n i e m a n

$1.25 autumn 1976

1947 - 1977
Thirtieth Anniversary of Hutchins Commission Report
Freedom for What?
A Free and Responsible Press — Louis M. Lyons
The press emphasizes the exceptional rather than the representative . . .

r e p o r t s

nieman reports

autumn 1976
vol. XXX no. 3

Contents

Editor – James C. Thomson Jr.
Executive Editor – Tenney K. Lehman

Nieman Reports is published quarterly by the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, 48 Trowbridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Subscription $5 for 4 issues; add $1.35 annually for foreign mailing. Single copies $1.25. Third class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

Guest Editorial

Eureka! Free at Last to Be A Jimmy, a Real Jimmy!

by Jimmy Thomson

(The following editorial is an up-dated version of an op-ed page piece from The New York Times, *September 12, 1976.)*

TRURO, Mass. — I am neither a Georgian nor a Southern Baptist. But I am, and have been extensively, a "Jimmy." It is therefore an unsettling experience, one that makes you reflect, to have a President who has chosen to run for that august office as "Jimmy."

James is, of course, the root of the problem in most cases, including Mr. Carter's. James is a heavy burden for the very young and very small, at least in America. It seems not only plural but much too formal. It evokes thoughts of that precocious prig, "James James Morrison Morrison," or haughty chauffeurs ("Home, James"), or unexciting saints, or British kings. It is, further, in many families, the name used by parents or older siblings when you have seriously misbehaved.

So, early on, all parties seek out less formidable nicknames. Actually there aren't many — only Jimmy, Jim, Jamie, and perhaps (quite rare) Jimmer, or even Jimminy. One 1950's college classmate of mine who made the mistake of naming his son James III has lived to see that child change his entire name to "Yossarian" — or, more informally, "Yo-yo."

The problem is that while Jim seems too old and tough, Jimmy seems too infantile and vulnerable. Can, for instance, a Jimmy be entrusted to make an adult decision, like finishing his custard or declaring war, much less govern the nation?

My own story is somewhat embarrassing. In China, where I grew up as a missionary child, Jimmy — transliterated into Chinese — became "Chi-mi," or "Chicken-feed." The name caused hilarity among all Chinese I encountered as I was trundled off to kindergarten and even higher institutions of learning. No one would tell me why, and the final discovery was not good for my self-esteem. I did feel better, however, when I eventually found a new friend in Shanghai's Jessfield Park Zoo, "Jimmy the Giant Kangaroo." I attribute to weekend kangaroo-viewing my rising sense of manliness.

Back in America the problem got complicated by the existence in my high school class of another who shared, approximately, my surname. He became, naturally, "Thompson, E.A.," and I "Thomson, J.C." For too many years Jimmy gave way to "J.C.," creating — in this believing Presbyterian child — excessive grandiosity.

Way back, maybe in sixth grade, I did some research in that little pamphlet some gasoline company used to put out about

(Continued on page 17)

Whales and Minnows:

The Struggle between the Executive and Congress over Foreign Policy

by Nicholas Daniloff

Q: *How, specifically, Governor, are you going to bring the American people into the decision-making process in foreign affairs?*

Carter: *First of all, quit conducting the decision-making process in secret as has been characteristic of Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Ford . . . I would restore the concept of fireside chats . . . I would also restore the involvement of Congress.*

Ford: *Now as far as meeting with Congress is concerned, during the 24 months that I've been President of the United States, I've averaged better than one meeting a month with responsible groups or committees of Congress – both House and Senate . . . The Secretary of State has appeared in the several years he has been the Secretary before 80 different committee hearings in the House and Senate . . . I have made myself at least 10 speeches in various parts of the country where I have discussed with the American people defense and foreign policy.*

— from the second debate between President Ford and Democratic challenger Jimmy Carter, Oct. 6, 1976

WASHINGTON — Conflict between Congress and the White House was one of the unfortunate characteristics of President Ford's administration. In foreign affairs, particularly, this conflict led to a number of especially difficult situations: The congressionally-imposed arms embargo against a good ally, Turkey. The undermining of détente and most-favored-nation trade treatment for the Soviet Union by the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The unwillingness of Congress to go along automatically with the Administration, as in Angola a year ago.

How long can these internal tensions within the U.S. government go on? Will they abate during the new administration, which, once again, has been elected and brought into office in the normal way?

On Capitol Hill, and in the executive departments, more and more responsible leaders are appalled at what has transpired. Reflecting on the state of affairs between Congress and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Senator Hubert Humphrey said in a pre-election interview: "The biggest problem of communications is between the executive and Congress. It is worse than communications between Washington and Moscow.

"There is much more communication between capitals on foreign policy than between the executive and Congress, and I would hope that whoever is the new Secretary of State, and is President, would make it their business to have these informal meetings on areas of foreign policy they see developing."

Senator Humphrey is one of the concerned. Undaunted by major surgery, he aspired to replace Mike Mansfield as the Senate's majority party leader. He believed his experience as Vice President during the Johnson Administration would help him make a major contribution towards dissovling executive-legislative tensions. And he is promoting his own pet scheme of a new, joint committee of Congress on national security which could focus Congressional attention on foreign affairs in the broadest sense, and which could assist the executive as a Congressional sounding board.

