

1 A Courtesy Campaign

Bob Edwards, host: Nearly half of all American adults have wireless telephones. People are buying them at a rate of 46,000 a day. The rise of portable phones has been accompanied by a rise in complaints about mobile phone manners. A few cities have passed laws restricting their use. [But San Diego's trying a different approach, appealing to cell phone users with a courtesy campaign.](#) From member station KPBS, Scott Horsley reports.

Scott Horsley Reporting: It seems to be happening more and more, in restaurants, movie theaters, even in church.

Soundbite of Cell Phone Ringing Horsley: When it comes to the shrill interruption of a ringing cell phone, no place it seems is sacred.

Reverend Wendy Craig-Purcell: Well, if we're in the middle of prayer and meditation, I usually just ignore it. And I may make a comment afterwards, something like, "Well, you know, maybe the spirit of God is truly calling us and wanting our attention." ∥

Horsley: Not everyone is as forgiving as Reverend Wendy Craig-Purcell of San Diego's Church of Today. And not everyone views the cell phone as an instrument of divine intervention. [When San Diego Mayor Susan Golding conducted an Internet survey last year, thousands of people responded calling for restrictions on cell phone use, especially in movie theatres.](#)

Mayor Susan Golding: I know that I've been in the movies. And it's at the quiet time when everyone's on the edge of their seat and the phone rings next to you and the person starts to talk in a very loud voice.

Horsley: But rather than proposing regulation, Mayor Golding has launched a voluntary courtesy campaign, urging wireless phone users to mind their mobile manners. The campaign includes stickers that business can display, reminding customers they're in a quiet zone. The mayor herself posted a sticker outside one movie theatre as Doug Cohen looked on in approval. Cohen is a real estate broker whose own cell phone gets plenty of use, but he agrees there ought to be limits.

Doug Cohen: I have a very good friends that I won't eat lunch with. They just can't get away from it. So it's ... there's an etiquette. It's just like driving or anything else, you know. Some people will subscribe to a certain politeness and some people won't. But it's nice that there's an issue raised here. ∥

Horsley: San Diego might seem like an unlikely place to raise the issue of rude cell phone use since the cell phone industry is one of the city's biggest employers, with companies like Qualcomm and Nokia. [But Nokia is actually sponsoring the mayor's](#)

courtesy campaign. Vice President Larry Paulson says customers should set phone to vibrate rather than ring in certain settings, and sometimes even turn their phones off.

Larry Paulson: Certainly, I think everyone agrees with this. In certain public areas such as movie theaters, plays, churches, museums, and libraries, talking can be very disruptive and, essentially, it's a violation of basic courtesy.

Horsley: Cell phone companies realize a public backlash isn't good for their business. And with communities in Ohio and New Jersey already banning cell phone use behind the wheel, the industry may see a courtesy campaign as a way to head off further government regulation, like the beer companies urging their customers to drink responsibly. \\\

Instead of a strict enforcer, Mayor Golding hopes to play a gentle Miss Manners. The real Miss Manners, newspaper columnist Judith Martin, thinks that might work better, anyway.

Judith Martin: If you use the heavy hand of the law for everyday trivial things, you create this state where everybody is angry at everybody else, where the courts are clogged up. This is a very simple thing we're talking about: don't disturb people, you know. Don't talk at eh movies. Don't talk on the phone in the movies. Don't talk to the person next to you in the movies.

Horsley: Martin says it's not unusual when new technologies develop for people to believe they're in an etiquette-free zone. But gradually, a consensus develops about how the tools should be used. With cell phones, she says, we're halfway there. \\\

People agree that others shouldn't annoy them with their phones, but they don't necessarily apply the same rules with themselves. That will be the challenge, as Mayor Golding demonstrated during a news conference kicking off her courtesy campaign.

Mayor Golding: I think we will influence a great number of people to stop and think.

Soundbite of Cell Phone Ringing

Mayor Golding: For example, my phone is ringing right now. But I think we will influence a lot of people to turn off their cell phones or to put them on vibrate.

Clearly, there are places...and this doesn't even hang up well. But because I want to be courteous and not answer it during this press conference.

Horsley: The mayor later explained that hers was a new phone, and she hadn't figured out all the settings. She got a quick lesson from the Nokia vice president in how to turn off the ringer. For NPR News, I'm Scott Horsley in San Diego.

1. Reverend Wendy Craig-Purcell: Well, if we're in the middle of prayer and meditation, I usually just ignore it. And I may make a comment afterwards, something like, "Well, you know, maybe the spirit of God is truly calling us and wanting our attention."
2. Mayor Susan Golding: I know that I've been in the movies. And it's at the quiet time when everyone's on the edge of their seat and the phone rings next to you and the person starts to talk in a very loud voice.
3. Doug Cohen: I have a very good friends that I won't eat lunch with. They just can't get away from it. So it's ... there's an etiquette. It's just like driving or anything else, you know. Some people will subscribe to a certain politeness and some people won't. But it's nice that there's an issue raised here.
4. Larry Paulson: Certainly, I think everyone agrees with this. In certain public areas such as movie theaters, plays, churches, museums, and libraries, talking can be very disruptive and, essentially, it's a violation of basic courtesy.
5. Judith Martin: If you use the heavy hand of the law for everyday trivial things, you create this state where everybody is angry at everybody else, where the courts are clogged up. This is a very simple thing we're talking about: don't disturb people, you know. Don't talk at eh movies. Don't talk on the phone in the movies. Don't talk to the person next to you in the movies.

2 Give me my place to smoke

My name is Michael, and I've been smoking for fifteen years.

My name is Peggy, and I've been smoking for probably thirty and thirty-five years.

