aries were accepted by the United States. Texas expressly retained its public lands.

The government, in suits against California, Texas, and Louisiana, challenged state claims to ownership in the three or more marine mile coastal area. It said first, contradicting practically all international publicists, that no three-mile or other extension of natural boundaries was recognized in 1783, and that its acquisition was due to subsequent assertion by the United States as a nation. If the original states had no ownership beyond the tidelands, no other states had any different position. Even Texas, it was maintained, lost its extended boundary by accepting annexation on an equal footing. The government refused to press an argument it could have used against California. When that state was admitted into the union, the federal government reserved all public lands. It later ceded 500,000 acres to the state, not including any submerged lands. In its recent suit the government's main argument was that federal paramount powers over international affairs, foreign commerce, navigation, and defense were incompatible with state ownership of submerged coastal lands.

The Supreme Court, two justices not voting, decided five to two for the government in the California case in 1947. In the Texas case of 1950 the vote was four to three. The Louisiana case was controlled by the California ruling. The Court elaborated the doctrine of paramount powers, and denied that the states could benefit by estoppel or prescription by reason of more than a century and a half of federal acts and policies in recognition of the claims of the states. Texas lost its submerged lands by coming into the United States on an equal footing, which prior to this decision no one thought meant anything more than political equality within the federal union. Vigorous dissents by Justices Frankfurter and Reed objected to the majority's reading of history and derided the notion that the exercise of admitted federal powers had any necessary relation to the ownership of submerged lands. Curiously, the Court refused to decide that the federal government owned these lands, but only that the states had no authority over the oil resources in them. While the precise points of the cases had not been decided previously, the Court admitted that it was in effect overruling earlier judicial opinion. It also implied that Congress had power to dispose of the disputed lands.

Arkansas is reported to be planning to challenge in the Supreme Court the recent action of Congress in confirming the historic boundaries of the states. It is difficult to find constitutional warrant for any such suit either by a state or by a citizen. Congress has made a political determination in its own sphere. Historically, Congress has made many grants of public land to states and others. The Supreme Court has refused hitherto to review congressional judgment as to appropriations, at the suit of either a state or an individual. Congress, of course, may not renounce constitutional federal powers and delegate them to the states, but no such action is remotely comparable to the present situation. In the past, state-owned submerged lands, and indeed all other property in the nation, whether owned by states or citizens, have always been subject to federal paramount powers. That situation will continue. To find any derogation of federal power in congressional recognition of a jurisdiction the states have always exercised, in loyal subordination to legitimate federal authority, is an absurdity.

A Dangerous Doctrine

The new law is a salutary check on the tendency of the central government to encroach on the proper sphere of the states. What made the doctrine of paramount powers such a menace to the traditional federal-state relationship was that it had no logical limitation to submerged coastal lands. Taken together with the Supreme Court's overruling of precedent, and its denial that estoppel and prescription operate against the federal government, there was nothing to prevent future federal officials from questioning state jurisdiction over resources in lands under the Great Lakes, harbors, bays, and inland navigable waters. Some of these areas are perhaps more significant to the nation as a whole than the Gulf of Mexico. The doctrine of paramount powers, sympathetically enlarged by the courts, would have much appeal to persons who would like to see the states abolished. A little further enlargement of this doctrine would be to deny state jurisdiction over land in the interior if it contained some such resource as uranium.

No one should be misled by occasional efforts to present the submerged lands issue as one between the oil interests and the people. Whether such lands are under state or federal ownership, actual drilling and manufacture will be by private interests, the terms of whose contracts will be about the same under either authority. There is nothing to the notion that the oil in these lands should be kept as a reserve. Reserves are oil products ready for use, not oil still to be located miles underground.

No one really knows whether submerged oil resources are as vast as some estimates, or of comparatively minor importance. So far private interests have spent more than they have obtained in revenues under their leases and licenses. In the meantime, since the federal government retains control over the continental shelf resources beyond the historic boundaries of the states, an interesting opportunity is afforded for efficient state and federal cooperation.

The Audience Is Everybody

By FLORA RHETA SCHREIBER

Are mass communications producing a new kind of man with a mass mind? The answer depends far more on the individual, on his "growing up," than on the new media.

During the recent Dulles-Robertson telecast on the negotiations with Syngman Rhee, I heard a woman remark: "Dulles needs a shave." "No," replied her husband, "that must be some technical defect of the screen. Dulles wouldn't be seen that way." Whether or not Secretary Dulles needed a shave is not important. What is important is this new intimacy between public officials and the people, this almost universal acquaintance with the leading figures and issues of the day.

Only a short while ago the audience for any kind of communication constituted little more than a handful of the total population. Today that handful has become everybody. The change, first brought about by compulsory education, then by the popular newspaper and magazine, has received a big push from the newer mass media—the movies, radio, and now television. These newer media, which supplement and even supplant church and school, profoundly influence our way of life and our behavior, our outlook and our very thoughts.

Their influence is indirect rather than direct; they inform or entertain rather than teach. But information, too, is influence. If I tell you something and you act on it, I am influencing your action whether or not your action is what I wanted or its very opposite. These newer mass media exert more influence over the uneducated than over the educated, over the nonserious than the serious. There is, in fact, a clear cleavage between the tastes of the cultivated minority and the uncultivated majority. Criticizing the broadcasters, Lee De Forest, the inventor of the vacuum tube, has this to say: "This child of mine, now thirty years in age, has been resolutely kept to the average intelligence of thirteen years. Its national intelligence is maintained moronic, as though you and your sponsors believe the majority of listeners have only moron minds."

And yet, according to a recent survey, 70 per cent of the radio audience is extremely pleased with what it gets and believes that radio is doing a better job for the community than local government, schools, or newspapers. Thirty per cent of the audience, however, agreeing with De Forest, is not pleased. It feels that the average program does not meet its needs; that it is not being given the required service in terms of what a free radio should undertake in a democracy.

The majority runs from seriousness and thought as from a pang of conscience. They want to escape, to forget, to avoid any confrontation with life and its meanings. It is a flight by young as well as old; in fact, by young even more than old. Radio preference among those between fifteen and twenty-five is strongly for popular music and against public affairs programs; for entertainment, pure and simple. It is on this flight, on this denial of experience and of thought, that mass entertainment is built.

This is not to say that the mass media have not fulfilled a serious mission. "Invitation to Learning," a program devoted to great books and the ideas deriving from those books, after six months on the air, reached an audience of a million people in nearly forty cities to which the program was piped. Currently, at its peak it reaches two million in one broadcast.

TV and World Issues

The role that television played in the last Presidential campaign is further evidence of the mass media's serious mission. According to a survey made by the University of Michigan as reported in the *Scientific American,* slightly over half the population followed the campaign on television even though only two out of five homes have television sets. This means that people left their own homes to watch the campaign on television. Three out of five people who watched on television but who also made use of other media considered television their most important informational source.

The campaign on television had a greater impact on those with only a grammar school education than on college people. The television presentation of the campaign meant most to those who had an income of $5,000 or more a year, but who had not gone to high school. This suggests that television is meeting the need for political information primarily among people whose social status demands that they be informed, but whose lack of formal education has not given them a taste for reading.

Television is ubiquitous, as the coronation of Queen Elizabeth so strikingly demonstrated. Few people were admitted to Westminster Abbey, yet the entire world was witness to the Abbey's pro-