

# As Others See Us



## OTTAWA:

### *A Question of Purpose*

THE CRISIS OF CONSCIENCE through which the American people have been passing during the past year because of the Vietnam war has stemmed from the unanswered question: What is America's moral purpose in Vietnam? This question goes beyond the simplistic stand that the U.S. is in Vietnam merely to deter foreign aggression, or to prove that so-called wars of liberation are a form of aggression and will not be tolerated. For in South Vietnam there has been little doubt that the Communist Vietcong represents a genuine popular movement, based on rebellion against corrupt and tyrannical officials in Saigon and rapacious landlords in the countryside.

Flowing from this fact has been Senator Robert Kennedy's recent suggestion that the Vietcong should be allowed to participate in a South Vietnamese government following peace negotiations. General Maxwell D. Taylor, former U.S. ambassador to South Vietnam, has said he would support Senator Kennedy's position provided free elections are held first. And Secretary of State Dean Rusk has told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in response to a question by Senator J. W. Fulbright, its chairman, that he also would support free elections after a truce is achieved.

These views should help clarify American purposes in South Vietnam. Until recently there has been much confusion over these goals, and an understandable assumption that the U.S. was intent on using brute power to impose an unpopular regime on the South Vietnamese people. It has even been openly admitted that the U.S. opposed free elections in 1956 because the resulting vote might favor the Communists. Yet such opposition undermines the democratic principles that the U.S. professes, and makes an absurdity out of early American attacks on such people as Fidel Castro of Cuba, because he does not believe in free elections.

The line between a "war of liberation" and a true civil war aimed at deposing an oppressive regime can be very thin. Ideally, the issue should be settled without outside interference from anyone. If it can be settled through elections, so much the better. Having indicated that

they favor free elections in South Vietnam, even if it means participation by the Vietcong in the government of the country, the U.S. Government should now make specific proposals toward that end. . . .

—Ottawa Citizen.

## TORONTO:

### *Lessons of the Debate*

AMERICAN FREEDOM has never rung so clearly as during the debate on President Johnson's Vietnam policy. Resulting in an overwhelming mandate for the present Washington Administration, it has demonstrated the strength of the nation's democratic system and spirit.

The U.S. is at war in Vietnam, with hundreds of thousands of men and its arms machinery geared to the fighting. War usually induces a repressive climate in the name of security. But it would be hard to find a parallel example of a nation at war giving full rein to the voices of opposition. Against the background of teach-ins and demonstrations, the debate in the Senate and House of Representatives went on under the glare of publicity. It was especially nerve-wracking for the soldiers in the field and their loved ones at home, raising doubts and fears that the nation might be dangerously divided and the war effort impaired. But the conclusion leaves no misgivings as to where the U.S. stands on the issue of halting aggression. Indeed,

its citizens have been strengthened and uplifted by the exercise of unrestrained expression.

Free men everywhere will take heart from this evidence of faith in democratic principles, and as the details of the debate trickle into despotic lands the hopes and dreams of men there, too, will be nourished.

The unbridled play of opinion in the U.S. in recent weeks will be seen, above all, as an expression of the validity of the individual within the state.

From that stems, in turn, the concept of the consent of the governed from which the state derives its just powers.

The ideas implicit in this concept are relatively new in parts of the emergent world, and it is important and valuable to have had them laid out under the blazing light of the public gaze. They will strengthen the spirit of discontent wherever the despot's mandate runs among the oppressed.

All this cannot be but discomfiting to the forces that seek to overrun Vietnam. They are a tough and resourceful enemy, but they have now been presented with an object lesson of how tough and irresistible is the will of a people untrammelled by the vigilantes of thought police. . . .

—Toronto Telegram.

## GLASGOW:

### *An Eye on China*

ALTHOUGH THE HEARINGS are over and Congress has confirmed the President's wide control over the war and the total military commitment in Vietnam, the great debate is far from over. The average American's views on Vietnam can never be the same after the much-publicized and televised Senate hearing. For the first time since American involvement in Vietnam assumed the proportions of a major war, the unquestioned though uneasy consensus in favor of the President was threatened. The final effect of the debate is still unclear. Few voices advocated withdrawal; most critics emphasized the threat of an escalation of the conflict into a general war with China.

