

# Saturday Review

Editor: NORMAN COUSINS  
Publisher: J. R. COMINSKY

Associate Editors: HARRISON SMITH, IRVING KOLODIN, HORACE SUTTON

Associate Publisher  
W. D. PATTERSON

Managing Editor  
RICHARD L. TOBIN

Science Editor  
JOHN LEAR

Poetry Editor  
JOHN CIARDI

Education Editor  
PAUL WOODRING

Production Manager  
PEARL S. SULLIVAN

Book Review Editor  
ROCHELLE GIBSON

General Editor  
HALLOWELL BOWSER

Feature Editor  
JAMES F. FIXX

Editors-at-Large  
CLEVELAND AMORY  
HARRISON BROWN  
JOHN MASON BROWN  
FRANK G. JENNINGS  
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH  
T. S. MATTHEWS  
WALTER MILLIS  
ELMO ROPER  
JOHN STEINBECK



Contributing Editors  
HOLLIS ALPERT  
ALICE DALGLIESH  
HENRY HEWES  
GRANVILLE HICKS  
ARTHUR KNIGHT  
KATHARINE KUH  
MARTIN LEVIN  
ROBERT LEWIS SHAYON  
MARGARET R. WEISS  
JOHN T. WINTERICH

## Keeping Faith with the Traveler

THE FIRST American was an immigrant, a traveler in prehistoric times who journeyed from the ancient continents of Asia and Europe, where man originally emerged on earth, to find this unshaped, unpeopled continent of the still undreamed of New World.

Yet this nation, first inhabited and settled by travelers, is today violating its own history and traditions by discouraging its citizens from visiting other countries. In 1965, proclaimed International Cooperation Year by the United Nations, the U.S. Government is mobilizing a vast program of projects for international cooperation, while at the same time stifling one of the most basic contemporary expressions of cooperation: world travel, and tourism.

There can be little international cooperation in a world in which travel barriers—whether in the form of passport or visa restrictions or currency limitations or restrictive taxes—have the effect of choking off the fullest and freest movement of peoples. Travel is the great convener of people. It provides immediate experiences and insights that are available in no other way and are invaluable to the citizens of the most powerful and heavily engaged nation on the globe.

Much has been done since the founding of the United Nations twenty years ago to increase the ease and freedom of travel in all parts of the world, whether through technological developments such as the jet transport plane or through the reduction of visa, passport,

and immigration requirements. Hardly two generations ago, the lifetime travel mileage for a human being might be as little as 30,000 miles, and less than 20 per cent of the globe was accessible to him; today 3,000,000 miles is not beyond the reach of the average man and at least 90 per cent of the earth's surface welcomes him.

It is not so much that the world is smaller as that man's idea of the world has grown larger. Man's idea of the world has in fact become so large that for the first time in his history he sees himself as a part of all mankind. This is a revolutionary new factor in man's efforts to cooperate in managing the globe instead of dismembering it through conflict. Therefore the policy of the U.S. Government in discouraging or restricting the freedom of international travel because of an adverse balance of payments becomes more than a technical matter for accountants, economists and fiscal experts to resolve. Our so-called travel gap of \$1.6 billion is a serious problem, but a "Yankee Stay Home" policy would work even more seriously against the national interest.



The vital interrelationship of travel, trade, and international prosperity was reaffirmed last month at the Ninth Inter-American Travel Congress in Bogota, Colombia, when delegates from nineteen countries, including the U.S., unanimously urged all governments to support International Cooperation Year and especially to encourage and widen the role of international travel as a central expression of such cooperation. Moreover, when the world-wide travel industry gathers in Hong Kong next week for the thirty-fifth convention of the American Society of Travel Agents, the delegates are not only expected to endorse ICY but also to urge that it be carried on next year by a United Nations proclamation of 1966 as International Travel Year. And the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, the consultative agency of the U.N. through which ninety-four governments work to promote and develop world tourism, is also expected to urge the U.N. to proclaim 1966 as International Travel Year when it holds its twentieth-anniversary meeting in Mexico City next month.

MOST observers, in short, generally concur that foreign travel and tourism, a \$10 billion-a-year enterprise described by the United Nations as a "significant human activity deserving the praise and encouragement of all peoples and all governments," is also a peace-supporting, knowledge-expanding force.

Instead of restraints and taxes on travel, shouldn't the United States make clear that it is dedicated to a policy of expanding international travel? Shouldn't we acknowledge that our current annual trade surplus of \$6.5 billion is in very real measure made possible by the funds American tourists spend abroad, funds that flow continually back to this country for purchases of American products and services? Shouldn't we declare that Washington has no intention of curtailing the travel of its citizens?

It is worth hoping that the U.S. delegations in both Hong Kong and Mexico City will support such an initiative, and that it will be given further momentum when President Johnson convenes a three-day White House conference at the end of November to crystallize and approve the over-all U.S. program for international cooperation—including international travel—as a continuing expression of ICY.