Peggy and Michael sit in a smoky neighborhood bar in Washington D.C., a cigarette perched in each other's hands. They say there are fewer and fewer places like this, where they feel completely comfortable lighting up, and they expect the EPA report on secondhand smoke to contribute to further restrictions on smoking in public places. They both say they are keenly aware of the reception they get when they smoke, and how that has changed over the years.

Thirty-five years ago you really didn't give a lot of thought to smoking. Now you do. And of course you're finding that it's much less acceptable, much less popular, shall we say, to be smoker. And I don't know how much of that is basically political, and how much is apolitical. I don't like the atmosphere today, not only for smoking, but I find that that's true in many other areas of freedom. //

How do you experience it? How do you get that feeling from other people?

Well, fifteen years ago you didn't think about it. You walked in to someone's house and they would offer you an ashtray. You don't do that anymore. I don't even ask anymore. "Is it OK if we smoke?" because for a while there it was. "Well, I really wish you wouldn't."

And that was awkward?

No, it wasn't awkward; it's just that you learn not to ask anymore, and just assume that it's not right.

I found it awkward.

You go to parties now. You know, where it used to be that everybody was standing around with a cocktail in one hand and a cigarette in the other and blabbing, and now you see the smokers, kind of ... if it's an apartment, furtively standing around an open window, or if it's a house, standing outside in groups. It's pretty common. //

Has it changed your smoking habits in any way?

That's hard to say. I will say this: I know that I'm much more cognizant of my surroundings. For example, if I walk into someone else's office any more, I would never think to take a cigarette. And like he said, in someone's home, you wouldn't automatically sit down and have a cigarette. So in that regard, yes.

Yeah. I mean, I've develop a whole body language about smoking in groups and in places where it is permissible to smoke.

Oh, yes.

It's ... take a drag.

As you are doing right now.

Right, blow it straight up in the air so that it doesn't get in anybody's face, then try to hold your cigarette so that the wind catches, whatever wind there is catches it so that it goes away from the group. So after a while, you look like a factory. You're blowing smoke straight up, and you've got this cigarette flying out in the air there, //

it's whole body language.

And you do look a bit strange, you're right, now that you say that. Do you feel any

defiance?

I don't think I do. I've never felt a desire to inflict my habit on anybody else.

I guess I don't mean inflict your habit. I think when I mean defiance, what I mean by that is, if you are in an area where it is totally acceptable to smoke, that...but you know that there is someone there who doesn't really want you to smoke.

Yes, yes. Actually, one afternoon I was coming home from work. I was walking up Connections Avenue and I had my Walkman on. It had been kind of a rough day, and I was puffing away on a cigarette and walking up the street, and someone came around in front of me and pointed behind me. So I took my Walkman off, and turned around, and there was this man standing there, and he was going, "Excuse me, your cigarette is in my eyes."

And you were outside.

I was outside, on the sidewalk. And I looked at him, and I said, "Well, then walk in front of me." And I just felt like he was his own private smoking patrol. It had nothing to do with any kind of physical discomfort I was causing him.

And did you wonder if, the next day, he was part of the fur patrol? That's what I think I mean about defiance. I find that in myself, that when they make a judgment, and that's basically what they're doing, they're making a judgment on my behavior. //

Do you understand at all, though, this strong feeling that people have about smoking, that if they're not a smoker, they don't want to be around it, they don't want to inhale the smoke?

Yes, I can understand it. Sure. I mean, I've really knuckled under... I have changed my habits to respect the rights of people who don't want smoke around them, and I'm much more cognizant of how my smoking might be affecting the general area. If I'm in a smoking section, I feel that I'm entitled to smoke. If they take away that smoking section, I won't smoke in there anymore.

I wouldn't go there anymore, If it's a matter of spending my money in a restaurant, for example, I wouldn't spend my money there. But in regard to that, yes, I understand it, but I also feel, again, back to equity. Give me my place to smoke. That's all I ask.

Peggy and Michael both live in Washington, D.C. //

3 Kids and the media

The excesses of the media came under scrutiny this month over how **young people** are used as sources in news stories. ABC News has been under fire for airing an interview with six-year-old Elian Gonzalez, as many other networks for airing a home videotape of the child. Last year, CNN was criticized when it broadcast phone calls from students at Columbine High School as the shootings there were taking place. NPR's Rick Karr reports on the choices journalists make in dealing with children in the news.

//

When ABC's Diane Sawyer introduced her interview with Elian Gonzalez, she referred to one of the **bedrock** rules of the **craft** of journalism: Get the story **straight from the source**.

And even though the media has had him under twenty-hour-a-day **surveillance** and written, by our **calculation**, 11,984 articles about the politics of all this, not one of us has **sat down and looked in to his eyes**.

Just looking into his eyes would have been fine, according to Bob Steel. E's a journalistic ethicist at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida.

The problem is when he was interviewed. For Diane Sawyer or any other journalist to ask him questions of the weight that were asked of him about **his mother and the loss of his mother**, about whether he wants to stay in Florida, in the United States, or **return to Cuba**- these are questions that are **beyond the grasp** of a six-year-old in terms of taking with a journalist in a meaningful way. //

Steel says journalists need, first and foremost, to consider whether or not a child is mature enough to actually shed light on a story. An immature child may not know **fact** from **fantasy** and while that's no big deal if the story is on, say, Chicagoans' hopes for this year's White Sox, where a six-year-old might have as much to say as any other **pundit**, it's much more pressing a concern when **international relations** or **criminal allegations** are **at stake**. It's not solely a matter of **chronological age**, Steel says; **trauma** can make even adults **regress** to childhood. Steele says journalists need to step back and fight the urge to get it done right this second.

