

Effective Writing: A New Millennium—An Old Challenge

Col Samuel E. Riddlebarger

As the twenty-first century begins, accelerating change is the most notable characteristic of civilization. Technology and society are evolving exponentially and interactively. The world, the nation, and the Air Force must cope with the new and the altered. Yet one challenge facing today's United States Air Force (USAF) leaders has not changed fundamentally—the overwhelming necessity of communicating effectively.

If you hope to succeed in the increasingly complex Air Force and American society, you must learn to travel the information superhighway. But to keep up with—not to mention pass—the traffic on that electronic avenue to advancement, you need the proper skills as well as the right equipment.

In a word (six, actually), you must be able to communicate. It will not be enough to know how to operate the machinery; you will have to know how to get the most out of it. To communicate effectively, one must think, organize, compose, create, speak, and write. Especially write. And good writing is a product of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, erudition, literacy, and other scholarly skills.

You may have the latest umpteen-megabyte Silicon Valley wonder device at your fingertips, but if you can't drive that marvel, you are going to stay in the slow lane. It's not enough to be facile in pulling material from the computer; you also must be adept at putting worthwhile thought *into* the machine.

Bosses want people who can create as well as operate. There are plenty of experts who can store and retrieve stuff. But where does all that stuff come from? And how good is it? Consider the *quality* of much of that verbiage flashing onto the screen. Much of it is pitiful: unnecessary, redundant, shallow, open to misunderstanding, and poorly composed. Bad spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, sentence structure, and organization are common and reduce effectiveness. Sometimes unsupported assertions and outright claptrap undermine the material's credibility. Often there is too much emphasis on speed at the expense of worth.

Col Samuel Riddlebarger, USAF, retired (Journalism, University of Maryland; MPS, Auburn University) was commandant of the Air Force Professional Manpower and Personnel Management School and vice commander, Leadership and Management Development Center, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.

We need more *meaningful* information, not reams of crude, uncoordinated data. Sure, machines that spell, perform some grammatical corrections, translate voice into typescript, and search out relevant data can enhance speed, accuracy, and comprehensiveness; but those marvelous contraptions don't create the end product—you do.

So, can you? Technology is making available amazing tools and systems to enhance written communications, but without the ability to use words, you will not get the job done.

In recent years, much of the guidance on better writing in the Air Force has articulated a common theme: make it simple; avoid big words; keep sentences short; write the way you speak; be informal; write for your audience; use everyday language.

Baloney! (Is that sufficiently short and simple?) Get the fire ready; I'm a heretic. If the nation and the Air Force want better writers, I believe they need a smarter approach. The current game plan is taking us in the wrong direction, and the computer era is accelerating our slide down that dangerous decline.

Our society is losing the keys to advancing civilization: progressive reading and writing skills. Now, if you're not interested in what I have to say on this subject, stop here and read something else. No one reads anything unless he wants to (pleasure, curiosity) or needs to (profession, trade, business, personal welfare), a point I'll return to later.

After pushing a pencil for the Air Force since the mid-1950s from squadron swamps to Pentagon peaks, I've seen plenty of briefings and brochures on how to write more effectively (I have a full file drawer of them). Much of that guidance stressed simplified writing. And some of that advice came from ivory-tower types with little "combat writing" experience. My scar tissue says it ain't necessarily so; simpler is not always better. What you put into your paperwork and what you feed the computer need to be good.

Why must we write down? What's wrong with writing *up*? If, as some say, grade-level literacy is declining, why should we keep retreating instead of fighting to gain ground? As we continue to downgrade vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, grammar, formality, preciseness, style, and other aspects of good writing, we can look forward to communicating with grunts and sign language, while computers talk to one another.