There is a risk that this healthy, democratic voicing of genuine doubts will be interpreted in Hanoi as a weakening of America's will to fight. Such a misreading of the debate could make Hanoi more determined to fight on and refuse all American offers of a peaceful settlement. And, ironically, the demands of many of the critics for a rapid end to the war could lead to its prolongment. Despite this, the debate, by clarifying the aims of the United States and the doubts of the critics, is likely to prove healthy in the longer run. Morale in a country fighting a long war deteriorates most rapidly



—Krokodil (Moscow).

From a diplomat's diary: "In Latin America the abundance of fruit strikes you in the eye."

when the aims are unclear and the doubts and fears expressed only in whispers.  
—*Glasgow Herald*.

## PEKING:

### *Words of Warning*

ALTHOUGH THERE ARE groups with different interests within the monopoly capitalist class in the United States and although there are acute conflicts of interests among these groups, they are completely at one in their goal of the enslavement of the people at home and abroad; they are all reactionaries. . . . There is no such thing as supra-class "sensibleness." If the representatives of U.S. monopoly capital are "sensible" at all, they are "sensible" only in safeguarding the fundamental interests of their own class, in oppressing the American people at home and plundering other peoples abroad, and in executing their policies of aggression and war. The new leaders of the Soviet Union are keen on dividing U.S. ruling circles into the "sensible" and the "reactionary," but what other interpretation of their real intention is possible except that it is to provide a cover for U.S. imperialism and help it lull the people of the world?

Sometimes the new leaders of the Soviet Union mouth a few phrases attacking Johnson. This is only a smoke-screen. For Soviet books demonstrate that, like Khrushchev, they portray the Presidents of the United States as angels of peace and absolute representatives of the American people. The reason is very simple. It is that the Khrushchev revisionists invariably put their stakes on the chieftain of U.S. imperialism. They always do their utmost to prettify the President of the United States, whoever he is.  
—*Peking Review*.

## MOSCOW:

### *The Missing Bomb*

FOR SEVERAL WEEKS now world public opinion has been alarmed by the hazards to human life and health arising from the loss of a ten-megaton American atomic bomb off the shores of Spain. . . . The harmful consequences of nuclear radiation, from which the Spanish population may suffer, show how dangerous for the peaceful population is this monstrous sporting about with bombs and planes, even if they are not put to their intended uses. . . .  
—*Tass*.

## PERTH:

### *Support for Saigon*

HAVING HAD HIS peace feelers rebuffed by Hanoi, President Johnson is faced

with further military commitments aimed at producing a situation in which the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese leaders would be willing to negotiate peace. In this light, his first purpose in meeting Marshal Ky and other South Vietnamese leaders at Honolulu seems to have been to counter Communist propaganda that this is a war of U.S. imperialists against the Vietnamese people.

The meeting was designed to demonstrate that Washington is helping the legitimate government of South Vietnam, at the wish of the Vietnamese, to fight Communist aggression. Marshal Ky contributed to this end by taking a disconcertingly tougher line than the President and insisting in his part of the

communiqué that the Vietcong must be defeated.

President Johnson's second purpose is clearly to show that the United States has no interest in conquest but is determined to hold the line against Communism and anxious to improve the social and political lot of the people. Marshal Ky has yet to show that he is willing or able to carry out the program of U.S.-financed economic and social reform outlined in the communiqué. He, at least, is the first South Vietnamese leader to recognize that the regime in Saigon must be more popularly based if it is to justify the principles on which the Vietcong is being fought.

—*West Australian*.

**The Press and the President:** With the President's critics in Congress overwhelmed, the American press stands today as Lyndon Johnson's most formidable foe on Vietnam. It is important, of course, not to exaggerate: on the whole the "popular" press—with the *New York Daily News* as its cheerleader—is vociferous in its support of LBJ's policies and merciless toward those who, like Robert Kennedy, attack them. But among what in England would be called "the quality papers," led by the *New York Times*, there is a growing mood of doubt and questioning—a mood that is plainly beginning to make an impact, if only in terms of irritation, on the White House.

The syndicated columnists have so far been the main targets of Presidential ire. I had not, for example, been in Washington a fortnight before I was drawn to one side by what is known here as "a high source" and solemnly assured that Walter Lippmann was "senile"—a diagnosis which those who have met Mr. Lippmann know to be totally absurd.