Slow down enough that you can assess the situation and assess the individuals who may be the witnesses and may be the interview sources in a particular story, and to **ascertain** the best we can at that moment **what kind of vulnerability** they may have. //

Sometimes witnesses to a crime can be vulnerable in terms of **the perpetrator going after those witnesses**.

Bob, is it outside the school right now or are they still inside, can you tell?

They're inside....they're inside the building. I haven't seen...

CNN and a local Denver television station were criticized last year when they broadcast this tape and others like it: **cell phone calls** from students hiding in and around Columbine High School, which Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris could, in theory, have used to **pinpoint** the locations of their intended victims. They're OK. One of my friends is still in the school, though.

Really?

I guess his mother paged hi. He called her back, said that he's ... I guess he's in the choir room.

Suzanne McCarroll was on the scene at Columbine High School that day. She's a reporter with KCNC, Denver's CBS station. She says in breaking news situations, judging **right from wrong** is a matter of gut instinct.

A lot of time I look at the those kids' faces I think, "Oh, my God, this could be one of my kids and am I doing something that's OK if this were my child, if somebody came up and started interviewing my child about whatever given topic or grilling my child with those questions?"

McCarroll says when she's interviewing kids, parental consent doesn't mean much. Sometimes parents are **more confused than kids** and sometimes they give their consent for the wrong reasons. Suzanne McCarroll won praise from media critics for her sensitive handling of Columbine. But journalism is a deeply competitive field and sometimes the urge to scoop the competition trumps the gut check. So had she been in Diane Sawyer's shoes, would she have interviewed Elian?

I don't know...I...you know, I would hat to...I don't know. I...truthfully, I uses, I don't think I would've, but I'm not in her position.

Suzanne McCarroll says the bottom line of practicing ethical journalism where children are concerned is **context**. What's going on around the kid in question? How has the reporter couched the interview?

Bob Steel of the Poynter Institute says it would be hard to confuse the tape of Elian Gonzalez, provided to the media on Thursday by his Miami relatives, with journalism. The question is: When it showed up on the evening news, **how was it presented?** Steel says the listeners, readers, and viewers need to keep questions like that in mind. Rick Karr, NPR News.

4 Is it a sculpture, or is it food

In the near future, you might be able to buy a tomato in the supermarket that has been genetically designed and engineered, a tomato that would stay ripe much longer, strawberries that are not so fragile in freezing temperatures, vegetable oil that's lower in fat. Already on the market: a **gene-spliced product** that's used in cheese making. There are impressive claims being made for **genetic manipulation** of food, including production increases that could help alleviate world hunger. But there's also concern, and indeed some fear, about the use of gene-splicing techniques; and last week more than 1,000 chefs from restaurants all around the country made a **pledge** they will not serve such foods, and they'll work to see that genetically engineered foods are labeled as such. It was announced back in May that no special labeling would be required. Joyce Goldstein has joined the **boycott**. She's the owner of Square One Restaurant in San Francisco. //

When I first heard about it, I thought, well, they're not even talking about flavor. The only thing they're talking about is how long they can keep the damn thing in the shelf.

You are talking about tomato, basically.

Basically the tomato. You know, you worry how long they want to keep it. Is it a sculpture or is it food? And I just kept thinking, I hope that we will get to find out more about this, and that they'll do some testing. For example, if they're using these **trout genes** in other products, and we have customers with fish allergies, are they going to get sick?

There's the idea that they would use a fish gene to make tomatoes more frost-resistant.

Right, well I mean, will people with fish allergies have responses to this, or will that be so **sublimed** that they won't have any effect? I guess the thing is, when a new product comes on the market like this, number one, you'd like to be aware that it's being sold to you, and number two, you'd like to know that they have checked out all of these ramifications before they put it on the shelf. //

It sounds like your concerns are more practical than others'. Other people are talking about science fiction food; and I've heard it referred to as "Franken food" in the past.

Well, you know, it's very easy to **poke fun at**—and I want to put this in quotes—"progress." I mean, those of us that were attached to typewriters, I think, poked fun at people using computers until we started using them. So I don't want to sound like I'm some old **fogey** saying, "In the old days we didn't do it that way." If they would come up with a wonderful product through genetic—I mean, they've done wonderful roses with genetic breeding that are perfectly beautiful and still have some

scent- If they could do this and prove it was safe to the public, I'm not going to say it's a bad thing. All I'm saying is, right now we have a lot of nonknowledge about this stuff, and until things are tested and until we know what they taste like and how they are, we don't want to put them on the menu.

There's an argument that's being made that this could be, I've seen one quotation, "the biggest **boon** to corporate profits since frozen food." that this could be that big a breakthrough in the food area.

Well, they're always worrying about corporate profit. What if the stuff turns out not to be good?

I got a letter from a lady the other day, who said she's the wife of a scientist, and she would prefer to serve genetically engineered food to her children, and I shouldn't worry because it's under the wonderful eye of the Food and Drug Administration, and she will boycott my restaurant as long as I boycott these foods. And I started thinking, God, with an attitude like that I certainly don't want her eating in my restaurant anyway.

But also, I mean the Food and Drug Administration has not been foolproof. I think we just need to see a little bit more data on this, and I think it's too soon to tell. //

Now you're very concerned, I'm sure, about **pesticide residue** in the foods that would reduce the dependence on pesticides in the field.

I think that's a good thing. I'm just concerned when they start crossing trout with tomatoes as to what happens. I'm concerned. I will be delighted if they can make something taste wonderful and not have chemicals and pesticides. When you read that the first person that it's good for is **agribusiness**, and that they will put these things at the market or try to sell it to use without letting us know, I think we are the right to know. I think when we have the choice to say I'm going to buy it, or I'm not going to.