Consider America's "eyesight" as the dawn of the Information Age breaks into full day. In 1986 a federal Department of Education official said, "We are creating a new nation of illiterates."¹ In an article titled "The Illiteracy Blight," *Publishers Weekly* called the situation a national crisis.² Another observer claimed that nearly 60 million Americans could not read or write adequately.³ Have we stopped or even slowed the erosion? I don't think so. Studies and surveys continue to report that, although measurement standards and exact percentages can be argued, literacy levels in the United States are poor. "One-fifth of the population is functionally illiterate," says *Futurist* magazine in an October 1999 article, "The Demise of Writing," by Geoffrey E. Meredith, who predicts that within 100 years "few people will want to read at all, and fewer still will know how to write."⁴ "Well into the computer age, we discover that as a nation we are more communicative than ever but less articulate," says Stanley J. Solomon in *Modern Age*.⁵ Assessing the impact of computers on literacy, Solomon concludes that "the further we distance ourselves from a tradition of fine writing, the more we place in jeopardy even commonplace business writing, losing not only the sense of nuance but even lucidity itself."⁶ Why this ominous trend away from effective writing? Experience and logic tell me that we are emphasizing the wrong things. Why must writing be aimed at the fourth-grade level or the sixth or at whatever arbitrary benchmark? Why set ceilings? Why use the computer as an excuse for poor prose? Why promulgate "fog count" guidance that stultifies the writer's efforts to precisely express himself? (The Air Force says, "Aim High," but don't try that with a pencil in your hand.)

Let's get serious. If we want good writing, we will have to strive for it the old-fashioned way—by working for it. To handle third-millennium hardware, advanced aerospace concepts, and twenty-first-century societal development, we need commensurate writing skills, capabilities that are not acquired overnight.

By now some of you think I'm pushing the pedant's view: big words, fancy sentences, and copious ostentatious obfuscation. Wrong! I'm calling for a return to freedom and progress in writing. I believe in using the *right* word, not necessarily the shortest or longest. The most accurate term usually is the best. If the word has three letters and best represents what you want to say, use it! But if a bigger word more precisely or more persuasively communicates your thought, use *it!* Using the shorter word just because it's shorter is losing sight of your writing objective. Complicated subject matter is not going to become simple by being addressed by a bunch of one-syllable words—it's only going to get screwed up and thus will not be adequately or properly understood by the reader.

A good writer also needs a synonym now and then to avoid excessive repetition. Using *divers* in lieu of *various*, for example, may help hold the reader's attention (even if he thinks you left the *e* off at the end). A healthy vocabulary represents power, communicative power. Just as a great

painter blends a variety of colors and strokes to create a meaningful image, the writer armed with a wide array of words and phrases can convey messages that move his or her reader. Our language is full of evocative words, and we ought to use them!

Furthermore, a more precise word can save time by taking the place of a phrase or sentence, thereby making the communication both sharper and shorter. If I write "anorak" instead of "a heavy jacket of a bulky material, with a hood," haven't I saved words? As to the argument that a reader may not understand the word *anorak*, let him look it up! Better writing is a two-way street. Readers have responsibilities too. Why are we so quick to blame the writer when a reader doesn't know a word's meaning? *Anorak* is used in a novel by an author who has sold millions of books.⁷ Or how about the eminent news magazine that wasn't afraid to use the term *morganatic* to describe the marriage of Wallis Simpson to the Duke of Windsor?⁸

Just as short, simple words aren't always best, staccato sentences aren't always going to get the job right. Sentences may need to have more than three or four words. I don't like to read something written with short, choppy words and sentences; it often resembles a telegram or a computer printout, with the loss in subtle human communication characteristic of such transmission modes. Complex objects and thoughts frequently require complex words and sentences. Why should that surprise or discomfit us?

Society and the Air Force are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Do we really think that complicated equipment and systems can be managed with rudimentary language skills? If USAF members can't read and write adequately, how can they handle F-15s and advanced logistics systems? And legal documents concerned with subtle points of law are written the way they are because they must be as precise and unequivocal as possible, not because lawyers and jurists are playing games.

The long and the short of the writing function ought to be articulated as follows: use the right words and sentences—even if they are long rather than short.

The chiefs, colonels, and generals know that. When the hucksters tell you to straighten out the senior folks and get them to always write at the fourth-grade level, just remember that the general got to be a general while writing the way he or she does. As a veteran of high-level ghostwriting, I have learned that senior officials have reasons for wanting paperwork written their way; and if you don't give it to them that way, someone else will.

Put succinctly, if you think you are going to remodel sensitive, important, or complicated paperwork into McGuffey Reader language, good luck! Writing is usually hard work, and you're not going to become proficient or successful by taking shortcuts.