Other legislators and administration officials have their own suggestions, but above these specific and technical proposals loom questions which still seem imponderable, despite President Ford's comments, and former Governor Carter's announced good intentions:

How deep-seated are the antagonisms? Are they solely the product of such catastrophes as Vietnam and

***Mr. Daniloff,** Nieman Fellow '74, is an international affairs specialist for United Press International in Washington, D.C. "Whales and Minnows" grew out of a talk he gave to the Nieman Fellows last year.*

Watergate? Are they the product of a Democratic-controlled Congress and a Republican White House?

Or, are they inherent in the American system?

Two complaints, most clearly, must be dealt with by the new administration:

— Congress is appalled that the elected representatives of the American people have had only minimal input into U.S. foreign policy formulation during the last decade.

— The White House is appalled that, over the same period, strong Congressional leadership has dissolved. The "Old Consensus" leaders, the "whales" of Congress, are gone.

"As a political scientist," former Secretary of State Dean Rusk told a conference in Houston, Texas, in May 1976, "I can make a rather strong case against the whale system. But what case can you make for 535 minnows swimming in a bucket?"

The fact that the minnows are swimming—and swimming quite happily—speaks eloquently of the relatively relaxed international situation which prevails today. Perilous times promote discipline, national cohesion, and strong Congressional leadership. But when Leonid Brezhnev announces the end of the Cold War during his 1973 visit to the United States, when the United States ends its Indochina intervention, when Washington all but recognizes Peking, then one hundred flowers begin to bloom. And a hundred schools of thought contend in Congress. Actually, it is 535 schools of thought!

Any legislative body, composed of 535 members as Congress is, is bound to be cumbersome and inefficient. It does not help that members of the House must run for re-election every two years. Nor does the helter-skelter crush of issues. Nor the unpredictable way much legislation comes to the floor of the House and Senate. Nor that gloomy feeling of impotence that the single legislator inevitably feels if he/she ever ponders his/her real influence in national affairs, or tries to effectively translate grass roots feelings into legislation.

Yet despite this, what is precious—even genial—about Congress is its willingness to hear all sides of an issue, and especially the critics. The late Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon was one of the original heretics on Vietnam, and he was proved right. Vietnam challenged the Old Consensus and found it wanting. By getting elected in 1968, Representative Michael Harrington (D-Mass.) showed that a disestablishmentarianism is abroad again. The election two years ago was particularly catalyctic, throwing out nearly a quarter of the membership of the House, and turning that chamber into a more radical body than the Senate. Veteran committee chairmen lost their positions, and now other "whales" are disappearing.

Senator Mike Mansfield, one of the recently retired leaders, makes no bones about the fact that he elevated non-leadership into a virtue in reaction to the arm-bending techniques of his predecessor as Majority leader, Lyndon Johnson:

"I hope one of the things I have done," Mansfield said in a farewell interview, "is to have made it possible for the younger members not to be wallflowers. To serve on at least one important committee. They are just as good. Just as equal. And, after all, this is a body of peers, not supersenators."

Then a pot-shot at Rusk for his remark about whales and minnows: "Dean Rusk should have known better. He wasn't a whale in the State Department!"

The executive branch, of course, has not been without its shortcomings, either.

Historically, the nation's highest leaders have shown an uncanny disregard for advice which did not accord with their own preconceived ideas. Historian Barbara Tuchman brilliantly dissected this tendency in a speech to the American Foreign Service Association on January 30, 1973. President McKinley prayed to God for advice before annexing the Philippines in 1898; President Roosevelt disregarded reports from his Moscow embassy about massive purges in the late 1930s when the United States was beginning a new relationship with Russia and Stalin; President Truman discounted the reports of the Old China hands and chose to believe the Nationalists, not Mao's Communists, would remain the vital force in modern China.

... What is precious — even genial — about Congress is its willingness to hear all sides of an issue, and especially the critics.

President Nixon's much-vaunted overhaul of the National Security Council apparatus was supposed to correct this executive deficiency by constructing an orderly, rational means of presenting every point of view. Yet, subsequently, his national security adviser Henry Kissinger was using the system to dominate bureaucratic disputes, to corral power, and, ultimately, to manage policy. Needless to say, no systematic provision was made to take regular account of the babble coming from Capitol Hill.

Unfortunately, Senator Humphrey is right in saying the White House has a natural urge to deal first with foreign governments rather than with Congress (which is becoming the foreigner in our midst). After Congress attached the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the 1974 Trade Act (making most-favored-nation trading status for the Soviet Union dependent on liberalized Soviet emigration procedures), President Ford still wanted to signal to the Kremlin the White House's continued hope for an expansion of U.S.-

Soviet trade. So, on June 27, 1975, the President sent a "Dear Russell" letter to Senator Russell Long, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and an identical missive to Representative Al Ullman (D-Ore.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, promising remedial legislation. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment, Ford said, has "proved to be politically and economically harmful to the national interest."