Joyce Goldstein, the owner and head chef of Square One Restaurant in San Francisco.

5 What's happening to Home?

Hey, come on in.

My work came home last week. It's not that I've never worked at home, but this was different. This job means our daughter's bedroom has been turned into a mini-studio and our house suddenly seems like the Bethesda bureau of NPR. During my recent vacation to get ready to come over to this show, an interview was arranged with Maggie Jackson. Her new book is called *What's happening to home? Balancing Work,*

life, and refuge in the Information Age. She came into NPR's New Work studio while my engineer came to me.

The fusion of work and home is not a new phenomenon. In earlier centuries, many families lived above the store. But Maggie Jackson says that while there are similarities, there are also major differences. //

Because of technology, we are able to have our bodies at home, but our minds in a different place. When you're on the laptop, your mind is in somewhere else, usually. Your body might be home. So you have a different relationship with the people at home. You are doing work that separates you mentally from the home.

Your book actually began with your own exploration, right? I mean, as I write an interviewer...

Yes.

...and raising two small children, your work lines began to blur at home. You wrote about, for example, trying to hurry your kids to bed so you could get back to work.

Yes, that was, although I can't say it only happened just once, that was a sort of eureka moment. For me, I was writing about the world of the workplace, the work/life balance, and noticing that the lines were blurring and also, at the same time at home, I was gaining the technology to be more flexible in my work. I could come home for dinner, put the kids to bed, finish a story or interview people in California- and I'm on the East Coast- and I had a lot of flexibility. At the same time, I felt as though my work was seeping and leaking and bleeding into the rest of my house. //

Let me tell you my situation here. I love the fact that I'm sitting at home right now. I've had a cup of coffee, I'm sitting in a very comfortable armchair. I have a beautiful view. Now that being said, I do have a home office now and I feel as if, if I close the door, the office is going to be... there. How else can one set psychological boundaries in the home to keep work from interfering, aside from a physical boundary?

Well, I think that boundary is the perfect word to use because I am certainly not saying that all technology automatically means the work takes over your life or that, in this day and age, all the changes that are going on are bad, I think that the—you know, are making is important, and I think that in this age we don't make enough boundaries. //

I'm looking at page 123 of your book, and you quote Olivier Marc, "Home allows us to create an area of peace, calm and security, for once we have crossed the threshold and shut the door behind us, we can be at one with ourselves, and we're not

necessarily talking about architecture and physical doors.

Exactly. And I just found so many pieces of the picture all around me that show that that kind of experience of home is being lost if we continue down the road. Not everyone lives in futuristic households. I wrote about an apartment in New York City where a currency trader has video monitors all around the apartment, including in the arm of a sofa, so he can watch the markets. Now this is the kind, again, of sort of sci-fi apartment that few of us will ever have. But at the same time, I think that we are marching down that road in little daily decisions that we make.

Are all Americans facing these sorts of issues? What about those who are not in these maybe high-tech, high-creative, high-paying jobs? Are they facing these same issues?

I think in many ways they are, and many more people will be facing these issues as technology, computers, etc., gadgets become smaller and less expensive. I interviewed secretaries all around the country and just in the last few years they have gotten cell phones and they're checking their voice mail and e-mail on vacations, on sick days. They really felt often as if their home wasn't a refuge as a result, and I think that we are going to find more and more people are going to be facing the kinds of problems and dilemmas I describe.

Maggie Jackson, thanks a lot.

You're welcome. Thank you.

Maggie Jackson is the author of *What's happening to home? Balancing Work, life, and refuge in the Information Age.* //

6 Create Controversy to Generate publicity

Benetton has produced a set of controversial ads which, even in these hard times for advertising revenues, magazines are turning down. The three controversial ads depict a very young nun kissing a priest, a newborn baby only seconds old, and a little blonde white girl next to a little black boy whose hair is fashioned into something that looks a little bit like horns. Our own Bob Garfield, in his other life, is the advertising critic for *Advertising Age* magazine, and since he has opinions about practically everything, and professionally he has opinions about advertising, we called in. //

Bob, what about these ads? What do nuns and priests and newborns and little toddlers blonde and black have to do with selling T-shirt?

Well, they have everything to do with us doing this interview right now. An important element of this whole campaign is to create controversy and to generate publicity, which not only has an immediate value all of its won, it also enhances every consumer exposure to Benetton ads in their natural habitat, so that when you're paging through some magazine and run across a picture of this newborn baby covered with the blood and the vernix and with the umbilicus still attached, instead of casually passing it, being aware of the controversy, you're apt to look at it more seriously and to react one way or another-probably with anger or disgust, is my guess. //

I think that if you were paging through a magazine and saw this picture, you would stop cold, even if you'd never heard of the ad or Benetton...because it is such an arresting picture, this baby, you could stop cold, even if you'd never heard of the ad or Benetton...Because it is such an arresting picture, this baby.

Well, it is that,...uh, arresting, some would say disgusting. And I suppose the Benetton people would say that it's magnificent and natural. Uh I think a large intestine is natural and kind of magnificent in its way, but I sure don't want to see it in the middle of a fashion magazine, though I suppose that's next. //

Essence and Child magazines did not take the ad with the two children. *Self*, which published the baby, refused the nun. *Cosmo* decided it did not see itself with a newborn baby in its pages. Now, were you surprised? I mean. I'm surprised by that. This is a double page ad, and magazines are awfully skinny; it seems to me they're being awfully touchy about it.