We are advised also to write for the audience (despite increasing illiteracy?). Well, as I've already asserted, readers need to hold up their end too. There are only two reasons why you ever read anything: interest and need. In neither

case must the writer compromise his meaning because of possible deficiencies in potential readers. The writer's *primary* allegiance should be to his subject, not his audience! (How's that for heresy?) If the author is preparing a nursery rhyme, common words are consistent and appropriate. If the topic is the metaphysical connotations of Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, grab your reference books.

My experience says that good writing requires a definite degree of loyalty to the subject. As for the reader, if she picks up something to peruse for pleasure, she's on her own. I like to read Will Durant, and the reality that I sometimes have to consult a dictionary or an encyclopedia is no deterrent. Mr. Durant was true to his themes, subjects, and objectives; he didn't compromise to accommodate a Virginia mountain boy's limited vocabulary. The point is that it's *my* choice to read Durant, so it's *my obligation* to know or learn the inherent language.

Likewise, if the material is pertinent to one's job or personal life, the reader ought to know the appropriate terms and concepts. When I had to deal with the sometimes abstract and convoluted intricacies of a theater war plan, I had to understand the terms and rationales outlined, even when those key elements were expressed in less than pedestrian words and phrases.

We may have our thinking backward when we insist the writer is wrong because the reader doesn't understand. Before you light the fagots at my feet, let me say that I'm not advocating overwriting. I'm suggesting that we shouldn't underwrite either. Furthermore, I do not deny that some Air Force writing needs to be simplified, only that all of it can or should be.

To cite an example of overemphasis in this regard, a few years ago an Air Force writing manual (a good one, for the most part) criticized the following sentence: "Request this office be notified when your activity's supply of paper clips falls below the 30-day level." The manual suggested that "Let us know when you need more paper clips" would have been better.⁹

I don't agree, for several reasons. First, the original sentence was close enough (see Tip 2 in the attached guide). Rewriting a memo concerning paper clips is wasting time. There wasn't that much wrong with the original version. (Don't call *me* a pedant if you are the kind of nitpicker who would revise a reasonably comprehensible statement regarding a trivial matter.)

Second, the revision doesn't pass the stupidity test (see Tip 1). Do we actually believe that folks won't ask for more paper clips when they need them unless we send them such a memo? When I was a pilot, I didn't need a flight order cautioning me to land when I needed more fuel. The manual's revised memo is rhetorical, a waste of time, because it only states what the reader already knows.

The third problem with the rewrite is the most serious and goes to the heart of my theme in this essay. The revision significantly *changed* the message, making the communication less precise and therefore less informative (see Tip 4). Who

defines "need" in the second version? Sergeant Bilko may order a two-year supply of paper clips, just to be safe or for trading, even though he has enough on hand to last six months. The point is that the original version said something, contained specific, useful information (it apparently established a 30-day policy on paper-clip inventory) and therefore was arguably worth preparing. By trying to be simple and informal, the revision lost sight of the message to be conveyed.

Another so-called good-writing pointer that disturbs me is the suggestion that we should write the way we speak. I don't enjoy conversations laced with "you know," "like, man," "uh," and "I mean," so I certainly don't want to read such drivel. Granted, language is an evolving body that adds new cells (words, phrases) and sheds old ones, but slang can be carried too far. Serious communication, especially writing, must retain a minimum level of formality to remain effective.

If many of us were to write the same way we speak, the written word would constitute a new Tower of Babel. These two modes of communication, speaking and writing, are distinctly different.

The spoken word immediately disappears and is subject to misinterpretation. Even when recorded, statements can be misunderstood. Speakers use mannerisms, tone, body language, inflection, and other techniques like dramatic hesitation to help convey the message; and visual recording still requires the viewer-listener to correctly assess these nuances. I supervised a USAF project that obtained tape-recorded interviews of individuals who served in the Southeast Asia conflict, and those tapes had to be transcribed into typescript (including every "uh," "you know," and "I mean") before they could be used for official purposes.

Since they can't be seen or heard in the literal sense, writers function in a more sterile environment. But the written word typically reflects more careful study and analysis, more reasoned thought and judgment, and more organized resultant form; thus it can be better absorbed, understood, and evaluated; it also puts down a footprint and lasts. (Important in this regard, computer print such as E-mail resembles speech more than writing, in that it tends to be extemporaneous and informal. In essence, computer communications use technology to make conversation synonymous with writing.)

