

THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

July 27th, 1951

Description: In the opening segment, ER and Elliott Roosevelt respond to a listener's question regarding inefficiency in Congress. In the interview segment, ER and journalist Lester Markel discuss the International Press Institute.

Participants: ER, Elliott, Lester Markel, Ben Grauer

[ER:] How do you do? This is Eleanor Roosevelt. Every Monday through Friday my son Elliott and I have the opportunity to visit with you here in my living room at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York City. Each day it is our desire to bring interesting guests that we are hopeful you will enjoy meeting. Elliott, will you tell our listeners today's plans?

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mr. Lester Markel [1984-1977], Sunday editor of *The New York Times*, is Mrs. Roosevelt's guest today. He recently returned from a trip to Paris in connection with the founding of the International Press Institute, an organization set up for the purpose of the editors of newspapers all over the world understanding one another, and thereby rendering more valuable press service. We'll hear more about this institute from Mr. Markel in just a few minutes. But first Mrs. Roosevelt and I have a problem to discuss. Now our announcer with a few words.

(Break 00:59-1:09)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] The question up for discussion today comes from Mrs. Mary Wilson of Oceanside, New York. She writes, "I read a recent editorial in the New York paper which accuses the 82nd Congress of turning out legislation than any previous Congress within the memory of veteran Washington reporters. Certainly less than any in the last two decades and concludes with the comment: 'All in all it can be reported today that Congress seems to be getting nowhere slowly.' Isn't it hard, Mrs. Roosevelt, for people such as I, an ordinary citizen, to have faith in these perilous times when we get reports such as these? Why now, of all times, should our Congress be bogging down? What is the reason? Perhaps you can give me some glimmer of hope that the affairs of our nation are not as black as they are sometimes painted."

[ER:] Well, just because they're accused of-of passing less legislation doesn't mean that they haven't done a good job. Adding laws uh just for the sake of adding laws would be a very stupid performance. Uh it may mean in--that they are going to have uh more, better considered laws. And that they're taking more time to think through on them. Now I don't know that it does mean that, but I-I personally have always felt that there were too many little, personal interests that were injected into Congress and that got through and made a volume of laws. And that um perhaps a little more time devoted to the big questions um were--might reduce the number of little things that were brought up and done. And-but um-uh would be time better spent and now it happens that perhaps it's taken longer uh to discuss some of the things. They are very complicated questions that are coming before Congress now. And I would not condemn them till the end of the session. And uh until you really know um what they have done. And very often um there would be a difference of opinion as to what should be done.

And-and that takes longer, and we hope it will be resolved in the wisest possible way. Occasionally it is not. Occasionally it takes time and another Congress will have to change what a previous one has done. But I uh-I personally [Elliott Roosevelt coughs] would think that uh the mere fact that there have not been a great many laws passed should not discourage anyone. What I think does

require our attention is the kind of arguments uh and the speeches that are made in Congress on the different subjects that are of vital interest to the people. I think if we would pick out, in our newspapers and through our Congressional directory, what were the subjects that we felt were important and follow what was said on those subjects in Congress, and let the congressmen and senators know what we felt about their positions, we as citizens would be doing a very valuable piece of work. For instance, just now the controls bill and inflation are a primary domestic importance to every one of us. And the fact that they extended a weakened bill, but that they have a-a month in which to do something better should stimulate every one of us to get in touch with everyone we know and say what we think about that. Um on our on our Point Four Program, on our foreign relief in other words, on our military bills, all those are things in which uh we should not want to hurry, we should want due consideration. But we should take a part, [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes.] we should really feel that it's what our representatives are arguing that interests us. (5:50)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mhm. Well, do you--don't you also feel that uh due to the makeup of this particular Congress uh where there is uh a coalition of southern Democrats, more aptly called Dixiecrats, and uh the Republicans who are anti-administration, and the balance of power is-is really uh very, very close uh between those two groups and the administration, uh that probably it makes it all the more difficult to come to eh an agreement on all of these policies and problems it faces. (6:35)

[ER:] Oh, of course it does. I mean that coalition is a perfectly terrible coalition because it means the administration has a very narrow margin. And uh they-they have a very hard time to get consideration that is fair consideration of the things that should go through or that they feel should go through.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mhm. [ER: Now--] I was very much interested, for instance, in reading in yesterday's paper that on the question of controls, uh price controls for beef, uh that the administration wasn't even able to uh get in favor of its bill. The majority leader of the administration in this United States Senate, uh Mr.--