Oh, I don't know if awfully touchy is right. I mean, I frankly don't think Benetton really expected these ads to be accepted by anyone. I'm little surprised that the newborn one was in the pages of *Self*, which published the baby in its pages. The ads were created for the express purpose of ticking people off, for creating controversy, for inflaming consumer outrage, and so forth and so on, and it's really very cunning advertising, Linda, for a lot of reasons. Not only is there the publicity benefit, they also are a great example of what I call distraction marketing. And it's distracting, because, rather than focus on trying to come up with some sort of rational benefit for buying a \$49 cotton T-shirt, which Benetton knows is not a rational kind of consumer behavior, they're kind of playing a little three-card monte in creating a distraction over here so you won't pay attention to the facts of the matter over on the other side, the facts of the matter being that a \$119 cardigan sweater is not a particularly good buy.

Thanks very much.

My pleasure.

Bob Garfield, when he is not appearing on national Public Radio, is the advertising

critic for *Advertising Age*. //

7 A Contribution to Make the World a Better Place

April is tax time, so Morning Edition will spend Tuesdays this month talking about money and what it means to rich people, the poor, and those in between. NPR's special correspondent Susan Stemberg starts her series with one of the world's wealthiest men, financier and philanthropist George Soros.

Retired now, Gorge Soros ran a hedge fund, buying and selling stocks and bonds and speculating in currencies and became a multibillionaire. //

You said that the responsibility of handling money makes you acutely anxious?

Naturally, because if you manage other people's money, you take risks. And that means that you can lose. So there's a tremendous tension. It gives you sleepless nights, psychosomatic diseases. I used to have backaches. And, in fact, the backaches used to be very useful to me in telling me that there's something wrong in my portfolio. My back seemed to know it before my brain did.

Imagine if Wall Street had known that. They'd have sent him for daily X-rays. This is a man who's given backaches, too. His currency may have contributed to Asia's financial crisis, a charge he denies. The story of George Soros and money began in Budapest where he was born seventy years ago. His father was a lawyer who liked living well. Then the Nazis invaded Hungary and young George started his economics education. //

When I was fourteen, being Jewish, we assumed false identities and we lived sort of underground. And my father used me to trade in currency because a fourteen-year-old boy is not suspected to be carrying currency. So he thought it was less dangerous for a kid to do it.

Especially when the kid had blue eyes and blonde hair. While the father helped Hungarian Jews get false papers, his teenager got lessons in trading. Someone had a gold bracelet he wanted to sell. "It's worth a lot of money," he told young George, who ran it to black marketers and got a lesson: Sellers' estimates are not always reliable.

I learned that fast.

So when you went sell it, they said, "Oh, but look at this thing. It's full of dents.

It's awful. It's not worth anything."

That's all right, that's all right.

You learned that.

That's right.

But you also learned about gold being a commodity.

Right, right. That's right.

So they gave you that idea.

Well, of course.

And that the price of it could go up and down.

Right, right.

But these lessons could get you killed with Nazis on the street. Frightening for a teenager? No, says George Soros.

It was like the film *The Raiders of the Lost Ark*. You know, you go through tremendous perils but you come through unscathed.

Indiana Jones in Budapest. All he needed was the hat.

For a child of fourteen, to be exposed to that kind of adventure is a gift. That experience was, in some ways, the happiest time of my life. It's a strange thing to say when you know that there's tremendous suffering around you. But we were fighting evil. //

The Nazis, later the Communists. Soros says those experiences helped shape him into a high-finance risk taker. He left Hungary at seventeen, studied economics in London, came to America in 1956 with \$4000 in his pocket, he thinks.

I don't remember anymore, you know. The figures are so small, they don't mean anything.

A few thousand and a plan. Make half a million dollars on Wall Street in five years, then retire, live on \$50000 a year and become a philosopher, his real interest. But George Soros outperformed his five-year plan, showed a talent for making big money and he says got sucked into the world of business. Money made Soros influential, and he liked that. But there were drawbacks.

In fact, I felt rather uncomfortable because I was appreciated for my ability to make money. And in reality, I would have liked to be appreciated for other qualities. And...

Like what?

Well, let's say as a thinker. I was much more interested in ideas. I sought people with whom I could talk about those things rather than people who wanted to talk stock and stock market.

So money itself, the pursuit of it, has never been that interesting to you.

No. I think trying to anticipate the future, that is fascinating. And it is almost addictive, and to see whether you're right. So that is what captured me.

You know, when we think about money, pretty much all we think of, ordinary people like us, is what it can buy. It sounds as if that was never really your driving force.

I mean, of course I like to live well and I like my comfort and I particularly like the idea that I don't really have to worry about money when it comes to spending. I don't need to be concerned how much something costs. For instance, I don't need to have a private plane.

You don't have a private plane?

I don't have a private plane. I don't need to have a private plane.

Got a nice boat anywhere?

I don't need a boat. Money gives me- now that I have a lot of money, it gives me a sense of freedom, which is wonderful. And then, of course, it enables me to pursue my ideas, which is also wonderful. //

Well, I read somewhere you said your full pursuit is no longer making money. Now it's saving the world.

Well, that's maybe an exaggeration. But yes, why not call it that? Yes. I'd like to make a contribution to make the world a better place. And I think that is possible.

His foundations allocate half a billion dollars a year in some thirty-one countries, mostly Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. His lives of thousands have been touched by this man, whose personal wealth exceeds that of some nations.

When you walk on a city street and see homeless people sleeping on grates, how do you react to that?

I don't give money to beggars as such. I don't think that's the way to change things. And I also don't look for personal gratitude.

So if someone comes to you and says, "You made such a difference in my life, the work of the foundation."

Well, of course, it's nice to be

You like that

It's nice to hear it.

Yeah.

I am pleased to know that money has reached them. In effect, I avoid situations where people would come up to me.

Is it embarrassing to you?