All in all, speakers can be especially emotional and moving, while writers can be particularly logical and efficacious. Nevertheless, as the eighteenth-century French naturalist Buffon observed, "Those who write as they speak, however well they speak, write badly."¹⁰

Having criticized certain guidance on better writing, I've risked appending some suggestions of my own for improving Air Force pencil whipping.

Good writing, I am convinced, has three fundamental characteristics: substance (important information, serious statements, relevant material—worth); clarity (organized, sequential, appropriate words and sentences, using precise and meaningful terms—communication); and force (style, originality, format—impact). And you will not acquire these

writing skills by reducing your printed prose to the “see-Jane-run” level.

As for winning the paper (or computer overload) wars in the twenty-first-century Air Force, the following “Heretic’s Guide” provides some brief tips (learned the hard way!) that I’ve used and added to over many years of blue-suit writing and teaching. These hints may help you. Try them; you’ll like them and reap substantial rewards. And concentrate on the *subject* when you write.

We need better writers in the Air Force, not better data retrievers. And we need readers who are more erudite, not writers who are less literate. Perhaps books will go the way of the buggy, something seen only in a museum. I hope not. If savoring a mystery novel by the fire becomes as archaic as churning butter, life will have lost something for me.

Meanwhile, remember, the mission of the Air Force is to “Fly and Write!”

THE HERETIC’S GUIDE TO BETTER AIR FORCE WRITING

1. Is this paper necessary?
 - Does it pass the “stupidity test”?
 - Don’t contribute to the “paper mill” or data overload.
 - Pick up the telephone or walk down the hall.
 - Avoid CYA files. (Most MRs are sissy.)
2. Use the “close enough” rule.
 - All paperwork is not equal.
 - If it’s routine, don’t sweat grammar, spelling, punctuation, neatness—and longhand may be okay.
 - Speed may be more important than perfection.
3. Clocks, chiefs, and colonels won’t wait.
 - Don’t waste time arguing about the suspense.
 - Forget the old cliché “Do you want it right, or do you want it on time?” (The boss wants both.)
 - Avoid overcoordination. (Don’t ask for opinions you don’t need.)
 - Late can mean useless.
4. Audiences don’t come first.
 - Readers have responsibilities too.
 - Concentrate on the subject.
 - Say what you mean.
 - “KISS” with care. (Cavemen were not good writers either.)
 - Use the *right* words (even if they aren’t the smallest ones).
5. Get to the point.
 - Make the first sentence count.
 - You aren’t writing a murder mystery.
6. Longhand shouldn’t be shorthand.
 - Scribblers never win.
 - Reasonable penmanship saves everybody’s time.
 - Learn to write legibly, especially if you work in the medical field.
7. Get a dictionary and use it.
 - It’s the writer’s best friend.
 - Don’t guess; look it up.
 - That spell-check function won’t always save you.
 - Search for synonyms.
 - Experience the sweet spell of success.
8. Proofread or perish.
 - Double-checking isn’t sissy.
 - A tight paper builds credibility.
 - Don’t develop good prose and then submit trash. (To win the race, you must take the last step.)
 - Don’t blame the typist or the computer; if it’s your paper, it is your responsibility. Learn to spell “assumption.”
 - Murphy was an optimist.
9. Don’t get too cute.
 - Be judicious with abbreviations, acronyms, parochial words and phrases, and jargon.
 - Don’t change nouns into verbs.
 - Be cautious with humor, sarcasm, subtlety, alliteration, and their cousins.
 - Slang can be lazy writing.
 - If uncertain, decide in favor of formality.
10. Clean up the common, telltale mistakes.
 - Who, which, that—use the right one (if you have to use the word at all).
 - Principal/principle, affect/effect, complement/compliment, farther/further, credible/creditable, ordinance/ordnance, capital/capitol, inter/intra, discreet/discrete, lay/lie, imply/infer, continually/continuously, blond/blonde—learn the difference.
 - Promiscuous pronouns will get you in trouble.
 - Misplaced modifiers confuse the reader.
11. Build and use a reference file.
 - Recognized dictionary.
 - Synonym-finder or thesaurus.
 - Grammar guide.
 - World almanac.
 - *Tongue and Quill* (AFH 33-337).
 - One-sheet writing aids (punctuation, capitalization, numbers, possessives, and so on).
12. Keep learning; keep trying.