[ER:] No, because he comes from a state where beef is very--where beef owners are very strong, they're cattle owners [Elliott Roosevelt: Right.] and he doesn't dare. Now uh the people as a whole should understand that uh these-these interests uh have organized lobbies, and they work all the time and the people have got to work all the time, or organized lobbies will be what will control us. [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes.] And there's a very strong farm block always and uh there is um a-a large group of special interests. And um when-when an effort is being made to protect the people as a whole uh then they ought to be awake to the special interests that go to work. [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes] And they ought to let the--their representatives know that they're not--they haven't gone to sleep.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Didn't there used to be uh taxpayers associations, uh organizations of plain ordinary taxpayers that used to uh appear in Congress before congressional committees to fight for good legislation? (8:44)

[ER:] Well, I don't know about that. I've known a great many groups that in special areas appeared. Uh I've known a great many women's groups, for instance, in the old days that fought for certain labor uh laws for women. I've known uh of-of um the League of Women Voters, for instance, will give you impartial information and will back a measure. And um where foreign affairs are concerned the United Nations Association will give you impartial information and back measures. [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] But uh I don't um I-I don't remember those taxpayers associations, though I have a faint sort of feeling they sound familiar to me. [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] But I don't--don't remember actively working in them.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] But uh it would be through uh people organizing and starting that type of activity that we can work to prevent special interests from uh railroading through legislation that is purely in their interest and not um necessarily for the public good.

[ER:] Yes, but probably they can work through their existing organizations if they um are awake to the need.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mhm. Well, this-this whole question of uh the amount of work that is done by a-a particular session of Congress, like the 82nd Congress as in this letter, I remember when the 81st Congress uh was in session they said the same thing about it. [ER: I don't think they said the--] And they said the same thing about the 80th Congress. (10:32)

[ER:] I don't know that they said they hadn't passed enough legislation, that's a-a new one. And they usually say that what they've done uh is so bad ah-that they will go down into history as the worst congress. I've heard so many congresses called the worst that I've begin to think that that's probably a slight exaggeration. I imagine there are always good and bad things in every congresses and there are always men who stand out who've lived and voted according to their principles but um there are others who have not, that's all.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, today -- as of today, uh would you say that the present Congress has uh-uh met with most of the major issues and has-has dealt with those issues uh up to date? Or are they still way behind in the solving?

[ER:] There are a good many -- oh they--but they're still--but usually the talk all goes on at the beginning and you never work as hard in any legislative body at the beginning, you always wait until the end, and then the last part of the time you rush everything through. And that's how a lot of bad things get through. [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes.] But um-uh you can't expect that the beginning will show the record of accomplished legislation that the end will.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, do you feel that uh that what has been said of so many congresses, that we have too many old uh people in the seats of importance because of our uh system whereby a length of service determines how important you are in Congress. Do you think that that has uh that the Congress today is-is made up of more older people than before or do you think it uh--that that is--

[ER:] Well, I don't know the proportion. It would be natural- natural to have more older people, though I think now there are a fair sprinkling of younger ones. Personally, I think that sprinkling should be increased. Um it ill befits me at my age to say at what age exactly we should retire, [Elliott Roosevelt laughs] but I think that uh-um when we begin to feel that our opinions are solidifying we had better retire. (13:01)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] All right, well, I think that that answers the uh this question from Mrs. Wilson. And I see now that it's time for us to go on to another part of the program.

(Break 13:15-13:22)

[ER:] Thank you, Elliott. I'm very happy to have with me today Mr. Lester Markel, Sunday editor of *The New York Times*, Mr. Markel.

[Lester Markel:] I'm very happy to be here, Mrs. Roosevelt, because I think we are both engaged in solving what--trying to solve at least what seems to me the great problem in the world, the problem of understanding.

[ER:] I'm glad to be included with you, sir, in that.

[Lester Markel:] Well, I know you are doing it, Mrs. Roosevelt, and I hope we are.

[ER:] Well now, first of all, Mr. Markel, what is the purpose of the International Press Institute?

