

September 27, 1962

GLOBE-TROTTING With GINNY

Filipinos Generously
Sacrifice For Missions

By Virginia Harris Hendricks

DAGUIO, Philippines (BP)--The Filipinos are a freedom-loving people. They have remained the best friends the Americans have in Asia.

Although the Philippines have the second highest cost of living in the world, the average income is much less than \$150 per year. Tuberculosis and hunger are ever present scourges.

In spite of low wages, the Filipinos are better off than most Asian peoples. The Filipino women, compared to other Asian women, have an elevated position in society. The wife controls the purse strings and owns the property. She is thrifty in providing for her household.

Her husband recognizes her outstanding talent for stretching the family pesos.

When the Woman's Missionary Union in the Baptist church in Baguio was observing the week of prayer for foreign missions, a missionary hesitated to encourage a Lottie Mott Offering for Foreign Missions.

After all, this is a foreign mission field and these people are already giving their best in service and money, she reasoned. The missionary was also acutely aware of the financial limitations of these faithful Baptist women.

"Of course we shall give an offering for foreign missions," one lady insisted. "I shall save rice out of my family's portion and I shall sell it and give the money to missions."

A second lady spoke: "I shall make extra rice cakes when I cook them for my family, and I shall sell these in the market. That will give me money for missions."

A third lady, who always wore the same dress whenever the missionary saw her, said: "Since I have one dress to wear at home and one to wear away from home, I really do not have to have a new dress. I shall give the money I have saved for my new dress to missions!"

Will the women and men of America catch this spirit of sacrificial giving, and give proportionately from their plenty as these Filipinos gave out of their poverty?

EDITORIAL WORKSHOP

By Roy H. Copperud

SETTING the STYLE--II

(The second of three columns on the wire services' stylebook.)

For capitalization, the wire services have settled more or less consistently on an "up" style (Senate Judiciary Committee, Juvenile Court, Social Security Act, Labor Day, Missouri River).

It is a regrettable inconsistency that the stylebook directs party to be lower case in such terms as Republican party, Communist party (1.20). Party in these instances is part of the name. This objection applies also to the rule concerning congressional committees; subcommittee is an official designation, and if House Ways and Means Committee (with a capital C) is specified, the rule should also call for Transportation Subcommittee. Stylistic inconsistencies are to be avoided because they cause trouble; they should never be capricious.

Section 8.4, dealing with clerical titles, gives as examples the Rev. John Smith, the Rev. Mr. Smith. Then comes the admonition, "Do not use Rev. without Mr. or a first name or initials."

This is strictly correct usage, but the instruction misses an important part of the point. To carry out the principle established, it should read, "Do not use Rev. without the; use the Rev. when the first name or initials are given, and the Rev. Mr. with the last name alone."

This goes for the Rev. Dr., if the style is to be consistent. But unhappily the next paragraph gives an inconsistent example, Rev. Dr. John Jones (that is, n the). An array of Roman Catholic titles including Rev. is next cited, also omitting the. Either the examples were carelessly set up, or the stylebook wants to have it both ways. Result: confusion.

The stylebook directs that St., Ave., Blvd., and Ter. be abbreviated in addresses, but specifies that Drive and Road be spelled out. The abbreviations Dr. and Rd. are commoner than Ter. Or did the stylemongers fear that Dr. with an address would be misread doctor?

The choice of language and the punctuation in the text of the stylebook itself leave much to be desired:

"Capitalization of names should follow the use of preference of the person" (1.33). This could be Englished to "Names should be capitalized as their owners do it." Or at least use of should have been omitted from the quoted instruction.

Make sense out of this, if you can (3.21): "Parentheses set off material, such as nicknames or identification; or an element of a sentence; or insertion of identifying material."

There are too many typos. (One would be too many in a book of this kind.) Yet the job was in the works several months, I believe.

The expression is annoyingly elliptical and telegraphic, and inconsistently so. What has been saved in space in this way could have been made up by better structure and organization, and by eliminating the considerable superfluity in the content. A good many instructions are absurdly elementary: "The period separates integer and decimal: 3.75 per cent; \$8.25; 1.25 meters" (3.4). How else?

Some examples are unconsciously comic: "The 6-foot man eating shark was killed (the man was)" (3.32). I'm not so sure. What nut would equate the example with "The 6-foot man who was eating shark was killed?"

A book that sets standards should itself meet good standards of clarity, logical organization, proofreading, writing, and editing. This one doesn't.