- Writing is the most important skill in getting ahead.
- You build walls and literacy brick by brick and word by word.
- Develop a positive attitude, a striving to be better.
- Bring passion, integrity, and skill to your writing.
- Read!
- Write!

MORE ON THE HERETIC'S GUIDE

Tip 1. Don't create paper or data that isn't needed or to tell people things they already know or to cover your behind. Maybe a phone call will suffice. And most memos for record just clutter files.

Tip 2. Treat paperwork according to its importance. A statement for the base commander to promulgate on Memorial Day should be worded precisely and typed impeccably. On the other hand, a note to the boss reminding her that today is her husband's birthday doesn't have to be Shakespearean in composition or prepared on flawless letterhead; it's the basic message that matters here, not the nuances or appearance. Save time for important writing by not dawdling over routine stuff.

Tip 3. Respect suspenses. Sometimes they're not reasonable, but don't waste half your time arguing about the deadline. The boss usually (not always) has a valid reason for the short fuse (maybe someone else didn't produce). If you must complain, do so *after* you get the job done. If the wing commander needs the paper in two hours and you don't come through, you may never get another chance. And don't try to get everybody to agree with your words unless you have to; remember, coordination often means only to alert certain offices, not necessarily to get their concurrence.

Tip 4. Consider and respect your subject, your objective. Don't become so engulfed in "Write for your audience," "Check your fog count," and "The paper is no good if the reader doesn't understand it" that you forget what you're trying to accomplish. Good writers get good by making their prose (words, sentences, style, length) fit their subject. Don't ignore your audience, but think about your topic and goal. Use the proper word! Those who read for pleasure are on their own; and those who read for professional or personal reasons have an obligation to learn the pertinent terms. The clichéd admonition, "Keep it simple, stupid," known as the "KISS" rule, if overworked can produce documents so generalized and simplified that they are more stupid than simple.

Tip 5. Don't beat around the bush. Tell readers quickly what your paper is all about. Don't make them read it all to find out. The first sentence should be short, simple (but accurate), meaningful, and in the active voice. The body of the docu-

ment can then etch with more detail, rationale, background, and precision—because you must provide the "beef," the necessary support. Don't go overboard on length, but don't underwrite either; you can *underwhelm* readers as well as overwhelm them. In short, consider the possibility that only the first sentence will capture the reader's full attention (it may determine whether he reads further), but make the *entire* paper worth reading.

Tip 6. Take the time to write legibly! Handwriting is atrophying in these days of the computer keyboard, but it hasn't disappeared or become less important. The medical profession continues to learn that unreadable scribbling is deadly and costly. And the chicken scratching that Air Force secretaries and horseholders have to ponder over is disgraceful. You are a worthless writer and a sorry supervisor if your penmanship is poor.

Tip 7. Let a dictionary help you. You will be a better writer if, as you compose, you verify meaning, check spelling, and seek synonyms (to provide variety). You are not in a spelling bee; it's fair to look up the word. The computer has not made the dictionary obsolete. That spell-right crutch will not keep you from stumbling. Will the machine know whether you meant "bare" or "bear" (I couldn't "bare" those revelations versus I couldn't "bear" those revelations); whether the sheep "was" crossing the runway (one woolly) or the sheep "were" crossing the runway (several woollies), or whether you simply used the wrong word (even if you spelled that word correctly)? If you ensure that you've used the proper word and spelled it right, you've saved time and avoided possible grief. (Did you use "principal" when you meant "principle"? No one will know if you checked it to be sure, but everybody will know you didn't if you mess up the usage and the secretary doesn't catch your carelessness.) And don't risk alienating the reader by being too lazy to consider a synonym for a word you use over and over. Bottom line: vocabulary is like a savings account; as you add words you build compound interest and, oh, what you can buy with that interest!

Tip 8. Read what you sign or prepare! And read it carefully. The refusal to proofread is an inexcusable problem in the Air Force and society (just watch television, read a current novel, or surf the Internet—the typographical mistakes, distorted grammar, and crude composition are disheartening). The boss isn't going to blame the typist or the computer if there's a glitch in your paper. If the document is important (remembering Tip 2), don't weaken the impact of careful composition with careless proofreading; if the words are spelled wrong or put together poorly, the reader may conclude that your thinking and message are just as error-filled. On the other hand, if the manuscript reflects meticulous preparation, the credibility and reputation of the writer are enhanced.