[Lester Markel:] Uh I think the purposes, Mrs. Roosevelt, can best be expressed if I read from the preamble of the constitution of the institute, adopted last--this past summer in Paris. Uh there are four purposes named. First, "The furtherance and safeguarding of freedom of the press, and by freedom of the press is meant free access to the news, free transmission of news, free publication of newspapers, free expression of views." Second, "The achievement of understanding among newspapers and so among people." And third, "The promotion of the free exchange of accurate and balanced news among nations." And finally, "The improvement of the practices of journalism." (14:45)

[ER:] Well, that's a very um interesting list of purposes. Uh how was the idea for it originated?

[Lester Markel:] Well, it came about, Mrs. Roosevelt, through my belief that uh this problem of understanding was the great problem. And editors were extremely important in helping to solve that problem. For a number of years I have been a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, in which I met editors from all over the country, and I realized what personal contact would accomplish. I, therefore, tried to translate that into international terms. And with the help of the Ford and the Rockefeller Foundations, we have now enough funds to bring into being the International Institute for a period of three years. After that it must be self-supporting. (15:33)

[ER:] Well now, uh just how do you propose going about uh improving understanding between peoples?

[Lester Markel:] Well, uh of course, that is a very large problem and the newspaper is only one part of it. The radio and television are other parts of it. The community in general must help in what is a great crusade. So far as editors are concerned, I think it is important that nations understand each other and that can be done only, I believe, through personal exchanges. And it's especially important to bring about these meeting of editors and to consider their problems.

[ER:] Well, um I-I think that is true, but now, for instance, um to give you a concrete example: I've found in the discussion that we had um in the United Nations in Committee Three [Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural] that one of the people who was the most bitter about American press for things was Saudi Arabia, the delegate from Saudi Arabia. Now he had a feeling that his nation had been badly represented and that the mere fact that we were so powerful in our press, um in the money we had to spend on our press associations and so forth, um meant that freedom should be curtailed um for us because we could get across so many things and he felt they weren't always truthful. Now editors, I suppose, can do little about that except to set a kind of standard for what their reporters do. (17:16)

[Lester Markel:] Well, I think there is a double responsibility. I think there is the primary responsibility of the editor to see that our press is responsible as well as free. And then there is the responsibility of the reader, which I think deserves a great deal of attention, to make certain that the bad press does not exist in the United States. As for the problem of Saudi Arabia, I think that is one of the problems that an International Press Institute could well study as to whether they are having the proper news from the United States--

[ER:] Now I'm not sure that he was right in his feeling, you see, because I never--I have no way of ascertaining what were the particular articles that he objected to and whether they were true or untrue, do you see?

[Lester Markel:] Yes, but I was saying, Mrs. Roosevelt, that I think an International Press Institute could determine whether one country was getting the proper, true information about another and vice-versa. Because I think uh our impressions of other nations are based mainly on what we read through the media mass communication. Now I think an International Press Institute, so far as the newspapers are concerned, could inquire into the sources and the nature of information that passes between one nation and another.

[ER:] Well now, that is one of the ways that you will operate um to achieve your aims as an International Press Institute. Are there any others? (18:43)

[Lester Markel:] Well, I ought to explain exactly what the organization is. There are two main branches. There is the general membership which would meet once a year to discuss questions of interest to international journalism, and there is a permanent secretariat which will conduct continuous research with headquarters at Zurich. And it is for the establishment of that secretariat, on a rather elaborate scale, that these foundation funds have been granted.

[ER:] Oh, I see. Well now, who may belong to the International Press Institute?

[Lester Markel:] The International Press Institute will be composed of representatives from any free country in the world.

[ER:] Well now, how does the conception of the institute differ from UNSECO's conception? (19:33)

[Lester Markel:] Well, uh in the first place UNESCO, of course, included all the nations, we require that any member of the Institute shall be a member of a staff of a newspaper that subscribes to the principles of the free press as they have been defined in the preamble, which I read at the beginning of this talk. Uh

[Lester Markel clears his throat] in the second place, uh we believe that any such organization ought to be free of any government affiliation, national or international, in order to avoid some of the difficulties, frankly, that we have run into at the UN and at UNESCO. And I think, Mrs. Roosevelt, you have seen a good deal of that kind of difficulty where our conception of what a newspaper ought to be is quite different from that of other nations.