Historically, the nation's highest leaders have shown an uncanny disregard for advice which did not accord with their own preconceived ideas.

Then, President Ford did the unforgivable.

He gave copies of these letters to Senator Hugh Scott, the Republican leader, who was starting out for a parliamentarians' meeting in Moscow with a U.S. congressional delegation. On instruction, Scott handed the letters to Brezhnev at a Kremlin meeting on July 2, 1975. Since this transaction took place during a Congressional recess, Brezhnev actually had in hand internal U.S. Government correspondence before the intended recipients had received or read the letters!

A triffle—perhaps.

But from Capitol Hill this unorthodox maneuver could only be seen as another executive branch effort to gang up with a foreign power—and a prime adversary at that—to force an issue in Congress.

Another example of White House insensitivity occurred during the heady days of the Mayaguez crisis. The seizure of the American merchantman by Cambodian Communists, and the proposed use of force to recover the ship and crew, posed the first live test of the War Powers Resolution. The Resolution, which seeks to insure a proper Congressional role in war-making, requires close consultation between executive and legislature on the use of troops in combat activities overseas.

By the afternoon of Tuesday, May 13, 1975, President Ford was nearing a decision to commit Marines. The memory of North Korea's seizure of the U.S.S. Pueblo was still fresh, and Ford and his advisers had no desire to allow Cambodia to incarcerate the American seamen ashore where their recovery would prove problematical in the extreme. The White House Congressional liaison team headed by William T. Kendall began calling leading Congressmen at the end of the afternoon. Senator Mansfield was called at 5:55 p.m.; Senator Case, the ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee at 6 p.m.; Deputy majority leader Robert Byrd was reached at 6:10 p.m.; Senate minority leader Scott was found at home at 6:15 p.m., and so on. At 10:20 p.m., the National Security Council met, and President Ford ordered an attack on Cambodian gunboats surrounding the Mayaguez off Koh Tang island.

The next day, Mansfield issued an acerbic statement. He charged that he had been "informed," not "consulted." From the White House point of view, it was not a welcome comment.

Point one: Kendall could have passed on the message of an impending decision to use force in this form: "The President is leaning towards committing Marines in the next several hours. If you have any views on this possibility, please communicate them to us immediately, and we will put them before the President for his consideration." That, at least, would have been a minimal attempt at consultation.

Point two: Leaders in Congress deserve to be kept informed in a crisis by a high ranking, substantive officer, in this case, say, Philip Habib, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs.

Besides White House insensitivity, and Congressional disorder, there are other obstacles and antagonisms along Pennsylvania Avenue:

— Like it or not, a conflict is raging over the place of morality in foreign policy. Kissinger asserts that in foreign affairs "good will is not enough." But the legislators on Capitol Hill counter that the converse is also true: "Power is not enough."

America remains the last best hope for buttressing human rights, not just in the United States but elsewhere in the world. America's influence may not always be great or effective, but America should speak out. America should speak

. . . .The White House has a natural urge to deal first with foreign governments rather than with Congress. . .

out for the civil rights of man; should defend the right to travel, to communicate, to emigrate. America should favor those societies which try to govern themselves by democratic principles; which abide by the rules they profess. America should look askance—not necessarily boycott but at least look askance—at nations which show little regard for human rights.

Such aspirations are expressed in a variety of ways: in the landmark restrictions incorporated in the International Security Assistance Act of 1976 (which President Ford first vetoed May 7 because he said it would shackle his conduct of foreign affairs) cutting off military aid in cases of substan-

tial violations of human rights; in the Senate and House investigations of abuses in the American intelligence community; in the pressures brought to bear against South Korean President Park Chung Hee by Representative Donald Fraser (D-Minn.), president of the Americans for Democratic Action; in the criticisms of President Ford for snubbing Aleksander Solzhenitsyn when he visited Washington during the 1975 U.S.-Soviet space link-up.

The debate in Congress on cutting off arms aid to Turkey—coming as it did after President Nixon's resignation—way very largely a debate about morality. The executive's perfectly valid argument about disastrous strategic consequences carried very little weight. Turkey had violated U.S. aid provisions in using American equipment in an offensive operation in Cyprus in July 1974. Even the State Department's legal advisor conceded that. In such cases, U.S. aid contracts call for a termination of aid.

If you have rules, how can you fail to observe them? *Especially after Watergate?*

Too often the White House and State Department have appeared reluctant to accept the proposition that U.S. foreign policy must embody a moral quotient. This is not to say the executive branch must adopt the varying standards proposed by 535 Congressmen. But the White House and the State Department must pay due respect to the notion. Ritualized respect is better than no respect at all. The world is not too dangerous for morality. The world, after all, did not blow itself up in the Cold War, or even in the Cuban Missile Crisis. And to ordinary Americans, and ordinary Congressmen, the thought that the world could still explode because somebody went beserk, somebody made a mistake,

The next day Mansfield issued an acerbic statement . . . he had been "informed," not "consulted."

someone's technology failed, still seems remote (even though it is probably all too true).

