Hayden's command as a veritable Titania were not only large fairies with large wings, but also smaller fairies with smaller wings (a stageful of children from the American Ballet School), a rather literal interpretation of Shakespeare for one of Balanchine's bent.

When this had been disposed of, real resourcefulness began to assert itself in the actions of the adults, though their tangled relationships are by no means easy to elucidate by movement alone. But there was real Balanchine quality in the endearing pas de deux of Titania in love with Bottom (Roland Vazquez wore the donkey's head eloquently), with its use of the magical "Nocturne," in the lively interplay of the artisans; in the brilliant actions of Edward Villella as Oberon, and above all in the galvanic movement for Arthur Mitchell as a dusky Puck with overtones of Ray Robinson. Here, in fact, was the one character above all others who fired Balanchine's imagination to a full-blown fusion of aptitudes and functions.

Perhaps it was asking the impossible to expect Balanchine to make clarity of line, either narrative or choreographic, of the comings and goings of Hermia and Helena, Lysander and Demetrius, with Shakespeare's music muted and Mendelssohn's (in these contexts) improvised. But that was what our esteem for him expected. Instead, one settled for astuteness in casting not merely those already mentioned, but also Patricia McBríde as Hermia, Jillana as Helena, Theseus and Lysander capably performed by Francisco Moncion and Nicholas Magallanes, and Gloria Govrin as a perfect visualization of Hippolyta, Queen of the Amazons. David Hays's scenic conception suggested more atmospheric possibilities than the execution for this stage realized, while Robert Irving's musical direction was devalued by an orchestra that was not always playing the notes by Mendelssohn at the tip of his baton.

DAVID BLUM, who is tall for twenty-six (or any other age), is also talented for the work of conducting in which he offered his credentials for the first time in a Town Hall concert. In this first of three programs, as well as those to follow, he included a Haydn symphony, wherefor the designation of his chamber group as the Esterhazy Orchestra.

The promise that these works would be from "the unknown Haydn," as D. F. Tovey phrased the numerous symphonies only recently printed, was not quite borne out by the choice of the F minor No. 49 (known as "La Passione"), which is not much played but has been recorded. It is a work of intense, ardent, far from "company" character with which the composer is commonly associated, and Blum provided for it earnest, forthright, high-minded leadership, equally sparing of musical excess or technical overemphasis. Not searching, to be sure; but with both feet on the musical highroad.

As an orchestral technician, Blum's success was greatest where the demands were the most limited-in the opening F major Divertimento of Mozart (K. 138), which is really a string quartet with multiplied parts and double bass, least in the C major Piano Concerto (K. 467) where winds and percussion included, in the latter category, the solo piano itself. This was operated with proficiency and grace by Rosina Lhevinne, whose endearing old charms are as potent this year at eighty-one as they were last year at eighty. Some of the passage playing was a mite incisive and brittle, but there was suavity as well as vigor in the total line. She also found time to guide her young associate in and out of the orchestral mazes in which the work abounds

For the first programs of his fourweek engagement as guest conductor of the New York Philharmonic, Thomas Schippers went, alternately, his way and Zino Francescatti's in a sequence that provided the D major Suite of Bach and the B minor Symphony of Tchaikovsky on either side of the soloist's appearances. At the Saturday night concert it was the G minor Concerto of Bruch, at the others the Second (also G minor, if not quite as specifically) of Prokofiev. For whatever reasons, neither of these added much to esteem for Francescatti as other than a virtuoso. Brilliance and strength are not the answers to all the questions these works pose for a violinist.

Schippers made his strongest impression in the Tchaikovsky, which had shape, clarity of texture, and admirable orchestral discipline. His view of the work rarely related it to such a title as "Pathétique" (even less to the nickname of "Suicide" symphony by which it was known to one generation of English concertgoers). Glum, perhaps, or unhappy, but hardly more. This, at least, is an honest view preferable to postures of profundity, or simulated heartbreak. —IRVING KOLODIN.