[ER:] Yes, we've seen that difficulty in writing a convention on freedom of information. [Lester Markel: Which turned out as I believe--] turned out to be a limitation of freedom.

[Lester Markel:] And which I understand we will not--we are now voting against--

[ER:] Well we will never be able to sign the present document. We couldn't possibly. We never-we never could have stood for it. When it was being written, we fought it every inch of the way.

[Lester Markel:] Even though the idea came originally from us.

[ER:] The idea came from us originally, but we were thinking about freedom we weren't thinking about restricting freedom. [Lester Markel: So.] That's what it's turned out to be.

[Lester Markel:] So you can see therefore why an institute such as this kind, free of any such government affiliation could do the kind of job that is impossible at the UN. And I'm not saying this with any idea of disparaging the kind of work that the UN does. (21:17)

[ER:] Well now, what kind of research will your secretariat do in this institute?

[Lester Markel:] Well, the kind of research we have just been talking about. For one thing, the kind of news, the kind of information, that flows from one nation to another. At our Paris meeting and this--these are merely four-four examples, we decided on four media projects to be undertaken as soon as the secretariat is established. And I think if I tell you what those are briefly, it will indicate the kind of work we can do. It was first a survey of freedom of information throughout the world. And the need of that I think is reinforced by the news the other day, as surveyed by the Associated Press, of the way censorship and restriction was increasing all over the world. Uh in the second place we decided to do a symposium of five hundred leading editors on what they thought newspapers could contribute toward better understanding. And I think that would be an interesting publication. There were then two definite projects uh one, which interests me a great deal, a seminar on the problem of collecting and presenting news from Russia. I think that is an intensely important and interesting and complicated problem. And finally a project to study why *La Prensa* was suppressed, how that came about, what lessons that holds for the future. And I think while the case is still fresh we can get together a great deal of information on what is one of the important cases in international journalism.

[ER:] Well now, what kind of reception has the plan had among editors, Mr. Markel?

[Lester Markel:] I think it's had a most favorable reception. I was abroad; I've just come back from abroad. I spent three weeks conferring with editors. Um before that they were very enthusiastic and after it, I say, modestly, they are more enthusiastic. Especially, the London editors who have been very difficult people to reach in any international organization and they have formed a committee to help us. And I'm deeply gratified by that. (23:28)

[ER:] No, I think that's very gratifying. Well now, will the Institute be confined to the North Atlantic countries only?

[Lester Markel:] It is a world institute and-and any free nation can [ER: Any free nation?] send its members to it.

[ER:] Well, that's uh very interesting. Well now, I'm-I'm interested in what you think you can do about *La Prensa*, for instance, when you make your--do your research work.

[Lester Markel:] Well, we can't--the adoption of resolutions will do no good, the case is over for the present at least. We can, as I have indicated, study that case as an example of what might happen and what can be done to prevent similar things happening in the future.

[ER:] Yes, well that's uh that will be of great value because I think to a great many people uh there is very little understanding of what that case has meant in the way of curtailment of freedom of the press and just the feeling that, "oh, well, Argentina has a dictator and nothing can be done about it." But something should--one should be able to do something, even in a dictatorship.

[Lester Markel:] Yes, and I think it's particularly interesting because there is a democratic tradition in the Argentine, and nevertheless this did happen there. Well how did it happen? [ER: How did it happen?] [ER and Lester Markel overlap] Why? Why did it happen in Germany under Hitler? (24:49)

[ER:] Well now, I see that we have to uh give our announcer a chance to say a few words but we'll come right back as soon as he has said his say.

(Break 24:59-25:07)

[ER:] Now we return to our interview with Mr. Lester Markel and continue uh the discussion of how we are-- United States papers uh can help for the-to the better understanding between peoples. And I would like to ask you, Mr. Markel, if you can give us uh an idea of how you think our-our papers in the United States can make a real contribution to this understanding, which is so essential to the peace of the world.