It is embarrassing. It's not the reason I do it. And so it's not something that I seek.

George Soros, philanthropist, financier, author of several books on global capitalism. If he remembered at all, Mr Soros says, he'd like it to be as a practical philosopher trying to understand what life is all about. I'm Susan Stamberg, NPR News, Washington. //

8 Medicine by the Minute

From Wallingford, Vermont, comes one solution to the crisis in front-line medicine. Like so many other doctor, osteopath Lisa Grigg had it with insurance companies and insurance forms, so she hung out a shingle as an acute care provider and decided that her clinic would accept no insurance at all. Patients would be charged according to a fee schedule they could easily understand. //

I charge \$2 a minute for my labor, and we have to charge a little bit here and there for parts once in a while.

Let's say I want in with, you know, a bruise or a cut and you had to bandage me up.

I'd still charge for my labor. I'd have to also charge for a suture tray because my instruments will have to be sterilized after I use them on you, and a little bit for an injection.

Hmm.

Hoping we want to anesthetize you.

So I really get an itemized bill here and I know exactly what I'm paying for.

Right.

And charge me by the minute and by the part.

Yep.

Where'd you get this idea?

From my mechanic. //

From your mechanic?

Yes. I was just feeling fed up with the way the practice I was in was running, which was an owned clinic and doing a lot of managed care and capitated care, and there was an awful lot of paperwork and an awful lot of tail chasing and an awful lot of fighting with insurances for tests or medicines that patients needed and I just wanted to get back to being a doctor and treating patients. And I was at my mechanic's and I thought, "Boy, wouldn't that be nice if I could just put up a board like he's got that says so much for labor and so much for parts and keep it really simple?"

And if I visited your clinic, your office, would I see the price list up in the office?

Yes, you would. It's a felt board with some pressed-in white letters and that's what it says on it: part and labor. //

Hmm. Now does this check out? I mean, some people might have health insurance coverage and they might say, "Well, if you accepted insurance, I would only be charged for a co-pay personally and it might be less expensive." Or does it work out just as well?

It's really comparable. Sometimes I'm a little less than the average co-pay here, which has been \$10 and is creeping up to \$15 with the various plans. And I'm very careful to emphasize that I'm doing acute care, which is the simple stuff: cough, cold, cut, sprain. I have an acute care clinic and I don't want people leaving their primary care

physicians to come see me. I encourage people to stay with their primary care and go ahead and use their insurance 'cause that's what it's there for.

At your last job, how much of your time do you figure was spent filling out insurance forms?

I worked eleven to thirteen hours a day when I was not on call, eight of that was patient care. So whatever was left, three to five hours every day, would be phone calls and paperwork. //

If you were examining a patient who came in with what he had every reason to believe was just some kind of bruise and you suspected it was something considerably more serious, is there any point at which you might say, "Let's go off the clock here. I want to talk to you about something and it may take ... this could take a half an hour." Or is simply a blanket rule for billing, no matter what the problem is?

No. I'm actually fairly liberal with my off- the- clock time. That's a problem. My office manager would like me to be on the clock a little more. But, yeah, if this is gonna be a major life-changing thing and your bruise I'm thinking is not a bruise, I probably would stop the clock and sit and talk with you about that.

Well, your office manager is probably very frustrated with us by now, so we're gonna let you get back to practicing productive medicine by the minute.

All right. Thanks a lot, Robert.

Thank you very much for talking with us. Dr. Lisa Grigg, an osteopath in Wallingford, Vermont. She charges by the minute. //

9 Facing the wrong end of a pistol

LESLIE BREEDING,co-host:Handguns account for much of the violent crime in this country.

Statistics show that one out of every five of us will face the wrong end of a pistol in our lives.The Senate Judiciary Committee decided this week to propose changes in the 1968 Gun Control Act that would lift most bans against the sales of guns across state lines.During the debate Senator Edward Kennedy tried,but failed,to exempt the guns known as "Saturday Night Special" from the proposal.Olen Kelley,a grocery store manager from Silver Spring,Maryland,has launched his own attack against Saturday Night Specials.He's filed suit in his home county's circuit court to try to stop the manufacture and distribution of the cheap handguns.Kelley has been held up more than once;each time the robber had a gun.A year ago he was held up for the fifth time

by two men who were after the money in the store's safe.//

OLEN KELLEY: And I missed the combination the first time. So one of 'em, with the gun, put the gun up to the side of my head, pulled the hammer back and said, "Uh, don't miss it a second time." So, I slowed down, made sure I got the safe open, and then they told me to lay down on the floor. Well, after I lay down on the floor, they... one of them hit me over the head with something. It probably was his fist, I'm not sure; and the other one shot me.

BREEDING: He shot you?

KELLEY: Yes.

BREEDING: Did he injure you badly?

KELLEY: He shot me in the shoulder. It came out my armpit, went back in my armpit, traveled down my side, and came out the lower part of my side.

BREEDING: How about the other times that you were attacked? Were they also with guns?

KELLEY: Handguns, yes.//

BREEDING: Who are you suing, then?

KELLEY: I'm suing the distributor of this particular gun, what is the name of the company... the name of the gun is a Rolm. The distributor is in Florida, and the maker of the gun is in Germany. I don't know all the legal technicalities to do this, but I feel that these people that make these guns and distribute them throughout the country should repay for what they're doing.

BREEDING: There would be some people who would say to you that if you had been robbed at knifepoint, say, rather than gunpoint, would you then want to sue the knife manufacturer?