The U.N. would welcome such an initiative, which would do honor both to world travel and to the twentieth anniversary of the IUOTO. It would serve the national interest of the United States and keep faith with that first American, the first foreign traveler who came to these shores from overseas thousands of years ago.

—WILLIAM D. PATTERSON.

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## The Uses of Anger

I own most of Ivor Brown's books and make a point of reading everything else of his that appears in print. So, quite naturally, I read his article "Those Angry Authors—Why Their Protests Fail" [SR, Aug. 28].

Mr. Brown is correct in every instance he cites: Bernard Shaw, Charles Dickens, Lord Byron, and all the others. But sometime I hope he will tell us why some other authors do succeed in their efforts to reform. For instance, the effects of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* are still being felt not only in her native land but, I read, even more so in Ivor Brown's own Great Britain.

Could this be because Miss Carson told the truth *without* anger?

N. M. DAVIDSON.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

I HAVE OFTEN FELT, as Ivor Brown does, that even the greatest of those "angry" authors are but driftwood on the powerful currents of their times and must always fail, except in rare instances, to be anything but entertainers.

I cannot yet believe, however, that the artist's main function is mere entertainment or that the artist must fail forever in fulfilling his basic drive as gadfly, teacher, and prophet.

There is certainly evidence a mile high that Aristophanes, Dickens, and Shaw were not, in the long run, the failures Brown thinks them.

It is abundantly clear that, ever so gradually to be sure, such men worked on the sensibilities of the economic and political leaders of each generation, making them a little more wise and responsible than their fathers had been. Thus we have edged feebly to a clearer view of the inner reality of things—which I submit is a fulfillment of the artist's true function.

To believe otherwise is, of course, to believe the artist a mere clown whose whole existence is beside the point—except as court jester to madmen.

CLYDE MARTIN.

Chelmsford, Mass.

## Maximum Burdens

THANK YOU for R.L.T.'s excellent editorial on the International Labor Organization's report on maximum permissible weights. As you undoubtedly know, it isn't often that a report of this kind finds its way into the better magazines.

You may be interested to know that a preparatory technical conference on the maximum permissible weight to be carried by one worker will be held at the International Labor Office, Geneva, from January 25 to February 4, 1966. One purpose is to discuss further action that may be taken to obtain acceptance of the idea of a maximum permissible weight and to recommend such new action to the International Labor Conference.

It has been suggested in the past that a maximum permissible weight be written into an ILO Convention, thereby making it



"Don't take it out on him—take an Anacin."

an international standard. An action of this kind is still possible.

WILLIAM J. KNIGHT,  
International Labor Organization  
Liaison Office with the U.N.  
New York, N.Y.

## Kazantzakis and Candy

YOUR PREVIEW of the Kazantzakis drama *Man and God in Dialogue* [SR, Aug. 28] was a cooling breeze in the heat of summer.

While Americans rush to their stationery stores to buy their paperback copies of *Candy*, self-styled censors are still trying to get the works of Nikos Kazantzakis removed from the shelves.

Isn't this something of a Coney Island mirror image of our rather unstable literary folkways?

BERT S. GERARD,  
Administrator,  
Westchester Reform Temple.  
Scarsdale, N.Y.

## Help!

I CAN'T BELIEVE that a magazine of your high quality could publish such an unrefined opinion of the movie *Help!* [SR, Aug. 28]. I've been a subscriber to your magazine for nearly two years now, and I've seen nearly every good movie murdered by your critics—but this is going too far. The photography was out of this world, the dialogue was immensely clever, the music haunting and catchy. As for the Beatles themselves, they're just as diverting, cute, and talented now as they always were, if not more. Please tell Mr. Alpert not to worry about Richard Lester; he'll get his share of Academy Awards for this movie. Instead, tell him to

start worrying about Hollis Alpert, whose reviews lack what the movie has plenty of: artistic talent.

GERI AHLES.

Elm Grove, Wis.

I HAVE JUST FINISHED reading Hollis Alpert's review of *Help!* He didn't seem to like it much, poor man.

Because I am only fifteen years old and cannot be considered an able critic, you may not consider this as a world-shaking letter. However, I have the full support of my mother, my father, and my boy friend—who was once anti-Beatle.

I don't see how anyone who likes to have fun can help loving the Beatles. Anyone who says their "spontaneity is forced" or, worse, compares them to Abbot and Costello should be instantly charged with Communism.

When they tell us that everything in the world is on the edge of disaster, and when movies like *Harlow* and *The Sandpiper* are the current attractions at movie theaters, how can anyone criticize a beautiful, fun movie like *Help!* If more people would let themselves go and just *enjoy* these wonderful Beatles, they would be a whole lot happier!

JO COLLINS.

Rochester, Mich.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Alpert replies: "Non-sense! My reviews are full of artistic talent. My wife thinks they're marvelous, my mother wonders where I learned all the big words. We all think teen-age Beatle hysteria is icky. And anyone who says I'm a Communist for not particularly liking the new Beatles caper is probably a stockholder of the United Artists Corporation."