Tip 9. Use the right words, but eschew shorthand. Humor and other informal approaches, jargon, acronyms, abbrevia-

tions, verbs formed from nouns (or, worse, from abbreviations), parochial slang, and such artifices are effective communication shortcuts in some situations (mostly oral), but don't get carried away. Wit is wonderful when it works. Nonetheless, cute may be perceived as cavalier. Unless you're writing a comedy script, be careful with irony, facetiousness, satire, and other avenues along the light side, especially in this age of heightened sensitivities. You may think you were clever; your reader may not. Clarity is the goal, not a short, snappy message that misses the mark. And the reader's responsibility to know pertinent terms can be abused: "I PCSed from that Sierra-Hotel homesteader base because I got a flesh-peddler in my six and had to E-and-E a seven-day opt so I could ice a fogey that put me into a better sleepy-hollow situation." Don't go there!

Tip 10. Don't continue to make the typical mistakes that brand the poor writer. Pick one problem or weak area each week (or even one a month) and take the time to learn the correct usage. You will enjoy the increased respect your writing will receive. Those who know when to use "affect" instead of "effect," or that "consensus" is proper (not "con-sensus" or "consensus of opinion") will get more opportunities to use—and benefit from—their writing skills. Learn to differentiate between words often incorrectly used interchangeably (is your writing style "classic" or "classical"?). And keep your modifiers and pronouns under control. "Pilot praised as instructor crash-lands new fighter." (Say again?) "Sam's dad died when he was 28." (Who died?) Yes, there may be certain rules of grammar that apply in convoluted cases ("Either Sam or the Shea sisters were behind that trick," but "Either the Shea sisters or Sam was behind that trick."), but will the reader know those more obscure rules? When you correctly use "lay" and "lie" (even if you don't care to learn the difference between a transitive and an intransitive verb), discerning readers (like your commander) are impressed. Sure, you may need an hour or more to clearly grasp one of these examples, but, once learned, consider the time (and the rewards) you will save over your career. If you can handle confidently just the terms listed

here in Tip 10, most of your writing competitors will disappear from your rearview mirror.

Tip 11. I've had a file like this since the 1950s, and I've used it *a lot*. Keep the dictionary current (I buy a new one every few years). A good world almanac is a gold mine of useful data; get a new one each year. The Air Force Handbook (AFH) 33-337, *Tongue and Quill*, is a fine guide in preparing Air Force paperwork. The writing guides provide quick answers for everyday questions. If you develop the habit of using these references, you will spit-shine your writing.

Tip 12. Never stop trying to be a better writer. If you do, don't expect promotion. Writing is the one skill indispensable to advancement; ignore it at your peril. The ability to do Immelmans with a pencil will get you a lot more than the ability to do them with an airplane (and I've done both!). Writing skills can be acquired through practice; conviction and honesty come from within and will show in your prose. And the more you read, the better you will write. All in all, the effective writer is the individual who realizes that there is always more to learn—and goes for it!

Notes

1. Robert Barnes, "Losing the War of Letters," *Time*, 5 May 1986, 68.
2. "The Illiteracy Blight," *Publishers Weekly*, 24 May 1985, 27.
3. Jonathan Kozol, "Dehumanizing the Humanities: Scholars and Adult Illiteracy," *Education Digest*, December 1985, 6.
4. Geoffrey E. Meredith, "The Demise of Writing," *Futurist*, October 1999, 28–29.
5. Stanley J. Solomon, "Artless Writing in the Age of E-mail," *Modern Age*, Summer 1998, 322–23.
6. *Ibid.*, 319.
7. Lawrence Sanders, *The Fourth Deadly Sin* (New York: Berkley Publishing Group, July 1986), 33.
8. "The Woman Who Cost a Kingdom," *Time*, 5 May 1986, 39.
9. John C. Smith and Maj John R. Grellman Jr., *Plain English, Please!* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University, 1982), 43.
10. Georges Louis Leclerc de Buffon, quoted in *The Age of Voltaire*, by Will and Ariel Durant (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), 574.