— There is, too, the eternal openness-secrecy conflict between executive and legislature. The 535 Congressmen are only too delighted to use every shred of information to fan their own egos and political prospects; the executive seeks to develop its long-range policies quietly, systematically, without undue intrusion. Former Secretary Kissinger has made his own contribution to this conflict—despite his very considerable frankness on chosen occasions—by his lonely and elitist approach to foreign policy formation. One middle-level State Department official put it succinctly in a private conversation: "There is a deeply ingrained attitude in the executive, an attitude of elitism, or call it professionalism, depending on how you view it, to keep information secret. Kissinger is that way to an astounding degree, and he has his people terrorized. His instincts for secrecy have filtered down and found a response at lower levels of the State Department. It is as if no one has learned the lessons of the Nixon White House, of Watergate."

The remarks of a single, anonymous official. But they are corroborated on a much broader plane by the arrantly self-serving report of the Interagency Classification Review Committee in May 1976. The panel was created by Mr. Nixon after the Pentagon Papers to reduce overclassifica-

Like it or not, a conflict is raging over the place of morality in foreign policy.

tion, and to make public as soon as possible top secret, secret, and confidential documents. Praising itself on its own good work, the Interagency Committee disclosed that 4,086,319 "classification actions" occurred in 1973; 4,022,962 in 1974, and only 3,794,455 in 1975.

Wow! Down to an average of 100,000 classification actions a day in the executive departments of the federal government!

— Finally, Kissinger's mode of operation presented a problem for Congress. Because the Secretary was reluctant to delegate authority, he had come to be viewed as the sole real power in American diplomacy. Everything important depended on him. Therefore, every committee, every subcommittee, every member of Congress wanted to have at that one man.

In fairness to the former Secretary of State, he had poured himself into relations with Congress (and with the press) with more energy, and more determination than any of his predecessors. And yet that was not enough! No one person has the time to devote to the myriad demands and interests of the 535 minnows. There must be a surrogate, indeed, several surrogates. To improve relations with Congress, there must be delegation of authority in the Department of State. And after that, there must be assistant secretaries of state, and deputy assistant secretaries of state, and working level officers, who are articulate, energetic, responsible, and responsive to Congressional questioning.

How, then, will relations between Congress and the executive branch improve?

With difficulty, most probably.

The problem is not transitory. It is a complex mixture with a built-in potential for strain. A few observations:

— Given the dissolution of strong Congressional leadership, and the hopes for further relaxation in international tensions, it seems unlikely that the minnows will be replaced by latter-day whales.

— Some Congressional tinkering may prove useful: more sensible divisions of labor among subcommittees; better circulation of information and testimony.

— Senator Humphrey's proposal for a joint committee on national security, may prove illusory, however. The executive likes the idea of this joint committee because it would be a single panel in which to confide. But it would also be one more Congressional committee (among the 358 existing committees and subcommittees). It would be purely advisory, without legislative mandate, with an uncertain role and function at best. It is misleading to think this committee might one day become the modern replacement of the old leadership system, which the executive branch, obviously, would like.

— The new Secretary of State may find a way to delegate more authority, and thereby satisfy Congressional demands for satisfactory relations with second-level officials who are fully competent and authoritative in their own spheres.

— Probably the greatest potential for improvement lies with the executive's resources for promoting frequent, and informal contacts. The President and the Secretary of State could, and should, work out regular plans for meeting with all members of Congress. Breakfasts, lunches, dinners, cruises on the *Sequoia*, informal office chats, telephone calls. Follow-up calls by designated subordinates. A little imagination. A little sensitivity.

Ritualized respect is better than no respect at all.

One thing seems certain: if tensions are not resolved, Congress will attempt to improve the situation by throwing legislation at it. That is probably the worst solution of all, because legislation by its nature creates artificial inflexibilities. Yet, already the use of the Congressional veto (disapproval of a program by concurrent resolution of House and Senate) is gaining ground. The House subcommittee on international security and scientific affairs is holding hearings on its usefulness and potential. And Senator Dick Clark of Iowa threatens to recapture the treaty power for the Senate by proposing legislation which would define when a diplomatic pact can be an executive agreement, when it must be a treaty requiring approval by two-thirds of the Senate.

It will be only a short step before the House will next discover a means by which its co-equal voice can be brought to bear in ratifying, or rejecting, international accords.

And so forth, and so on . . .

Television Techniques: The 1976 Presidential Election

by Lee Winfrey

Television greatly influenced the 1976 presidential election, but it did not determine the final result.

Enormous amounts were spent on TV this year: more than $30 million in political advertising by all the candidates, more than $30 million expended by the networks on political news coverage.

But in the end, Jimmy Carter won because of regional loyalty and economic hunger. His native South, almost all black people, and most labor union members: these elements elected Carter for reasons other than the influence of TV.

If Gerald Ford had won the election, the story to be told would be different. Except for strength he derived from being an incumbent president, no other weapon in Ford's campaign arsenal was as strong as his TV advertising.

Ford outspent Carter in a so-called "media blitz" that swamped the nation's TV sets in the last three weeks of the campaign. The blitz came close to electing him.

