
NIEMAN REPORTS

VOL. XLII, No. 2, SUMMER 1987

PETER JENNINGS discusses warring countries, terrorism, and politics.

DANA BULLEN presents an introduction to the worldwide media conference challenging censorship.

VAN KORNEGAY describes the blending of fact and fancy in docudramas that mesmerize television audiences.

A NIEMAN FELLOWSHIP applicant proudly recounts the stories he has covered. And yet, is that enough? No.

THOMAS COOPER interprets both sides of a controversy — to reveal or conceal a tape recorder.

ZWELAKHE SISULU Wins Lyons Award

BOOKS

David DeJean on a touchy international resource issue settled peacefully at a conference.

SUSAN DENTZER on the Third World grasping for a toe-hold up the economic ladder.

LUCINDA FLEESON on a psychological thriller with the protagonist as villain.

MICHAEL GARTNER on an enthralling story of editors and reporters on a memorable morning newspaper.

THOMAS GRIFFITH on an indispensable presidential advisor during depression and war years.

DERRICK JACKSON on teaching pupils to write using journalistic precepts.

PHILIP S. KHOURY on a perceptive portrayal of Arab society, religion, and politics.

IRA ROSEN on a plethora of programs that affect too many lives.

JAMES D. SQUIRES on a television personage as famous as those he rakes over coals.

ROBERT TIMBERG on press fault-finders venting a "bloodless form of criticism."

Cast of Characters

If *Nieman Reports* were a play, the scenes for this issue would be set on every continent. The curtains would be raised on acts of celebration, deliberation, frustration, sadness, and intrigue. The stage would be crammed with a cast of thousands; entrances and exits would be an endless procession. An eighteenth-century description of the roles to be played remains fresh and appropriate.

"A journalist is grumbler, a censurer, a giver of advice, a regent of sovereigns, a tutor of nations."

Grumblers in today's press complain about serious matters. They report on life-threatening situations such as environmental pollution; the rising curve of the world's population growth and its partner, global hunger; the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the organizations opposing their use; health and safety in the workplace and in the home; crime and its twin, violence; and the ultimate finiteness that is a part of every battleground. Humorists and political cartoonists lighten these borders with satire, enabling us to smile, even as we recognize inadequacies and hopelessness.

Censurers are public scolds. They question the efficacy of the classroom, the boardroom, and the democratic process. The laboratory also is a target. Scientific discoveries now go hand in hand with problems of ethics and morality.

Nonetheless, the stage directions are clear. The journalist is to deliver the message.

"Act I" opens with Peter Jennings on stage. Incidents of terrorism — hijacking and the taking of hostages — are played through. The story within the story depends upon a reporter's skill in decision-making under conditions of extreme stress.

Dana Bullen follows with a background and an introduction to the perilous state of the press. Government repression in country after country cannot be tolerated. The message here is to organize against media control. Thus, a group of international journalists formalized their outrage with The Declaration of London, an action making them "tutors of nations and regents of sovereigns."

Thomas Cooper as dramatist looks beyond the practice of tape-



recording interviews and conversations. He sees troubling dilemmas in fine points of law and morality.

Van Kornegay speaks in a soliloquy on the unsettled place of truth in presenting and interpreting leading news events on television. Is fact a masquerade for fiction, or is fiction the truer mirror?

"Author unknown" walks on to play a bit part of whimsy.

In the Books Section, reviewers make cameo appearances; some in flashbacks (*The Paper: The Life and Death of The New York Herald Tribune*, and *Harry Hopkins, Ally of the Poor*).

Others are shown in contemporary settings (*The Arabs*; *Watching Television*; *Hold on, Mr. President!*; *Reading the News*; *The Traveler*; *The Global Struggle for More*; *Free to Write*.)

One reviewer steps into the future (*Tracing New Orbits*).

Threads of sadness in news items about Nieman Fellows are balanced by joyous birth announcements and by impromptu champagne parties for winners of the Pulitzer Prize.

At the closing "act" of *Nieman Reports*, the curtain descends. For a moment it parts and reveals the identity of the man who, more than two hundred years ago, described the role of a journalist. The words were spoken by Napoleon Bonaparte, a person who knew about power.

— T.B.K.L.

NIEMAN REPORTS

Vol. XLII, No. 2
Summer 1987

Publisher
HOWARD SIMONS

Editor
TENNEY BARBARA K. LEHMAN

Consulting Editor
(This issue)
FAY LEVIERO

Editorial Assistant
ELIZABETH TIBBITTS

Business Manager
KETTEE J. BOLING

Nieman Reports (USPS #340-650) is published quarterly by the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Copyright ©1987 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Subscription \$15.00 a year; add \$10.00 for foreign air mail. Single copies \$4.00. Back copies are available from the Nieman Office.

Please address all subscription correspondence and change of address information to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts, and additional entries. POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------|
| 2 | Cast of Characters | Tenney B.K. Lehman |
| 4 | The 1986 Joe Alex Morris Jr. Memorial Lecture | Peter Jennings |
| | <i>The ABC television reporter-manager covers diverse topics on foreign and domestic events.</i> | |
| 10 | Voices of Freedom '87: Challenging the Censors | Introduction by Dana Bullen |
| | <i>The Declaration of London adopts measures for supporting nonrestrictive news-gathering.</i> | |
| 16 | Television Docudramas: Fact and Fancy | Van Kornegay |
| | <i>The pseudo-documented dramas are made in Hollywood — not in network news departments.</i> | |
| 20 | Biographical Statement (Revised Standard Version) | We Will Never Know |
| | <i>A found-on-the-floor ms tells of the hopes and dreams of a Nieman applicant.</i> | |
| 21 | Hidden Taping: The Arguments For and the Ethics Against | Thomas W. Cooper |
| | <i>Is the practice ever justified? Do human feelings against its use ever count?</i> | |
| 26 | Nieman Fellows 1987-88 | |
| 28 | Books | |
| | Tracing New Orbits — Cooperation and Competition in Global Satellite Development
<i>Edited by Donna A. Demac</i> David DeJean | |
| | The Global Struggle for More: The Third World Conflicts with Rich Nations by Bernard D. Nossiter Susan Dentzer | |
| | The Traveler by John Katzenbach Lucinda Fleeson | |
| | The Paper: The Life and Death of the New York Herald Tribune by Richard Kluger Michael Gartner | |
| | Harry Hopkins. Ally of the Poor and Defender of Democracy by George McJimsey Thomas Griffith | |
| | Free to Write: A Journalist Teaches Young Writers by Roy Peter Clark.
<i>Foreword by Donald M. Murray</i> Derrick Jackson | |
| | The Arabs: Journeys Beyond the Mirage by David Lamb Philip S. Khoury | |
| | Watching Television Tod Gitlin, Editor Ira Rosen | |
| | Hold on, Mr. President! by Samuel Donaldson James D. Squires | |
| | Reading the News Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, editors Robert Timberg | |
| 50 | Zwelakhe Sisulu Wins Lyons Award | |
| 51 | Nieman Notes | |

The 1986 Joe Alex Morris Jr. Memorial Lecture

Peter Jennings

The ABC television reporter-manager covers diverse topics on foreign and domestic events.

Nieman Curator Howard Simons introduced the 1986 Joe Alex Morris, Jr. Lecturer:

Joe Alex Morris, Jr., graduate of Harvard, Class of 1949, worked for a long time as a foreign correspondent with *The Los Angeles Times* and in January, 1979, Joe Alex was killed covering the street fighting in Tehran. In '81, Joe Alex's family and friends and fellow journalists and Harvard classmates put together a fund, so that we could have the Joe Alex Memorial Lecture each year. It is given annually by the Nieman Foundation as an award to an American overseas correspondent or a media commentator on foreign affairs.

Last year Peter Jennings was named as the 1986 Morris lecturer, but Peter had to stay in New York, anchored down by a breaking news story called the Philippines, and we

Peter Jennings has covered news stories throughout the world, including five foreign wars, the imposing of martial law on Poland, and the violence in Northern Ireland. He is the recipient of numerous awards for his broadcasts including a national Emmy award from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, and several Overseas Press Club awards. Mr. Jennings, a Canadian, started his career in 1959 at CFJR-Radio in Ontario.



had to cancel his talk. This is, therefore, the 1986 lecture.

Peter Jennings is my kind of newspaperperson. He reads, he writes, and he reports. He reported from abroad for fourteen years. He established ABC's bureau in Beirut, which is the first by any network in the Arab world. He was named ABC's news' foreign correspondent in 1977 and he has covered just about every major

characters this racket produced. Most of you did not know him, and most of you probably did not know his name. I am going to give a talk in his name because it will tell you something about Joe Alex Morris, that he would despise the word lecture, but he had an enormous impact on my attitude towards journalism, and as much as anyone else, he helped me to understand what I

Television journalism is not just technology, and though the picture is enormously powerful . . . television more than ever . . . needs experienced minds to guide us through the pictures.

foreign and domestic event during and since that time. And just this week, Peter tied with the other guide as the best television anchor in the *Washington Journalism Review's* annual contest of the best in the business.

But perhaps most significant for today's purpose is that Peter and Joe Alex were colleagues and friends, and covered the Middle East together and were mutual admirers. I am an admirer of Peter Jennings. And here is Peter.

I'm flattered that so many of you came, and I am immensely flattered to have been asked to come and talk in the name of one of the great

really wish more journalists, or more people, would understand, and that is, the great value that one derives from walking the byways of a town, a city, or a foreign nation rather than simply riding down highways, as I think many journalists do today.

Joe Alex Morris was a man with an enormous appetite for life, who took the most exceptional joy in telling his readership or audience all that he had discovered along the way, and I think we have that in common, except that I am infinitely more verbose than Joe Alex was. I love to tell people what I discovered yesterday. As Howard said, Joe Alex was killed dur-

ing the Iranian Revolution. He was killed by a stray bullet. He was out at the airport watching a fight between what has subsequently become the revolutionary guard of Ayatolla Khomeini, fighting with some air force personnel, and the bullet was not intended for him. It didn't have his name on it. He might have been killed in countless other hairier situations, some of which I shared with him.

I really do confess, without being sacrilegious here, that if you had to be shot at, which always put the absolute fear of God into me, I would rather be shot at in Joe Alex's company. He had a really wise sense of when one should run, and when one should stay behind the wall. I cannot impress upon you what it was like to be a young correspondent. To be in a violent situation and have him say to me, "It's ok, just stay here, the shooting will stop." He had a wonderful sense of humor and adventure about his life. A talk in his name is something of a challenge. Neither he then, nor I now, are what you would call expert on the theory of journalism, and God knows there is a lot of theory about journalism today. I think we both would embrace the formula — it's the first rough draft of history — but most of us are surely mindful that if we were writing or broadcasting today for people on another planet, or perhaps even our grandchildren, much of what we say, and much of what we write, would never make it through the ether.

In journalism generally, I think we are going through a very difficult time in the country, and it is particularly true about television. Print has never really felt comfortable with television because we are, in part, responsible for the closing down of a lot of good newspapers in the country, and therefore you see a good deal more written about the difficulty that television journalism is facing than you do about print journalism.

You have all read or heard, I am sure, the stories about network news being forced to rethink its role. I

noticed as recently as the day before yesterday in *The New York Times* that some of the network executives believe that we are headed toward a day when the photographer or the sound recordist also will go out and will be the reporter and transmit the story as well.

The chief executive at one network argues for — or perhaps is in a position to demand that — the overseas staff of his network be reduced because the pictures are so much more readily available today, thanks to technology. There is a dangerous misconception here, and it is really what I have come to talk to you about.

The Washington Post
and *The New York Times* . . . have no
compunction . . .
about having full-time
Arab correspondents
in Beirut. Broad-
casting is not yet that
sophisticated . . . Not
yet as comfortable
with people on the air
who look different
from the acceptable
norm

Television journalism is not just technology, and though the picture is enormously powerful, perhaps because it is so powerful, television journalism more than ever, I think, needs experienced minds to guide us through the pictures. Perhaps some are in this room. So I think the best thing I can do in Joe Alex's name is share some illustrations with you of how we do our job under certain cir-

cumstances, so that you may go away from here having somewhat of a better understanding of why it is we tell you so little on some occasions, and why we have failed — I suspect many of you will think — to give you a fuller understanding of your community, your nation, and the world.

Reporters and managers are very different people. I was a reporter most of my life, now I am a reporter-manager. It's an uncomfortable and ambiguous relationship, but reporters and managers are always making decisions about crossing lines. I think it may surprise some of you, but the Iranian Revolution in which Joe Alex was accidentally killed was not an inherently dangerous situation for a reporter, provided you wore a Canadian maple leaf in your buttonhole. The only time I think any of us had a very difficult decision to make about danger to ourselves — direct and deliberate danger — was among a small group of us who decided, or had decided for us by our offices, that we were going to accompany Ayatolla Khomeini back to Tehran when he left France.

Most of us on that flight were fairly convinced that the chance of the Shah's airforce shooting us down, in the first light of day as we entered Iranian air space, was very good. Most of us took the risk notwithstanding. The managers these days do not believe it is worth the risk to maintain a staff reporter in Beirut. In almost every case, by the way, a staff reporter is an American or a Canadian. We look alike. I happen to be Canadian. We look alike, we sound alike for the most part. *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*, to name two newspapers, on the other hand, have no compunction at all about having full-time Arab correspondents in Beirut.

Broadcasting is unfortunately not yet that sophisticated. Not yet as comfortable with people on the air who look different from the acceptable norm, or within the narrow range of minorities, and who sound much different than most Ameri-

cans. It may happen, but as yet our failure or our inability or our reluctance to hire foreign nationals from regions to work there inhibits our ability to cover the story at the moment. So when it comes to covering the incredible or explaining the incredible sway that Lebanon holds over much greater powers than herself, the majority of people in America who watch American television for their news are reduced to second-hand reporting, and you are — I am afraid to report — the recipients of much filtered material.

I am a great advocate of filtering and editing material, as TWA Flight 847 taught a lot of us. But in an unusually dangerous situation of great consequence to the United States at the moment, you are getting pictures, but very often no explanation of what I call video flow.

danger. There are, I am embarrassed to say, reporters who sit in the hotel room and let the cameraperson go out and cover the dangerous story. When that happens, the cameraperson decides what you and I will see at home, because he or she is making the choice through their lens. Some day in American we may get to the point where we will give camerapeople credit on the air. We don't at the moment, except in most unusual circumstances. But as you watch at home, bear in mind that the cameraperson may have had much greater impact on the news story than the reporter.

Beirut has been a testing ground for a great many journalistic practices. Some of you may have experienced the simulated decision-making process on a recent Public Broadcasting Service series on ter-

to shoot a hostage in front of her. "Oh," she said, "Stop," and turned off the camera. The hijacker then said to Leslie, "Turn your cameras on, or the first person we'll shoot is your cameraperson." The point I am trying to make is that the decisions made on the spot can lead to enormous complications farther down the road.

When ABC's Charlie Glass stood there on the tarmac in Beirut talking to TWA's John Testrake in the cockpit, I think you all remember, he had some very weighty decisions to make as a reporter. An experienced reporter would try to think not only what effect his or her decision would have about lives in the immediate area — his or hers perhaps most of all — but whether or not what they were doing might ultimately have an impact on national policy. It is an overwhelming argument for experience. All news organizations encourage their reporters to be aggressive, but in a world in which we may one day be choked by video flow, pictures everywhere, the need for thinking people — dare I assume like yourselves — to become involved in public communications in this country is enormous.

For example: During the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, networks and newspapers threw a lot of young and inexperienced reporters on to the story. We are often used as cannon fodder by our organizations, and many of the inexperienced reporters on the scene could not tell the difference between the damage which the Israelis had done during their drive to Beirut, and the damage that the Lebanese had done to themselves in the previous five years of civil war. And thus in that instance, and in many others, inexperience can lead to the most horrible distortion.

I think it is true today, and sad, very sad, but unless the American people had seen the war on the evening news, the war probably doesn't exist. My own impression is that the war in Vietnam has conditioned us in a rather awful way to watching

The cameraperson . . . is one of the most influential people in television . . . in . . . covering danger. There are . . . reporters who sit in the hotel room and let the cameraperson go out and cover the dangerous story.

Incidentally, television companies have no compunction about hiring third country nationals to look through the lens in a dangerous situation, and in an age where pictures are so readily available to local stations and networks all over the country, you as observers of the news should remember that the cameraperson can also be an editorialist.

The cameraman in television or the cameraperson, as it is increasingly, because many women have become camera operators in the last few years, is one of the most influential people in television, particularly in terms of covering

rorism. It was quite a fascinating experience for those of us who participated in it, and I can assure you that what you would have seen then, and what I will try to explain to you today, is how a single decision on the spot can lead to the most God-awful complications.

I was in a simulation, ordered to order Leslie Stahl to go on board an aircraft and take pictures of the hostages on board the aircraft and talk to the terrorists.

Leslie went willingly, seeing this great scoop that she was going to have. Not an unknown journalistic instinct. When she got on, in a simulation, the hijackers decided

war over dinner.

Because we have not been allowed to report it, because we have had incredible difficulty reporting from either side in the Iran-Iraq war, for example, it is fantastically difficult for you to understand what is going on there. There is no way to confirm the astronomical casualty figures. The analysts seem to have Iran winning one week, and Iraq not losing the next. There are no tours of the front by independent reporters that are not organized by the government. Access is wholly and completely, in the case of Iran and Iraq, at the behest of the governments involved.

As a result — and I haven't thought this all through — it might have been altogether too easy for Israel to convince the Reagan administration that the Israeli view of the Iran-Iraq war was the right one for the Reagan administration to take.

We are faced with a similar situation in Afghanistan. There are occasional trips by brave men and women to Afghanistan. They almost invariably go via Pakistan. They invariably end up walking with the *Mudja Hadim* for a few days or a week, in some cases, two or three weeks, and in the home office we are obliged to make really difficult decisions about what to do when these people emerge. Some of them, I must tell you, with emotional as well as physical blisters. Our decision in the home office is conditioned by the person's credentials, the quality of the video, and I am sad to say, whether it shows us something we haven't seen before. I am also sad to say that most Afghanistan footage looks like the Afghanistan footage you had seen the month before.

Our conscience usually bothers us enough that we have done a bad job of explaining the war in Afghanistan, and we usually put the cameraman or reporter's work on the air. But it is rarely enough, as I think you must observe, to give you, or for that matter us, any deeper understanding of

how Afghanistan has been changed by the Soviet presence. In the case of Iran-Iraq, it is somewhat different, because often there is video taken by government cameramen on one side or the other. The Iraqis are particularly good at it. It is eked out to us by a satellite, free, on those occasions when the government in question believes its purpose is always served, or better served. The videos are almost always similar, as you can tell. Rockets going off, tanks moving in the distance, bodies lying in trenches in great number.

I sometimes wonder whether those aren't the same bodies we've been looking at for four or five years. Now we put little labels up on the screen, which you may or may not know is called file, which means it's file footage, but it is like a flea on an elephant in terms of the impact that the picture has. So we are, in a sense, creating the impression inadvertently that we are there covering the war between Iran and Iraq when we are not.

What I am trying to do is to make a point, that in this day and age journalists who understand these techniques, who understand how to use the deal simply as a backdrop for political and social and cultural analysis, are as important, perhaps more important, than they have ever been in the country before. Out of sight, out of mind, is a really serious problem for a journalist — print or television — but particularly television, and nowhere are we more challenged than by the present situation in South Africa.

The South African government, I can tell you, really knows what it is doing. If you prevent the media from taking pictures of the violence in black townships, then the violence will plummet from the front pages and the television screens of America. The violence won't stop, of course, but America's interest and perhaps even its conscience, it seems to me, has already been dulled as a result of the Draconian censorship that the South African govern-

ment has put on incrementally.

And if there is no daily story to fire the imagination, then the general struggle in South Africa will not be on the popular agenda. I think those White House managers who know it so well are quite right. We in television do not set the agenda. But we have a large part to play in setting the sort of public debate within the agenda or within the parameters of it. In South Africa the problem, as you know, is not too much picture, as it is from the government of Iraq, it is too little.

The South African government . . . knows what it is doing. If you prevent the media from taking pictures of the violence in black townships . . . the violence will plummet from the front pages and the television screens of America.

The South African government has now made it virtually impossible for foreign correspondents to tell the daily story, particularly in television. When I say the daily story, I mean the one about the children being arrested without charge, about the kind of people who have disappeared because they have taken it upon themselves to publicly challenge the present system of racial separation. We are still free to document much about South African life, but I must tell you, it is very hard, as an editor, to be convinced by the correspondent there that he or she should do a really good take-out on the impact of the great

trek by the Afrikaners to the Transvaal, when you know that you cannot report about the indiscriminate shooting by the security forces around the corner. You feel like the South Africans are getting away with it, and so the story tends to drop away from the front pages and from the screen.

There does come a time when every news organization ultimately takes the risk and says the story is so important, damn the censorship, and we will run the risk of being thrown out. We tried that a couple of times ourselves, several times in South Africa, and much to our surprise we haven't been thrown out yet. I think sooner or later the South Africans will get us all, as you know they recently got Alan Cowell of *The New York Times*. *The Los Angeles Times* had to make some kind of a deal which I don't understand, in order to stay. They are doing it with their own press. We want to stay as best we can, but it is going to be extremely difficult.

Let me return to the general dilemma of network news. In all of this talk about how satisfied you would all be having your major national and international news reported by someone on your local station, I think we are forgetting that one of the most crucial and sensitive decisions made by news managers is what person to put on what story. It is a process I go through every day. Were I assigned to do a story in a hurry on the impact of Harvard on Cambridge, I think you can imagine it would be a pretty superficial job. Every time a local station, or for that matter, a network, sends a greenhorn to work in a foreign land, you, in the audience, take a risk on his or her experience or lack of it.

One of my colleagues at ABC was murdered in Nicaragua — Bill Stewart — at the end of the Somoza regime, when the Sandinistas were coming to power. It was the last days; he was murdered in cold blood; and many of us have never

gotten over it. He was also murdered on camera. The young woman who works with me and who used to work with Bill, said to me in a very bitter outburst, that before he went to Central America he was scared out of his mind. He knew he was unprepared. He had only worked in one country before in his life overseas. He didn't speak Spanish. It suddenly occurred to me that one of the mistakes we are making, in terms of the audience and in terms of people's lives, is not preparing them at the elbow of people like Joe Alex Morris.

By the way, all our problems are not overseas, by any means. The challenge of access, of censorship, of self-censorship, of misrepresentation is something we face every day at home. The Iran-Contra affair has it all. Long before we knew that the Tower Commission had access to the backup computer tapes at the White House, many folks in the media were behaving as if this were another Watergate. It may turn out to be another Watergate, but at the time we were behaving like it was, I don't think it was. I think there is no question whatsoever that there was too much hype in the media about the Iran-Contra affair at the beginning, and I am also inclined to think, as are other more serious observers of our medium, that our decline in the public's estimation in the ratings may have been the result of this hype. I don't want to be seen as too pious on the subject.

You may have heard that Ben Bradlee, the editor of *The Washington Post*, and Michael Kinsley of *The New Republic* challenged the reporters to stand up and say in public that they were really having a terrific time. They were both savage. Michael Kinsley in particular.

He was younger. I think his honesty may have been unseemly. But a reporter who tells you this is not a very good story is not a reporter worth his salt. And now the press is catching up, and is often ahead of the special prosecutor, and somewhat ahead of the congress-

sional committees. And that is a function which journalists, I believe, should and must play in a free society.

I assume there are reporters who would love to have a hand in the downfall of the Reagan Administration. But I also suspect they are roughly equivalent in number to those people in the general population who would like to have a hand in the downfall of the Reagan Administration. I may not judge accurately for the media in general, but I do not believe that cynicism has yet overtaken our souls. I think we feel the chill of it. And there are fine lines that we have to walk along. We at ABC news knew that the United States Air Force was going to attack Libya, some time before the attack occurred. At the

... it may be one of our flaws that in the wake of Watergate, everybody wanted to be an investigative reporter. They are a peculiar breed . . . Not many people are qualified . . .

time we thought it was prudent to say nothing. Now we have learned, as a result of Seymour Hersh's recent piece in *The New York Times Magazine*, that the intention of the Reagan Administration may have been deliberately to kill the head of the sovereign government, Colonel Khadafi, notwithstanding. Had we known that, I wonder whether or not we should have kept silent, just because it was Khadafi.

Most often people get angry at us because they don't believe we give the President respect. I get more

mail about Sam Donaldson, and I have people every day telling me the presidency is a venerated institution. I know the presidency is a venerated institution, but I also know that Ronald Reagan, who cannot remember when he gave an order to send arms to Iran, is a politician who is answerable to the American people. And what would you have us do when the chief of staff has us in to tell us about the spin control they are going to put on the disaster at Reykjavik? What should we do when they take the truth, and twist it to fit the administration's image of itself, and then tell us they are taking the truth and twisting it to fit the administration's image of itself? And how would the American people in the main have us respond when the Secretary of State or the President's former national security advisor tells us it is perfectly all right to use the American media for a disinformation campaign against a foreign leader?

My answer is very simple. If it is a foreign leader today, it may be you tomorrow. I know that there is certainly a great deal we can learn about humility. I think it may be one of our current fatal flaws that in the wake of Watergate, everybody wanted to be an investigative reporter. I must tell you, it is a title I hate.

Investigative reporters are a peculiar breed, but everybody wants to be one, and for a long period of time everybody wanted to ascribe to themselves the title that they were an investigative reporter. Not many people are qualified to do it. You must, perhaps, at this point be asking why is he saying all this stuff? I must say it is really a measure of self-promotion and a measure of support that I am looking for. Because you as influential Americans are going to have an enormous effect as you get older, and as you go forth from this somewhat cloistered environment, on what kind of an information and communication system we have in the

country.