KELLEY: Well, the knife manufactures, just like rifle manufacturers, they're not meant to be such an item as to be used in a crime. They are used that way, granted, but in most incidences you'll find that cheap handguns are used, and used to kill people with. Now a knife is used... has other purposes, and that's what it's made for. I'm not after the NRA or I'm not after sporting-type guns. I'm after these particular junk guns—they are of no use to society. And if you probably tried to shoot one of them at a good distance, you probably couldn't hit anything with it anyway. Up close you could, but—and in my instance the guy was about a foot-and-a-half away from me when he shot me.

BREEDING: This is likely to be a controversial case. Are you prepared to take it for years and years, you know, all the way to the Supreme Court if you have to?

KELLEY: If I have to, yes, Cost me a lot of time, but I'm willing to try. I have to try. I feel I have the right to try.

BREDDING: Olen Kelley's suit asks \$500 million damages from RG Industries. His lawyers say they hope, that, with that award, to make it impossible for the company to make the guns.//

10 What Constitutes a Family?

EMAIL GUILLERMO, co-host: The traditional family , a wage-earning father and a wife who stays home to take care of the kids , is a disappearing species in this country. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that just 15 percent of American families fit this profile. But many of the nation's institutions don't recognize the growing ranks of non-traditional groups who are living together: gay couples, foster parents, and stepfamilies . Now California has become the first state in the nation to publicly register these nontraditional groups as official families. Kitty Felde of station KLON in Los Angeles reports.//

KITTY FELDE: Shannon Gibson is like a lot of sixth-graders. She has a mouth full of braces, and she has two fathers: the one visits every other weekend, and her mother's new husband, Pat Howard. Shannon says she worries about her stepfather's visitation rights if her mother were to die.

SHANNON GIBSON: Pat is not my biological father, but he's raised me since I was two years old. So it wouldn't be right...that I wouldn't be able to see him or anything like that.

FELDE: To guarantee that Shannon's extended family will be recognized by the outside world, the Howards have registered with California's secretary of state as a family. For a ten-dollar fee, any group of people can qualify for family status past by filling a form. This might include stepfamilies, like the Howards, couples of the same sex: even unrelated seniors, like TV's Golden Girls, who choose to live together for economic reasons but consider themselves a family.//

A private agency, the Family Diversity Project, championed family registration concept in California. Executive Director Thomas Coleman says California isn't the only state grappling with the question of what constitutes a family.

THOMAS COLEMAN: It was about a year-and-a-half ago that the New York Court of Appeals recognized in a housing survivor case that you can't evict a surviving family member from a rent-controlled apartment, even if they're not related by blood, marriage, or adoption. And unfortunately, what happens then is that you get onto all these matters of proof. Well, how do you distinguish a family from a nonfamily? Then the court set up criteria. This is an ongoing process that will probably take at least another ten years to really play out fully.

FELDE: California state law allows labor unions, historical societies, or any other association to register their names. Coleman reasoned: Because a family is also an association; they could also register. The secretary of state agreed. Several other states—Oregon, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Virginia, and West Virginia—have registration procedures similar to those in California. But they have not yet registered a family. //

The certificate itself carries no automatic legal benefits, but John Brown says it could help legitimize his status as a single father. Brown is legal guardian to four teenage boys. His health insurance covers them, and he legally claims them on his tax return as dependents. But that could change when the oldest starts college next year.

JOHN BROWN: Just like any parent, I'm going to keep claiming him as a dependent, I'm going to keep him covered on insurance, and if somebody messes with that, I'll use anything I have at my disposal to prove that yes, he is my dependent and yes, I am his parent and we are a family.

FELDE: It's likely both the Internet Revenue Service and insurance companies would challenge Brown's family certificate, but backers of the project say registration is an important first step in helping nontraditional families gain acceptance. For National Public Radio, this is Kitty Felde in Los Angeles.//

11 Business Across Borders: Is Bigger Necessarily Better?

BOB EDWARDS, host: government and business leaders still are considering the significance of the merger between German car maker Daimler-Benz and America's Chrysler Corporation. The scale of the deal is unusual, but what's becoming more commonplace is the joining of companies that are geographically distant and perhaps culturally distinct.

In an increasingly global market, trade barriers are falling, communication are

increasingly efficient and cheap, and companies see national boundaries as no obstacle in their expansion.//

Joining me now is Jeffrey Garten, dean of the Yale School of Management. Good morning.

JEFFREY GARTEN,(Dean,Yale School of Management): Good morning.

EDWARDS: This Daimler-Chrysler deal's the biggest industrial merger ever. Is it a watershed in the process of globalization or just the latest high-profile merger?

GARTEN: Well, I wouldn't say it's a watershed, I think it's a continuation of a trend, but it certainly is a big step up. There have been very few foreign takeovers of major American industrial companies, and I think this will set a mark and perhaps accentuate that kind of trend.//

EDWARDS: So, it'll spur more globe integration, with the biggest companies here in the U.S. and Europe and Asia joining forces?

GARTEN: I think –I think it's likely to. But I also think it will—it will make very clear that these are going to be very difficult transactions to work out in the end. There are a huge number of problems.

EDWARDS: Such as?

GARTEN: Well, in this case, and in the case of so many cross-border mergers, there are a number of problems in actually implementing the merger. Huge cultural differences. Operational problems because the companies operate in much different ways. And it looks a lot easier on paper than it is in practice.//

EDWARD: Do you see more mergers in the auto industry specifically?

GARTEN: Well, I think so. I think that what this merger does is it puts on notice, for the smaller firms around the world, that the automobile industry is consolidating, is becoming much more competitive, and you'll need to be very big in order to succeed. So that means companies like Renault in Europe, Peugeot, Mazda in Japan, these medium-size and small companies, I think, will be looking for partners now.//

EDWARDS: What about antitrust considerations? Any reason for the U.S. and European regulators to stand in the way of this Daimler-Chrysler merger?