[Lester Markel:] Well, I-I think the important question, the important issue always is this one, as I have stated it before, namely that it is vital in view of the fact that we have this large world role to play, that the newspapers realize their responsibility. In other words, uh they have a tremendous responsibility in the formation of public opinion. Unless our public opinion is well informed, unless it is sound, unless it moves by reason rather than emotion, I think we are in for trouble. Now the newspapers must play an important part in forming that intelligent public opinion. Our-our newspapers, probably I shall say, our newspapers are without the "probably," the best newspapers in the world. But I wonder whether they are good enough in the present emergency. I wonder whether they are providing enough information to bring about that informed public opinion without which the world is going to be lost because the world looks to us. I've said it in a very global momentous way but I really mean it that way, Mrs. Roosevelt.

[ER:] Well, there are a great many questions that occur to me. Um and perhaps I'll have a few minutes later to ask them but I first would like to ask you, what is your appraisal of the present newspaper performance in the United States?

[Lester Markel:] My present appraisal is that the newspapers are doing a better job, a considerably better job than they ever did. But that that job is not sufficient for the present need because in too many instances I think newspapers, and I say newspapers and I ought to include other media of mass communication, even the radio and even television, are doing too much of a job of entertainment and not enough of a job of enlightenment. And I think the problem is to make the important issue of the day as dramatic as any of the sensational stories with which these media are concerned. Now I'm certain it can be done, it requires a great deal of thought, but this problem of presentation is one that requires the study. Now I think the newspapers especially must take the lead in doing that because they are enabled--they are able in a way no other medium of mass communication is able, to give perspective and background. Uh now it is not--that is not a reflection -- I'm very conscious of being on the radio at this moment -- that is not a reflection on radio but on the newspaper. You do have eight columns in which one column can be put in its proper perspective. On the radio you announce first things first and get the first flash and that's ones you register. Now possibly in television that can be corrected, but the newspaper I feel has that large responsibility and it must exercise it. (28:53)

[ER:] Well now, um I-I think you've been rather kind to our newspapers by and large. I think we have, in the United States, some--without question--um some of our papers are the best papers in the world. And because of the fact that we have more sp-newsprint available they probably give more information to people than it is possible for newspapers in other parts of the world. Now the very place that you've chosen for your International Press Institute to have its headquarters, Zurich, has one of the best papers in the world. But--[Lester Markel: That's one reason it was put there.] That's one reason it was put there. Well, I happen to have interviewed their editor while I was in Geneva. And I, therefore, read the paper and I know, but I would say that we also had some of the worst papers in the world in this country. Eh worst because they catered to a public--the worst in the public. The desire for sensation, the desire for the uh horrors that uh naturally happen in any large area of the-of the world and in many cases the-the enlightenment um that you want to give is not asked for by the public and somehow it will take, I think, extraordinarily good and dramatic presentation to make the public read it. Now um how would you improve the possibility for this?

[Lester Markel:] Well, I would like to talk for a moment first on this question of whether we also have the worst newspapers. I think we have among the worst and they probably are the worst because they could

be the best. [ER: They could be without a question the best.] And because we do have the newsprint and the opportunity, and therefore inasmuch as they fall down on their jobs they are the worst. But the papers, I don't think we ought to delude ourselves, there are papers in other countries that are [ER: Just as bad.] just as bad. Including those that are crying for newsprint, and I think possibly if they had twice as much newsprint they'd print twice as much trash [ER: They'd be just as bad as ours.] Yes.

[ER:] I-I think perhaps that is true, but in many of the countries where they are at present most stirred up against us, they have practically no press really because their press is subsidized by the government as it is in India partly and in--it was in the old days in China completely and so forth. Um but I um I-I think you can't compare what uh coverage we have with what coverage they have in almost any other part of the world today. (31:58)

[Lester Markel:] Well, I don't think there is any argument on that score. And what I was saying was really a footnote to come back to your main question as to what can be done [ER: Yes.] to improve the newspapers here. I think i-it's a job that requires the effort, as I have indicated, both of the editor and of the reader. So far as the editor is concerned he must recognize this responsibility. If he is intent on putting out entertainment instead of enlightenment then I think he ought to go buy himself a movie house. I think he ought to get out of journalism because I think he's abdicated his real function. I think there are increasing number of newspapers recognize that. I think there is much more demand for that kind of paper than most editors realize, and that brings me to the second point. In the United States a bad paper exists because it has readers. If the reader didn't buy it, it would wilt away. Therefore, the reader must insist on some of this. The reader must be educated to realize that matters uh that the question of Korea, questions at the UN, are matters of life and death to them. Now it's up to the editor to present it in that form. Now how it can be done is very difficult to lay down the form of a general formula. I think it has to be done case by case. Uh I-I don't know whether I'm permitted to mention *The Sunday Times* but I'll try anyhow. In *The Sunday Times* we do make an effort to present what we call the background of the news in a section that has had a great deal of acceptance, namely the Review of the Week section, where we try to be objective and at the same time informative. And I think we come close to being a national newspaper in view of the fact that half our circulation is outside of New York. And I'm not saying this for advertising purposes but merely to indicate that there is a demand for this kind of thing. And I think the newspapers will find it a help to circulation if they do it also. (33:59)