We do have, indeed, a crisis in the public airwaves of America. Don't ever forget that they are public, even though they are deemed on occasion to be owned by corporations. There is no question that television news particularly got a little too fat for its own good, and we are suffering through reduction pains at the moment, but I think they know in Detroit that when you rebuild a car or make it smaller, you don't simply improve it by knocking off the bumpers. You redesign it.

is going to have on Wall Street, they say "No, we'll move to Tokyo or to London," because the information, the technology has allowed us to push the information around so easily.

I would simply hope that you, as influential Americans, will demand first-class journalism, because if you don't have it, and if you don't guard it as we try to guard it, then you are quite likely to have at large an ill-informed electorate, which is quite likely to elect ill-informed leaders, and there and then that's what we'd

I would hope that you, as influential Americans, will demand first-class journalism . . . if you don't have it . . . and don't guard it . . . you are likely to have an ill-informed electorate which is quite likely to elect ill-informed leaders

What is happening to television news is important because there is no country in the world where television plays such an integral role in the political, in the social, and in the cultural environment of life. Broadcast journalists, I would argue, have devoted more than three decades now to developing what we believe is a responsible service for the American people. Flawed without question. But much more responsible today than the wire service of the air it used to be. And it seems to me only common sense that because the American people rely so much on television, and some economic segments of the society rely totally on television for their information, that we all would want it to remain coherent, responsible, open, and staffed by experienced people.

I am not going to dwell at any great length on the need for mastering the technology in a world in which when you ask arbitrageurs if they are worried about the effect this

all be.

Thanks very much for having me. □

The first Joe Alex Morris Jr. Memorial Lectureship by the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University was awarded in 1982 to Flora Lewis, Foreign Affairs columnist for *The New York Times*. Other lecturers follow:

1983 - Norman Kempster, Jerusalem bureau chief of the *Los Angeles Times*.

1984 - Eric Sevareid, broadcaster, author, and newspaperman.

1985 - Jack Foisie, Nieman Fellow '47, former foreign correspondent for the *Los Angeles Times*.

1986 - Peter Jennings, ABC television reporter-manager.

1987 - Stanley Karnow, Nieman Fellow '58, author of books on China and the Vietnam Era. He also served as a foreign correspondent for *Time*, *The Saturday Evening Post*, and *The Washington Post*.

Voices of Freedom '87: Challenging the Censors

Dana Bullen

The Declaration of London adopts measures for supporting nonrestrictive news-gathering.

Storm warnings are flying on censorship worldwide — and we should heed them.

The urgency of the situation brought 150 editors, reporters, publishers and broadcasters to a Voices of Freedom '87 conference in London earlier this year to discuss ways of fighting restrictions on print and broadcast journalists more effectively. Coming from 34 countries, after two days of talks, sensing strong need to intensify the fight against restrictions, they called urgently for creation of a world "fund against censorship," for a "censorship hot-line" and for other steps. Why?

They saw trouble all around them.

A special 32-page survey of censorship practices around the world was prepared for this "action" conference, called by the World Press Freedom Committee, by *Index on Censorship*, a London magazine that

monitors abuses against writers and news media. The breadth of the problem quickly became evident.

"In many countries *all* the media are in the hands of the state, which means that censorship is as total as human ingenuity can make it," wrote George Theiner, editor of *Index*.

deign to criticize the country involved. Entry visas are refused, existing accreditation is revoked, and journalists expelled. Foreign newspapers and magazines are banned, or allowed in but then carefully screened for offending material, which is laboriously blacked out in every copy before the publication goes on sale.

. . . they [the conferees] called . . . for creation of a world "fund against censorship" . . . Why? They saw trouble all around them.

"Where privately owned media do exist, governments resort to a variety of methods to keep them in line," he said. "Opposition magazines are closed down, journalists arrested and imprisoned, often detained without charge or trial for long periods, anti-terrorist or similar legislation is used elastically to silence dissent, various economic sanctions are applied; fines, bribes in the form of subsidies, the withdrawal of lucrative official advertising, the withholding of licenses, newsprint, etc."

For foreign correspondents and outside news media, the survey reported, there are specially tailored obstacles, especially when they

The cumulative impact is disheartening, and unsettling. Every account is the same.

A recent issue of *IPI Report* has these headlines: "Indonesia bans daily," "Mexican newsman murdered," "Editor deported," "Singapore cuts *Time*" — or, simply, "Kicked out." The current issues of *Index on Censorship* requires 25 columns of small type to chronicle abuses from Algeria to Zimbabwe. The latest Inter American Press Association's press freedom report, reciting problems in the Western Hemisphere alone, takes 37 pages. A report in the *International Herald Tribune* listed as current trouble spots: Singapore, Malaysia, In-

Dana Bullen, *Nieman Fellow '67*, is executive director of the World Press Freedom Committee which unites 32 journalistic organizations on five continents in support of press freedom. Before joining WPFC in 1981, he was Supreme Court reporter, United States Senate reporter, and foreign editor during his 21 years with The Washington Star.



onesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Chile, Paraguay, Kuwait, and South Africa. Elsewhere in Africa, it said, the control of information remains firmly in government hands, with notable exceptions in Senegal and Nigeria. Last year, says Freedom House, 39 countries banned newspapers or radio stations. In 31 countries, journalists were beaten.

"One of the most poignant statements I've read recently was that of a Central American newspaper editor's wife," said Wilbur Landrey of the *St. Petersburg Times*, chairman of IAPA's Freedom of the Press Committee, at IAPA's meeting last fall. "The greatest enemy of press freedom, she said, did not come from governments but from wives and families who did not want to see their loved ones die or disappear."

"That is not quite right, of course," said Landrey. "It is governments, and sometimes other groups, who instill the fear in the families."

To try to find answers, the WPFC, based in Washington, organized *Voices of Freedom '87* with five other leading free-press organizations: the International Press Institute, International Federation of Newspaper Publishers, Inter American Press Association, International Federation of the Periodical Press, and North American National Broadcasters Association. The meeting, titled "Challenging the Censors: A World News Media Action Conference," was held in London, January 16-18. Sponsors included The Reader's Digest Association, Inc.; Time Inc.; Samuel I. Newhouse Foundation; CBS, Inc.; Capital City Press, Baton Rouge, La.; *Los Angeles Times*; *The Washingtonian*, and the Philip L. Graham Fund. The Edward R. Murrow Center of Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy coordinated arrangements.

Speakers from Britain, India, South Africa, Australia, Lebanon, Poland, United States, Spain, Uruguay, Mexico, Paraguay, and West Germany led off, with comments and

suggestions flowing from dozens of other speakers from the floor. Listen to some of the voices of *Voices of Freedom '87*:

- "The best answer to the relentless pressures of governments to censor news dispatches is to pressure back." — David Laventhol, Times Mirror Co., Los Angeles.
- "Censorship has a thousand faces, openness only one. Of all its masks, self-censorship can be as bad as any, the willing decision not to report something you know is happening." — John Tusa, BBC, London.
- "Politicians always talk to us about our shrinking world. They tell us that we inhabit a global village. And yet they spend so much time erecting barriers to free movement across national borders." Cushrow Irani, *The Statesman*, Calcutta.
- "The world media should focus on one country and attempt to destroy censorship there." — Peter Galliner, IPI, London.
- "We carry a front-page headline each day that reads: 'This newspaper may be censored. We are not permitted to tell you how or where.'" — Harvey W. Tyson, *The Star*, Johannesburg.
- "The name of the game is . . . restraint, balance, fear and more fears . . . All the fighters have a headline somewhere." — Samir Atallah, *Al Mostagbal*, Paris (on conditions in Lebanon).
- "It is estimated that some 100,000 people are involved in printing and distributing the underground press." — Stefan Bratkowski, former president of banned Polish Association of Journalists.
- "Shots!" — Aldo Zuccolillo, *ABC Color*, Paraguay (identifying sounds on tape of attack on independent Radio Nanduti).
- ". . . licensing (of journalists) is spreading like the plague . . ." — Juan Luis Cebrian, *El Pais*, Madrid.
- "Yes. Of course the press can make

a difference. And the Western press, especially, has an obligation to stand up, to speak out, to clarify, to illuminate cases where censorship is going on." — Nicholas Daniloff [NF '74], *U.S. News & World Report*.

- "Interruption of careers becomes worrisome when the repeated cause of this interruption is death by homicide." — Alejandro Junco de la Vega, *El Norte*, Mexico.
- "The fundamental reason for opposition to censorship is that it destroys truth. Censorship destroys truth, and that is why free societies cannot live with it." — Lord McGregor of Durris, London.

A special panel discussed problems facing broadcasters. Some of those cited are common to both print and broadcast coverage, but others seemed designed precisely to make things maddeningly difficult for those carrying bulky television cameras.

Ian MacIntosh, Asia manager for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, based in Singapore, quickly ticked off a formidable list of obstacles:

"The visa or accreditation application which is neither approved nor denied . . . simply not replied to; the failure to renew visas or work permits with scant or no justification given; the expulsion of journalists for stepping over vague and often-undeclared lines; the taboos on certain subjects (again these may be ill-defined); the official who smilingly forgets to make the arrangements required for a satellite transmission, or who pulls the plug, or who will not permit the use of a portable earth station; the customs officer who impounds equipment and tapes because 'the papers aren't in order'; restrictions on access to government-controlled broadcast stations and technical facilities when the stories being covered are not considered 'favorable' or

the journalist is judged to be 'hostile'; the extraordinary detail required in some countries when applying for that iniquitous piece of paper, the filming permit; the policeman or security man who can and will block even routine filming and recording in the streets on the flimsiest of pretexts; the playing-off of favoured journalists against those who are deemed, or suspected of being, too critical; the odious practice of the so-called 'press clubs' and 'pools' given exclusive access to leading public figures and official institutions; and on and on goes the list."

confiscation), litigation and "anti-pornography wars," requirement of "advertising permits," and bureaucratic obstacles requiring frequent visits to government offices for interpretations, clarifications, special permits, concessions, licenses, subsidies, import quotas, hard currency, credits, etc.

A telex message received in London while *Voices of Freedom '87* was under way seemed to underscore problems in many places. The director of beleaguered Radio Nanduti in Paraguay's capital, Asuncion, notified participants that the independent station had been forced to shut down. One tactic used against it had been to starve advertising

of restrictions.

- Compilation of a list of lawyers experienced in such cases.
- Establishment of a "censorship hot line" as a clearing house and for obtaining help.
- Organization of an "early warning system" on restrictive press laws, regulations and other measures.
- Public service advertisements to spotlight severe abuses.
- Dispatch of journalistic missions to places where news is being suppressed.

These were considered the most pressing of the suggestions that were offered.

"This program of possible action has the potential for significant impact," said WPFC Chairman Harold W. Andersen, chairman and chief executive officer of The Omaha World-Herald Company, who presided at the sessions. "The challenge now is to find ways to translate some of these words into action."

The conference directed that "further exploration of what can be done to implement the proposals of the Declaration shall be undertaken urgently by the organizers of this conference."

The goal of the meeting was to identify new and practical ideas on what can be done. In addition to the half-dozen proposals selected for priority consideration, other suggestions included:

An international press freedom legal handbook; "twinning" of news media in free-press countries with sister media under censorship pressure; periodic listing of the "worst ten" offenders; use of special labels showing when articles have been censored; electronic mail-box listing of activities, censorship problems; preparation of a censorship yearbook;

Listing of instances in which journalists are denied visas for coverage in countries; a special

Censorship . . . has many faces. It is not just a hard-eyed official wielding a blue pencil. It is an enormous matrix . . . ranging from subtle to brutal.

There are a few rays of hope, said MacIntosh, but in countries whose governments control broadcasting — which he noted is most of Asia — "no TV or radio official is going to risk his or her neck to help a foreign reporter transmit a report critical of the government or otherwise suggesting that all is not well in the land."

Censorship, thus, has many faces. It is not just a hard-eyed official wielding a blue pencil. It is an enormous matrix of things, ranging from subtle to brutal.

Economic pressures for "self-censorship", for instance, can be as threatening as direct censorship.

Such levers for coercion in government hands in Mexico, said Alejandro Junco de la Vega of Monterrey's *El Norte*, include state monopoly control of newsprint supplies, subsidized competition, control of new technology (in some cases through

revenue through continuous jamming.

"We have no reason to be ashamed of our activities," said station director Humberto Rubin. "Our goal has always been to serve truth . . . (but) persecution and repression has made the situation impossible . . . I hope that your deliberations in London will find practical means of combating that most formidable enemy of democracy which is censorship."

The 150 participants in London, plus a number of those observing the proceedings, offered numerous proposals for action. A 1,500-word Declaration of London adopted by the conference expressed the strongest opposition to censorship, self-censorship and other abuses and urged priority consideration be given:

- Creation of a "fund against censorship" to support legal challenges

journalists' task force to report suppressed news from South Africa; raising of funds for news media forced to go underground; ensuring government leaders raise press abuse issues in visits to countries employing censorship; systematic publication abroad of news banned by censors in a particular country;

Encourage "truth squad" questioning of authoritarian leaders when they appear at international press conferences; listing of organizations fighting censorship, their projects, needs; formation of an alumni association of former Moscow-based correspondents to follow and report on harassment, intimidation or censorship of colleagues presently there; establishment of similar alumni groups for other places.

In some cases, further consideration by individual organizations seemed likely. In others, proposals overlapped existing activities or appeared less compelling.

There was strong desire among conference participants that the meeting speak directly to increasingly repressive conditions in South Africa, where further restrictions, including censorship, now are piled on top of some 100 press laws already on the books. It was feared by some speakers that a deal was imminent between some publishers and the government that would trade self-censorship for a relaxation of pressure.

Fulfilling a commitment made to the conference, WPFC Chairman Andersen on February 3 wrote to the heads of 23 South African newspapers to urge rejection of any arrangement that might restrict the rights of any other news media.

"Speakers . . . expressed deep concern that if any major news media should be co-opted by any such agreement . . . it could leave other news organization in an isolated position

and more vulnerable to government sanctions, including closure," Andersen said in the letter.

"The strategy of divide and conquer is not new, and in some places it has worked," he said. "The clear consensus of the World Conference on Censorship was to support those South Africans who are striving to assure that this strategy does not prevail in their country."

Answers to this letter expressed vigorous support for press freedom, noting in some cases the difficult struggles that the publications involved have waged against restrictions. No deal emerged.

The Declaration of London approved by the reporters, editors, publishers, and broadcasters participating in *Voices of Freedom '87* is quite plain:

"Where censorship exists it must be contested . . . where instituted it must be countered . . ."

"Where censorship exists it must be contested, and where censorship would be instituted it must be countered," it states. "Censorship, direct or indirect, is unacceptable."

The statement calls for continued protest and publicity against abuses of press freedom, stating the work of groups active in these areas has proven helpful in aiding journalists in difficulty. It stresses need for still better coordination of the fight against restrictions. It states that editorial independence, free access, open frontiers and nondiscriminatory official procedures must be afforded journalists. While there are great differences among countries, the statement asserts no government is entirely beyond reproach.

"Only through the fullest commitment to a free and unrestricted flow

of news gathered by free and independent journalists will we overcome those seeking to blind the world to what is happening in it," the Declaration states.

Seeking to translate words into action, leaders of the six organizations that organized the London conference (WPFC, IPI, FIEJ, IAPA, NANBA, FIPP) met April 2 at *El Pais* in Madrid to consider implementation of the conference's proposals. Under a rotation system, the sessions were chaired by Juan Luis Cebrian, editor-in-chief of *El Pais* and chairman of IPI.

At this follow-up meeting, the six organizations agreed:

1. To establish a "Fund Against Censorship."
2. To base this on the informal coordinating group comprised of the organizations that held the London conference.
3. To include both legal challenges and investigatory/protest missions within the Fund's activity.
4. To proceed with initial projects.
5. To have WPFC act as coordinator, but to create no new organization as such.
6. To implement the other London recommendations (lawyers list, "hot line," closer coordination of protests, etc.) within this framework.

Initial projects in Africa and Asia were discussed.

The Fund Against Censorship will operate as a "pool," with print and broadcast media experiencing censorship or related problems contacting it through any of the six organizations involved. The WPFC, for instance, will represent its 32 affiliates in this as in other areas and can relay cases for them and others to the coordinating group for possible joint action.

The Fund Against Censorship is not intended to supplant any group's activity, only to strengthen and broaden this where desired.

Andersen, WPFC's chairman, pledged initial support from the

"Only through the fullest commitment to a free . . . flow of news will we overcome those seeking to blind the world to what is happening in it."

WPFC in Madrid to get the Fund Against Censorship going, but further funding will be needed for its operation.

"The London conference saw urgent need for concerted efforts in this field," said Andersen. "The decisions reached in Madrid indicate our various organizations, working closely together, are determined to take the words of the Declaration of London and translate them into action.

"If we are to succeed in this new initiative in the battle against censorship, we will need the continued support and, in some cases, additional help from those who believe in the cause of worldwide press freedom," he said.

The Fund Against Censorship is an embryo — with large potential. From two days of talks in which 150 journalists from 34 countries tried their best to see how to fight censorship more effectively — it emerged as the best, the most doable new idea. It's time to move ahead.

The analogy is not perfect, but I see an example in the fight here at home against racial discrimination.

For years, the NAACP fought as hard as it could with publicity, protests, and other means against discrimination. It made important gains, but discrimination remained strong. Then the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund came along, and those fighting discrimination started winning in the courts.

I'd like to see something like this for journalists and news media everywhere. They need it. □

DECLARATION OF LONDON

(adopted January 18, 1987)

We inhabit one world, a world whose very survival depends more than ever on mutual understanding. This mutual understanding cannot exist without a free press ensuring a free flow of information between us all. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms the right of all men and women to freedom of opinion and expression, and the freedom "to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers." Yet worldwide, these freedoms are being threatened by censorship, some of it crude and naked, some of it clothed in other guises, but all of it directed to the same ends — restriction of the public's right to knowledge of the public business, denial of the people's right to be fully informed of all that affects their lives and their future.

We of the print, broadcast and electronic media believe that our primary responsibility is to our readers, our listeners and our viewers, and that our obligation is to inform them to the best of our professional ability. Thus it is to challenge those who would put fetters on the free flow of news in word and image that we reporters, photographers, editors, publishers and broadcasters from 34 countries throughout the world have gathered in London, 16-18 January 1987, for the first international conference convoked specifically to combat censorship. We believe that where censorship exists it must be contested, and where censorship would be instituted it must be countered, by our concerted efforts.

* * *

The price of press freedom is not cheap, and we pay tribute to those of our profession who have taken great personal risks to battle censorship at first hand. Some have been silenced,

some have triumphed in the end. Others have been driven underground, to continue publishing or broadcasting despite the peril to their lives or livelihood. But all of them shame the censors and, by their courage, put us in their debt.

Journalism has always been a hazardous profession. And in this age of violence, the press has not been spared from terrorist bombs or bullets. This conference, however, has attested to a more ominous trend: the growing use of brute force by government powers, criminal forces and other interests seeking to intimidate the news media. We condemn the many incidents presented here of our colleagues being killed, assaulted, jailed or otherwise harassed in pursuit of their journalistic duties, and we find particularly abhorrent the current practice of taking journalists hostage.

Journalism has always been a hazardous profession . . . the press has not been spared from terrorist bombs or bullets . . . there is a more ominous trend: the growing use of brute force by government powers, criminal forces, and other interests seeking to intimidate the news media.

We are disturbed also by the proliferation of press controls which equate with censorship in all but name. In this respect, no government, however democratic, is entirely beyond reproach. While direct pre-publication or pre-broadcast cen-

sorship remains limited, indirect censorship flourishes worldwide. The menace of official reprisals under national security laws or punitive press codes engenders a climate of fear in which journalists practice self-censorship. Implicit threats to withdraw publishing or broadcasting rights serve to restrain the independent news media. The same is accomplished in the case of individual journalists through government licensing or compulsory membership in government-sanctioned professional organizations.

Implicit threats to withdraw publishing or broadcasting rights serve to restrain the independent news media. Economic and other pressures . . . are similarly effective in muting voices that those in authority do not wish to be heard.

Economic and other pressures, including government controls on press telecommunications facilities or on the production or distribution of newsprint, and in allocations of government advertising or foreign exchange for the import of printing or broadcasting equipment are similarly effective in muting voices that those in authority do not wish to be heard.

These curbs on the domestic news media are matched by the obstacles erected by many countries to international press coverage, such as the exclusion of foreign journalists, restrictive documentation procedures and limitations on travel or access to news sources. Equally

repugnant is the censorship of information emanating from outside the country, by the complete or partial banning of foreign news services, newspapers or magazines, the excision of offending articles or pictures in these publications, the jamming or proscribing of foreign broadcast transmissions.

National security and the needs of public order and national development are frequently invoked in justification for restraints on the free flow of information. Journalists have no wish to see their nation's safety endangered. But we have been witness too often to official secrecy or disinformation being used to hide official embarrassment or corruption if not worse, and the similar use of other pretexts to stifle legitimate public debate.

* * *

In calling for press freedom throughout the world, we of the news media believe that this freedom begins at home, and that the flow of news across national frontiers cannot be free if the flow of news within those frontiers is not free. Nor can there be any "national sovereignty" over news and opinion.

. . . it is time to enunciate basic principles that should apply in maintaining a universal, free and uncensored flow of information

We believe therefore that it is time to enunciate basic principles that should apply in maintaining a universal, free and uncensored flow of information:

- Censorship, direct or indirect, is unacceptable; thus laws and practices restricting the right of the news media freely to gather and distribute information must be

abolished, and government authorities, national or local, must not interfere with the content of print or broadcast news, or restrict access to any news source.

- Independent news media, both print and broadcast, must be allowed to emerge and operate freely in all countries.
- There must be no discrimination by governments in their treatment, economic or otherwise, of the news media within a country. In those countries where government media also exist, the independent media must have the same free access as the official media have to all material and facilities necessary to their publishing or broadcasting operations.
- Government media must enjoy editorial independence and be open to a diversity of viewpoints. This should be affirmed in both law and practice.
- There should be unrestricted access by the print and broadcast media within a country to outside news and information services, and the public should enjoy similar freedom to receive foreign publications and foreign broad-

casts without interference.

- National frontiers must be open to foreign journalists. Quotas must not apply, and applications for visas, press credentials and other documentation requisite for their work should be approved promptly. Foreign journalists should be allowed to travel freely

continued on page 27

Television Docudramas: Fact and Fancy

Van Kornegay

*The pseudo-documented dramas are made in Hollywood —
not in network news departments*

An instant replay ought to end a controversy, but in the world of history it starts them. History's instant replay is the television docudrama, a blend of fact and fancy that generates large audiences and criticism from those who charge it is only a "B" movie version of the past with hyped plots and all-star casts.

Since man began dragging dinosaur meat back from the hunt, storytellers have mixed fact and fiction to create the glamorous out of the mundane. No one wanted to hear about hunters following dinosaur patties in search of a beast they could kill with dirt clods and clubs. The folks back at the cave wanted to know about the moment of truth when menacing teeth were bared, bones crunched, and brave hunters brought home the bacon.

Like their crude ancestors, playwrights and movie producers often glean the banal and tedious details from a good story and then reconstitute the facts to create composite

characters and events. But television has created a stage for the historical drama that is distinctly different from that of live theatre or the big screen.

Docudramas are hybrids of the made-for-television movie that first appeared in the late 1960's with ABC's *Movie of the Week*. These television movies held audiences through the commercials with a formula that put someone in a new kind of peril every fifteen minutes. By 1971 all three networks were deluging the public with a weekly diet of TV movies short on quality and long on exploitation.

escapist TV movies, were developing an appetite for more realistic films based on fact.

Networks identified the "ought-to" factor as being responsible for the trend. They explained that audiences were feeling guilty about watching mindless television and wanted a more legitimate excuse for sitting in front of the tube. Fact-based movies, the networks reasoned, offered viewers the chance to justify their video addiction by learning about something that was true.

By 1973, sensationalized television movies were experiencing serious ratings problems, so networks began

Audiences were feeling guilty about watching mindless television and wanted a more legitimate excuse for sitting in front of the tube.

Van Kornegay is a graduate student at the University of South Carolina in Columbia. He is finishing his first year of a two-year journalism course and is a news-writer on the Carolina Reporter, the weekly newspaper of the journalism school.



In her book *Up The Tube*, Sally Bedell wrote that network executives began to notice an interesting trend among audience ratings for television movies during the 1971-72 season. They found that the "small film," personal stories usually ignored by big screen producers, could be easily adapted to television and usually attracted a large audience. The executives also found that audiences, gorged and sated with the glut of

injecting variety into the overused form by cutting back on fantasy and adding more "reality." Hollywood propagandists concocted the term "docudrama" to reassure viewers these new programs were based on real-life events and characters and represented a novel departure from the made-for-TV movie.

The first television productions with the docudrama format aired in 1973 and 1974. *The Missiles of*

October, based on the Cuban missile crisis, and *Pueblo*, a dramatization of North Korea's seizure of a U.S. Navy intelligence ship, used real names and events to recreate well documented facts. ABC's promotional gurus billed *Missiles* as "theatre of fact," a phrase probably borrowed from Truman Capote's term "non-fiction novel" to describe the application of fictional techniques to a true story.

But it was NBC's 1974 production of *A Case of Rape*, a fictionalized account of two actual case histories from Los Angeles Police Department files, that was first tagged with the term "docudrama." The show attracted a 50 share (representing 22 million TV homes) and revealed a healthy audience appetite for fact-based dramas. In the wake of *A Case of Rape's* success, networks began scouring newspaper headlines and police blotters in search of potential docudrama plots.

Network research departments discovered that the public had a great desire to see a sugar-coated version of somebody's life — make that anybody's life.

The personal-profile movie quickly became one of the most popular forms of docudrama. Network research departments discovered that the public had a great desire to see a sugar-coated version of somebody's life — make that anybody's life. The stories didn't have to be about someone famous; they didn't even have to be about someone real. They just had to *appear* to be real.

The Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman was a highly acclaimed ac-

count of a black woman's struggles over a hundred-year period from slavery to the civil rights movement of the 1960's. In spite of its authentic-sounding title, the story was completely fictional, yet a few years after its showing, New York Governor Hugh Carey delivered a speech in which he cited Jane Pittman as a black woman who had played a significant role in American history.

In contrast to the made-for-television movie, docudramas have endured. Ratings have remained high, and viewers have been fed a steady diet of shows that meld fact and drama. Last autumn there were docudramas on the life of Sam Houston, Nazi hunter Beate Klarsfeld, and a work of fiction "representative of the collective courage and experiences" of 104 American nurses incarcerated by the Japanese during World War II.

If the docudrama has boosted network ratings by alleviating schlock-glut guilt among viewers, it also has inspired warnings about its potential for abuse and criticism for its transgressions of truth.

A big part of the problem seems to be the docudrama's medium. Television has become a ubiquitous part of American life. The public turns on the television for news and information as well as entertainment. One result is that docudramas are wrapped in a mantle of authenticity when viewed alongside daily newscasts on the same networks that spend millions to assure accuracy of news and documentary programs. Viewers may conclude that the networks' news organizations give docudramas a tacit seal of approval, when in reality, docudramas are made in Hollywood and have nothing to do with network news departments.

Another problem with television is that it is a medium of immediacy with an inexhaustible appetite for programming. Traditional historical dramas on the stage and screen usually appear after historians and scholars have had time to digest and interpret events. In contrast, docudramas are

often done on hurried production schedules in an attempt to capitalize on public awareness of recent or current events. As a result, the docudrama-of-the-week may give viewers a foreshortened or inaccurate historical view in which significant political and social events are trivialized.

...docudramas are often done on hurried ...schedules...to capitalize on public awareness of recent or current events.

One can imagine the series of docudramas that would be done on Gandhi if he was leading the movement for India's independence today. For weeks preceding the show, commercials would saturate the air with a deep well-resonated voice imploring us to watch "*Homespun* — one man's struggle to make his own underwear." Each new confrontation with the British would bring another docudrama, and soon Gandhi would be competing with *Moonlighting* and *Wheel of Fortune* for ratings.

Because it is a competitive entertainment medium, television is as sensitive to the viewer as a highwire artist is to his balance. In the private video village, the on/off button, coupled with a plethora of commercials about products for feminine hygiene, means a story must grab the audiences' attention and hold it. People who pay eight dollars to see a movie rarely walk out and head for the theatre down the street. They're sharing a communal experience with the rest of the audience and are willing to give the medium time to engage their attention.

But instant gratification determines the viewing habits of America's television audiences, and as a result,

producers and directors (who know that traditional "pure" documentaries score low in Nielsen ratings) must be subject to tremendous temptations to fortify a docudrama with a lot more "drama" than "docu."

In a triumph of style by adulteration of substance, ABC applied the docudrama technique to a 1977 production of *The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald*. The show asked viewers to consider what would have happened if Oswald had lived and been brought to trial for assassinating President Kennedy. This "what if?" production then proceeded to blend hard evidence with pure conjecture to fashion a persuasive case for the conspiracy theory of Kennedy's assassination. It featured a re-enactment of the shooting designed to look like the actual Zapruder home movies and used contrived news footage to help legitimize the fictitious trial. There were dramatized flashbacks in which Oswald is seen meeting with sinister-looking figures prior to the assassination and allegations of CIA-Mafia involvement, complete with potential witnesses who end up in the morgue.

In addition to epitomizing some of the shortcomings of the docudrama, this trial-by-speculation raised more disturbing questions about shows that corrupt legitimate facts from history to create crusading entertainment.

Such was the case in *The Atlanta Child Murders* when CBS restaged the trial of Wayne Williams, who was convicted in 1982 of murdering two young blacks. It was writer-producer Abby Mann's contention that Williams was railroaded by city officials who were anxious to close the books on as many as 29 child murders that were holding Atlanta under a siege of fear. Mann delivered his televised verdict in spite of the fact that Williams was convicted by a jury in a trial that received extensive publicity and that the jury's conviction was later upheld by the Georgia Supreme Court.

To shore up his case, Mann's show focused on all of the shortcomings of

the prosecution's case and belittled or ignored convincing evidence against Williams. It specifically failed to mention the fact that the murders of ghetto children stopped after Williams was arrested.

Another CBS production, *Kill Me If You Can*, a docudrama about convicted sex offender Caryl Chessman, was a blatant attempt to deliver an anti-capital-punishment message. Many may consider that a noble cause, but the show chose to downplay the brutality of Chessman's crimes and dwelt instead on his gruesome death in the gas chamber.

The show's producer later admitted that "the point of view of that piece purely and simply was anti-capital punishment. What we intended to do...was show that, indeed, gassing is not a nice way for a state to put someone to death. It's not a gentle, easy, lovely minute. It's eight minutes, and it's hell."

Advocacy docudramas also can have social or political consequences by revising attitudes toward controversial issues or events. The promotionals for *The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald* urged viewers to "watch the

dedicated they thought Oswald had not acted alone.

For producers with axes to grind, casting easily recognizable stars in the right roles is one way to further stack the docudrama deck. A generation of viewers had grown up watching Lorne Greene rescue "Little Joe" and "Hoss" from every conceivable mischief on *Bonanza*, so when the Wild West patriarch was chosen to play the defense counsel for Lee Harvey Oswald in *Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald*, it was easy to draw the conclusion that "Little Harvey" couldn't be all that bad. He had just gotten in with the wrong crowd who'd given him a gun and told him to shoot the president. Alan Alda played sex offender Chessman in *Kill Me If You Can*, and his established good-guy image was bound to fuzz the seedy realities of Chessman's character. *Up The Tube* author Sally Bedell notes that Elizabeth Montgomery, the star of *Bewitched*, was chosen to play the victim in *A Case of Rape*, because of her wholesome, family-oriented image.

Docudramas regularly feature controversial subjects and current events

The network news departments...risk their credibility by devoting parts of their newscasts to resurrecting events and individuals featured in the latest docusaga.

conclusion and voice your own opinion" by sending in ballots printed in *TV Guide* and newspapers. The ballots asked viewers to decide on whether Oswald was innocent or guilty and if guilty, did he act alone or in a conspiracy. Of the 55,565 ballots returned, 83.2 percent voted guilty and 16.8 percent voted innocent. An astonishing 78.7 percent of the guilty verdicts agreed with the conspiracy tilt of the show and in-

to ensure a large audience, and as a result, the shows themselves often become part of the national debate. The network news departments, already under fire for mixing news and entertainment, further risk their credibility by devoting parts of their newscasts to resurrecting events and individuals featured in the latest docusaga.

The night after ABC's *Nazi Hunter: The Beate Karsfeld Story*

aired, Peter Jennings introduced an update report on Klaus Barbie by saying, "I can't remember when we've done this before, but if you saw last night's story on ABC about Nazi hunter Beate Karsfeld..." He went on to describe Karsfeld's role in bringing Nazi Klaus Barbie to justice and introduced a special report on the Barbie case by Paris correspondent Pierre Salinger.

The report was lengthy and complete with interviews of French authorities involved in the case. Its in-depth nature suggested it had been prepared and scheduled in advance, possibly to capitalize on any residual viewer interest aroused by the docudrama the night before. Salinger turned in an excellent report that brought to light intriguing evidence of a conspiracy to keep Barbie from reaching trial so he won't implicate numerous Frenchmen as war crime accomplices.

But the Barbie story broke on a heavy news day in which plans for a coup in the Philippines had been uncovered, and the story on the arms shipments to Iran had just begun to unfold. In spite of those stories, ABC devoted a major part of its newscast to updating the status of Barbie's case in the French court system. In view of the other major news stories breaking that day, one wonders if ABC's decision to devote that much time to the Barbie case reflected good news judgment or a previous commitment to the network's entertainment division.

The fusillade of criticism leveled at docudramas has brought some reforms, and while plenty of exceptions remain, the networks should be commended for trying to establish some ground rules for keeping the docudramas responsible.

In the late 1970's the networks implemented a number of policies aimed at setting guidelines for docudramas. CBS organized a special unit to check the accuracy of all "fact-based" films and ABC and NBC urged their lawyers to begin examining broader questions of social responsi-

bility in presenting docudramas. A few of these safeguards have resulted in a more tempered approach, and in some cases docudramas have never made it to the screen, thanks to closer inspection by the networks.

For example, CBS dropped a project on the Symbionese Liberation Army after paying \$100,000 for the script when researchers could not substantiate a number of scenes and utterances called for in the production. NBC spent \$500,000 on a docudrama about the legal battle waged by survivors of a 1972 dam disaster in West Virginia, then aborted it when lawyers discovered passages in the script that could not be documented independently.

A number of docudramas have been cited for encouraging positive social change. *A Case of Rape* dealt not only with the crime but also with the inequities of rape law. The show's writer has been quoted as saying the production "literally changed the law in America. I think it changed it for good. . . ." For two consecutive weeks, *Roots*, which writer Alex Haley called "faction," involved much of the nation in a re-examination of its history of race relations.

Most networks now preview their docudramas with disclaimers warning audiences that some situations and composite characters have been created for dramatic purposes. Yet these disclaimers also can serve disingenuous ends by intellectually disarming the audience. The one that aired before the docudrama on Sam Houston told viewers the story was based on documented fact, but that time had blurred fact into folklore and folklore had become history.

To assuage any anxiety the audience may have felt about the show's validity, the preamble concluded, "However you read it, the story of Sam Houston is larger than life."

Of the three docudramas aired in the week before Thanksgiving, the ones that made less extensive and explicit preshow confessionals relied more on syrupy dramatic devices and

seemed to be less diligent in following the facts. The first twenty minutes of *Sam Houston* focused on the man as lover and fighter with a lengthy scene of Houston undressing his bride on their wedding night.

Despite the potential for controversy (some would say *because of the potential*), networks continue to churn out docudramas unabated. The new form has extended the longevity of the made-for-television movie, and as long as ratings continue to remain high, the networks will cull their programming from the headlines of humanity's foul-ups, bleeps, and blunders. The two most recent submissions, *The High Price of Passion*, a story about a high class prostitute and a Tufts University professor, and *Barnum*, a tale about the legendary P.T. Barnum, recently aired opposite each other.

Some critics have suggested mandatory safeguards to prevent miseducation-by-docudrama. Proposals have been made that would require docudramas to use disclaimers at the beginning of a show if it contains scenes based on speculation (such as closed cabinet meetings) or composite characters.

Other recommendations include refusing to cast big-name stars to prevent emotionally loading the dice and requiring programs to be reviewed by a qualified consultant or the network's own news department.

Most of the suggestions for reform have the ring of good common sense. The networks should make every effort to collaborate a story with the facts. But history-as-entertainment always has been fair game and television producers should have the same freedom of inquiry and expression as playwrights and movie makers. No doubt, networks in search of ratings will use this freedom to violate the bounds of good taste and occasionally mislead the public with sensationalized speculation. But libel laws, television critics, and the public debate they inspire provide a forum for condemning irresponsible docudramas. □

Biographical Statement (Revised Standard Version)

We Will Never Know

In a found-on-the-floor ms, a Nieman applicant tells of his hopes and his dreams.

One of this year's Selection Committee for Nieman Fellows spied this manuscript on the floor. Apparently, it had fallen out of an applicant's folder. It was dusted off and turned in. How fortunate that it was found: it may well become the prototype for all biographical data.

Obituaries. At long last I had won the most active "beat" on the *Times Beach (Mo.) Chronicle*. It had been an arduous, active, optimistic struggle but I finally had succeeded in my life's ambition: to be a journalist, to be good at my job, and to be a star. All this and \$300 a week at the age of 47. And yet...I began to ask myself in the ever-questioning insatiably curious way that so many of my editors have grown to love and fear: is this all there is?

It hasn't been an easy road. Along the way I have done all the normal things, paid my dues, and grown into a compassionate, tightly organized, brilliant writer and a fine human being. But that's not where I began.

Caribou, Maine, July 4, 1940. At my birth my Aunt Minnie, who was acting as a midwife until the doctor could reach our log hovel, far out into the middle of a potato field, exclaimed: "Here comes a future Nieman Fellow." My father, a peck of dirt thrust far up under his fingernails, replied "Ayuh." Those were the

Photograph and biography of the writer are missing. The committee member who found the ms cannot trace the applicant or hazard a guess as to the identity.

first words I ever heard.

Words. All my life has been tied up with words. But along the way I have

- Been shot at by Filipinos.
- Wrecked the company car on a telephone pole on the way to a well-known New York mobster's *bris* (I got the end of the story).
- Rescued a drunken colleague who was about to file copy about a crucial high-school basketball game with the score reversed (nobody ever knew).
- Stayed up all night with the director of the leprosy colony on the island of Molokai, waiting for the helicopter that would — finally — relieve the toilet-paper shortage that had brought the inmates near to despair (the paper got through).
- Integrated the locker room after an all-female roller derby.

With what pride the paternal parent greeted the little newcomer — that one word of welcome had all the eloquence of an Elizabethan sonnet.

Significant experiences like these have taught me the central lessons of our profession: tell the truth, yes, but do it with compassion, with care for our fellow human beings. That's what it's all about.

Or is it? Have I learned enough to put — 30 — beside the story? A tough but loving old city editor, his green eyeshade wreathed with smoke, once said to me: "Listen kid, you're just *drek* in this business until you've been a Nieman." I've carried those words next to my heart ever since.

For me — Mecca-Valhalla-Heaven — culminate in Harvard where I could ~~learn to~~ read and write, and meet interesting people to further my career.

Harvard. A magic word, as I learned when I turned away from the sports page and on into the business section. At last a shot at the books. A chance to read and not merely to imitate Hemingway, Faulkner, and Charles Wright Mills. To reflect. To learn how to use sentence fragments properly. To see the great, the near-great and the near, to sit at the feet of some of the historical monuments of our time. To trace the path of the red-coats up route 2, past the Shell station, under the spreading chestnut? elm? Whatever! The chance to mingle, to hobnob, to interface, to network with the classics.

As my tough but loving old city editor put it: "Why the hell not?" □

Hidden Taping: The Arguments For and the Ethics Against

Thomas W. Cooper

Is the practice ever justified? Do human feelings against its use ever count?

Many foreign correspondents who telephone the Soviet Union ask themselves, "Am I being secretly taped?" Reporters in the United States who phone CIA or FBI headquarters may ask the same question. However, the typical American citizen who phones in news to a reporter or who is being interviewed might not realize that a hidden machine may be taping the conversation.

Thus a debate has begun about the rights of a news source to be informed that forthcoming conversation with a reporter will be tape-recorded. Recently that debate has emphasized not so much human rights as the tape machinery: "Does the tape recorder, if concealed, alter the ethical nature of the interview?" This question places the tape recorder, and not the reporter's responsibility, nor the source's rights, at the center of the moral analysis. The technology *per se*, to which human behavior is secondary, is increasingly placed on trial, and frequently found innocent.

Thomas Cooper is assistant professor of mass communications at Emerson College. For six years, he was assistant to Marshall McLuhan at the University of Toronto. Prof. Cooper is the author of several books and a number of articles.



Recently a language of justification has emerged out of journalists' dialogues and their writing in professional journals. Frequently this language presents a rationale for accepting the hidden tape recorder. Three important journals have published articles which are typical examples: *Nieman Reports* ("On the Morality of Secretly Taped Interviews" by Theodore L. Glasser, Spring, 1985); *Washington Journalism Review* ("Causing a Hoopla in Kentucky" by Michael York, January, 1986); and *The Quill* ("Taping on the Sly" by Frederick Talbott, June, 1986). All three articles merit discussion.

Glasser vs. the Muffled

One reason for the rising number of justifications for hidden taping may relate to the increasing pervasiveness of surreptitious recording. This *pervasiveness* is matched by sophisticated *persuasiveness*. Glasser traces his arguments to Sissela Bok's philosophical literature, develops formal reasoning, and uses scholarly language.

However, the case against covert taping has remained foggy, and often is poorly articulated through tautological statements. Some arguments against hidden taping seem more intuitive and emotional.

While the differences between tape recorder and written notes will be considered for ethical implications, it is human behavior, within the framework of rights and responsibilities, which most merits investigation.

... some arguments against hidden taping seem more intuitive and emotional.

The Case For Hidden Taping

In the January, 1986, *Washington Journalism Review* Michael York captures his controversial investigative reporting adventures in "Causing a Hoopla in Kentucky." In writing a 1985 exposé about concealed pay-offs to University of Kentucky basketball players, York had collaborated with colleague Jeff Marx of the *Lexington Herald-Leader* and openly taped telephone interviews with many of the players suspected of involvement. Several players however, were unaware that Marx and York were audiotaping their phone interviews. In this case, York later argued that reasons of expediency and technological superiority supported the choice of the hidden tape recorder. In a list of arguments for secret taping, York's reasons are followed by the most common legal and social arguments. Glasser's opinions end this list.

- 1) The tape recorder "hears" better: York states, "We wanted to make sure we were completely accurate in our use of quotes." While tape recorders, like human ears, may "hear faintly"

or malfunction, they pick up entire conversations, rather than selective excerpts transcribed during continuing narration. Few people can concentrate during 100 percent of a conversation, let alone replay ambiguous words and sentences hours later.

- 2) The tape recorder has better "memory": Marx and York thought that, because of the controversial nature of the story, "There was a good chance some players would develop what Carroll called 'amnesia' after the story appeared." A tape "remembers" a complete interview, or whatever portions were recorded. A person may forget parts of the context or specific transitions between particular notes. Witnesses, sources, and

The tape . . . if clear, provides full evidence of what was actually said. [It] also may have recorded preliminary . . . off-the-record remarks . . . which give the reporter more meaning and context than notes . . .

other "interviewees" may later develop "amnesia" or disclaim "misquoted" statements if an interview proves damaging to themselves or others. The tape, however, if clear, provides full evidence of what was actually said. The tape also may have recorded preliminary or "off-the-record" remarks, background sounds, voice tones, and "non-verbals" which give the reporter

more meaning and context than notes, even months or years later. Moreover, unclear understanding during a first listening may be clear during a second or third, because of the "total recall" of mechanical "memory."

- 3) The tape recorder is expedient/practical: York states that he and Marx "wanted the tapes and transcripts because of their usefulness in ordering a large amount of material." With the computer or sustained patience, transcribed tapes may be organized according to key words, subjects, and topics. This material may be stored in a shoe box and transcribed only as relevant. Moreover, during the "in person" interview, the portable tape recorder, unlike the pencil and pad, leaves the reporter free to make eye contact, to use one or both hands, and to concentrate on other questions, and listen for apparent contradictions.
- 4) The tape recorder is protection against libel suits: In "Taping on the Sly," Frederick Talbott claims that "team interviewing or listening can fail miserably compared to taping when provability in a libel action . . . is at issue." Reporters can use tapes as superior evidence to notes, team listening, and prior documentation, if the reporter's truthfulness or memory is in question. The increasing number and cost of libel suits against reporters and their employers makes taping a valuable form of insurance.
- 5) Tapes are historical documentation: Notes often include only fragmentary interpretation of the thoughts of one party within a two-party dialogue. While a reporter may accurately (or inaccurately) recall his or her exact questions, a historian would have to reconstruct two-way conversation from a reporter's notes. Tape recording, unless erased or edited during the interview, re-

cords a closed approximation (+ 5 percent) of "real time," in which 60 taped seconds approximates "clock seconds." Thus tapes are accepted as more precise, complete, and direct forms of historical documentation.

- 6) Secret taping is legal in 78 percent of the United States: In 39 states and the District of Columbia, it is legal to record a conversation you are a part of without telling the others involved in the conversation. It can be reasoned that if almost four-fifths of the United States authorizes secret taping, then a large majority of politically representative voices support concealed taping in some situations.

Glasser's Protective Arguments for Hidden Taping: Perhaps the most sophisticated arguments for concealed taping are given by Dr. Glasser's article "On the Morality of Secretly Taped Interviews," which anticipates and rebuts predictable attacks upon secret taping.

- 7) Secret taping does not invade privacy: Glasser deduces "rules of privacy focus on roles — the role of reporter and the role of the source. When a conversation is said to be private, its participants are not 'acting' in their public roles. Accordingly, an individual acting as a reporter and an individual acting as a source are not by definition, engaged in a private conversation." For Glasser, social roles connote social rules; thus a source/reporter relationship differs from the relationship of the same two people when they are "off-duty." Consequently, the rules of source/reporter dialogue, as construed by Glasser, discount privacy and its potential invasion.
- 8) Secrecy is not necessarily anti-democratic nor dangerous: Glasser appeals to Sissela Bok's argument in her book, *Secrecy*. Secrecy serves at least four social

needs, which "concern protection for 1) what we are, 2) what we intend, 3) what we do, and 4) what we own." Secrecy in taping interviews may evoke more honest or uninhibited response. Potentially, the public and indeed the spirit of truthfulness, are better served.

- 9) Taping is different from wire-tapping and entrapment: The tendency to falsely associate all hidden taping with Orwell's Big Brother is deceptive. Eavesdropping, whether via wire-tapping (and wire-taping), remote reception, or "bugged" rooms include an *uninvited* and disclosed "third" party into an otherwise two-party dialogue. Entrapment seduces, through some type of reward system, behavior toward which the entrapped is arguably predisposed. Any source who knowingly engages in dialogue with a news reporter consents to different conditions. Only if an outside party secretly taped the interview or if the reporter seduced the source toward illegal activity would questions of "eavesdropping" or "entrapment" arise.

These nine arguments bolster the practice of secret taping and negate its potential dangers. In the list of opposing arguments, no attempt will be made to undercut the validity of these statements.

The Case Against Secret Taping

Statements appear in the foregoing paragraphs that imply that the objections to taping are frequently emotional proclamations, intuitive guesswork, and unsubstantiated opinion. A more precise and clear understanding of objections to hidden taping is necessary. Twelve ethical problems posed by hidden taping follow.

Admittedly, some of these "problems" arise from "feelings" held by interviewees about taping, both secretive and public. But failure to acknowledge and validate human

feelings may itself be inherently unethical, and failure to communicate clearly the source's feelings may leave the surreptitious reporter in an unfair dominant position. The — what I consider — violations to human dignity and privacy are based upon historical arguments, academic and professional dialogue, and common sense.

- 1) Taping preserves greater intimacy between source and reporters than is assumed by the source: Sources are led to believe that reporters primarily want information pertinent to "stories." However, hidden taping records other levels of communication — speech impediments, drunkenness, irrelevant defamatory remarks — which, if overheard by others, could provide embarrassingly "intimate" information about the source. Such tapes may be used by others or replayed months or years later without permission. This replay leads to an invasion of privacy that is not there with note-taking. One of the ground rules of interviews is that the journalist will use quotes or paraphrase, so thoughts and feelings reach readers indirectly. Taping, however, is direct talk revealing personality directly to others. It is as if the source had agreed to pose clothed for a painting, but instead, discovers that he or she has been photographed in the nude.

- 2) Secret taping forfeits a source's confidentiality and right to speak "off the record": In a non-taped interview, the interviewed person may speak "off the record" and ask that the reporter not take notes. A statement may be retracted or a mind changed and this may determine what the reporter writes or ignores. A concealed tape recorder, unless monitored, will automatically record all statements without the source's awareness. The

reporter may later be tempted to consider or include thoughts, triggered by replay, which would not have been written. Confidential and off-the-record conversation is meaningless, if the tape is later heard or quoted by others. When a reporter takes notes in person he or she is seen, but a hidden tape recorder, cannot be seen.

Secret taping decreases trust: If a reporter hides one item, will he not conceivably hide others?

- 3) Secret taping decreases trust: If reporters hide one item, will they not conceivably hide others? Will not the trustworthiness of the reporter be challenged by the source (and community) when the secret taping is revealed? The act of hiding may itself arouse suspicion and decrease credibility.
- 4) Taping is illegal or should be: In eleven states (California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington) taping without the consent of both parties is illegal. This number is misleading as the total population of these states exceeds one-third of the U.S. population. More importantly, law is not the same as ethics. For example, most types of lying are not illegal, but most types of lying, in most ethical systems, are unethical. Secret taping should be illegal because the source has not consented to the preserving and replaying of complete thoughts and speech by another. In television and

radio programming, for example, guests must usually sign written releases giving companies the right to tape their comments for replay.

- 5) Secret taping increases the potential for identifying sources: A reporter's notes may be stolen or rifled by others. But, unless the reporter constantly uses a headset, the likelihood of the tape recorder source being identified greatly increases. The source does not intend that his or her comments be overheard by the reporter's family or colleagues. Rather, the source assumes that only useful information will be printed, and that, in some cases, identity will be withheld. Thus taping increases the likelihood of (accidentally) overhearing conversations and recognizing sources.

Taping may change the source's behavior: Those who know they will be videotaped might be more likely to dress up and comb their hair.

- 6) Taping might change the source's behavior: Those who know they will be videotaped might be more likely to dress up and comb their hair. Those who know they will be audiotaped may be more likely to become presentable in other ways, such as speaking slower and more thoughtfully. Slips of the tongue and off-the-cuff comments may be minimized or deleted. If a tape recorder would alter the source's level of formality, confidentiality, and self-revelation, individuals should be informed of its presence so as not to

violate the dignity of their self-disclosure.

- 7) Secret tapes are nondeniable: Humans make statements which later may be denied by other statements such as, "I take that back" or "I was only joking." Taping allows words spoken in jest or in reckless abandon to be played or even broadcast out of context. Individuals have no guarantee, and no knowledge, that their taped words might (not) later be used against them, whether in court, in other news media, in public, or by the government and its secret agencies. In such instances, tapes have far more authority than reporters' notes.