Tony Schwartz, an advertising expert who produced commercials for Carter, paid tribute to the Ford commercials in a comment a few days before the voting.

"The Ford commercials are superb," Schwartz said. "They're much better than the candidate."

The Ford commercials tootled across the little screen behind a brass band and a chorus singing, "I'm feeling good about America." The excitement generated by them tended to obscure the fact that Carter's commercials, meanwhile, were more quietly doing winning work.

Typical of how Carter's commercials were underestimated was an article published the day before the election in Media Industry Newsletter, a high-priced weekly report addressed to the advertising and communications industries.

The article, by Michael Rowan, was headlined, "How Carter Lost the Election." It blamed the supposed loss on alleged failures in Carter's TV advertising.

Of course, the election results showed that the Carter TV campaign, directed by Atlanta advertising executive Gerald Rafshoon, did not fail. When you win, you don't have to apologize for anything.

Besides the commercials, TV probably most influenced the campaign by simply serving as a transmission belt for the three presidential debates between Carter and Ford.

Mr. Winfrey, columnist with the ***Philadelphia Inquirer,*** *was a Nieman Fellow in the Class of '72.*

Unlike 1960, when the first set of presidential debates between John Kennedy and Richard Nixon was held in TV studios, the TV industry did not control the presentation of the Ford-Carter encounters.

The League of Women Voters set up this year's debates in Philadelphia, San Francisco and Williamsburg, Va. TV did the job of carrying each of them to about 90 million viewers.

. . . In the end, Jimmy Carter won because of regional loyalty and economic hunger.

Yet, like the commercials, the debates did not determine the election outcome. Most people thought Ford won the first and Carter the second, with the third one probably a tie. No decisive advantage seemed to fall to either man.

Notable in TV coverage of the campaign was that TV arrived first with almost none of the news that dominated election discussion. More often, the things that people talked about most appeared first in print.

There was Carter's "lustful heart" interview in Playboy magazine. There was Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz's obscene trinity of what he thought black people most desire, printed first in Rolling Stone and subsequently in New Times.

Probably the biggest piece of news that appeared on TV first was President Ford's slip of the tongue, "There is no Soviet domination over Eastern Europe," during the second debate.

But, basically, TV did no more than just pick up on an open mike. Even the question that drew that famous response was asked by a print journalist, Max Frankel of *The New York Times.*

A case can be made, in fact, that TV missed the biggest news of the election campaign. It paid too much attention to Ford's alleged gains in the polls, which turned out to be less than completely accurate, and failed to tip off viewers how Carter was going to win.

TV failed to note, or at least to adequately report, what an unshakable grip Carter had on the South. Perhaps misled by the pollsters, TV's skimpy commentary on the South was usually directed into inaccurate conjecture about how Ford had a chance to carry as many as five southern states. He got only one: Virginia.

TV did not pay enough attention to blacks. Occasional action footage of Coretta Scott King, or some other prominent black leader, was substituted for the shoeleather that should have gone into tracking down how heavily blacks were going to go to the polls for Carter.

TV also paid inadequate attention to the determined work of the labor unions. Now and then the evening news would mention that it looked like labor was going to spend a lot of money, and there would be a shot or two of a computer print-out of workers' names. But the depth of the determination and drive that brought such states as Ohio into the Carter column was not made clear.

Too often, action footage of President Ford signing a bill at a table specially set up in his Rose Garden, or another rehash of how Carter was in trouble with Catholics, formed the bulk of TV's campaign coverage on a typical evening. Often, what really mattered was going on elsewhere.

In the end, what TV did best in this campaign year was not to influence voters, which it probably shouldn't do anyway, but simply to inform us all speedily and accurately of the results.

When you win, you don't have to apologize for anything.

TV coverage of the convention and of the important presidential primaries, in which Carter came to the fore and Ford edged Ronald Reagan, was unrelenting and thorough. NBC, which went out to the primary states much more often than the other networks on voting nights, did an especially impressive job.

And on presidential election night, TV left no important race anywhere uncovered. Surely there must be millions of young people in the country by now who cannot imagine an election night without Walter Cronkite or John Chancellor at their anchor desks, without projections of who is going to win, without polls of why they did.

"I heard a young man speaking out just the other day.
"I stopped to take a listen to what he had to say.
"He spoke straight and simple, with that I was impressed.
"He said, 'Once and for all, why not the best?' "

"Why Not the Best?"
by Jack Turner

Despite the sentiment expressed in his campaign song, Jimmy Carter's political use of television was not the best of any candidate for President in 1976.

But it was, like the candidate himself and like the rest of his campaign organization, good enough to win with something to spare.

Carter was fortunate that TV was not the controlling factor in this year's presidential election. If it had been, the next

President would probably be that master of the medium, Ronald Reagan.

Carter never really mastered, for example, the technique of landing free time on the evening newscasts in ways that would show him in the best possible light.

As Carter complained in an interview one weekend, TV correspondents focused most closely on his "mistakes." But that really only means that the network reporters, driven by the daily necessity of finding 90 seconds of film that would preferably show conflict, were continually able to clamp a better wrestling hold on Carter than he was able to apply to them.