[ER:] Well, I think there is a demand but I always go back to um something that you will probably remember. That in the campaigns which my husband um took part in, he frequently did not have press with him and yet he won. And I once um had an amusing experience, I was talking to a taxi driver in New York and I noticed that he had one of the papers who was most-vociferously--it was just as much against my husband as it could be, lying on the seat beside him. And yet he turned around and told me how he loved my husband. And I said, "Well, why do you read that paper?" And he said, "Oh, is the paper against your husband?" And I said, "Well yes, it certainly is. What do you read the paper for?" And he said, "Oh I just read the comics and the sports. I never read anything else." Now [Lester Markel: Well--] there's something I think you people have got to uh think about.

[Lester Markel:] But, Mrs. Roosevelt, I discussed this once with your husband and I think there is a little confusion about it, because when you say the newspapers were against your husband, the majority of them, they were against him on the editorial pages. But they continued to print his speeches on the first page [ER: Oh yes. Oh yes.]. And he always said that if he got the first page for speeches he didn't give a hang what happened on the editorial page because many more people read the first page. And I think [ER: That's true.] he was quite correct and I think it was a very shrewd analysis of the situation.

[ER:] Well now, of course, what you have said varies, uh the value of a free press. Namely, eh that no matter how much the publishers or the-the editors or anybody else um may be against something, as long

as the press uh story is kept factual and not slanted, you have got an informative um free press because you're getting the facts. And the person who reads must learn to look at the facts and then make up their own mind with the help of the editorial page or not as they choose. But um--

[Lester Markel:] That is the great test, Mrs. Roosevelt. (36:15)

[ER:] That's the great test.

Lester Markel: Whether opinion is kept out of the news columns. That is the great test of the free and responsible press.

[ER:] That is--that is the great test. If the--if the news columns carry um facts that are not tainted in any way by opinion.

[Lester Markel:] I agree fully.

[ER:] But that is very difficult um uh to get across to people in other countries. Now, for instance, I've been through long discussions in the United Nations uh where they cannot understand that our press and our articles represent individuals and don't represent the government.

[Lester Markel:] I've encountered the same thing and always do.

[ER:] And what are we to do to educate that uh point of view in other countries?

[Lester Markel:] Well, I think to come back to the beginning I think the International Press Institute might do--encourage a series of articles explaining the nature of the American press and uh how it differs from their conception of the press. I think it'd be an important service.

[ER:] You know, I think that is probably one of the most important things that you could do. I've encountered, for instance, in Mr. [Raul] Noriega of Mexico a bitterness about the American press which takes my breath away almost. And in various other places and I think that is something that the Institute can do.

[Lester Markel:] That would be an important step toward the understanding which we're agreed [ER: Between peoples.] must take place.

[ER:] Thank you so much, I'm sorry to say our time is up, but I want to tell you how glad I am, Mr. Markel, that you could be with us today.

[Lester Markel:] Thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt.

[Ben Grauer:] This has been *The Eleanor Roosevelt Program*, recorded in Mrs. Roosevelt's living room in the Park Sheraton Hotel. Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest was Sunday editor of *the New York Times*, Lester Markel. Mrs. Roosevelt and Elliott Roosevelt will be with you again on Monday when our guest will be the well-known mystery writer Rex Stout [1886-1975] and every day Monday through Friday from 12:30-1:15 pm. Till Monday then this is Ben Grauer bidding you good afternoon.

Transcribed from holdings at Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (FDRL)
File(s): 72-30(208)

Transcription: Emily Whaley

First edit: Natalie Hall
Final edit: Seth LaShier

The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project