The Deeper Concerns

Some concerns are less clear when stated as concepts rather than as percepts, as McLuhan distinguished. Not all impressions or feelings can or should be frozen into beliefs, concepts, or theory. In Jung's terms, there are objects and processes that we may consciously describe in one way but subconsciously identify (cf. intuit, dream or glimpse) in another. Consider the following phenomena:

- 8) Some Native Americans and other tribal cultures have refused to be taped because "it steals your soul." The machine which rereleases a person's disembodied spirit, which takes without giving (unlike face-to-face dialogue), which mechanizes human sounds, still alienates certain personality types. From this viewpoint are not all recording machines, in all circumstances a form of theft, unless the individual freely parts with his "soul"? Suppose the tapes are "sold"? Is not the interviewee the rightful owner? Even if a majority do not have such feelings, is it not discrimination to discount the minority who do? Have we become thoroughly insensitive to this seemingly remote point of view?

- 9) Taping exposes vulnerabilities: From a psychological standpoint, most people may be subconsciously aware that we all lie in subtle ways. By exaggeration, by selective perception, and by overt deception, we each form different patterns of childhood prevarication. One example is our childhood denial of stealing from the cookie jar or refrigerator, which lies we may perpetuate in other ways throughout childhood and beyond. Various personality types carry with them the constant fear of being "found out." Taping, particularly clandestine recording, poses a much deeper threat that the mask of language will be penetrated when the participant is "off guard." If the source is told that he or she is being taped, they may not be as open but may reduce the amount or degree of prevarication.

- 10) Clandestine taping is associated with wrongful conduct particularly in images created by national news stories: Seen from a distance, secret taping reminds naive onlookers of the deceit behind Watergate, the controversy surrounding ABSCAM, and the police state tactics of totalitarian governments. However innocent the intention (and the intention is not always innocent), hidden taping suggests the opposite of openness, trustworthiness, and respect. Reputation and public cooperation are often earned on the basis of perceived openness and integrity.
- 11) Secret taping alters power relations: If "knowledge is power," then controlled knowledge about others is super-power. If a tape may be used as evidence to show that the interviewed was a) under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of the interview, b) unfaithful to a spouse or relative, c) violating a state or

federal law, d) delinquent or incompetent in the performance of employment, e) otherwise irresponsible, the tape may later be used as bait for the obtaining of a favor or for more serious forms of blackmail. The source becomes the victim.

- 12) Secret taping implies that ends (more accurate news) justify means (covert taping): Many reporters have used some level of falsification or bribery — assumed identity, feigned friendship, used illegitimate press credentials, practiced checkbook journalism, promised headlines — to obtain a scoop, expose, or exclusive. However, can more "truth" be ultimately obtained through greater dishonesty? On the surface, secret taping appears to be a means for obtaining greater "truth" through mechanized accuracy. However, if all meaningful learning is by example, will not a source conceal more from a reporter who by nature also conceals? Conversely, does not an atmosphere of openness inspire reciprocal openness? Finally, from a purely ethical standpoint, can dishonest methods ever be employed in the interest of greater honesty?

Weighing the Arguments: On the one hand, hidden taping can be justified both in practical and moral terms. This justification is well argued by reporters such as York and Marx, and scholars, such as Talbott and particularly Glasser. However, important questions are raised about 1) the nature of surreptitious taping itself, and 2) the assumptions upon which many justifications are founded.

The arguments "against" obviously outweigh the "pro" arguments in quantity. Quantity, however, is secondary to considerations of quality, particularly when other justifications could probably be added to either list, or any number of the listed rationales could be partially

deleted, reorganized, or merged on the grounds of partial overlap.

Two contradictory premises have been advanced in defense of hidden taping, from which various justifications arise: 1) the tape recorder has no indigenous properties and consequently only extends the note-taking process; 2) the tape recorder has many indigenous qualities (expert hearing, perfect memory, etc.), and thus greatly improves the interviewing process. The first argument appears in articles such as Talbott's "Taping on the Sly" and the second in York's "Causing a Hoopla."

If the tape recorder is simply a "neutral" extension of note-taking . . . its presence should be declared so that honesty and openness will be recognized and reciprocated.

Against Hidden Taping: If the tape recorder is simply a "neutral" extension of note-taking by the reporter, its presence should be declared so that honesty and openness will be recognized and reciprocated. How can reporters who are neither fully honest nor fully open expect their sources to be both?

But there is a far deeper reason for openness. It is rooted in the fact that most arguments for clandestine taping favor some form of "expediency." The arguments against this supposition consider the conditions of "humanity" and particularly those of individuals. Most "pro" arguments seem to originate within the mind, while the opposite notions come from both the mind and the heart.

The predominant arguments for taping seem in line with this general spirit of technological progress. Tap-

ing extends, expands, evolves, or improves pencil-and-paper note-taking, which soon may be obsolete. Talbott quotes *Newsday's* Robert Greene, "The tape recorder is the state-of-the-art in taking notes today." Like all new technologies, it is more of or better at something, in this case, more accurate, thorough, and retentive. It expedites the information-gathering and storage process. Perhaps someday remote controlled portable recorders, both public and concealed, may replace news reporters. Recorders are, after all, more "effective" and "precise." Certain types of satellites and hidden cameras already perform related functions.

For Human Dignity: But such a line of thinking, while exposing specific values, conceals the issue of concealment. If emphasis is given to the issue of the tape recorder technology, emphasis is thereby displaced from its covert employment. Sources are not news objects. They are individual people who are to be served and respected no less than any other members of the "public" to whom the press claims devotion. Hidden technology, with its potential for abuse, and violation of an assumed contract, undermines any professed "respect for" or service to "the public". Ultimately, "sources" comprise the "public."

A "source," like a "reporter," whether public or private, is a human being. As such, he or she is part of the public and indeed humanity, and inherits the quality of dignity. As Robert Fortner has stated:

Dignity is not bestowed by one human upon another, nor created only by those intending to do so. It is an endowment of humankind. But it can be relinquished, or stripped away by others. Either act, however, in these terms would be judged immoral — dehumanizing. Man's natural endowment would have been usurped.

continued to page 27

Nieman Fellows

1987-88

Twelve American journalists have been appointed to the 50th class at Harvard University. Established in 1938 through a bequest of Agnes Wahl Nieman, the Fellowships provide a year of study in any part of the University. Nieman Fellows from other countries will be announced later.

The American journalists in the new Nieman class are:

ELINOR BRECHER, 39, Sunday magazine writer and columnist with *The Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Ky. She studied at the University of Oklahoma and is a graduate of the University of Arizona. At Harvard, she plans to focus on American social history, urban and women's studies and 20th Century American literature.

FRANK DEL OLMO, 38, editorial writer at *The Los Angeles Times*, Los Angeles, Calif. He is a graduate of California State University Northridge and studied at the University of California, Los Angeles. He plans to study U.S.-Soviet relations, sociology and economics, especially as they relate to Latin America.

WILLIAM DIETRICH, 35, reporter with the *Seattle Times*, Seattle, Wash. He is a graduate of Western Washington University. During his Nieman year, Dietrich plans to concentrate in history, American religious thought, and economics.

ROBERT HITT III, 37, managing editor of *The Columbia Record*, Columbia, S.C.

Hitt is a graduate of the University of South Carolina, where he also has been a graduate student in business administration. At Harvard, Hitt wants to concentrate on social, political and economic change as they relate particularly to the South.

JOHN MacCORMACK, 37, South Texas bureau reporter for the *Dallas Times Herald*, Dallas, Tex., is a graduate of Houghton College. While a Nieman, he wants to study Mexico, as well as Mexican and South American literature; the Romantic Poets; and the American Civil War.

DALE MAHARIDGE, 30, general assignment reporter with *The Sacramento Bee*, Sacramento, Calif. He attended Cleveland State University. While at Harvard, he plans to read classical literature and to study the social-economic history and social movements of the United States.

MICHELE McDONALD, 34, photographer with *The Virginian-Pilot*, Norfolk, Va. She attended Bensalem College of Fordham University. At Harvard, McDonald's proposed studies will include contemporary American history, American history, American foreign policy particularly in relation to Latin American, and writing.

EILEEN McNAMARA MAY, 34, reporter with *The Boston Globe*, Boston, Mass., is a graduate of Barnard College and the Columbia University

School of Journalism. During her Nieman year, she plans to study the law and American social history and to examine the relationships between the courts and public policy.

LINDSAY MILLER, 39, producer with Public Broadcasting Service/*Bill Moyers*, New York, N.Y. She is a graduate of Wellesley College. Miller wants to attend classes in art, music, religion and history.

EUGENE ROBINSON, 33, city editor of *The Washington Post*, Washington, D.C. He is a graduate of the University of Michigan. Robinson proposes to study Latin American history, literature, culture and the Spanish language. He wants, too, to take a course in cosmology or geology.

WILLIAM SUTTON, 31, city hall reporter with *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, Philadelphia, Pa. He is a graduate of Hampton Institute/University and attended Rutgers University Law School. Sutton wants to focus his studies on the United States role in the Caribbean.

GENE WEINGARTEN, 35, editor, *Tropic Magazine*, *The Miami Herald*, Miami, Fla. He attended New York University. At Harvard, Weingarten proposes to study American intellectual history, focusing on 20th Century literature.



Hidden Taping

continued from page 25

Privacy, then, is essential to the protection of dignity, for it allows the opportunity for undignified action without public consequence. Violation of privacy — exposure of such action to a public forum — is an act violating humanness.

In short, it is immoral, that is, unethical. When people betray other's confidences, they do not merely expose secrets, they also invalidate the person betrayed.

Finally, the greater danger of surreptitious taping is not its monstrosity, but rather its subtlety: We have come to expect that incremental improvements in communication are valid whatever their effects upon society, or encroachments upon individual dignity: The privacy invasions made possible by satellites and computers loom so large that a hidden taping of a mere news "source" seem miniscule, even rational. Therein lies the deeper problem.

Individual choice about personality disclosure, intimate revelations and private conversation still remain a matter of individual dignity, which reporters, no less than others, must ask permission to reveal. Permission to publish selected information is fundamentally different from permission to record moments of a person's existence. Only when full permission is granted do the ingenious, but impersonal, arguments of Glasser hold sway.

Unless the source of information, no less than the reporter, is treated in human terms, rather than as a news object, all such justifications will ring hollow. Unless the source is free to choose, then neither is society. If reporters will conceal from their sources, what will they hide from the rest of their public? Unless the source is honestly treated, neither is humanity. □

Declaration of London

continued from page 15

within a country and have access to both official and unofficial news sources, and be allowed to import and export freely all necessary professional materials and equipment.

- Legal, technical and tariff practices by communications authorities which inhibit the distribution of news and restrict the flow of information are condemned.
- Restrictions on the free entry to the field of journalism or over its practice, through licensing or other certification procedures, must be eliminated.
- Journalists, like all citizens, must be secure in their persons and be given full protection of law. Journalists working in war zones are recognized as civilians enjoying all rights and immunities accorded to other civilians.

* * *

In a world that is becoming increasingly one through new communications technologies, press freedom is indivisible. When censorship applies anywhere, it restricts access of the public everywhere to full knowledge of events. We intend by this meeting to help create an atmosphere in which censorship is recognized for what it is — a denial of human rights. From this Declaration of London, we shall move forward to joint action:

First, in continuing to protest and publicize abuses against press freedom. This makes it clear to the world what others would hide, and has proven helpful in aiding journalists in difficulty.

Second, in intensifying and better coordinating the fight against censorship, we urge priority consideration for the following suggestions for joint action developed at this

conference:

- Creation of a "fund against censorship" to support legal challenges to censorship measures and to other abuses of press freedom. To support these challenges, lists could be compiled of lawyers experienced in handling litigation involving the news media.
- Establishment of a "censorship hot line" as a clearing house for complaints by journalists subjected to direct or indirect censorship. This contact mechanism could be used by them in seeking assistance and advice, and would help in focusing international publicity on the abuses to which they have been subjected.
- Production, on a periodic and professional basis, of public service advertisements which the print and broadcast media could use, spotlighting particularly severe or striking examples of news censorship, or other abuses against press freedom.
- Organization of an "early warning system" to provide information on restrictive press laws, regulations or other measures being prepared or proposed, in order that international attention be brought to bear in time to oppose their adoption.
- Dispatch of journalistic missions to regions where official suppression of the news is especially severe, in order to investigate fully those conditions or events which the censors would conceal.

Only through the fullest commitment to a free and unrestricted flow of news gathered by free and independent journalists will we overcome those seeking to blind the world to what is happening in it. We pledge ourselves to renew this effort. □

THE BOOKSHELF

The Space in Space

Tracing New Orbits — Cooperation and Competition in Global Satellite Development

Edited by Donna A. Demac.
Columbia University Press, 1986.
\$35.

by David DeJean

This is how small the world has gotten:

We are rapidly depleting a natural resource that we have agreed is "the common heritage of mankind." As usual, the lion's share is taken by the industrialized nations — 72 percent in 1984. Inevitably, it has led to a confrontation between the haves and the have-nots of contemporary geopolitics. The poor of the earth, what we euphemistically call "Less Developed Countries," have banded together to force their claims on the rich. And in the face of their vastly superior numbers, the Over Developed countries scramble to find a compromise.

It is a mark of the sophistication of the issue that all this has happened without a shot fired, that the major battleground so far has been an international meeting in Geneva two years ago, that it will be another year and another meeting before anything is resolved, that an adverse outcome could affect the economic growth of major nations, yet that technological change could render the controversy moot by turning the limited resource into an unlimited supply.

It is also a mark of the sophistication of the issue that the natural resource in question is more or less intangible: The "geostationary orbit" is a circle around the earth 22,300 miles above the equator. A satellite placed in this orbit and accelerated to match the speed of the earth's rota-

tion in effect stands still: Precisely suspended between the pull of gravity and the centrifugal force of its own momentum, it hangs over one spot on the ground as if it had been put at the top of a 22,300-mile-tall tower.

From there, using radio frequencies in the microwave range which travel only by line of sight, radio receiver/transmitters on satellites can receive a signal from the ground and retransmit as a highly directional signal, a cone-shaped beam that can deliver a clear signal anywhere within an area as big as, say, the continental United States with most of Latin America and Canada thrown in.

The geostationary orbit has become very crowded very quickly. In mid-1984 there were 149 communications satellites in geostationary orbit. About 30 were devoted to telecommunications traffic within the United States, where much of the signal content is in transit to television broadcasters and cable-TV systems. This industry has grown very quickly. In a dozen years demand, capacity, and technology have built a major communications activity that did not exist before.

Domestically, the cost of entry into satellite communication has dropped precipitously as technology improvements have had dramatic effects. Exploitation of extremely high frequency ranges means that signals from space don't have to muscle their way through earthly interference. Far more powerful electronics in orbit have made it possible to miniaturize the dish antennas used to send and receive satellite signals: Equipment that once needed to be monstrous engineering projects 30 to 90 feet wide and many stories high today can be home-appliance size, a couple of feet across. The net result is

that what was once affordable only by the biggest electronics and communications giants — Western Union, AT&T, RCA — is now affordable and even necessary to the operation of any cable system, television station, or business with data to telecommunicate.

Internationally, satellite communications developed rather differently. International communications satellite traffic is dominated by a consortium, Intelsat, owned by both industrialized countries and LDCs (the United States, with 29 percent of the voting rights, is Intelsat's biggest stockholder). Intelsat's major role is to provide international telephone service. To do this, it maintains some 17 satellites in orbit linked to client nations' ground facilities around the world. Intelsat operates as an acknowledged monopoly, and charges the same rates to all its clients, rich and poor, the world over — although a very large part of its revenues come from telephone and television traffic over the North Atlantic.

It is this international arena that is addressed by *Tracing New Orbits: Cooperation & Competition in Global Satellite Development*. This collection of papers clusters around the political problems posed by satellite telecommunications in general, and in particular the problems slated to be addressed at the "Space WARC," a World Administrative Radio Conference sponsored by the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) in Geneva in the summer of 1985. This meeting, more recently known as ORB(1), was the first half of a process that will conclude with ORB(2) in 1988.

The book is not a primer on the subject of satellite communication. It casually presumes a level of technical knowledge and acquaintance

with the issues that will quickly drive away the faint of heart. In its lack of overt organizational scheme it presents a sketchiness worthy of the Impressionist masters. But in the end it paints a picture of technical constraints and political possibilities that are so complex and difficult to grasp that they look like they could be the truth.

Tracing New Orbits begins with a lawyer's review of the ownership of space and its resources as a subject of international law — a line of treaties and international conventions that began in 1967 and continued through a United Nations Agreement on the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies that took effect in 1984. It is this document that establishes the doctrine that "the Moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind." Significantly, the United States is not a signatory.

The book touches very briefly on the technological issues involved in expanding access to telecommunications: While the key resource is position on the geostationary orbit, coordination of frequency ranges and satellite signal strength are also important because they affect the three-way trade-off between the cost of the satellite in orbit, the cost of the transmitting and receiving equipment on the ground, and the type of service being provided.

International telephone and data-transmission service between national capitals, for example, calls for relatively few earthside transmit/receive installations. The most efficient combination of technology and economics in this situation is to use a relatively low frequency range, a low-powered, inexpensive satellite, and large, expensive earthside facilities.

Less Developed Countries are increasingly interested in very different services. An example is Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS), which holds great promise of providing centralized educational, cultural, and communications services. The technological

and economic efficiencies of DBS, however, call for very many very cheap earthside facilities, very powerful, expensive satellites, and the lowest possible frequency range, where the technology is the best developed and farthest down the cost curve.

Because it is politics, not technology, that is really the central focus of *Tracing New Orbits*, the history of Intelsat is given more careful treatment. The organization was founded in the early 1960's at the behest of the United States as an economic cooperative of investors and users, and given a monopoly on international services by its creator countries. The mission of Intelsat was shaped by presumed scarcity — as with many things that are hard to do in the beginning, it was thought that satellite communications always would be expensive, in short supply, and difficult to manage. To assure its revenues, the organizing countries gave Intelsat what appeared at the time to be a natural monopoly over international telecommunications. In the 1980's, however, Intelsat is facing challenges for the lucrative North Atlantic service that underwrites much of its activity elsewhere around the world, and it has begun to feel pressure from regional groups of countries that want satellite services such as DBS which Intelsat is not positioned to supply.

There are other advantages of satellite technology that could benefit the Less Developed Countries as well — weather forecasting, natural-resource surveying, and national security. They are aware of these, and they are aware how fast the natural resource that they need access to — the geostationary orbit — is being used up. (Describing the difference between the industrialized nations and the Less Developed Countries as "North-South" issues appears to have gone out of fashion, but it has some relevance here: The industrialized countries are populating the geostationary orbit around

the equator with satellites that look Northward, diminishing the real estate and clear frequencies that eventually could be used to look Southward.)

As early as the late 1970's the Less Developed Countries realized what the explosive growth in commercial communications satellites might mean for them. When India and Indonesia had difficulty coordinating frequencies for national and regional satellite systems, the gauntlet was clearly down. The LDCs put together a strategy and picked a political forum — a World Administrative Radio Conference devoted to satellites. The WARC is an international meeting with substantial precedent, and it is held under the auspices of the International Telecommunications Union, a United Nations agency charged with administering the assignment of the radio frequency spectrum. The advantage to the LDCs was that because it is a UN agency, it operates on a one-country-one-vote basis, and what the LDCs lack in economic clout at the UN they more than make up for in numbers. Accordingly, in 1979 a Space WARC was called, to be held in two sessions — one, now called ORB(1), in 1985 to set policy, and a second, ORB(2), in 1988 to decide on implementation.

Here, two-thirds of the way through the volume, is where *Tracing New Orbits* exhibits its greatest strengths — and its greatest weakness. In the strongest, most interesting papers in the book, the cases for North and South are drawn, possible strategies and counter-strategies developed. The varied backgrounds and viewpoints of the authors are used to maximum advantage here, and the reasons for the inclusion of some of the early papers at last become clear.

On the negative side, all these papers were written in 1984, a year before ORB(1), although the book was not published until 1986, a year after the conference was over. *Trac-*

ing *New Orbits* delivers no resolution of the issues, no editor's "Afterward" on how the meeting came out. ORB(1) is history, but what happened?

Apparently, what happened was pretty much what the authors in the book foresaw. In their writing they predicted that after all the rhetoric about the "common heritage of mankind" worked its way into the record, the Less Developed Countries would move the adoption of a very rigid planning process, in which the ITU would assign orbital positions and frequencies based on plans to be submitted by each country — regardless of how soon (if ever) that country might be able to actually launch a satellite and build the ground facilities required.

Other writers foresaw that the interests of the industrialized North, and of Intelsat (although the two are not congruent by any means), might best be served by striving for a compromise on a more flexible planning process. This would somehow recognize the rights and the needs of the LDCs while avoiding any absolute assignment of resources to countries not likely to utilize them in the near term. The role of Intelsat in this compromise would be as a sort of safety valve — to accept a change in its charter, and begin to make available regional services and DBS.

(Here's a nutshell "Afterward", if you can't stand the suspense: ORB(2) next year will implement procedures for planning the use of the geostationary orbit — the victory that the book anticipated for the LDCs. But only selected frequency bands will be planned — a compromise not anticipated by any of the authors. And two distinct planning methods will be implemented: Apparently one method, for the selected frequencies, will be rigid enough to guarantee any LDC who wants it, access to the geostationary orbit. Another method, very flexible in its approach, will be used to "plan" other frequency ranges, to be

occupied by the industrialized nations, by encouraging technological innovation which would get the most out of the limited resources.)

If you don't recall reading about the outcome of ORB(1) on Page One of your daily paper, it's undoubtedly because it never ran there, which is unfortunate for a couple of reasons:

First, because, as *Tracing New Orbits* depicts, the United States has managed, in its handling of the very complex issues of international politics surrounding satellite development, if not to do itself proud, at least to avoid some of its customary wretched excesses of self-interest, to deal sensitively and fairly with other nations, and (particularly in its support of Intelsat) to show some vision early on.

(Washington could still snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, various authors imply, by granting existing requests from private U.S. companies to offer international telecommunications services in the North Atlantic, in contravention of the monopoly on such services devised for Intelsat. Another Afterward is needed on this issue.)

Second, we do live in a small world, a world of scarcity and limits, a world in which we must find ways of resolution, rather than ways of confrontation. It is encouraging that in a sense the issues of satellite communications contain the seeds of their own solution. The last paper in the book is written by Ken Schaffer,

a satellite systems engineer, who in the early 1980's overcame the special problems of receiving the signals from Russian satellites (because much of the Soviet Union lies far from the equator, it cannot be served by satellites in geostationary orbit) and installed a system to deliver Moscow's television programming to a TV set at Columbia University.

Mr. Schaffer writes that as he worked to improve the quality of his system he also immersed himself in the programming. "I found myself starting to make sense of the repeating themes and patterns, the body-language, that was program content. I do not speak the Russian language. For the first time I found the video medium to be so powerful a context that much of the meaning came through without my knowing the verbal language," he writes, adding further on, "One can see how the younger generation, who will take over the reins of our planet, might, through such technologies come to see that, balanced on a precarious hair trigger, we all share a common fate.

"It is hard to hate a country when you get to know its weather-lady. . . ." □

David DeJean, Nieman Fellow '78, is executive editor, news, for PC Week. Before coming to Boston, he was in charge of the video text department of the Los Angeles Times.

The Neglected Third World

The Global Struggle for More: Third World Conflicts with Rich Nations. A Twentieth Century Fund Essay.

Bernard D. Nossiter. Harper & Row, 1987. \$20.

by Susan Dentzer

Fads in economics, as in anything else, come and go. This year's is "Competitiveness" — a concept that

has apparently inspired everything from tariffs on Japanese goods to Democratic Presidential campaigns. While the concern about America's ability to compete is justified, the problem with such fads is that they steal the limelight from other issues. Among the most neglected are the troubles of the Third World, now largely relegated to the business pages in stories about banks to

whom poor Southern debtors are in hock.

Into this void steps Bernard Nossiter [NF '63] with *The Global Struggle for More*. He's to be congratulated: this Twentieth Century Fund essay thoroughly maps out the key sources and ramifications of conflict between the rich North and developing South. Students of the subject may find little new, or quibble with some of Nossiter's proposed solutions; moreover, the book would have been more provocative had it succumbed to a bit of faddishness and addressed more of the substantive issues of the "competitiveness" debate. Still, as an overview of the gulf dividing rich and poor nations — the greatest economic tragedy of this century — *The Global Struggle* will be a lasting and useful work.

Nossiter, formerly a reporter for *The Washington Post* and United Nations bureau chief for *The New York Times*, has a long track record in reporting the North-South conflict. The *Post* sent him to cover the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in Geneva in 1964, a meeting that launched what Nossiter describes as an "endless dialogue of the deaf" between the Third World and the industrialized nations. Ever since, the Third World has contended that its impoverished status was the result of Northern exploitation; that trends in world trade and commodity prices ran inexorably against it; that the North had a moral obligation to pull the South out of its misery through foreign aid. And as UNCTAD demonstrated, Nossiter notes, the South also held "an almost mystical belief in the utility of global conferences, a conviction that if the North met with the South, the self-evident reasonableness of the Third World position would induce the North to yield."

However warranted many Third World complaints may be, nowhere was this belief proven more

groundless than during the depths of the 1980's debt crisis. Nossiter opens with an account of the now-familiar financial follies: Desperate to recycle the flood of petrodollar deposits during OPEC's heyday, Northern banks shoveled hundreds of billions of dollars in loans into the Third World. "Borrowers gave only cursory explanations of how their debt might finance profitable projects," Nossiter notes; much of it went to support the military or bad economic policy, or was siphoned off in graft or dissipated in capital flight. Banks, meanwhile, "assumed that flags pay debts" — an assumption proven erroneous when Mexico defaulted in August 1982.