This may not be true much longer. Carter's first post-election news conference, held at the little old abandoned railroad station in Plains, Ga., showed the President-elect in easy-going control. Since he is such a quick learner, it is reasonable to speculate that within two years, Carter will be more adept at using TV than any President before him.

In many ways, Carter's whole campaign for President was a learn-by-doing process, in which he pragmatically abandoned whatever approaches did not work. This attitude applied especially to TV.

As long as he was ahead of President Ford in the polls, Carter continued using commercials that were months old,

. . . TV did no more than just pick up on an open mike.

assembled from more than five miles of film shot in advance last year by Philadelphia producer Rod Goodwin.

These were the commercials — Carter in a work shirt, Carter sifting his hands through the peanuts that had made him rich — that helped win 17 out of 30 Democratic presidential primaries for the ex-Georgia-governor.

Artfully compiled by film editors Ed Keen and Joel Stango, overseen by Carter's advertising chief, Gerald Rafshoon of Atlanta, these commercials for most of the year went down as smooth as peanut butter. Expert tribute from the opposing camp was paid by Walter Staab, president of SFM Media Service Corp. of New York, the chief TV time buyer for President Ford, who said:

"These commercials quite effectively introduced a relative unknown, showed us he was a real person, a working man, a man of the earth, and gave us a good basic impression of him."

But when President Ford drew close to him in the polls in mid-October, Carter jettisoned the Rafshoon commercials that had brought him so far. He turned to an old familiar TV warrior, Tony Schwartz of New York, who had produced commercials for every Democratic presidential candidate since 1964.

Schwartz took direct aim at the splashy Ford commercials, which had been drawing much attention. In the first sentence of one 60-second spot, Schwartz had Carter begin: "The Republicans in their TV commercials are saying that the economy is healthy.

"This is what I see," Carter said in reply. And he reeled off a long list of counter-arguments, including "eight million people, every one of them out of work. Every trip to the supermarket, a shock. Cities collapsing. Teachers fired. Crime growing. Police departments cut. Welfare skyrocketing. Energy in foreign hands. That's our reality."

Rafshoon's feelings were hurt. When I saw him in Williamsburg, Va., during the third presidential debate, he said disparagingly of the Schwartz commercials, "Frankly, I was disappointed."

At the same time, Barry Jagoda, Carter's TV adviser, indicated to me that the Schwartz commercials would not be used.

But of course they were, and quite effectively. With the benefit of hindsight, it seems reasonable to conclude that the two different kinds of Carter commercials worked well together.

Carter carried his native south, where the rural, down-home orientation of the Rafshoon commercials was probably most persuasive.

On the hard, cold sidewalks of the urban Northeast, where the TV image of a Georgia peanut farmer had less relevance, the Schwartz commercials centered on lunchbucket economic issues that were more effective.

It will be interesting to see, if and when Carter runs for President again, whether he concluded that the way Ford's advertising men purchased TV time was more astute than his system.

Charlenne Carl, Carter's time buyer, put his first fall campaign commercial on TV on Sept. 2. Ford's first commercial did not appear until more than three weeks later, on Sept. 26.

The TV networks were careful to offer each candidate an equal share of the best time slots, particularly the preferred one — at 10:55 p.m., which, in the East, is at the end of prime time and just before late-night local news shows.

. . . Carter's whole campaign for President was a learn-by-doing process. . .

And Carter and Ford bought network time just about equally; approximately $1 million each, for example, on ABC, the network whose prime-time programs are currently most popular.

But because Ford's advertising men concentrated their ads near the campaign's end, the President's commercials seemed to swamp the air as Election Day approached.

But despite all that, Carter's last commercial, an election-eve half-hour broadcast, still managed to outdraw a corresponding program of Ford's.

When Carter, the night before the election, went on ABC at 8 p.m., NBC at 9 p.m., and CBS at 10 p.m., he drew a combined audience estimated by the A.C. Nielsen Co. to have been slightly more than 34 million adults. Appearing a half-hour later on each network, Ford drew only slightly more than 25 million people of voting age.

"I'm feeling good about America, and I feel it everywhere I go.
"I'm feeling good about America, and I feel you ought to know."
"Feeling Good About America."
by Robert Gardner.

Among advertising men who create television commercials, an old slogan is: "When you haven't got anything to say, sing."

During Gerald Ford's losing campaign for President, his TV commercials sang a lot.

In Ford's three-week closing blitz of TV commercials, music was probably heard more often than his own voice. Even in the instances where he spoke, the pulsing thrum of a

. . . These commercials . . . went down as smooth as peanut butter.

big brass band often underlaid generalities of his like, "It is from your ranks that I come, and it is on your side that I stand."

Ford's commercials were exciting, in a way that Jimmy Carter's were not. Producer Quinn Martin, creator of one of Ford's favorite TV shows, "Cannon," is fond of saying, "Movies should move." Ford's commercials moved and sang and stirred the pulse.

But, in the end, Ford was cancelled, just like "Cannon." His commercials did not fail him. He failed them.