James Reston, who has lately been writing some sharp columns on "rhetoric and reality," is now getting much the same treatment. Go to any Washington dinner party and a moment arrives when the Administration spokesman will lean earnestly across the table and confide that "as an old newspaperman" he finds "nothing sadder than the decline in Scottie Reston's reputation." With the boot now going in, too, for Marquis Childs . . . it is hard not to recognize in all this part of a concerted plan of professional demolition of the President's newspaper critics.

Its personal background, however, is not so much one of brutality as of sheer bewilderment. No President has ever wanted, or worked harder for, the good will of the press than has LBJ since he came to office. Practically every newspaperman in Washington has his tale of how LBJ has rung him up at home—the tone sometimes wheedling, often peevish, occasionally downright furious, but always holding out the invitation for a kiss to make it all better. No one disputes the President's desire to be loved, but it did not take long to detect that what he had in mind was a rather special form of love—love, in fact, on Big Brother's terms.

In the U.S., newspapers have always until now enjoyed a far more formative role in policy than they have ever been allowed in Britain: it was, indeed, one of Mr. Johnson's own White House aides—Mr. Douglass Cater, formerly of the *Reporter* magazine—who once called the press "the fourth branch of government."

The President is plainly more than content for the arrangement to continue, provided only that the press takes its place on the government benches. What he will not tolerate is their lining up with the opposition. It is precisely because the opposition in the U.S. is at the moment so fragile that the threat goes well beyond the considerations of mere journalistic *amour-propre*. It touches, in fact, on the whole place of dissent in LBJ's America.

No one would suggest that Lyndon Johnson is currently behaving like a Kwame Nkrumah or even an Ian Smith. But though the methods are clearly different, the objective does not appear to be wholly dissimilar. Bonds, after all, can be made of silk, just as easily as of steel. Having crushed Congress, can it really be LBJ's desire now to castrate the press?

—*Anthony Howard in the Observer (London)*.

When Rudolf Serkin made his American debut with the New York Philharmonic under Arturo Toscanini in February, 1936, Olin Downes wrote in the *New York Times*: "When a soloist of such capacity arrives, it is an occasion to remember." Since that historic date, audiences in this country and abroad have found Serkin's performances...on records, in con-

cert halls, at the Marlboro Festival...unforgettable.

Serkin Month on Columbia Masterworks offers eloquent additions to Mr. Serkin's distinguished recorded repertoire. In these impeccable readings, the maestro epitomizes *Life's* description: "Rudolf Serkin looks like a scholar and plays like an angel." The halo of acclaim that surrounds Mr. Serkin is richly deserved.

## Columbia Records Honors Rudolf Serkin on the Thirtieth Anniversary of His American Concert Debut.



**Rudolf Serkin**  
Schubert: Piano Sonata in A Major  
ML 6249/MS 6849\*

**Rudolf Serkin**  
Mozart: Piano Concertos  
No. 14 in E-Flat, K. 449 / No. 17 in G, K. 453  
Alexander Schneider conducting  
the Columbia Symphony Orchestra  
ML 6244/MS 6844\*

**Rudolf Serkin**  
Beethoven: Piano Concerto No. 2 in B-Flat  
Mozart: Piano Concerto No. 27 in B-Flat, K. 595  
Eugene Ormandy  
The Philadelphia Orchestra  
ML 6239/MS 6839\*/MQ 792f

**Rudolf Serkin**  
Brahms: Concerto No. 1 in D Minor  
Concerto No. 2 in B-Flat Major  
Wendell Lohr: Concerto No. 1 in G Minor  
Schumann: Concerto in A Minor  
D3L 341/D3S 741\*  
(A 3-Record Set at a specially reduced price. Also available singly.)

**Rudolf Serkin**  
BEETHOVEN THE FIVE PIANO CONCERTOS & THE CHORAL FANTASY  
EUGENE ORMANDY  
PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA  
LEONARD BERNSTEIN  
NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC  
THE WESTMINSTER CHORUS  
D4L 340/D4S 740\*  
(A 4-Record Set at a specially reduced price. Also available singly.)

### April Is Serkin Month on Columbia Masterworks

\*Stereo    jTape

©COLUMBIA  MARCAS REG. PRINTED IN U.S.A.





Tape recorder in attaché case ready for concertgoing.