The dialogue over debt has since devolved into a morass of rescheduling agreements, hair-splitting over interest rates, periodic threats of debtors' cartels, and talk of *capacidad para pagar* — the ability of Third World countries to continue to pay their debts. Yet for Nossiter, this struggle is only an echo of the larger North-South conflict that caused the debt bubble to burst in the first place. The chief culprit was the United States Federal Reserve and the cult of influence of central bankers in the industrialized nations — who insisted on fighting global inflation with the blunt instrument of monetary policy. Specifically, Nossiter argues, central bankers chose to battle today's "cost-push" inflation — imbedded into the economy through wages and prices set in imperfect markets — with tools "designed to subdue an inflation of demand." The result, he says, was recession and unnecessary suffering at home and abroad when growth-oriented policies would have served all countries much better.

The debt crisis did have one useful outcome, Nossiter argues: It laid to rest, at least for the time being, much of the economic humbuggery that had haunted North-South discussions for two decades. One element was the school of thought promulgated by the Argentine

economist Raul Prebisch, UNCTAD's first secretary general, who had argued that the South would be ever under the North's heel by virtue of the laws of economics. In Prebisch's view, as industry modernized in the North, it would require less and less of the raw materials the South exported, depressing their prices. At the same time, rising Southern incomes would demand more industrial goods, pushing their prices higher. The Third World was thus "doomed to ever-deteriorating terms of trade" — a contention that seemed to fix the blame on capitalist exploitation while freeing the South from any responsibility for its own condition. The empirical evidence on prices never was really on Prebisch's side, Nossiter notes, but the general drift of his theories lived on in the notion of *dependencia*, or dependency theory — this time with multinational corporations substituting as the evil geniuses who conditioned the Third World to an intolerable and destructive symbiosis. Nossiter suggests that it took the real emergency of the debt crisis, and the desperate need to export more goods and import more foreign capital, to put many of these notions to bed.

A similar fate befell the so-called New International Economic Order, (NIEO), a loose amalgam of programs, proposals, and demands laid by the South at the North's doorstep during the late 1960's and 1970's. Many of them constituted "a curious blend of the inconsistent...the Lud-dite...and the outmoded," writes Nossiter, while the rest were "largely a string of devices to secure aid without conditions." Among them were demands for a greater Third World role in the decisions of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; technology transfers to the South; and the formation of Southern producer cartels along the lines of OPEC. The decline in the petroleum cartel during the early 1980's produced an object lesson, however, and the collapse of most of

the agreements to prop up commodity prices spelled disaster for future commodity pacts. The NIEO, Nossiter writes, "was neither new, international, economic, or orderly," and by the early 1980's it was mostly dead.

In outright bids for foreign aid, the Third World has fared somewhat better. Here at least the industrialized countries have often proved willing to go the second mile, either through bilateral lending programs designed to compliment foreign and defense policies, and through multilateral lending via the World Bank and other agencies. Yet the aid programs have been riddled with contradictions and blunders on a colossal scale, and Nossiter spares few of the familiar details. Paramount among them were the infusions of massive aid into countries where government policies ran counter to economic development, or for projects benefiting established elites and their largely urban supporters. The result often has been to undercut economic growth. Nossiter cites the case of sub-Saharan Africa, by and large self-sufficient in food production around 1960. Thereafter, while the aid dollars flowed to white-elephant projects, agricultural production was virtually destroyed — done in by government-run monopoly marketing boards that forced farmers to sell them their crops at low prices.

Nossiter saves his most scathing criticisms for the donor countries, of whom he seems to have expected greater wisdom and less self-serving behavior. Applauding what he terms the "ethical" motivation behind much foreign aid, he nonetheless derogates the alternate tendencies of the three largest donors (the United States, the Soviet Union, and OPEC) to "put their money where their guns are" — in the case of the U.S., devoting more than a third of its bilateral lending to Israel and Egypt combined. He also derides what he terms the "crude economic na-

tionalism of the Reagan era," which has engendered the so-called "mixed credit" — aid dollars tied to the purchase of U.S.-made equipment at subsidized rates. It's bad enough that we know very little about the process of economic development, writes Nossiter; but the problem with the mixed motivations of foreign aid is that they doom it to failure on all accounts. Security assistance doesn't protect donor policy interests because countries are turncoats — witness the Soviet Union's experience with Egypt. Subsidizing our exports under the guise of aid distorts trade, which ultimately works in no one's favor. Finally, these forms of aid will fail on economic terms: they will serve to maintain the dominance of elites and forestall painful reforms necessary for economic growth.

Nossiter's disgust at the shortsightedness of foreign aid carries over into an excellent chapter on trade problems. He notes that development experts long urged the Third World to industrialize — but now that the South's dependency on manufactured exports is rising, all hell has broken loose. Protectionism is on the increase; "the Northern markets, where three-fifths of the South's manufactured goods are sold, are ringed or closed off." The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is moribund: in 1984 an estimated 45 percent of all international trade was subject to costly barriers, not including tariffs. The Third World isn't guiltless, either, Nossiter admits — with nations like Brazil zealously protecting their own incipient industries and home markets from many imports of foreign goods.

Clearly, the issue facing both North and South is "how to find the least painful way back to the open trade of the first twenty-five postwar years." Nossiter correctly diagnoses the political problem: the benefits of free trade are diffuse, while the adverse consequences are focused on struggling industries and

unemployed workers with seeming hotlines to elected officials.

He offers several solutions: compel beneficiaries of protection to draw up plans of action to become competitive once again; issue government-guaranteed loans for investment and modernization; allocate funds to retrain and encourage the movement of workers "from dying to growing industries." Above all, he proposes that the cost of every piece of protection should be made explicit by ending the secrecy of many so-called "voluntary restraints" or orderly marketing arrangements. Bravo — and to begin to educate the voters, how about garment tags like the current care labels, estimating the savings to consumers were textile import quotas not in place?

Since much of the protectionism of the last decade has been traceable to economic stagnation, Nossiter affirms that "a prosperous economy is the single most powerful contribution that the rich North can offer the poorer South." Returning to an earlier theme, he blasts the industrialized countries for abandoning fiscal policy as a macroeconomic management tool and ceding authority to inflation-fearing central bankers. Nossiter predicts that this Reign of Torpor won't last: "At some point, Western voters will reject the waste and misery of policies that hold down prices by idling men and plants. . . . Once again, voters will insist on increased living standards, on a growing economy." Central bankers will then be sacrificed on the altar of fiscal expansion. To "restrain the pricing power of corporations and unions," industrial nations will abandon tight monetary policy — and turn to that old standby, the tax-based incomes policy, or TIP.

Essentially a tool to impose tax penalties on companies or workers who raise prices or wages too high, a TIP isn't without flaws, as Nossiter explains. Still, for economics writers, invoking it is a little bit like

writing enthusiastically about the coming perpetual motion machine; I know because I've done it myself. Other than Nossiter's sense that the current system isn't working, there seems realistically to be little basis for the belief that central bankers' dominance of economic policy-making will soon be overthrown and TIPs imposed in their places. To do so would require shelving the Reagan ethos of minimal intrusion in the marketplace — an approach that I suspect will outlast the 1988 elections — as well as an unlikely end to the ongoing recalcitrance of Japan and Germany to undertake more than the slightest degree of fiscal expansion.

This analysis is one of several in *The Global Struggle* that are problematic, in that they oversimplify the issues and advance prescriptions that seem too sweeping or theoretical. For example, one of Nossiter's key proposals for revamping foreign aid is to scrap all bilateral lending while beefing up the multilateral lending agencies like the World Bank. However warranted on its face, this is surely a purist's solution in a world where the United States and the Soviet Union compete to purchase influence through aid. The chapter "Easing the Debt Crisis," meanwhile, calls for reining in the International Monetary Fund — specifically attacking the many demands for austerity that the IMF attaches to its financial assistance to debtors. Yet the IMF's pressure is often an invaluable source of economic realism for governments — and as Nossiter notes, can provide regimes the cover they need to impose unpopular policies while blaming them on someone else. Given the many criticisms Nossiter levels at foreign aid programs for not attaching enough conditions, moreover, it's difficult to see why the IMF should impose fewer.

Nossiter also omits much in his discussion of flawed economic policies among the industrial na-

tions. Perhaps this is necessary; after all, this isn't a book solely about the sins of the North. Yet any dissertation so critical of the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve ought to make at least passing mention of the context in which it took place — namely, amid contemporary fears that the heavy deficit spending and tax cuts of the early Reagan years would boost inflation and in general, prove the economic undoing of the United States and the rest of the world. The absence of any discussion about the current implications of deficits is equally disturbing. It's clear that the U.S. will sooner or later have to pay a price for its budgetary profligacy and overwhelming dependence on foreign capital. What happens to the plight of the debtor nations when America becomes one of the largest of them would have been an appropriate topic for this book.

Similarly, Nossiter gives the changing economic relationships within the Northern and Southern blocs too short shrift. These are taken up to some extent in his discussion of trade. Moreover, to be fair, it has only been since Nossiter's book went to press that new evidence has emerged suggesting that America's "competitiveness" problem goes far deeper than an overvalued dollar. Still, the United States' loss of competitiveness relative to Japan — and the emergence of the Newly Industrializing Countries such as Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Brazil — is clearly shifting the balance of economic power in ways that will ultimately affect the poorest nations. As economists have noted, these developments have already made terms like "the South" and "Third World" virtually obsolete; can the concept of a monolithic "North" be far behind?

The absence of such a discussion is doubly disappointing, given that *The Global Struggle* comes complete with a lengthy chapter on the negotiations over the Law of the Sea.

Not only does it seem to last nearly as long as the dreary treaty negotiations themselves; it seems almost as fruitless, since it fails to bear out Nossiter's faint point that the Third World came away from the talks with a great victory. Some deal: the South won virtually worthless rights to share in the profits from seabed mining that may not be profitable into the next century — and as a result, the Reagan Administration refused to sign the treaty. One can only postulate that Nossiter's years covering the United Nations left him with notebooks full of Law of the Sea material he at last found a chance to unload.

In a discourse about the economic aspects of the North-South conflict, it was no doubt wise that Nossiter chose not to deal with possible cultural and sociological explanations of the disparities between rich and poor nations. In a sense, this necessarily makes *The Global Struggle* an incomplete book, just as our understanding of the problem will always be partial and fragmentary. It is this sheer complexity and resistance to solution that makes it so tempting to ignore the existence of the North-South conflict. As Nossiter notes, as the enthusiasm of the Kennedy years — when an Alliance for Progress truly seemed possible — began to wane, and until the debt crisis reared its ugly head,



Subscribe
to
*Nieman
Reports!*

(See page 55)

"the South as a problem had simply lost much of its appeal."

Would that there were more books like Nossiter's to keep the Third World's problems on the in-

dustrialized world's agenda. □

Susan Dentzer, Nieman Fellow '87, is general editor with Newsweek.

The Flowering of Evil

The Traveler.

John Katzenbach. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1987. \$18.95

by Lucinda Fleeson

I recently heard about a woman who had two dogs, a big one and a little one. The dogs were lifetime pals, but one day the woman returned home and found that the little dog had been torn apart, limb from limb, and the basement looked like a bloodbath. The woman called her vet, who told her that sometimes these things happen and there really was no explaining it.

Since then, the big dog has refused to come out of the basement. He is totally traumatized by the incident and appears guilty and grief-stricken over the loss of his little friend.

When animals act like savage, cruel beasts, it is accepted somewhat philosophically as a primordial flashback. Analyzing why humans act irrationally violent has become a national pastime.

That the big dog shows remorse, however, puts him miles above the inhuman creep in *The Traveler*, the second crime novel by John Katzenbach. Like his first acclaimed novel, *Heat of the Summer*, which was made into the movie *The Mean Season*, this book is a fast-paced thriller, about the pursuit of a serial, psycho-killer.

In his epigraph, Katzenbach warns us that he will delve into the broad themes of good and evil in modern America. He quotes the devil admonishing the famous senator in Stephen Vincent Benet's *The Devil and Daniel Webster*: "though I don't

like to boast of it, my name is older in this country than yours."

And that, of course, is what *The Traveler* purports to be about - the persistence, some might say flourishing, of evil in America, in this case embodied by Douglas Jeffers, a demonic and cold-blooded killer of young women, bums, or whoever else inopportunely crosses his path.

But the choice of a random psychopathic killer as the villain in a detective novel is always a risky one, and this is Katzenbach's second psycho-killer book.

Even forgetting the whole question of whether such books promote prurient interests, there is the problem that they fit uneasily into the genre of American detective fiction.

When a random killer is the villain in a detective novel, the author eliminates many of the obvious motives for crime. The usual weaknesses of the human animal that gets him into trouble - greed, jealousy, revenge, lust, thirst for power - are no longer operating motives, except in a larger, psychic sense.

Jeffers doesn't kill to get rid of some wealthy husband, nor to gain control of a business, or to snuff out a blackmailer. He kills for pleasure, and why, we don't really know - perhaps because of the absence of a mother's love, perhaps because of isolation in a society that robs him of any control except through humiliation and domination of a weaker victim.

He is deranged and malfunctioning, and there is an existential nothingness in his crimes. The combination of genes, illness, and en-

vironment that formed the breeding grounds for such dementia is as happenstance as the collision course between the killer and his random victims.

That's not to say that this is an illegitimate enterprise. It's just part of a plethora of television specials, Grade B movies, and novels that I don't particularly care for. Many do, and will undoubtedly continue to buy Mr. Katzenbach's books, for he does deliver a superb chase that tears from end to end. He has a gift for evoking places - "the licorice night" in Miami, the sterility of a Trenton prison. He also has a very funny knack for Americana. The best line in the book is delivered by a small town police chief on Martha's Vineyard who goes out to investigate a suspicious incident, assuring his wife, "Don't worry none. I'll be back in time for *Magnum P.I.*"

Detective fiction reflects in many ways the evolution of the quintessential American hero. The detective is a perfect standard bearer for the can-do American spirit - a detached observer with an analytical mind and the physical prowess to match. The detective, and increasingly the journalist, serves as an ideal hero, who can easily slip across cultures, from lowlife to high society, and who works alone, outside established authorities. Most essentially, the detective maintains an inner code that punishes the wrong and upholds the just.

Katzenbach has created an interesting variation on the hard-boiled detective, with his heroine, Detective Mercedes Barren, a Miami homicide cop whose niece was slaughtered by a random killer in Miami, whom she is determined to identify, find, and punish.

She's tough on the outside, a meticulous professional with the attributes we've come to expect as part of our national heritage of tough guys. But there is a war between the professional icicle of Detective Barren and the vulnerable wounded

woman on the inside. Attractive, age 40, she lives a celibate life in Miami, carrying a barely cauterized wound that used to be her heart twenty years ago, until her newly wed husband was blown to bits by a landmine in Vietnam.

She has retreated from life, her evenings enlivened by an occasional glass of cheap Cabernet Sauvignon and televised Miami Dolphins games. She dresses for the occasion in a football T-shirt and happily cheers and swears.

But she rides a sea of contradictions. Afraid to swim, she likes the beach; an analytic bloodhound of criminals on the outside, she is plagued by nightmares that she will lose control. When she goes to the park overlooking Biscayne Bay where her 18-year-old niece Susan is found raped and murdered, she panics that she will react emotionally.

She finds solace in an inner strength and ability to keep terror under control despite a palpitating heart. Detective Barren's salvation is her work and she has a thirst for vengeance. When she discovers a clue that clears a muddled Lebanese student who has plead guilty to the murder of her niece, it is Detective Barren who is not content to close the case file. She turns her small Miami apartment into a command post, straps on a .38 police special and keeps a .9 millimeter semi-automatic close by. She has to wade through a field of patronizing male cops who assume that her emotions are out of control. They try to keep her off the case to protect her feelings.

But she starts sifting the evidence again, eventually finding a scrap of paper that leads her in a circuitous route to the trail of Jeffers.

Katzenbach's work as a police reporter shines through - his descriptions of the police team who dispassionately catalog the artifacts of the murder scene, and the hungry reporters who arrive on the scene are all-too-realistic. Also, he has given us a knowing portrait of a

psychopath similar to Ted Bundy - good-looking and charming enough to talk his way close enough to his female victims before he zaps them over the head and kills them brutally without much of a second thought.

"You have to understand how much I admire true strength," Jeffers lectures at one point. "Because to do what I do requires an absolute dedication. A solidarity with your soul. . . You see, when I kill someone it's because I want to. It's the only way I have of reminding myself that I'm still alive."

He presents Jeffers in a classic portrait of a troubled youth, abandoned by parents, taken in reluctantly, and beaten often by a cousin and her strict pharmacist husband. Jeffers suffered from an absence of love and developed an early taste for hate.

It is the stuff that newspapers are full of after a mass murderer has been arrested. Too often crime journalists are guilty of trying to report on the criminally insane as if writing about a jigsaw puzzle designed by Freud - they look for the telling clue to unlock the mystery. Katzenbach seems to confront the awful truth that there is no answer, there may be hints, but how it happened only can be guessed at.

As a teenager, Douglas Jeffers mixed chemicals for photo processing at the pharmacy, and seemingly naturally falls into photography. News photography becomes the perfect vehicle for his descent into murder - he roams the country, from Cincinnati to Dallas, a drifter who stops at local newspapers for a few months at a time, his services always welcomed because of his knack for capturing psychic pain on film - the horrified reaction of teenage girls to a brutalized sex crime victim, the glint of panic in savaged eyes.

"Give me some tension, some edge," screams one photo editor, and Jeffers complies.

He photographs some of the world's larger landscapes of pain,

suffering, and malevolence - Saigon, Beirut, Central America, Jonestown, "I follow on the heels of evil," Douglas tells his brother.

Like many madmen, Douglas operates as if he has a justifiable mission, worthy of public notice. He plays to the newspapers that will eventually chronicle his travelogue of horror. In order to present his own story right, he thinks his violent odyssey merits his own private Boswell - a college senior he kidnaps in his car one night.

There is the added twist that his brother, Martin, is a psychiatric resident at a treatment center for sex offenders in Trenton, N.J., trying to return them in some fashion to society. Martin calls his patients "The Lost Boys," and muses that they all suffer from the same thing: "Once upon a time, in each man's childhood, they had been lost. Abandoned, perhaps was a better term. The rocky shoals of childhood. The darkness and cruelty of youth. Most people rise and grow and leave it behind, carrying their scars internally, forever, learning to adjust. The Lost Boys did not."

The real mystery that Katzenbach evokes is an unanswered one: How did Douglas Jeffers become a brutal sadist-killer, while his brother, who shared the same genetic background, same abandonment as a child, became a healer. One angel; one devil? At one point the psychiatrist brother finally blunts out, "Doug, why did you become you?"

Doug responds: "Now who the hell knows? Maybe it was the difference in years. A few months can mean you see things differently, feel things differently. It's like asking ten people to recall the same event that they witnessed. They'll all come up with slightly skewed versions of the same thing. Why is it any different with people? I'm just a slightly skewed version." □

Lucinda Fleenor, Nieman Fellow '85, is on the staff of The Philadelphia Inquirer.

A Wonderful Paper Remembered With Reverence

The Paper: The Life and Death of The New York Herald Tribune.

Richard Kluger. Random House, 1986. \$24.95

by Michael Gartner

A newspaper is a business, not a toy. A newspaper is a public trust, not a family hobby. Newspaperpersons are human beings, not serfs. Those are some of the lessons from *The Paper, The Life and Death of The New York Herald Tribune*, the absolutely wonderful book by Richard Kluger.

I read books with a yellow marker in hand. I highlight passages that I think are important or interesting or funny or telling or especially nicely written. When *Nieman Reports* asked me to review *The Paper*, which I had already read, I looked through to find the parts I had marked. In the main, they were passages that were lessons — lessons for reporters or editors or publishers or owners. Here are some.

For editors:

The rule at the *Tribune* was: good editors don't fix writing that doesn't need fixing.

"Nothing human is alien to an editorial page," [chief editorial writer Geoffrey] Parsons taught.

"I was not made for a publisher," [Horace] Greeley conceded, noting that "indeed, no man was ever qualified at once to edit and to publish a daily paper."

Greeley surveyed [*Times* founder Henry Jarvis] Raymond's handiwork and announced that it appeared to be "conducted with the most policy and least principle of any paper ever started."

[John] Hay considered [Greeley] an editor prone to snap judgments and loose reasoning — one who too

often "dipped his pen of infallibility into his ink of omniscience."

[Stanley Woodward] was like that. His excellent if short-lived turf writer, Joe Palmer, said of Woodward that he was "often contemptuous of superiors, barely tolerant of equals, and unfailingly kind and considerate to subordinates."

Greeley wore himself out in the struggle to win dignity for the degraded and instill decency in the hearts of all. For him there was no better way to spend a life, no better end in publishing a newspaper.

For reporters:

[Stanley] Walker's professional precepts, which helped educate a generation of journalists, may be distilled [thus:]

First and foremost, don't ever betray a confidence or knife a comrade. (2) Always get the other side of the story. That's why you have legs and a voice. (3) The higher you go for a source, the more likely you are to get comment — but don't call after midnight. (4) Great reporters can cover any story. Yours is not a divinely inspired art form. Greatness at it requires good wind to go with the legs, a touch of imagination to lead the brain, sleepless curiosity, and ability to write the blunt Saxon tongue. (5) Monotony is your chief occupational hazard. There is no shortcut to waiting for something to turn up — or someone to die. Or searching out the little details that turn your piece into gospel. When you're out at tedious charity luncheons, testimonial dinners, or organizational meetings that yield drab copy, use the occasion to connect with sources — and eat well. (6) A servile reporter is sickening; just be polite. (7) Never ask your editor how to get to Canarsie or what to do next on your story. Editors are not wet nurses. If you are

not resourceful enough to figure it out for yourself, beat it. (8) Don't drink on the job. Your writing will only suffer. (9) Most of what you need to know about libel: Every story that imputes unchastity to a woman or crime to anyone is actionable; better be sure you've got it straight. Even then, no story is worth ruining a woman's life for. (10) Don't let the paper down.

He was equally direct in his strictures on style. His minimum requirement for satisfactory copy was that it be clear, vigorous, informative, and accurate; charm and vividness were prized but not essential. Dullness was his cardinal sin. Risk fresh phrases and dancing verbs and don't be cowed by journalism-school discouragement of lively language. Do not, however, get carried away on a tide of swollen ego when given a major assignment and turn out "Taj Mahals of verbal flubdub." Fancy writing is the sign of an insecure craftsman. Reach only when appropriate — and almost never for whimsy. Pick adjectives as you would a diamond or a mistress; too many are dangerous and produce diminishing returns.

[Red Smith] composed with great deliberation. Writing for him he often said, was "like opening a vein and letting the words come out drop by drop."

But it was fact upon which Tom Wolfe built his effects. "Style can't carry a story if you haven't done the reporting," he said. "If you're writing nonfiction that you want to read as well as fiction, you've got to have all those details — you can't make it up."

[Critic Virgil] Thomson was offered two cardinal rules by his guru: (1) Never criticize the audience and (2) don't appear to be superior.

[A]s [Greeley] put it, ". . . to write nobly, excellently, is a far loftier achievement than to rule, to conquer, or to kill, and. . . the truly great author looks down on the little strifes and agitations of mankind from an eminence which monarchs

can but feebly emulate, and the ages can scarcely wear away."

"I pray you," [managing editor Sidney Howard] Gay exhorted in words that constitute a model directive from editor to reporter, "remember ye Tribune is a (set italix) daily news- (end italix) paper — or meant to be — and not a historical record of past events. Correspondents to be of any value must be prompt, fresh, & full of facts. . . ."

For owners and publishers:

The *Tribune* staff, [Helen Reid] liked to believe, were members of her extended family, but she came to view them in fact as family retainers, to whom she attended, more or less, in their hour of need and from whom she expected fealty the rest of the time. She preferred that this benign autocracy remain undisturbed by reality. Outsiders were not invited to appraise her rule; the *Tribune* board of directors was a rubber stamp composed of family members and executives on the paper, and hard numbers were not presented for its inspection.

"You don't inherit the ability to run any business — you've got to learn it from the ground up," remarked Punch Sulzberger's mother, Iphigene, in contrasting his grooming for the *Times* throne with that of the Reid boys. Whitie "lacked confidence;" Brown Reid "had pep, but they pushed him too fast. We sent Punch to Milwaukee — you can learn a lot working where you're not the boss's son."

It would take [Walter] Thayer several years to concede that, as managerial assignments, newspapers and oranges could not be compared.

[Jock Whitney's] fortune, though, had hardly been enhanced by his journalistic endeavors; indeed, "it may be that there are worse investments in this country than running a competitive morning newspaper in a busy, bitterly competitive, sophisticated town, but I have never run across one." As to the function of the modern daily as

perceived by the *Herald Tribune*, he said: "Our task is to cut through the junk in the public mind by seeking the order that underlies the clutter of small events; to winnow out of the apparent what is the real. . . and to look behind the bare event for meanings."

Thayer accomplished the execution in a more polished fashion than the way he dispatched ex-general manager Tom Robinson, whose resignation he asked for while passing him in the hall one morning.

To one who complained about ads for a certain Dr. Brandreth's remarkably efficacious pills, Bennett shot back in 1836: "Send us more advertisements than Dr. Brandreth does — give us higher prices — we'll cut Dr. Brandreth dead — or at least curtail his space. Business is business — money is money. . . . We permit no blockhead to interfere with our business."

Reporters on great American newspapers, as Brown Reid seemed not to know or care, were not supposed to serve partisan interests, even when on leave. For when their leaves were up and they returned to action, how vigorously might their readers expect them to pursue negative or damaging stories about the figures whose causes they had supported in campaign season?

And here are some little stories I marked for one reason or another:

[Smith] was always grateful to [Stanley] Woodward for having given him the chance to make it big. He expressed the feeling, however, in subtle gestures. One night the two of them were out drinking with Jock Sutherland, the University of Pittsburgh's behemoth of a football coach. Woodward, about as big, got well oiled and challenged Sutherland to a wrestling match on the spot. "A quarter-ton of beef smashed to the floor," Smith recounted. "The house trembled. Stanley was pinned. He lay gasping. 'Smith,' he said weakly, 'help me up.' I handed him a scotch and soda where he lay. He knew I went into

newspapering because I disliked lifting things."