Ford spent more than half his $21.8 million in federal campaign funds on the production and broadcast of TV and radio commercials. The commercials were designed to obscure his hopeless ineptitude as an in-person campaigner on the stump.

For example, the last 10 days of Ford's campaign were highlighted by a series of regional half-hour TV shows in which he appeared with TV sportscaster Joe Garagiola. Ford's campaign manager, Stuart Spencer, candidly described these shows as "the most intelligent use of the man's abilities and a maximum restraint on his liabilities."

The very day that the first of the Garagiola shows went on the air, Ford, in a stump-speech, referred to S. I. Hayakawa, California Republican senatorial candidate, as "Hiawatha." TV, at least, presented a controlled atmosphere in which gaffes like that could be edited out of the sound track.

But, in the end, there was little more to put on the TV sound track but the oompah of tubas and the rattle of drums.

. . . An old [advertising] slogan is: "When you haven't got anything to say, sing."

Because Ford had no creative vision of this nation's future, his commercials seldom did anything but look back.

The first set of Ford's fall commercials showed him shielded by his family, particularly his wife, Betty. The pitch provided was: "Sometimes a man's family can say a lot about a man."

But Jimmy Carter was possessed of an attractive family, too, so obviously there wouldn't be sufficient campaign mileage in just a family portrait. So Ford's next set of commercials turned to his supposed accomplishments, with his announcer asserting:

"Forceful, as with the vetoes. Bold, as with the Mayaguez. But always the power of the office tempered with the decency of the man. He is making us proud again."

But many people didn't like some of the vetoes, such as those which said no to some bills aimed at creating jobs. And putting the muscle on a little country like Cambodia didn't really sound like all that big a deal in retrospect.

So the commercials struck up the band. In a jingle written by Robert Gardner, former San Francisco advertising man, enthusiastic voices said:

"There's a change that's come over America, a change that's great to see.

"We're living here in peace again; we're going back to work again; it's better than it used to be."

Despite the infectious whoop of the music, however, many viewers still remembered that it was not Ford who had ended the war in Vietnam, and that eight million Americans were still not "back to work again." So here came with a smile, and at a bargain fee of only $360 a show, gregarious Joe Garagiola.

During Ford's last 10 days of campaigning, his days were constructed not around him as he really met the people, but instead were calculated to catch him amid just one big crowd which could then be seen cheering him during the evening's "Jerry and Joe Show."

But in retrospect, always keeping in mind that Ford lost the election, it is worth wondering whether the President's simplistic chats with Garagiola really influenced many people. For as columnist John Osborne wrote in The New Republic magazine:

"Joe Garagiola in his televised self proved to be a slightly modified Archie Bunker. He boasted of his ignorance of complex issues and invited the President to explain them in terms that ignoramuses like Joe could understand. Mr. Ford obliged, in terms that didn't explain anything but satisfied his pal Joe."

But can a presidential candidate really be sold like a box of detergent or an anti-perspirant spray? Ford's TV campaign argues strongly against that idea. As recently as a year ago, Carter was far more obscure than Ford. But, with a much quieter and more softly-spoken TV ad campaign, he still won.

Tony Isidore, president of the Madison Avenue advertising agency of Isidore Lefkowitz Elgort Inc., and a frequent warrior in TV campaign trenches, said after the election:

"Carter's language was far superior during the whole campaign. He learned a new language with which to communicate with the voters. Here we had a politician hanging around with words like 'love' that a presidential candidate is never heard to speak.

. . . Can a presidential candidate really be sold like a box of detergent . . . ?

"The things Carter spoke of were more uplifting and closer to what people wanted to hear and feel. I think Carter is more human than our general concept of a politician. I think we went for that, and rightfully."

Ford's advertising, although artfully done, was fundamentally old-fashioned. It attempted to move him across the counter like a hamburger or a soft drink. But as columnist George Will wrote of Ford's TV campaign: "These commercials were attempts to seize the attention of a nation that long ago developed sophisticated mechanisms for filtering out such bombardments."

In the case of Gerald Ford, all the colorful carnival that could be created couldn't hide the fact that the product being pushed was a profoundly dull man.

(Reprinted with permission Philadelphia Inquirer)

On Joining the Government

(A Personal Note – Part II)

by Joseph Loftus

Unemployment and a "Statistical Quirk"

The Bureau of Labor Statistics announced on July 2, 1971, a decline in the June unemployment rate to 5.6 percent from 6.2 percent of the labor force. This was a husky cut for one month and became welcome news at the White House. It supported the Administration's expressed hope of getting the rate down to 4.5 percent by mid-1972, an election year.

The bloom faded fast when the White House discovered that both wire services had attributed the drop in part to a "statistical quirk."

Secretary Hodgson called me that night and asked where the AP's Bill Neikirk had gotten that phrase. I didn't know. I didn't even know Neikirk, not a regular on the labor run. I said I'd call him, though, and asked Jim, "What's up?"

The Secretary said the UPI had used the same phrase and the White House was upset. He didn't say who specifically was upset, or how much, though a chuckling remark hinted at the dimensions. "We may all be fired by morning," he said.