---

PIRACY ON THE HIGH C'S	By Richard Freed	55
RECORDINGS IN REVIEW	By Irving Kolodin	60
RECORDINGS REPORTS I:		
ORCHESTRAL LPs		62
MOSTLY MODERNISTS		
By Martin Williams		63
RECORDINGS REPORTS II:		
MISCELLANEOUS LPs		64
MOZART AND OPERA SERIA		
By Herbert Weinstock		67
MUSIC OF THE BIRDS AND BEASTS		
By Oliver Daniel		68
TESTING, TESTING		
By Ivan Berger		70
LETTERS TO THE RECORDINGS EDITOR		72

---

## PIRACY ON THE HIGH C'S

By RICHARD FREED

UNTIL RECENTLY the printed programs at Lincoln Center's Philharmonic Hall, like those in many other concert halls and theaters, carried a line reading, "The use of cameras in this auditorium is not permitted." Two months ago, at the request of the New York Philharmonic, the line was changed to read, "The taking of photographs and use of recording equipment in this auditorium is not allowed."

The admonition comes a little late, for determined hunters of sonic souvenirs have been at it for years, beginning when their equipment was a good deal more primitive and conditions much more difficult than today's. Moreover, the proliferation of transistorized and "sub-miniaturized" tape recording devices—many of them easily concealed or disguised—not only makes the activity more intriguing, but makes its proscription all but impossible to enforce.

It has always been relatively simple, of course, to record broadcast performances by such organizations as the Metropolitan Opera and the New York Philharmonic, but the surreptitious record-maker has never limited himself to that easy course: it is only in the hall itself, after all, that his sound source is pure and not subject to interference or interruption. The Metropolitan, for example, has been rather spectacularly documented on unauthorized discs, many of which preserve performances that were *not* broadcast, and there is a sizable assortment of similarly produced recordings of concerts, operas, and re-

citals from other sources in New York, London, Vienna, Milan, and virtually every festival city in Europe.

Such recordings are usually meant to be shared, and they are, not through ordinary merchandising channels but in limited editions (usually about 100 to 300 pressings) whose labels bear the words "Private Edition" instead of a trademark. Barely a month after Montserrat Caballé made her sensational New York debut in Donizetti's *Lucrezia Borgia* with the American Opera Society at Carnegie Hall last April, a New Yorker received a letter from a friend in Germany asking if he would like to have a recording of the performance. The recording, which has circulated in a limited edition (one copy is even on display at the Lincoln Center Library and Museum of the Performing Arts) was not issued by a record "company." The labels identify no manufacturer or producer, only the performing personnel. But the sound (mono only) is excellent, and an exciting musical event is thus preserved.

FROM time to time comparable matter has found its way into the *Schwann Catalog*, often with the performers' names changed (as in the Bayreuth *Ring* formerly on Allegro, and several operas from the mythical "Patagonia Festival" on Period). New York Philharmonic broadcasts provided material circulated on odd labels in the early Fifties, with the performances attributed to such conductors as Karl Alwin and the Russian composer Reinhold Glière. One distributor of "pirated" material even

called his label "Jolly Roger." But what there is, or has been, in *Schwann* of recordings taken from "airchecks" and other unauthorized sources must be regarded as only a tiny fraction of the vast quantity available to those interested enough to seek it out in Private Editions.

The opera-lover whose appetites range beyond what is offered in *Schwann* can find not only "Golden Age" performances of the standard repertory from the Met—Bruno Walter's 1942 *Don Giovanni* with Pinza, the same conductor's 1941 *Fidelio* with Flagstad and René Maison, a whole slew of *Aïdas* and *Bohèmes*, much of the Wagner canon with Flagstad and Melchior—but also such "nonbasic" works as Howard Hanson's *Merry Mount*, Deems Taylor's *Peter Ibbetson*, and Italo Montemezzi's *L'Amore dei Tre Re* (conducted by the composer in 1941, with Grace Moore and Charles Kullman). From European and Latin-American sources there are more recent recordings of such rarities as Donizetti's *Il Furioso*, Gomes's *Il Guarany*, Fauré's *Pénélope*, Rossini's *Zelmira*, Giordano's *Siberia*, Berlioz's *Benvenuto Cellini*, more composer-conducted Montemezzi (*L'Incantesimo*), a Berlin *Ariadne auf Naxos* (dating from 1935, with Ursuleac, Roswaenge, and Berger), and the Strauss operas *Intermezzo*, *Guntram*, *Die Liebe der Danae* (première broadcast under Clemens Krauss, 1952), and *Feuersnot* (1964 Vienna Festival performances under Peter Maag).

If the operatic-and-vocal category seems to get the bulk of this kind of attention, it does not get it all. An aston-