Bearing only an incidental resemblance to its New York parent, *Le New York*, as it was known in Paris, was a somewhat eccentric sheet that reflected [James Gordon Bennett, Jr.'s] impulses — restaurants that did not serve him like royalty, for instance, were excoriated in print — and crotchets. Its letters column one day carried an inquiry signed, "Old Philadelphia Lady," asking how to convert centigrade temperature into Fahrenheit and vice versa; Bennett's exceedingly misshapen funny bone was so struck by this that he ordered the letter to appear every day thereafter, without answer or comment — and it did for more than thirty years, until a few days after his death.

Many who know nothing else about him believe Greeley to be the coiner of the phrase "Go West, young man," but they are misinformed. The attribution, like so much about Greeley, a skillful self-promoter, has passed into folklore; it is correct enough in spirit if not fact. Writing in *The New Yorker*, Greeley had urged, rather less pithily than the more familiar form puts it, "If you have no family or friends to aid you, and no prospect opened to you there, turn your face to the Great West and there build up a home and fortune." The short version is attributed by some sources to John Babson Lane Soule, who first used it in the *Terre Haute Express* in 1851. Greeley, believing city life to be morally degrading for those on its economic fringe, invoked the phrase — and often the sentiment — but did not coin it.

[Foreign correspondent John J. (Tex) O'Reilly] became a city-room legend. . . while covering the Free French forces on their march up from Lake Chad to a rendezvous at Tripoli with British troops for a joint westward push into Tunisia. Unable to find time to keep fastidious track of his expenses, O'Reilly made his account balance by listing "One

camel — \$350." Perplexed *Tribune* auditors decided the dromedary was a capital expense and wired O'Reilly: "WHERE IS CAMEL?" He wired back: "ATE IT."

It was [rewriteman Robert W.] White who passed on to Inky [Blackman] his seasoned, all-purpose theory of newsworthiness, which went, in its entirety: "Somewhere, a child is burning."

This freshness of outlook, tuned to the unexamined in what was familiar in life and to the delight or shock in what was unexpected, was lastingly expressed by Dana's city editor, John B. Bogart, who remarked apropos the Sun's philosophy, "When a dog bites a man, that is not news, because it happens so often. But if a man bites a dog, that is news."

[Rewriteman Bob] Peck's sole drawback as a journalist was an elfin strain that sometimes got the better of him. . . . Likewise spiked was his account of the fellow with a long Polish name who died, according to the rewriter, from "contraction of the vowels." . . . Assigned the kind of routine weather story he loathed, Peck one time submitted a piece

that ran, in its entirety, "It snowed yesterday with the usual results."

Those are the lessons, and an amusing story or two. *The Paper* is full of the men and women who peopled the paper — Horace Greeley and Karl Marx and Walter Lippmann and Red Smith and Jim Bellows and Clay Felker and the Stanleys, Woodward and Walker, and Marguerite Higgins and Homer Bigart and a cast of thousands. And, of course, the Reids, who more or less ruined it in their benevolent way.

The Paper is, as I said, a wonderful book, just as the paper was, in the main, a wonderful paper.

There are things you could quibble with in the book, just as there were things you could quibble with in the newspaper. But why bother? The newspaper was must reading for persons who wanted to be informed. The book is, too. I hope reporters and editors read it, but mainly I hope owners read it — before it's too late. □

Michael Gartner is editor of the Courier-Journal in Louisville, Kentucky. He is also president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE).

Presidents Nixon and Ford was more professionally confined to foreign affairs.

Advisers play a peculiar role in the modern Presidency. They may or may not hold official positions comparable to their influence. Much depends upon a compatible personal chemistry with the boss: someone he can confide in, relax with, and entrust with personal missions. Frequently these are men who attach themselves to the President long before he achieves prominence, linking their future to his; often this proven loyalty is their chief qualification for the job. Harry Hopkins did not begin with this advantage. He was a social worker who, at the onset of the Depression, became head of relief in New York State, but he was not an intimate of Governor Roosevelt. He accepted the same job in Washington, believing as Roosevelt did, that work relief would be temporary until the economy recovered; he had an offer of twice as much pay awaiting him at Macy's department store.

Instead, the WPA (Works Progress Administration) under Hopkins became all too permanent a fixture, a giant operation rescuing hundreds of thousands of the able-bodied unemployed. He believed that traditional handouts ultimately degraded and pauperized the recipient, but in providing jobs instead Hopkins also added leaf-raking and boondoggling to our literature of pejoratives. Hopkins always believed the unemployed to be good people down on their luck; he did not harry them with investigations and nannying, but hired and supervised them as employees entitled to work. He soon found himself feuding with the pugnacious Interior Secretary Harold Ickes, who favored big projects that might do better at paying back the Treasury but provided fewer jobs. Under Hopkins the WPA introduced hot lunches for the children of poor families, day care for working mothers, and literacy and immigration classes for im-

A Remarkable American

Harry Hopkins. Ally of the Poor and Defender of Democracy.

George McJimsey. Harvard University Press, 1987. \$25.

by Thomas Griffith

Harry Hopkins, sent by President Roosevelt to negotiate with Stalin in World War II, said to himself as he walked up the imposing staircase of the Kremlin: "What are you doing here, Hopkins, you — son of a harness-maker from Sioux City?" He described this awed feeling later to a friend, who dryly replied that the Kremlin had pro-

bably seen quite a few harness-makers' sons before. Still, there was indeed something special about this particular one, the man who became the adviser that Franklin D. Roosevelt trusted most.

In the years since Roosevelt, seven Presidents have relied on confidantes of varying degrees of competence, wisdom, and cupidity. Measured against all these cronies, counselors, hand-holders, and errand bearers, Hopkins holds up very well. Many of these were able but certainly none played so all-encompassing a role as Hopkins. Perhaps only Henry Kissinger was as influential though his service to

migrants. Unemployed artists painted murals in post offices and airports, writers put out tourist guides to every state, jobs that gave them dignity. Hopkins was a driving, imaginative, and caring administrator—a mixture of sentimental-tough sometimes to be found later in Kennedy people. Eleanor Roosevelt, a social worker herself, admired him; soon the Hopkinses were being invited to the White House, and to Hyde Park weekends.

One trait in the harness-maker's son troubled her and later led to an estrangement. From Hopkins' small town upbringing and from a pious mother came his dedication to social service, but from his happy-go-lucky father who liked to spend money freely, came Hopkins' love of luxury. Even on a social worker's salary Hopkins liked to travel first class, eat well, and sleep in silk pajamas. Later, this one-time Socialist who had spoken of "unhorsing the capitalist class" came to enjoy hobnobbing with such rich friends as Bernard Baruch, Joe Kennedy, and Jock Whitney, accepting their hospitality in clubs or at their Florida homes. Eleanor Roosevelt thought that supping with the rich didn't comport with serving the poor. Hopkins himself spent most of his life in debt or on the margin, but he also took pride in a cartoon which honored "the American Boy from Iowa Who Spent \$9 billions of his Country's Money and Not a Dollar Stuck to His Fingers."

Somewhere along the line, Franklin Roosevelt had become dependent on Hopkins' loyalty, admiring of his boldness and judgment, and fond of his irreverence and humor. According to George McJinsey, his latest biographer, Roosevelt went to work to soften Hopkins' rough edges and to tutor him in social graces. Hopkins had the courtier's knack of reading the President's moods, knowing how far to go in pressing a point, or when to turn from seriousness. At one point,

Roosevelt even thought of building up Hopkins as his successor, and began the process by appointing him Secretary of Commerce.

It didn't work: Hopkins had no constituency of his own, and conservative critics of the New Deal had long made him their favorite target. Hopkins was repeatedly quoted as favoring a policy of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect," and although he denied making the remark, he was not averse to using relief operations for partisan ends. Hopkins, convinced that those on relief were "the finest people on the land" regarded those who opposed his efforts as "bastards" who should be "cracked down upon." *The Chicago Tribune*, in its bad old days, cartooned him as Rasputin; he in turn thought the paper fascist.

Hopkins' ill-health would have disqualified him for the Presidency. His spindly six-foot figure always looked gaunt, and became more so after most of his stomach was removed because of cancer; he was in constant pain most of his life, working constantly to the point of fatigue. Those of us who lived through the era remember him as a mysterious haggard figure always photographed at the President's side. Wendell Willkie once asked Roosevelt why he kept so mistrusted a man around him. Roosevelt responded that if Willkie ever occupied the Oval Office "you'll be looking at that door over there and knowing that practically everybody who walks through it wants something from you. . . You'll discover the need for somebody like Harry Hopkins who asks for nothing except to serve you."

Hopkins became indispensable to the President as the country drew near to war. He was dining at the White House the day Germany invaded the Low Countries. He was not feeling well; Roosevelt invited him to stay overnight. Soon he was installed permanently in the Lincoln Room. (When Hopkins married again, for the third time, he brought

his wife to live in the White House. It wasn't an easy arrangement—the Hopkinses couldn't make social plans of their own, and eventually moved out. To Hopkins the privilege was more of a duty). One day a desperate message arrived from Winston Churchill. Alarmed by heavy shipping losses, Churchill asked for a "decisive act of constructive non-belligerency" from the United States, making ships available by "gift, loan or supply." Hopkins favored a gift; Roosevelt with sounder political intuition favored lending, and made the commitment acceptable with a memorably homely comparison, describing it as like lending a neighbor your garden hose to put out a fire.

Thus was born Lend-Lease, which Hopkins would later head. This great effort began with the dispatch of Hopkins to England to learn Britain's needs. Well briefed to woo the President's emissary, Churchill invited him to dinner, then launched into an oracular statement of war aims: "We seek no treasure, we seek no territorial gains, we seek only the right of man to be free," and much more of the same. Churchill paused: "What will the President say to all of this?" "Well, Mr. Prime Minister," Hopkins began. "I don't think the President will give a damn for all that." Then, to everyone's relief, he added: "You see, we're only interested in seeing that that goddam sonofabitch Hitler gets licked."

Hopkins got along famously with Churchill, as no mere errand bearer could: knowing Roosevelt's views well he did not go beyond them, but he also could respond frankly to candor offered. He saw his job as being "a catalytic agent between two prima donnas," and later at summits between the two leaders kept them so focussed on the matter at hand that Churchill nicknamed him "Lord Root of the Matter." After Germany invaded Russia, Roosevelt sent the frail and ailing Hopkins to discover Russia's fighting needs, writing to Stalin, "I ask you to treat

Mr. Hopkins with the identical confidence you would feel if you were talking directly to me."

At their first meeting Hopkins told Churchill that Roosevelt did not want to go to war but "would not shrink from it." Soon Hopkins was organizing the military and civilian agencies of the government to gear up for war if it came. Before long he was adjudicating between supplies intended for the British, for the Russians, and for America's own buildup. He did so with great skill and tact, operating out of the White House with little bureaucracy, preferring to work through men he trusted in each agency (one was General George Marshall, who believed he owed his promotion to Chief of Staff to Hopkins). Hopkins' own selflessness in these days was dramatized by his gaunt appearance and physical courage. His favorite technique in negotiating was to gain the confidence of all parties, define the issues, and seek an agreement that reflected the vital interests of all of them.

Though Churchill was one of Hopkins' greatest admirers, it is sad to relate that events to some extent drew them apart. The war-exhausted British at times seemed less than eager for the Channel invasion. And later when it came time to consider postwar aims, Roosevelt and Hopkins saw Churchill as a man intransigent in holding on to the Empire, and someone who would, in any case, disappear from public life after the victory parade. In meetings of the Big Three, Hopkins like Roosevelt, saw their role to be mediating between Russia and Britain. The Russians had to be drawn into the war with Japan, and into international cooperation after the war.

At Yalta, where both Hopkins and Roosevelt looked near death, Hopkins thought they had succeeded: "We really believed in our hearts that this was the dawn of the new day. . . . The Russians had proved that they could be reasonable and

far-seeing." Within weeks, Roosevelt was dead, and Hopkins, who had lost 17 pounds in two months, was back in the Mayo Clinic. But he was to survive long enough for one more taxing mission to Moscow. He was sent by Harry Truman to warn Stalin to keep his commitments on Poland. Truman told Hopkins to use diplomatic language, a baseball bat, or anything else appropriate to convey the message.

This is a twice-told tale. Hopkins' friend, Robert Sherwood, the playwright and presidential speech writer, wrote a splendid biography of his friend shortly after the war. George McJimsey, a history pro-

fessor at Iowa State, set out to update Sherwood but found so much new to say that he has written his own. The subtitle—*Ally of the Poor and Defender of Democracy*—unfortunately makes it sound like a puff job, which it is not. It may lack the flair and intimacy of Sherwood's book, for McJimsey writes with a stiffer pen, but he is fair and scrupulous, and has his own literary gift for incisive characterization. Both biographies do justice to a remarkable American. □

Thomas Griffith, Nieman Fellow '43, is a columnist on TIME magazine.

Say-It-in-Your-Own-Words

Free to Write: A Journalist Teaches Young Writers.

Roy Peter Clark. Foreword by Donald M. Murray. Heinemann Educational Books Inc. 1986. Paperback, \$15.

by Derrick Jackson

How joyous the night had been. Or so I thought. I sat at court-side on my first cub reporter assignment for *The Milwaukee Journal*. My interest was sports and the paper had entrusted me merely with a dream season-opener, a battle of inner-city high-school basketball rivals so enraged that it was clear that victory confirmed the winning school of bragging rights to blackness. I was so filled with myself of this privilege that I surveyed the crowd, the players, and the timekeeper with the eyes and countenance of a prince. Surely they had all congregated here to perform just for me.

I must have taken notes on every dribble, every shot, and every incantation from the cheerleaders [a chant that ended with "we're gonna kick your —," should suffice as to the

fever of the night.] I interviewed the coaches and players with what must have been an endless series of foolish questions. I walked out into an early-winter freeze and took the four-mile bus ride downtown.

Not many people ride buses at 11 at night in Milwaukee and as the driver and I passed the darkened bakeries, chained-up record stores, and muffled bedlam of liquor joints, my brain was on fire. I was still thinking like a prince, mad with the innocent knowledge that I was already passing out of this world into some other existence much closer to heaven than this. Seven hours and 1,800 words later, I was on a sunrise bus for the four miles back home. Sleep came easily, so drunk I was with the thought that this 17-year-old had written his way into immortality.

By midday, the *Journal* came. Heaven flew the coop. I grabbed my chest for surely my heart had been ripped up and grounded into the snow. The 1,800 words I had written were now 250. The lead I had composed, some overly dramatic setting of the scene, was now something to the effect of "In a close game, so-

and-so beat so-and-so. . ." I did not even make it to the score. When I boarded the bus that afternoon for the four-mile ride back to the *Journal* for the night shift, I was a destroyed manchild. When I got to the office, there were my 1,800 words of copy, 1,550 of which had been bludgeoned to death with what seemed to me was red vengeance.

The disparaging remarks, which clearly suggested that I was not fit to be on the newspaper, made my spine quiver. As I welled up and prepared to cry over a teletype, the only thing that saved me was a pat on the shoulder from the assistant sports editor. He looked at me and my foul copy. He pointed discreetly toward the chief sports editor, who had edited my story. "Don't worry," the assistant sports editor said. "That's the only way he knows how to deal with you young guys."

The cause for this humble remembrance was my reading of *Free to Write - A Journalist Teaches Young Writers* by Roy Peter Clark. I went on at length for two reasons. One, there cannot be a journalist alive who was not the victim of some sort of early tribunal on their fledging efforts. The second is that the above incident is exactly the one that Clark has done his utmost to avoid.

Free to Write is a primer on the teaching of writing to children. In an age where we are surrounded by news accounts of the declining literacy of our youth, Clark has given us a pathway to getting pupils to connect their minds with a pad and pencil. Whether it is future journalists in college, grade-schoolers writing their first string of sentences, or our own children, Clark has reminded us — if not teaching some for the first time — that the successful execution of writing is not a mere matter of properly slapping down apostrophes. Clark is a proponent of teaching writing through journalism. He has gotten children to observe with a fine-tooth comb the world that surrounds them and coaxed them to

regurgitate it in their own voice.

Clark is a nationally respected writer and writing coach who organized writing and editing seminars for grownup journalists under the auspices of *The St. Petersburg Times*. But it is clear through *Free to Write* that Clark is pushing us to encourage children to a point where when they reach our age, they won't be quite the burden that we were on our editing elders. His primary goal is to make children believe that writing is not a burden.

The book chronicles Clark's experiences with more than 100 children in St. Petersburg. Whether the chapter is merely thinking up a topic, putting details into a bland effort, or prodding a kid into writing his or her first work of substance, the message is the same. Positive criticism and inquiry on the part of the teacher almost always gets a positive effort from the pupil. One example came from a girl named Tiffany. She said that she had nothing to write about or no one to write to. In a frustrating series of questions and answers, Clark could not get her to think of anything to write. Out of desperation, Clark asked Tiffany if there was anything she had not told her grandmother.

"My brother tried to choke me," Tiffany said.

Tiffany wrote only one sentence that day. But the next week, she stunned Clark by spinning off a story about how her brother tried to choke her. The stories where Clark gets interesting copy out of blank faces and immobile writing hands flow as a springtime river through the book's 276 pages. A girl named Nancy wrote an essay about her mother's broom. Chrissy wrote about the embarrassment of squirting mayonnaise on everybody in a restaurant. Fifth-grader Nichole wrote a short but succinct essay on her revelation that friends who only like her for her material gifts aren't really friends at all.

"Parents and teachers know that children ask a lot of questions."

Clark says in the book. "Why is the sky blue? Where do babies come from? . . . Too often, we ignore this untapped reservoir of curiosity, sit it in rows in a classroom, and preach at it. Students are the banks as Paulo Freire has described it and we teachers are the depositors of wisdom. But we fail to inform them that there is a significant penalty for early withdrawal and that a lot of our talking will whip by them like the wind in the night."

What Clark often discovered instead were school systems that believe that creative writing comes only from writing fantasy tales. One of the most significant contributions of Clark's book is the proof that children can indeed observe and write about real-life things and situations to a riveting degree. An eighth-grade Laotian girl, Phonephet, wrote about her family's escape to the United States. She wrote: "The night we left was very dark and there wasn't a single star in the sky. We walked slowly and quietly into the dangerous forest trying not to make a sound because it could mean death to all of us. . . The country I once loved and trusted, once full of beauty, now full of evil."

Hallie, a fifth-grader, wrote about being "stuck" next to a baby for a two-and-one-half-hour flight: "Sarah's parents bought apple juice. Yuck! Everywhere I see a baby I see apple juice!" Michael, a sixth-grader, wrote about his attempt to kill a mosquito: "So there it lay on the ground. Its eyes no longer stared back, its wings no longer flapped, its mouth closed tight. And as I looked down at the agony at my foot, I realized the mosquito wasn't all I hit!" Anita, a seventh-grader, wrote of the rush she always felt upon walking into her neighborhood library: "The outside walls always seemed so bland like the white shell of an egg. Yet once inside, it was as colorful and exciting as the circus come to town."

Clark's ideas of the basic prerequisites for good writing are not sur-

prising: finding a theme, bringing it into focus, organizing material, and editing for clarity. The present problem is that he sees a current pattern of teaching that focuses more distinctly on exact punctuation and rigid systems of marking and grading rather than allowing for the teacher to probe for a child's free expression — then — harness that expression into coherent thought. When children start getting writers' block in his classes, he begins asking them to think about every conceivable event, object, or person that means something to THEM, everything from a MTV video or a sports trophy to an ice-cream soda.

I think back to my own experience. I was a solid student in English through junior high school, but it was not until I went to a Model Cities-funded inner-city writers workshop, at the age of 15, that I felt myself come alive. We had two teachers, one who taught poetry and another who taught us the who, what, where, when, why, and how of journalism. Maybe it was a coincidence that many of those kids, all black, found their voice and went on to college. I choose not to believe so. All I remember from those after-school classes was that no criticism came without a way to make the poem or the news story better. With each push for clarity, we understood more clearly the world we were growing up in and how best to equip ourselves to deal with it.

I suspect that without saying it exactly, Clark believes that a world in which children write more clearly will evolve into a world in which adults can deal with each other with far greater maturity and honesty. He is not trying to say that the actual task of writing will ever become easy. He is saying that if a teacher is willing to probe, even with a 30-second conference with a child, the child will feel the urge to do the job for him or herself. While he does not discard fiction or fantasy as a means of youthful communication, his years of working with children

have convinced him that the young flourish best when their observations of real life are validated.

In a Western society currently focused on test scores, *Free to Write* is an important step in the direction of the expression of the spirit. Lydia, a fourth-grader, wrote about the fact that she has to wear hearing aids in both ears. Her early paragraphs are about how annoying the aids are. In the end, she concludes: "I think

hearing aids are wonderful. Hearing aids seem special and different to me. I think they are wonderful because they help me hear. If I didn't have them, life would be silence and dark inside me. You might feel the same if you had them." □

Derrick Jackson, Nieman Fellow '84, is chief of the New England bureau of Newsday.

An Impressionistic Portrait

The Arabs: Journeys Beyond the Mirage.

David Lamb. Random House, 1987. \$19.95.

by Philip S. Khoury

American journalists have been writing books based on their experiences among the Arabs ever since Lowell Thomas went to Arabia to cover the heroics of T.E. Lawrence during the First World War. But truly perceptive accounts by American journalists are few and of recent vintage. They include books by John Cooley, Jonathan Randal, and David Shieler. David Lamb's [NF '81] lively new book can be added to the list.

Lamb has spent much of his professional career covering developments in the Third World for *The Los Angeles Times*. He wrote his first book, *The Africans*, following his posting to sub-Saharan Africa in the 1970's. His next assignment was the Middle East, starting in 1981. By the time he returned to the United States four years later, he had crisscrossed the Arab world from Morocco to Oman and had visited all but one of the Arab countries. He had covered negotiations between Israelis and Egyptians, wars in Lebanon and Iraq, the dramatic rise and perhaps less dramatic fall of Arab oil wealth, and the spread of

religious extremism and terrorism. These events were frequently front-page stories and they have become the themes around which his book is organized.

Lamb has written neither a history of the Arabs nor a systematic analysis of recent Arab politics. His is a broad-stroked, impressionistic portrayal of the Arabs, the forces pulling them apart, their self-perceptions, and how they are perceived in the West. His ultimate objective is to "strip away some of the stereotypes that have led to so many misconceptions" about Arab society, Islam, and oil wealth. He is disturbed by the way the Western media have cast the Arabs in the role of the world's villain. He reminds us that it was not so long ago in America that "Jews, Blacks and other minorities were subjected to similar degradation."

Why is Arab-bashing so popular in America? Lamb offers several reasons. The Arabs have "resisted assimilating Western ways or capitulating to Western values." They are "held hostage by religion and culturally obsessed with identity." They threaten Israel with whom the "West feels comfortable. . . because Israelis are perceived to be Europeans." They are "armed with oil" and are capable of using that weapon against the industrialized West.

America's relations with the Arab states are fragile in part because of such views. It is true that some Arabs are faced with a serious identity crisis, but, as Lamb mentions, most Arabs are not terrorists, pro-Communist, or camel herders. Islam is a significant ingredient in the modern Arab identity, perhaps more than at any time in this century, but most Arabs are not religious fanatics. In fact, Islam's history falls more on the side of tolerance than does Christianity's. One can rightly ask: Are the Arabs any more the hostage of Islam than they are of superpower rivalry or economic underdevelopment and dependence?

The West may think that Arabs threaten Israel but Arabs are convinced that Israel threatens them. From an Arab perspective, the Zionist movement was a Western implantation in their region. Every time the Arabs and Israelis have gone to war, the Arabs have been defeated. Most recently, Israel invaded Lebanon and still controls positions along its southern border. Israel remains in occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, and Golan and shows no interest in relinquishing these Arab territories. Israel's major ally and financial and military supplier is the leader of the Western world.

The West may see oil as a weapon in Arab hands. But, Lamb informs us, it was the late Shah of Iran, America's non-Arab ally, who took the first steps toward raising the price of oil that provoked the wild price increases of the 1970's. The conservative, oil-rich Arabs once believed the oil provided their own opportunity to persuade the West to adopt an even-handed approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict, one that would satisfy some of the Palestinians' fundamental rights and thereby enhance the prospects for stability in the region. They were wrong. And now falling oil prices and the challenge posed by the Islamic revolution in Iran have

diverted their attention away from the Palestinian question.

Lamb's first concern is to define what it means to be an Arab. There are some 170 million of them, distributed in nearly twenty countries. There are also significant *émigré* communities in West Africa and the Americas. He emphasizes the crucial role of the Arabic language in shaping their identity. The written word — originally that of the Koran and today that of the daily newspaper — is the lowest common denominator. But the Arabs are also defined by a shared history and culture which Islam has in great measure shaped.

Despite all that they share, the Arabs have not achieved political unity in modern times. Lamb understands the natural attraction of pan-Arabism but recognizes that stronger forces are pulling the Arabs apart: geographical divisions, disparities in economic and social development, different systems of government and conflicting ideologies, the challenge of ethnic and religious minorities, and small state nationalisms. He tells us that the dream of Arab unity turned into a nightmare as a result of the humiliating Arab defeat by Israel in 1967. Political unity is, indeed, problematic. But what of the various regional planning programs and joint-banking and entrepreneurial ventures that have quietly developed over the last ten years? By fostering greater economic integration, the Arabs may be creating the potential for real unity at some later date.

Lamb writes sympathetically about Egyptian life, the great conflict between tradition and modernity, and the striking contrasts of wealth and poverty. Cairo is where he always felt safest and most welcome, despite its abject poverty and tremendous overcrowding. What he finds so attractive about Egyptians is their irrepressible sense of humor and irony in the face of what seems to be hopeless adversity.