GARTEN: Well, I don't think it will be an antitrust issue per se. But there are a lot of big regulatory questions that are going to arise. For example, the SEC has to approve the way that the two companies are gonna merge, in a financial sense.

I think that there is going to be some questions in terms of environmental regulation, because in the United States we have much stricter standards, and already Mercedes has had to pay fines for not meeting American standards.

And I think there are going to be a variety of trade-related issues. Mercedes and Chrysler have approached international trade in much different ways, Chrysler has certainly been on the more protectionist side. And how they reconcile their attitudes in terms of trade police generally will be—will be an interesting question.//

EDWARDS: What are the implications for national governments in these global deals?

GARTEN: Well, I think what we're seeing is the gradual but steady increase in the power of markets and global companies and the eclipse of national governments as the center of international power. More and more power is gravitating toward the private sector and I think this is a—this is a clear case.

EDWARDS: So, the governments are just reacting to the agenda set by business.

GARTEN: Yes. But, you know, at some point here you will see, I believe, a resurgence of government intervention. Because the issues that I mentioned—SEC, environment, there are going to be some labor issues, issues relating to trade policy—this will bring government into the force.

The problem for government is that they're not really organized on a global basis. They have different procedures and different thrusts in terms of their laws, whereas the companies are much quicker to join across borders.

EDWARDS: Thank you very much.

GARTEN: A pleasure.

EDWARDS: Jeffrey Garten is dean of the Yale School of Management.//

12 Green Consumerism

In the last couple years, bookstore shelves have been flooded with “green” shopping guides. *The Green Consumer*, *Shopping for a Better World*, *Fifty Simple Things You can Do to Save the Planet*. The books are all part of an effort to broaden the environmental movement and bring ecological concerns into our most ordinary daily decisions. But some environmental watchdogs warn that consumers could be lulled into a false complacency by merely shopping differently. To explore the promises and pitfalls of “green consuming,” I spoke with Alan Durning, a senior

research with the World Watch Institute in Washington, D. C., and Alice Tepper Marlin, president of the Council on Economic Priorities, authors of *Shopping for a Better World*. //

The number one thing all of us can do to help the environment is to consume less, and to grow ourselves what we need to consume, and put in a compost heap whatever we have left over. But most of us do end up going shopping either at supermarkets, as well as department stores, every once in a while at least, and when we do, it's a good opportunity to turn your shopping cart into a vehicle for social change, by looking for the products that themselves are least harmful for the environment. //

What about this, Alan Durning? Does this make sense to you?

In general, I think it's a great idea. But in the long term, it's a first step, and as long as we only think of it as a first step, then I'm entirely supportive of it.

The long-term issues, though, are overconsumption. The roughly one billion people who live in advanced industrial countries are responsible for an overwhelming majority of the world's environmental problem, and we can't consume our way out of this. We have got shift our emphasis away from gross consumption of things to a more, maybe, subtle lifestyle. //

So on the other hand, one could say that green consuming is a bit like, what's the line, rearranging those deck chairs on the Titanic a bit. Or, do you think this is a vehicle for raising people's consciousness?

Well, I think that it really is an initial educational step, and I fully support it in that way. But I think that we have to, at the same time, be critical for the corporations that make use of this kind of rhetoric in their advertising to make themselves. There's a lot of "greenwash" going on. Most recently, I saw an ad from Texaco where they said if you fill your tank, they'll give you a tree seedling. You have to buy at least eight gallons per fill-up if you can go plant it somewhere to make the world a greener place. But that's the most absurd and ridiculous thing I've ever seen. Planting a tree seedling, which will first of all probably die, is never going to make up for the full tank of gasoline that you burned in order to get that tree seedling. So we have to be very leery about the green marketing that's going on right now.

Now what about this, Alice Tepper Marlin? Isn't there a lot of hustle out there, "ecohustle", in the market?

Well, there's no question there are a lot of hucksters out there in all areas. There are hucksters telling us things are safe when they're not, there are hucksters telling children that they should eat candy as breakfast cereals, and there are lots of hucksters out there right now on the green consumer bandwagon, because that's the hot issue from the nineties. That doesn't mean, however, that one has to throw out the entire concept. It means that consumers need to be well informed, and preferably that there are guidelines, enforced regulations on the federal level, which define what labels on the package and in advertising mean in the green area. //

It seems to me that the green consuming movement could get people just sort of feeling good about what they're doing and not taking the important steps that they need to take. Is that fair to say?

There's a definite risk that it'll make Yuppies feel they have clean hands, they don't

have to worry about the environment because they're doing their part by recycling bottles and recycling newspapers, but not really addressing their basic lifestyle questions. The advertisers are playing up to this in what I consider a very cynical way. Toyota recently has run a major series of ads. They flash something across that says, "New Values," and then they talk about how excess is out and recycling and friends and community are in. And then at the conclusion of this, this sort of perverse logic is, we may not have all the answers, but we now know which car to buy. Now that's absurd. The point is that you shouldn't buy a car. Cars are one of the most damaging artifacts of modern civilization. And sure, it's better to buy a fuel-efficient, small car than a big one, but really we should be thinking about reforming our transportation systems, about revitalizing public transportation, about revitalizing rail transportation. So there's a definite risk that this will make us feel better than we really are. But it's a risk that we have to take. It's a strategy for social change that's got to be used. We're got to use every strategy, and really, during the 1980's we in the environmental movement missed out all the millions of people who really would like to do little things...that do make quite a difference.

Alan Durning is a senior researcher with the World Watch Institute in Washington, D. C., and Alice Tepper Marlin is the president of the Council on Economic Priorities in New York City. //