One gets the impression from Lamb that they possess greater psychic security than their more materially fortunate Arab neighbors.

His depiction of the *zabbaleen*, the fraternity of rubbish collectors, suggests just how adaptive Egyptians are in the context of widespread poverty. Each morning these poor, illiterate Coptic Christians leave their homes among the tombs for Cairo, where they load their "rickety carts" with the trash of Cairo's 14 million inhabitants. Theirs is the only efficient municipal service in Cairo, and at no cost to the city government. For the *zabbaleen* get no pay for their labor; they get only to keep the garbage, 700 tons of it a day.

Then, there is Lamb's handyman who took weeks to pay a housecall to fix his leaking toilet, and then only provided a bandaid solution. The leak reappeared and so did the handyman, but after another delay and with the same impermanent solution. The handyman is a metaphor for the general Egyptian condition; treatment is always slow and, at best, temporary.

Lamb confronts the thorny question of Arab terrorism head on. Much of what he has to say is refreshing. Terrorism is a kind of last resort, a final revenge by those individuals and groups who have lived continuously "in an environment battered by the despair and desperation of fruitless conflict." He finds it odd that the American administration refuses to understand that terrorism, despite the "element of common thuggery," is "more a political problem than a military one, and that there is no purely military or technical solution to it."

The solution lies in a constructive peace process but this will not happen "as long as the United States and Israel remain insensitive to the Arabs." Lamb does propose an interim solution, however, which includes the "political, diplomatic, and commercial isolation of states that sponsor terrorism," and, when

possible, the assassination of terrorist leaders. Whether such measures will stymie terrorism or merely exacerbate it remains to be seen.

Although there is no innate relationship between Islam and terrorism, Lamb believes that today terrorism is an increasingly important dimension of resurgent Islam. Here, he requires a wider explanatory framework. Resurgent Islam is, in part, a reaction to the failure of the Arab state system to create a secular salvation for the Arab peoples.

The military officers, technocrats, and bureaucrats who swept away the *ancien régime* in the 1950's and 1960's promised a new, united, industrialized Arab world, one that would adapt the most successful development models the advanced industrialized world had to offer. The "radical" Arabs also promised that they would avenge the loss of Palestine. Expectations were raised, but economic and social progress advanced much more slowly than promised. Moreover, repeated wars were fought which resulted in even more Arab territorial losses.

By the mid-1970's, the political center of gravity in the Arab world had shifted away from the radical Arab states to the conservative, oil-rich Arab states which mistakenly believed that oil diplomacy could provide salvation. Meanwhile, the increasingly disaffected lower and lower-middle classes in several Arab countries had already begun to seek a more authentic, meaningful salvation which stressed the cultural traditions of Islam and the more revolutionary interpretation of Islamic doctrine and dogma. Then, the Islamic revolution in neighboring Iran burst onto the stage of world history, emboldening Islamic movements in the Arab countries to challenge their secular rulers. Today, the bellicose revolutionary fervor in Iran most threatens the Arab states of the oil-rich Persian Gulf; it also has loud echoes elsewhere in

the Arab world, especially in Lebanon, where the historically impoverished Shi'ites are being encouraged and supported in their bid to impose their hegemony over a fragmented, war-weary country.

Lamb offers us sketches of some of the more prominent Arab leaders. On Khadafi, he lavishes all too much attention. He has succumbed to America's perverse fascination with the Libyan leader; typically Khadafi's influence is blown all out of proportion. Had he given equal attention to Hafez al-Assad, the enigmatic and influential Syrian leader, he would have done his readers a greater service. Like most American journalists, Lamb was enamored of Anwar al-Sadat. Although he acknowledges Sadat's many failings and unpopularity on the domestic front, he is convinced that future generations will credit Sadat as a true visionary. Perhaps, but for the time being the Egyptian people have passed their judgment.

Yasser Arafat is not high on Lamb's list of Arab leaders for whom he has regard. He suggests that the Palestinian cause might be further along today had the P.L.O. generated a more gifted leadership. But he does not explain why it is so difficult to replace Arafat as P.L.O. chairman. The key lies in the success with which he and other first-generation P.L.O. leaders have used their keen political skills to prevent an emerging second generation from exercising authority within the Palestinian movement. Lamb points out, however, that the P.L.O. is engaged in something akin to a democratic process. This very process tied Arafat's hands as he tried to work out an arrangement with King Hussein of Jordan in a bid to have the P.L.O. represented in peace talks with Israel. Ironically, in a region of the world where democracy either has failed to strike roots or has been uprooted by war, the Arab flame of democracy flickers in the hands of the P.L.O.

The great strength of Lamb's book

is his generous treatment of the Arabs, their history and culture, their past achievements and their current dilemmas. Yet, because he dwells on the different political, economic, and socio-cultural extremes found in the Arab world — a device which many journalists rely on to capture the attention of their readers — his characterizations often ignore the ordinary, the typical and the mundane; the result is a compassionate but rather uneven portrait.

His exposure of American ignorance about the Arabs, while sharp and fundamentally accurate, does not preclude him from faulting the Arabs for misunderstanding the workings of the American democratic process. Were they better informed they might be able to make their case more widely heard in this country. These days the Arabs have all but given up their efforts to counter the influence of the pro-Israel lobby in Washington. That they are confronted with one of the most formidable lobbies in the United States goes without saying; but their inability to organize a successful pro-Arab lobby reminds us that the Arabs hardly speak with one voice back home.

Where the Arabs are making inroads in this country is in the fight against anti-Arab racism. The recently established American-Arab anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) is modelled on the Jewish Anti-Defamation League and is the most successful Arab-oriented organization ever to have been formed in the United States.

Lamb left the Middle East discouraged that not one of the burning issues facing that region was resolved on his tour. As for the Arabs, their "cocky exuberance. . . at the height of the oil boom. . . has become one of disillusionment and reexamination. . . because their dreams from that oil era have not brought them the promised victories."

On the divisions which plague the

Arabs, he quotes the Egyptian journalist, Mohammed Heikal: "There are those who have money and those who have ideas, but both are bankrupt." The Arabs today need a different approach altogether if they hope to resolve their endless problems. Many obstacles stand in their way.

Lamb is convinced that a more understanding and empathetic American government and public would remove one major obstacle from the path the Arabs must take out of the cave. His book is a small

but valuable contribution toward fostering greater American awareness of a people who are truly misunderstood. □

Philip S. Khoury teaches Middle Eastern history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he is associate dean of the School of Humanities and Social Science. Prof. Khoury is the author of two books: Urban Notables and Arab Nationalism (1983), and Syria and the French Mandate (1987).

Glued to the Box

Watching Television.

Todd Gitlin, Editor. Pantheon, 1987. Hardcover \$19.95. Paperback \$9.95.

by Ira Rosen

Sometime in the future, historians will be looking at our prime time television schedule to understand what type of people we were. Imagine the confusion of future scholars when they see our television programs consisting of midget black children (*Different Strokes* and *Webster*), car crashes, bomb explosions, adulterous romances, and MTV videos with the use of ritualistic animal slaughters to help sell the music.

Is this what the United States viewers want to see or are TV programmers getting their story ideas from the old traveling circus?

In *Watching Television*, a series of essays written by academics in communications, that is precisely the question each one of the writers asks, in varying ways.

"Television, contrary to the mythology about its immense power, rarely takes the lead on anything; rather, as a shift occurs, television follows cautiously behind," writes Daniel Hallin in the

book's opening essay.

Hallin fails to point out, though, that television takes the lead by its own story selection. When television began to get going in 1946, there were only 17,000 sets in the United States. By 1960, 87 percent of the households in this country had TVs. Television became, and has continued to remain, the most common shared experience for us. Shows like *Ozzie and Harriet* and *Leave It to Beaver* portrayed the middle-class family as the norm. Historians, even some at Harvard, point to the small screen's influence in contributing to the popularity of suburban life as viewers want to live a life like their television heroes.

As more sets enter our homes, many people adopt beliefs not from great literature, but from situation comedies. Senator Joseph McCarthy understood the power of Hollywood script writers when he went after them in the 1950's and accused some of being Communists. Can you imagine a Communist sympathizer writing "sitcoms"? What power! What influence!

Today, dramas focus on money, power, and greed. Have shows like *Dallas* and *Dynasty* contributed in some degree, to the creation of the "yuppie" generation? Stay tuned.

Along these same lines, Tom Engelhart writes that children's television is nothing more than "propaganda — propaganda meant to sell our own lives to our children. It may, in the end, be our truest educational television — because . . . it does teach our children what we most value."

And what do we value? For that we go to the "soaps." In an essay written by Ruth Rosen, she claims that "soaps" provide an illusion that people are not alone in their misery. "Life hurts on the soaps, but there is always the possibility of improvement. Despite hard knocks, everyone gets a second chance." It is this make-believe world which extends, the authors argue, into TV network news.

News creates the same type of soap operas in their stories, the authors contend. To do this, television focuses on personalities and reports on them to the exclusion of floods, coups, and famines. How many times have we seen Colonel Oliver North in his car driving his kids to school? And if there is a White House secretary who erases or shreds memos for her boss, all the better. News has been influenced by the soap opera, the authors write, and the line between entertainment and journalism is blurred.

This is a typical opinion many print reporters and academics, like some of the essayists in *Watching Television*, have about network news. The only problem with this is that it is overstated. Television network news is not entertainment. It is journalism first and foremost. And like journalism, if it works, it sometimes can be funny and sometimes sad. It can even, like a *New York Times* story, "be entertaining."

But again, first and foremost, television news tries to present a view of what's happening "out there." Is there a soap opera quality to news? Sure, but stories that have fallen into that category on the network — the Iran scandal, political corruption, AIDS — are the impor-

tant watershed events of our time. It is those stories that we want future historians to look at with care — not MTV, *Dynasty*, or *Wheel of Fortune*. Like a good history book, if network news works, it will be informative, accurate, compelling, and yes, entertaining.

Watching Television is a good book to help one to understand

television. Whether one sees it as a national entertainer, painkiller, companion to the lonely, or thief of time — TV is here to stay. And this book goes a long way in helping us to understand what it all means. □

Ira Rosen, Nieman Fellow '87, is a producer with 60 Minutes, CBS News.

A Book That Holds No More Than Was Promised

Hold on, Mr. President!

Samuel Donaldson. Random House, 1987. \$17.95.

by James D. Squires

When the money and sex scandal "Pearlygate" landed on ABC-TV's *Nightline*, inquisitor-anchor Ted Koppel bombed his evangelist-guests with questions about the "big money" in television preaching. Their response was to ignore his questions and taunt him about the "big money" in television news reporting.

When pressed for financial details of their operations, the preachers returned the pressure in kind, ultimately driving their interrogator to fumble for the obvious distinction — that at least his big salary is not financed by donations begged on television.

It was the blow-dried versus the blow-dried, an inevitable and fitting contest of glibness and style between news anchor and evangelist with no clear winner as to the biggest celebrity or the smoothest performer on television.

A good journalist, Ted Koppel is even more successful as a performer, a television star who competes with zany Johnny Carson and bawdy Joan Rivers for viewers and advertisers on late-night television.

Koppel's luminary status is a direct product of the medium itself

and the achievements of his boss at ABC News, Roone Arledge, whose skill at meshing news and entertainment has made him the dominant influence in the television news business for nearly a decade.

If there were a script for *Nightline*, an Arledge creation, the preceding four paragraphs would serve as a "lead in" to the central story line of this piece, which is that a friend and colleague of Koppel, ABC's Sam Donaldson, has written a book called, *Hold on, Mr. President!*, which a lot of publications are bothering to review.

And if Donaldson were a guest on *Nightline* and Koppel were to pick up the story at this point with his hallmark, a courteously belligerent interview, he might begin by asking, "Mr. Donaldson, is it true you only wrote a book because an agent said you are a famous person and could sell one if you did?"

Donaldson, whose hallmark is a not so courteous but belligerent single question ambush, would no doubt avoid all those evasive, dissembling, misleading responses that he as an interrogator of Presidents, press secretaries, and other public officials, has come to abhor. He would, in the words of former White House press secretary Jody Powell, come at you straight up as he always does. In this case, "straight up" would be: "Yes, Ted, without a doubt. That is the only

reason."

Under the Arledge formula, Koppel's allegation and Donaldson's response would then be debated by a panel of experts of opposing viewpoints, the more famous the better. In this case, however, it would be next to impossible to have any guests more famous than Koppel and Donaldson.

And therein lies the most important aspect of *Hold on, Mr. President!*, which has little reason for being, other than the prominence of its author.

Like Koppel, Donaldson is an outstanding journalist, a smart and tenacious reporter who over a decade of White House coverage has gathered a lot of personal observations and entertaining anecdotes. How many people can relate a personal call from President Ronald Reagan who just wanted to set the record straight that the suit he was wearing that day was five years old, not four?

But simply being a repository of White House trivia usually is not enough to get anyone a healthy advance, heavy promotion, and reviews in all the newspapers and journals. There are a lot of smart, tenacious reporters who have covered the White House. Some of them remember and write better than Donaldson. Some of them even have something penetrating to say. Still, they have a hard time getting a book published. Almost never are they solicited for the task as Donaldson was in this instance.

The true significance of "a Donaldson book," at least of this one, is reflected in the book jacket promotion copy, which describes the author as "the brashest, most irreverent, and most provocative television reporter in Washington."

Not the best informed reporter, mind you, or the most accurate, or the most perceptive, but the most noticed and therefore best known and worth your attention and money.

The aim of this sales pitch is appropriately quite low. It only pro-

mises that Donaldson is "telling us how he gets away with it — gets away, that is, with being the nation's most celebrated and outspoken White House correspondent."

Unfortunately, this book holds no more than was promised, unless there is value in a symbol of television news where simply being a personality and being on the air has become the heart of the culture.

A clue to the nature of the television news beast is the obvious struggle the book jacket writer had with Donaldson's credentials for authorship. "Sam Donaldson has probably spent as much time with, or in the vicinity of, the past two Presidents as their own staffs," the jacket promo boasts.

In all its stark sadness, there is a formula for success: Be brash, controversial, a celebrity, and well, "in the vicinity" of news. That's the ticket. Welcome to Roone's world.

Arledge is an enormous talent. His influence on the direction of television journalism in the past ten years is unsurpassed, which would be wonderful if his talent were for journalism. But it isn't. Arledge is a marvel at the television business and how to hype it. His main contribution to the craft of reporting the news has been to wrap it in a glittering cloak of entertainment programming, talk-show hosting, political film-making, and circus ringleading.

No better example is needed than the disgraceful behavior of all three networks during the TWA hostage crisis. While their live cameras were being used by the hijackers in an attempt to intimidate the American viewing audience, the network public relations mills were hard at work pumping out press releases extolling the talent, bravery, and access of its big-name correspondents. The big names had rushed to Beirut, which almost all other American news reporters had been forced to abandon months earlier because of repeated kidnappings.

At one time Arledge was only the

most creative sports producer in television, harmless enough even if he did loose on the public at every opportunity the incomparable Howard Cosell, who pioneered for journalists the art of becoming a bigger story than the one you are assigned to cover.

That changed in 1972 when as executive producer of the Munich Olympics, Arledge's ABC sports coverage apparatus found itself covering live a terrorist massacre. The emotion-drenched coverage that followed won two Emmys and set the stage for Arledge to become a news guru.

He can hardly be blamed for the checkbook journalism, outrageous salaries, and celebrity intrusion that are now so much a part of the television news business. But he must shoulder his share.

Barbara Walters, a nonjournalist, had already been lured to ABC and paid a million dollars to co-anchor the news when Arledge took over in 1977. But he soon escalated the salaries beyond all reason with his efforts to lure Dan Rather and Tom Brokaw from CBS and NBC respectively. Rather now reportedly makes more than \$2 million and some of the local news anchors in major markets approach the million annual salary figure.

Donaldson credits Arledge with the rise in correspondent salaries, too, starting when he paid the late Catherine Mackin [NF '68] \$100,000 to leave NBC in 1977. At the time Donaldson was making \$62,000 as a top correspondent at ABC.

Now most network correspondents and a lot of local ones are represented by lawyers or agents who bargain for them the same way they do for movie stars and sports celebrities. The top correspondents make several hundred thousand a year, the level of Fortune 500 chief executives, for doing basically the same kind of work for which newspapers pay \$40,000 to \$50,000 to reporters at least as qualified.

But money was only the begin-

ning of the problem.

As ABC News began its climb under Arledge into the same ratings league with CBS and NBC, the network competition grew boundless. They tried to see who could overstaff the story with the most bodies, install the most telephone lines, charter the most planes, and do it all in the grandest style. When the network biggies left New York to be "in the vicinity of news" they most often traveled in the style of heads of state: limousines, helicopters, private villas rather than hotels, private rooms in restaurants.

It is hardly a coincidence that the style of television news came to fit perfectly that of Roone Arledge, described by his friend Donaldson as "a man who loved bush jackets and gold chains, often missed meetings, and never returned phone calls, loved to be seen with celebrities and to hire them. . ."

Along with money came power, both real and perceived, that has contributed to the growing public skepticism about journalistic integrity, objectivity, and motivation.

Donaldson writes admiringly of Arledge as a "major force in broadcasting" and recalls how Arledge "once persuaded President Reagan to address an ABC affiliates convention by satellite from the Oval Office."

But it has been in the style of television news programming where Arledge has wielded the most influence, so much in fact that ABC News, which used to be ignored, has become a much-copied pacesetter.

When CBS scrapped its morning hard news show recently, it modeled the successor after ABC's frothy *Good Morning, America*. And CBS continued following the leader when it recently began doing fictionalizations of current news topics such as the string of Atlanta child murders.

In a chapter called "The Arledge Era," Donaldson extolls his boss's instincts for "what works on television," mentioning among other things his approval of a Ted Koppel

series that had been "jazzed up" with animation and special effects including — in technicolor — the exploding of an atomic bomb over the White House.

This same kind of "jazz" is now routine on television. And seeing the famous face of a television news personality does not mean necessarily that you are watching the news. For example, the staple format of Koppel's *Nightline* is the assembly of a panel of experts to comment on a legitimate news event. But the show took precisely the same approach following the telecast of an ABC movie about a fictional nuclear at-

tack on the United States. Ironically, that panel did include someone as famous as Koppel — former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The distinguished former diplomat, a celebrity if there ever was one, has also been under contract to ABC — as a paid news analyst.

The combination of Koppel, Kissinger, and Arledge is no doubt good television. That does not mean it is good journalism. And there is a terrible danger that the people responsible for both can't tell the difference. □

James D. Squires, Nieman Fellow '71, is editor of the Chicago Tribune.

Five W's and an H Under Fire

Reading the News.

Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, Editors. Pantheon, 1987. Hardcover \$19.95. Paperback \$9.95.

by Robert Timberg

Just as I've always believed that the best film critics are those who genuinely enjoy the movies, I think the most perceptive press critics are those who display a fondness for journalism even as they illuminate and bemoan its failings. Such criticism has the potential to connect with that part of its audience made up of working journalists, in large measure because it takes into account the human dimensions of the press and its often unlikely practitioners. At the other end of the spectrum is an essentially bloodless form of criticism, the unpleasant tone of which betrays a fundamental intellectual dislike for the structure and conventions of American journalism.

Reading the News, edited by Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, falls into the second category. Although at times Manoff, Schudson, and the four other contributors raise issues of importance,

the tone is unmistakably snide, sneering, and ultimately offensive. What comes across in many of the chapters is a deep-seated dislike for the very profession they devote considerable energy to analyzing. None of that would be especially germane if the book had the redeeming quality of informed criticism, that is, if it lived up to the promise on the back cover that the essays offer "fresh, provocative insights into a centerpiece of American culture, the news." In fact, with some few exceptions, I found the self-proclaimed insights neither fresh nor provocative.

The most novel aspect of the book is the manner in which it is organized. In separate essays, the contributors attempt, often at dispiriting length, to explain the meaning of, and the pitfalls that lie behind, the famous "five W's and an H," that is, who, what, when, where, why, and how. The idea is inspired, the execution in large measure pedestrian and pretentious.

As an example, Leon V. Sigal, a professor of government at Wesleyan University, argues in an essay on the "who's" of the news that the press is overly reliant on official sources, a charge that, though largely true and important, does not

meet either the test of freshness or provocativeness. To make his point, Sigal cites an incident from Watergate in which *Washington Post* executive editor Ben Bradlee challenges Woodward and Bernstein on their sourcing of a story. Learning that the information came from a junior White House aide and a former administration official, Bradlee tells the reporters to get some harder information. Sigal argues that Bradlee, in rewriting the story's lead to soften it and in consigning it to an inside page, was giving in to a journalistic tendency to trust higher-ups, people of substance, presumably Bradlee's kind of people, rather than a low-level official and a possibly disgruntled former aide.

But let's consider the same incident in the context in which it occurred. It's early on in Watergate, the dimensions of the scandal have not yet taken shape, the *Post* is out on a limb by virtue of its aggressive coverage of the affair, and Bradlee is confronted with a story by two local reporters whom he does not know very well. He is responsible for what appears in the *Post*, and before he prints a story he wants to know in his bones not merely that two or three people said something was so, but that it is true. Woodward and Bernstein failed to persuade him and paid the price. Ultimately, for the nation as well as the *Post*, it was a worthwhile lesson. The *Post's* Watergate reporting, because sources were constantly evaluated as to their credibility and not just toted up until some arbitrary numerical threshold had been crossed, was largely unassailable and authoritative. Judgments such as the one Bradlee had to make confront reporters and editors all the time. The real problem is not that the press refuses to take the word of lower-level sources, but rather that too many poorly sourced stories manage to make their way into print.

I mentioned the sneering quality of the essays. Some examples: Carlin Romano, literary editor and critic of

The Philadelphia Inquirer, cites a 1985 *USA Today* lead — "Investors are nervously anticipating a sub-1300 market." — then notes that if even one investor was not anticipating a sub-1300 market, or not anticipating it nervously, the statement is false. Romano then asks if the lead constitutes a fact because in newspaperese it really means "some" investors.

The author also asks who determines the relevant criteria for nervousness. Interesting, if not especially trenchant questions. But then Romano says, "If you're not even mildly humbled by these questions, you're probably a professional journalist." Gulp. Caught in the non-act of failing to be humbled by such penetrating questions, and exposed for what I probably am, a p_____l j_____t.

This kind of thing infects the book. Editor Schudson, chairman of the department of communication at the University of California, San Diego, says that most White House correspondents are reporters who began following the president during a campaign and this creates a four-year or eight-year "time horizon" that he argues dominates presidential reporting. He then says, "That is the limit of the journalists' own memories." Really? How does one respond to such drivel? By the way, with the exception of *The Washington Post* and *The New York Daily News*, I can think of no major newspaper whose principal White House reporter covered the 1980 Reagan campaign. *The New York Times* is on its third reporting team.

Schudson, in fact, seems especially enamored of the gratuitous insult. Discussing deadlines, for example, he makes the point that public officials can manipulate press coverage to their advantage if they are aware of reporters' filing times, an unarguable if obvious statement. But then he goes on to say that the more the press emphasizes the immediacy of the news, the more it will be vulnerable to manipulation

by those who know how to "prey on people with stopwatch mentalities."

The fact is, working journalists are portrayed in this book as stolid, intellectually lazy denizens of a curious netherworld who go mindlessly about their jobs — the pursuit of scoops — with neither a sense of their own limitations nor a sense of the mischief they can create. All this may be true, of course, but if these eminent essayists hope to trigger an improved performance by the press, they might consider resorting less to cheap shots and relying on more sophisticated, informed analysis.

This is not to say this book, offensive as it is, is totally without value. The chapter by James W. Carey entitled, "Why and How? The Dark Continent of American Journalism," almost redeems the entire volume. Carey, dean of the college of communications at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, seems to have the best sense of where daily journalism, which this book is about, fits into the larger picture of journalism as practiced in the United States.

"Journalism is . . . a curriculum," he writes. "Its first course is the breaking stories of the daily press. There one gets a bare description: the identification of the actors and the events, the scene against which the events are played out and the tools available to the protagonists. Intermediate and advanced work — the fine-grained descriptions and interpretations — await the columns of analysis and interpretation, the weekly summaries and commentaries, and the book-length expositions. Each part of the curriculum depends on every other part."

Carey shares with his fellow essayists the smugness of the unbloodied observer. He says, for example, "There is a harmonics to journalism; the stories write themselves," a statement that ranks as one of the more idiotic in this volume. But much of his criticism really is fresh, provocative, worth

reading and taking to heart. In a particularly cogent segment, Carey argues that journalists incessantly attempt to explain events by looking primarily at the motives of the actors when, in fact, the reasons are usually much more complicated.

This overreliance on motive explanations is a pervasive weakness in American journalism," he writes. "Motives are too easy. It takes time, effort, and substantial knowledge to find a cause, whereas motives are available for a phone call. And motives are profoundly misleading and simplifying. Motives explanations end up portraying a world in which people are driven by desires no more complicated than greed."

Carey is right. Many journalists look first for motive, and then are satisfied with the most banal. In a sense, journalists all too often portray politicians precisely as this book portrays them — as one-dimensional Pavlovian creatures. If the journalist is forever on the make for his or her next scoop, the politician is driven almost exclusively by concern for the next election rather than the more complex motives we ascribe to ourselves and even our most unsavory friends. Interestingly, it is easy — indeed almost mandatory — to note in a story that some politician is running for reelection even though we don't know if his action was so motivated, but nearly impossible to say that a politician's action was driven by an honest desire to come to grips with a difficult public policy issue, even when we strongly suspect that to be the case.

I find myself in the uncomfortable role here of defender of the faith. In fact, while I believe American journalism is generally good, it is not nearly as good as it could be and much of it is terrible. The problem with much of the criticism, however, is well demonstrated by this modest volume; that is, it does not relate well to the conditions under which most journalists work. It reminds me of the question often

put to White House reporters by President Reagan's detractors after a press conference: "How could you guys let him get away with that?" While there are ways to hold the president to account, the question invariably carries with it the sense that somehow reporters should punch him out or tell him he's full of crap on national television. It is the ultimate naive question.

At the same time, a look at how the dynamics and conventions of a presidential press conference permits the White House to manipulate the event is a worthwhile enterprise. Just as this book could have been a valuable effort. Journalists, at least the ones I'm close to, are constantly

questioning the system in which they operate and trying to deal with many of the questions and issues raised in this book. But instead of serving as enlightened partners in the effort, the contributors have chosen the easier course of above-the-battle snottiness.

When I finished reading this book, I felt like pulling my green eyeshade down a little further, taking a slug from the pint of Jack Daniels in my desk drawer, and calling my bookie to find out what was going on in the world. □

Robert Timberg, Nieman Fellow '80, is the White House correspondent for The Baltimore Sun.

South African Editor Wins Lyons Award

Zwelakhe Sisulu, an opposition newspaper editor jailed by South African authorities, has won the 1987 Louis M. Lyons Award for Conscience and Integrity in Journalism, the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University announced on May 4.

Sisulu, 37, editor of the Johannesburg-based *New Nation*, was chosen for the award by a vote of the 20 members of the Nieman Fellow Class of 1987. The award, named in honor of former Nieman curator Louis M. Lyons, recognizes Sisulu's courage and dedication in providing South African blacks with an alternative voice amidst harsh efforts by the South African government to quell a dissenting press. Sisulu has been detained without trial under South African emergency regulations since Dec. 12, 1986.

"As far as I can tell, Mr. Sisulu's only 'crime' has been to speak his mind," said Mike Pride, editor of the *Concord Monitor*, who with other American and South African journalists nominated Sisulu for the award.

Pride and Sisulu were members of the 1985 Nieman Fellows class.

The award, which carries a \$1,000 honorarium, will be presented this fall.

In the letter nominating Sisulu, the New Hampshire editor praised *The New Nation* for "vibrant, aggressive reportage and a desire to be a voice for justice and reason in South Africa. This is a logical extension of Mr. Sisulu's previous efforts as a reporter, an editor and a leading organizer of black journalists. These earlier endeavors led to better conditions for black journalists, but the cost to Mr. Sisulu was banning and imprisonment."

The weekly tabloid is sponsored by the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference and it was founded by Sisulu in 1985. Last summer Sisulu was detained for several weeks only to be released and arrested again in December. He also served several months in detention in the late 1970's and he was "banned" between 1981 and 1983. He was a founding president of the country's black jour-

nalists trade union and a reporter and editor for several daily newspapers in South Africa.

The black journalist is a member of a prominent family of antiapartheid activists. His father, Walter, a leader of the outlawed African National Congress, was convicted of treason along with Nelson Mandela and six others in 1964. His mother, Albertina, has been a leader of the umbrella opposition group, the United Democratic Front, and his brother Max is an exiled ANC leader.

"Zwelakhe Sisulu is an activist and a leader in a struggle," said Albert L. May, chairman of the Nieman awards committee. "His weapons are ideas and the printed word against an opponent who answers with force. It is in honor of that journalistic tradition and Mr. Sisulu's courage that we bestow this award. Freedom of the press has yet to flourish elsewhere in Africa but in South Africa there is a government that claims a democratic western tradition and then makes a mockery of it by putting editors in jail."

May noted that Sisulu is the third South African journalist to win the Lyons award in the last five years. The 1983 award went to Joseph Thloloe, who was jailed for owning a banned book, and Allister Sparks received the 1985 award for courageous reporting in South Africa.

Last year the award was won by Violeta Chamorro, publisher of the daily newspaper *La Prensa*, for her newspaper's efforts to keep a free press alive in Nicaragua. Other past winners include American correspondents who covered the war in Indochina; Tom Renner, a *Newsday* reporter, for coverage of organized crime; Joe Alex Morris Jr., a *Los Angeles Times* reporter who was killed while covering the Iranian revolution; and Maria Olivia Monckeberg, a Chilean journalist for *Analisis*, for her reporting in the face of official harassment.

The Nieman Foundation is a mid-career program at Harvard University for journalists from throughout the world. □

NIEMAN NOTES

Fellows are still mailing in the questionnaire sent recently to all Nieman. Many who responded let us know about their current endeavors. It is clear that the book allegedly waiting inside every journalist's heart and mind is in reality coming to life, judging from the contents of the mail bag these days.

— 1940 —

OSCAR J. BUTTEDAHL's family has written to us about his death this past April 16, at his home in Santa Rosa, California. Mr. Buttedahl, who was 83, taught at country schools in North Dakota before attending the University of North Dakota where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

After graduating from the university, he became a reporter for *The Minot Daily News*, and then for the *Walhalla Mountaineer*. Later, for six years, he was editor of the *Nonpartisan Leader*. He had also served as executive secretary to Congressman Charles B. Robertson, and United States Senator William Langer. He then became owner and publisher of weekly newspapers in Meridian, Idaho, and in Santa Rosa. For the past 25 years he has been engaged in investment and insurance work. His wife Hazle predeceased him. They had been married for 50 years. His family survivors include two daughters, Susan B. Dickson, Salem, Oregon, and Sally D. McKinley of Santa Rosa, and three grandchildren.

— 1941 —

GEORGE CHAPLIN, *Honolulu Advertiser* editor-at-large, was awarded the University of Jerusalem's Judah L. Magnes Gold Medal on April 26. Mr. Chaplin retired last December after 28 years as editor-in-chief of the *Advertiser*.

WILLIAM J. MILLER, of Truro, Massachusetts and Gainesville, Florida, recently has been serving in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, as an adviser to Prince Bandar bin Saud bin Faisal, grandson of King Faisal. The prince is in charge of

public relations for the King Faisal International Prizes in Medicine and Science.

Mr. Miller is a former editor with *Time*, *Life*, and *The New York Herald Tribune*.

— 1942 —

HARRY ASHMORE of Santa Barbara, California, informs us that he is working on a biography of Robert Hutchins for Little Brown and Company.

The last issue of *NR* carried a brief notice of the death of DONALD GRANT in Ireland. Recently received information augments that report.

DONALD S. GRANT, 72, author, columnist, and former United Nations correspondent for the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* died September 20, 1983 of a heart ailment at Bantry Hospital in County Cork, Ireland. He had suffered a heart attack ten days previously.

Mr. Grant retired in 1970 after a 25-year career as a reporter for the *Post-Dispatch*. He and his wife, Mary, moved to a refurbished farmhouse at Kilcrohane in southern Ireland. He filed periodic columns about farm life that were published in the *Post-Dispatch*.

In 1974 he wrote a book, *White Goats and Black Bees*, describing rural living in Ireland.

He had served as UN correspondent for 15 years when he retired.

During the previous ten years, he had handled worldwide assignments for the newspaper. In 1951 he went to Argentina to interview Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, editor of *La Prensa*, the newspaper censored by Juan Peron. He reported in 1953 on the communist infiltration into Guatemala, Panama, and what was then British Guiana; on the fall of the government of President Jacob Arbenz of Guatemala in 1954; and the Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, that same year. In 1959 he wrote a 32-article series on the conditions and riots in what was then Leopoldville, Belgian Congo. He also covered developments in Cuba under Fidel

Castro in 1962-63.

Before coming to the *Post-Dispatch* in 1945, Mr. Grant had been a war correspondent for *Look* magazine and the Cowles Publications.

He was born in Minneapolis. He moved to Des Moines as a child, and got his first newspaper job in the financial department of a newspaper there.

Besides his wife, survivors include a daughter, Ann Davidoff of Canton, Connecticut, three grandchildren, and one great-grandchild.

— 1943 —

Word about EDWARD DONOHOE, retired managing editor of the *Scranton* (Pa.) *Times* and *Sunday Times*, comes from his wife, Helen. She writes that he has Parkinson's disease and is in a Scranton nursing home, the Holy Family Residence.

— 1945 —

HOUSTOUN WARING, editor emeritus, who has started his 61st year at the *Littleton* (Col.) *Sentinel Independent*, was given the Distinguished Service Award for "outstanding service to the University" at the University of Denver on its 123rd Founders Day, March 6. In 1933, Dean Walters of the University asked Mr. Waring to start a department of journalism. Beginning with just two men, Houstoun Waring taught an hour a day, five days a week for six years, while also chairing the department and running the publicity for the University. At the same time, he operated the *Littleton Independent*.

He writes that he "is appealing through the Rotarian magazine for 23,000 clubs worldwide to hold more programs on international affairs."

— 1947 —

GILBERT (PETE) STEWART of Knoxville, Tennessee, is working on a history of the Revolutionary War. Before his re-

tiement he was assistant director of information, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

— 1949 —

DELBERT WILLIS, editor of the *Fort Worth Press* from 1971 until the newspaper ceased publication in 1975, died March 25 at his home in Fort Worth, Texas.

He started his newspaper career as a copy boy for the *Press* in 1934. Later, as a reporter, he won National Headliner awards in 1951 and 1953. He was editor of *Scripps Howard News*, the corporation magazine, following the closing of the *Press*, until his retirement in 1980.

He had served in the Army during World War II and was severely wounded while fighting in the Pacific Theatre. After leaving the Army as a captain, he became a Nieman Fellow and returned to the *Fort Worth Press* in 1949.

— 1953 —

ARTHUR BARSCHDORF, consultant and chairman of the Management Committee of the Electric Information Council, Grand Forks, North Dakota, writes: "I helped to found and develop the Council in 1978 while I was an executive with Minnesota Power in Duluth. I remained chairman of the management committee and have continued to ramrod the organization since my retirement in July, 1981.

"The EIC is a national communications effort for the electric industry, utilizing Paul Harvey and the ABC News Radio Network, currently totaling 1,319 stations throughout the nation. The Council is educational in nature, focusing on electric energy matters and issues vital to social and economic life in the USA . . . Its aims are to present both sides of such issues as nuclear electric power, clean coal technology, acid rain, and the vital part electricity has in everyday life . . ."

JOHN STROHMEYER, former editor of *The Globe Times* in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, has been named Atwood Professor of Journalism for the academic year, 1987-1988, at the University of Alaska in Anchorage. At UAA he will teach advanced courses in news writing and press issues, and act as adviser to the

student newspaper, the *UAA Voice*.

Mr. Strohmeyer, a 1972 Pulitzer Prize winner for editorial writing, is the author of *Crisis in Bethlehem: Big Steel's Battle to Survive*. The book, which is in its third printing, will appear in paperback in 1988; it will also be translated into Japanese.

— 1955 —

ALBERT L. KRAUS has been named editor emeritus of the *Journal of Commerce*, New York. On the staff since 1978, he previously had worked at the *Providence Journal-Bulletin* and *The New York Times*.

— 1957 —

HALE CHAMPION, dean of the Kennedy school of Government at Harvard University, has taken a leave of absence to act as chief of staff for Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Champion will hold the highest position on the governor's staff, oversee the day-to-day operation of state government, and act as a liaison to the Dukakis presidential campaign.

— 1958 —

J. WESLEY SULLIVAN, chairman (retired) of the editorial board, the *Statesman Journal*, Salem, Oregon, writes that he is "spending an important share of time trying to follow the electronic communications revolution into the future. I'm working with the paper, the city library, and the state library on this project. I'm on the city's Information Technology Commission. . . . I was named the Ruhl Fellow this year at the University of Oregon's Journalism School, giving lectures there on the future of communications. I also was the critiquer at the Northwest Editorial Writers Convention last year, and will be again this year. Keeping busy."

— 1960 —

JACK SAMSON has let us know that he took early retirement from CBS, where he had been an editor of their magazine division for twenty years. He is now devoting time to free-lance

magazines and books. So far he has "written 15 books — the latest, the biography of the late General Claire L. Chennault of World War II 'Flying Tiger' fame. *Chennault: Maverick General* will be published in August by Doubleday Co., Inc."

— 1961 —

ROBERT CLARK, as of January 1, left his full-time post with Harte Hanks Communications in San Antonio, Texas, and has become a consultant to that organization.

JOHN HERBERS, *New York Times* national correspondent, has been named Visiting Ferris Professor of Politics and the Press at Princeton University for the 1987 fall semester.

His fourth book, *The New Heartland: America's Flight beyond the Suburbs and How It Is Changing our Future*, was published by Times Books last October.

— 1962 —

EUGENE ROBERTS, senior vice president/executive editor of *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, was elected chairman of the American Committee of the International Press Institute at an April 9 meeting in San Francisco. He succeeds Thomas Winship, president of the Center for Foreign Journalists in Reston, Virginia.

— 1964 —

JAMES MCCARTNEY of the Washington Bureau of *Knight-Ridder Newspapers*, Inc. has been named president of the Gridiron Club for 1987. At the annual dinner, on March 28, as president, he was seated next to another President — Ronald Reagan. MOLLY SINCLAIR, Nieman Fellow '78, was also at the head table; she was seated next to Secretary George Shultz. Mr. McCartney writes: ". . . so our family, and the Niemans, were well represented."

MORTON MINTZ and his older daughter Margaret, a graphic designer, formed a father-daughter venture to publish *Quotations from President Ron* in August 1986. St. Martin's Press is issuing an updated edition of the

irreverent collection in May.

— 1966 —

ROBERT MAYNARD, president and publisher of the *Oakland (Ca.) Tribune*, was one of twelve black journalists whose portraits went on a national tour, as part of the observance of Black History Month last February. The likenesses were unveiled at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. They are being shown at Howard University and other sites in Washington. Later the exhibit will be seen in Minneapolis, New York, Chicago, and Dallas.

The "Gallery of Greats" was painted by Jamaica-born Bryan McFarlane of Cambridge, Massachusetts. He is an artist-in-residence on the faculties of three university art departments..

The twelve journalists he portrayed include four of the earliest pioneers of black journalism and eight who are still living. Four women are among the twelve: Ida B. Wells Barnett (1861-1931), a writer for the *New York Age*; Ethel L. Payne of the *Chicago Defender*; Clarice Tinsley, co-anchor newscaster at WDFW-TV in Dallas; and Charlayne Hunter-Gault, correspondent for Public Broadcasting Services' *MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*.

The others are: John Brown Russwurm (1799-1851), who helped to found America's first black newspaper, *Freedom's Journal*, in 1827 in New York; T. Thomas Fortune (1856-1928) who founded the *New York Globe* in 1881. The *Globe* evolved into the *New York Freeman*, later known as the *New York Age*; William Monroe Trotter (1871-1934), who founded the *Boston Guardian* in 1901. He also helped to start an organization in 1905 that was a forerunner of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Samuel H. Lacy, formerly a sports broadcaster for Washington and Baltimore radio and television stations. He also wrote sports for the *Washington Tribune*, *Chicago Defender*, and *Baltimore AfroAmerican*; Malvin R. Goode, who wrote sports for the *Pittsburgh Courier* and broadcast for Pittsburgh radio stations. In 1961 he was hired by ABC News to cover the United Nations; Gordon Parks, painter, photographer, composer, author of 12 books, and a professional basketball player. He made fashion photographs for *Vogue*

magazine, and for twenty years worked for *Life* magazine. His novel, *The Learning Tree*, was published in 1963 and made into a motion picture which he directed, scored, and produced; William Raspberry of *The Washington Post*, a nationally syndicated columnist on race relations; and Robert C. Maynard, *The Washington Post's* first black national correspondent. In 1979 Gannett appointed him editor of the *Oakland Tribune*, which he later bought from that company.

JAMES MONTGOMERY writes from Atlanta, Georgia, that he "took early retirement at the end of 1985 after nearly 33 years, half with the *Atlanta Constitution* and half with *The Wall Street Journal*. Finally [I] have nearly all the time I want for music, books, swimming, yard-work, and travel."



— 1970 —

WILLIAM MONTALBANO, foreign correspondent for *The Los Angeles Times*, writes from South America: "After three years here with a base in Buenos Aires, [I] will be moving to Rome as bureau chief in the fall."

HEDRICK SMITH and Susan Zox Eidenberg were married on March 7 in Washington, D.C.

The bride, who is known professionally as Susan Zox, is the acting director of public relations at the Children's Hospital National Medical Center in Washington.

The groom, who was chief Washington correspondent of *The New York Times*, is currently on leave to write a book about the uses of power in Washington. It is to be published by Random House.

Previous marriages for both the bride and bridegroom ended in divorce.

— 1972 —

R. GREGORY NOKES, diplomatic correspondent for the Associated Press in Washington, D.C. for the past three years, has joined *The Oregonian* in Portland in the newly established position of national correspondent.

— 1973 —

WAYNE GREENHAW, editor and publisher, writes from Montgomery, Alabama: "With two partners, I bought the *Alabama* magazine three years ago. Since my partners are attorneys, I run the magazine and have a very small staff."

— 1974 —

PATRICIA A. O'BRIEN, a national political correspondent for Knight-Ridder Newspapers, has become press secretary for Governor Dukakis' presidential campaign. She has covered Congress for Knight-Ridder since 1985.

During the presidential campaign of 1985, she wrote a political column for the newspaper chain. She is also the author of two books: *The Woman Alone* and *Staying Together: Marriages That Work*.

— 1976 —

MAGGIE SCARF is the author of *Intimate Partners: Patterns in Love and Marriage*, published in February by Random House. The book tells "real stories of real people struggling to make their marriages work."

She is also the author of *Unfinished Business: Pressure Points in the Lives of Women*. Published in 1980, it is a treatise on women's lives and the causes of female depression.

— 1977 —

CASSANDRA TATE writes from Seattle: "I have been working on a master's thesis dealing with the social history of cigarette smoking, a topic I hope to turn into a book. . . . The seeds for my project were planted a decade ago, during my Nieman Fellowship. . . . I expect it will take me at least another year and a half

to finish my master's degree, and possibly longer, since I'm continuing to work as a freelance magazine writer while pursuing my studies."

— 1978 —

DAVID DEJEAN writes from nearby Boston that he has been named executive editor, news, of *PC Week*, the national newspaper of IBM Standard Microcomputing. Before coming to Boston he was in charge of the video text department of the *Los Angeles Times*.

KAROL SZYNDZIELORZ, chief political commentator of *Zycie Warszawy* in Warsaw, Poland, was a recent visitor at Lippmann House. Mr. Szyndzielorz will be based in New York at the Institute for East-West Security Studies until December 1987.

— 1979 —

MARGARET ENGEL and her husband, Bruce Adams, announce the birth of their first child, Emily, on April 27, a date two and one-half weeks after the expected arrival of the newest family member.

Ms. Engel, a reporter with *The Washington Post*, is taking a leave of absence to become the executive director of the Alicia Patterson Journalism Foundation.

PEGGY SIMPSON of Washington, D.C. sent word to the Nieman office in February that her classmate ROYSTON WRIGHT had suffered a fatal heart attack in mid-1986. No details are known as we go to press. Mr. Wright was assistant editor of the Sierra Leone Broadcasting Service when he was awarded a Nieman Fellowship.

— 1980 —

STANLEY FORMAN, cameraman with WCVB/AP, Boston, has been honored with four prizes by the Boston Press Photographers Awards for 1986. He is a first place winner in Spot News; also first place for Picture Story (News); and third place for the category of Fire. In addition, his work was cited as Best of Show.

— 1981 —

DAVID LAMB, reporter with *The Los Angeles Times*, is the author of *The Arabs; Journeys Beyond the Mirage*, published in February by Random House. See Books section, this issue, for a review.

DON McNEILL and his wife, Sandra, stopped in at the Nieman office one day in April. Most recently he has been based in Israel for CBS News. He is taking a year off to write a book.

The McNeills have rented a place in York Harbor, Maine, where Sandra, an artist, has a studio.

— 1982 —

CHRISTOPHER BOGAN has won a third place award from the Associated Press Sports Editors contest for the *Dallas Times Herald* in the category of "best news story."

Mr. Bogan currently is studying at Harvard's School of Business Administration.

— 1983 —

CHARLES SHERMAN was on leave earlier this year from the *International Herald Tribune* in Paris to accept a Fulbright award to study business and economics in Japan. He wrote from Tokyo that his wife, Nancy Beth, "landed a job with the Asahi English-language news service and has been freelancing a good deal. Over Christmas we found a slow boat to Shanghai. From there by train to Beijing in time for the New Year's student demonstrations. [Classmate] ZOU DEZHENG took us in hand and made sure we saw the Forbidden City, pandas, and the summer palace. This was the ultimate in off-season travel — the temperature got up to 2 degrees one afternoon. The pandas even seemed put out by the cold."

— 1984 —

JANE DAUGHERTY and her husband, David Robinson, announce the birth of a daughter, Meghan Daugherty Robinson, on February 10, 1987 in Detroit, Michigan. Their family also includes a son, Ryan.

In November Jane Daugherty was promoted to Metro Projects Editor for the *Detroit Free Press*. She formerly was human services reporter. Her spouse is executive sports editor at the same newspaper.

ALICE KAO, deputy city editor, *United Daily News*, Taipei, Taiwan, came to Cambridge March 25-26 to participate in a two-day conference co-sponsored by the John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Research and the Nieman Foundation.

Her talk, titled "The Taiwan Comparison," followed a talk, "Reporting China," given by New York Times correspondent John Burns and New York Times columnist ANTHONY LEWIS [57].

— 1985 —

Donna Hilts, the wife of PHILIP HILTS, died April 4 at the National Institutes of Health in Washington, D.C. She had cancer. She was a free-lance writer in Bethesda, Maryland, and a former award-winning reporter and editor with the Journal newspapers; she also had worked for *The Washington Post* and the old *Washington Daily News*. She was 41.

Her newspaper career started in 1967, after her graduation from the University of Kentucky in her home state. She began as a reporter with *The Kentucky Post* in Covington. In 1970 she came to Washington and for the next two years she was a staff reporter with *The Daily News*.

From 1973 to 1974, she was a writer and associate editor of the Journal newspapers in Northern Virginia. She won first place honors from the Virginia Press Association for a series of investigative articles.

She worked for *The Washington Post* between 1974 and 1980. She was a copy editor in the Style section and contributed articles to several sections of the newspaper, including its Sunday Potomac magazine. In more recent years, she did free-lance writing and worked in broadcasting.

In 1983 Ms. Hilts was associate producer of a public television documentary, *Books Under Fire*, which told a story of pressure groups seeking restraints on the dissemination of works

they opposed. The program received an Emmy nomination.

Among her survivors are her husband Philip, a *Washington Post* staff writer, two sons, Benjamin and Sean, and a daughter, Alexis.

— Excerpted from *The Washington Post*

Donna Hilts was indomitable.

She loved chocolate and books and her children and Phil and mysteries and people and who can ask for more.

Once, when Phil was deep into his book and they were deep into debt, she thought of selling their furniture to keep Phil at the typewriter. Instead, she got a job.

She worked very hard, laughed a lot, let real things bother her and fake things not at all.

She was indomitable and we all will miss her now and forever and very damn much.

— Howard Simons

RANDOM NOTES

Among the officers elected at the April 7-10 ASNE convention in San Francisco were Nieman Fellows JOHN SEIGENTHALER ['59], editor and publisher, *Nashville Tennessean*, as treasurer. Two of the new directors elected to the 20-member board were: JAMES D. SQUIRES ['71], editor and executive vice president, *Chicago Tribune*; and LARRY ALLISON ['69], editor and senior vice president, *Long Beach (Cal.) Press-Telegram*. The board members will serve three-year terms.

ROBERT P. CLARK ['61], news consultant, Harte-Hanks Newspapers, is a director retiring from the ASNE board. JOHN O. EMMERICH ['62], editor and publisher, *Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth*, is a current member on the board of directors.

More than one thousand persons attended the 1987 ASNE convention — the highest registration ever for an ASNE convention held outside of Washington, D.C.

Three Nieman Fellows were among those named 1987 Pulitzer Prize winners.

H.G. (BUZZ) BISSINGER ['86] was a member of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*

team cited for its series "Disorder in the Court." The articles documented conflict of interest, incompetence, and politicking in the Philadelphia courts. Buzz Bissinger has worked for *The Inquirer* since 1981. The other team reporters were Frederic Tulsy and Daniel Biddle. Bissinger and Biddle spent more than two years investigating and writing stories that uncovered secret meetings between judges and defense lawyers in criminal cases, judges who raised campaign contributions from lawyers and later heard their cases in court, and a regular system of picking judges for political, not professional, reasons. The newspaper series led to further investigations and reforms.

ALEX JONES ['82], a reporter with *The New York Times*, won in the category of Specialized Reporting for his story "The Fall of the House of Bingham," a "sensitive report of a powerful newspaper family's bickering." In his article, he chronicled the family dispute that "pitted brother against sister and father against son. . . . As a result, the family's papers, *The Courier-Journal* and *The Louisville Times*, were put up for sale."

NANCY LEE ['87], newsroom graphics editor with *The New York Times*, was a member of the staff's team who won for coverage of the aftermath of the *Challenger* explosion. Their stories identified serious flaws in the space shuttle's design and in the administration of the space program. "One of the most important revelations was that the possibly disastrous defects in the shuttle's booster rocket had been known several months before the launching and that engineers had warned that cold weather could aggravate the problem."

Spring in the Nieman office, like the flowering shrubs outside the windows, has to do with promises.

Class members in residence are looking ahead to their return to the newsroom, and the newly appointed class has just been promised their Nieman year in the fall.

Ends and beginnings blend into a single experience. That one promises more to come.

— T.B.K.L.

NIEMAN REPORTS



Subscribe today!

☐ 1 year, \$15.00

☐ 2 years, \$30.00

Foreign: Add \$10 a year for airmail.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____

State/Zip _____

Send this form with your check, made payable to the
Nieman Foundation, to: Nieman Reports, P.O. Box 4951,
Manchester, N.H. 03108. Thank you.

NIEMAN REPORTS

ONE FRANCIS AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

Second-class
postage paid
at Boston, MA
and additional
entries