"Two weeks notice," I cracked.

The White House had called that afternoon, I remembered, and complained about the telephone tapes. All departments were equipped to record official statements and announcements. A reporter could dial a special number and get the official version automatically, like calling for the time of day or the weather. A radio station could hook up its own tape, get the Secretary's comment in his own voice, and broadcast it.

Both Secretary Hodgson and Harold Goldstein of the Bureau of Labor Statistics made telephone tapes that day. Both seemed innocuous. The White House complained that Goldstein seemed negative and that, in any event, the Secretary's interpretation should precede him on the tapes. I had the Information Division reverse the tapes but it was too late in the afternoon to matter much.

Mr. Loftus, '61, was the first Louis Stark Fellow under the Nieman program, an award designed for specialists in labor reporting. Before entering government, he served for 25 years with the Washington bureau of The New York Times.

I reached Neikirk at home and asked if he had gotten satisfactory help on his query for a story about the mechanics of gathering employment data. He had.

"Where did that phrase, 'statistical quirk' come from?" I asked.

"Out of my head," he said, noting that the UPI, too, had used the phrase.

"It seemed like the best way to say it." He had also thought of using "statistical deviation."

Somebody else, probably Chuck Colson, Special Counsel to the President, had questioned the UPI reporter, whom Colson knew. The UPI man also claimed authorship of the phrase. Unusual, but possible.

If Nixon that night could have found a Federal employee who inspired the phrase, said employee would have been lucky to escape beheading. Nixon was in rage ordinarily called towering. Not until later did I put together the pieces that showed *how* towering.

Nixon on a Saturday Morning

It was the Friday before the three-day July 4th holiday. Nixon ordered a 7 A.M. meeting for Saturday. He ordered the appearance of all relevant brass: Hodgson; Laurence Silberman, the Under Secretary of Labor; Geoffrey Moore, Commissioner of Labor Statistics; George Shultz, director of the Office of Management and Budget, and others.

Shultz had just arrived in the Berkshires, planning to spend the long holiday weekend with his family on the "farm."

Hauled back to the White House, Shultz cracked to Hodgson, "You know, teaching school wasn't all that bad."

Nixon showed up at 8 A.M. He felt he was getting a bad deal on the unemployment stories, that when news is bad he expects it to be so reported, and when it's good it shouldn't be undermined or belittled.

A reporter could dial a special number and get the official version automatically, like calling for the time of day or the weather.

Silberman, a few days later, reported: "I got seven calls Friday afternoon and night. The President was furious. It was good to see him mad, but by Saturday morning he had calmed down. All he knows is a fellow named Goldstein is saying things."

Silberman agreed, though, that the President had made the same errors as reporters who try to quantify and oversimplify every complex economic statement and conclusion.

The Secretary of Labor was assigned to work out a better procedure to clarify the news releases. The releases had been adequate. So had the briefings which Harold C. Goldstein had been conducting for eight years.

In his July 2nd briefing Goldstein had cautioned the reporters that the size of the June decline in unemployment "may be somewhat overstated" because "more young workers were still in school and therefore not seeking work" when the canvass was made in the week of June 6th to 12th. (Seeking work is a condition for being counted as unemployed.)

This was the kind of cautionary interpretation that is the principal grounds for an oral briefing to supplement the prepared release. The wire service stories included Goldstein's explanation, but not in the bulletin leads, where the short form, "statistical quirk," set the tone. *The New York Times* the next day used "statistical aberration" and "fluke."

I was reminded of a remark by Alfred Marshall, Cambridge University's great economist at the turn of the century: "Every short statement about economics is misleading (with the possible exception of my present one)."

And then I remembered another case of economic confusion:

The end of World War II was in sight when William C. Davis, an unsung patriot who had been chairman of the War Labor Board and then Economic Stabilization Administrator, held a news conference and foresaw the day when real wages would be five times greater than they were then. Davis envisioned general prosperity and higher levels of living for everybody, but the *New York Herald-Tribune* story read as though he were forecasting an explosion of inflation. The reporter missed the significance of "real" wages and dropped the word.

The next morning President Truman fired Davis on the basis of the *Herald-Tribune* piece. Some years later I asked Davis whether he was hurt by the incident. "I was hurt blind," he replied. He said Truman learned of his mistake and apologized, but the dismissal decision was never undone and the apology was never made public. Davis never whined publicly about the story that ruined him in Washington after five years of selfless service.

Colson: Influencing Reporters

Came August and the White House braced for another commotion about the monthly data on unemployment. Chuck Colson called me on Thursday, August 5th, and said that either the Secretary should make a statement accompanying the Bureau of Labor Statistics release, or I should

go to the press room when the release was distributed and tout the reporters on the plus signs in the summary, even though unemployment rose by two-tenths of a percent.

I cautioned Colson that he was suggesting a delicate operation which, if not handled consummately well, could be counterproductive.

"Tell them they owe us one," he said, referring to the "statistical quirk" episode. "I spent the whole day last time trying to straighten things out," said Colson. "If it happens again, my man will—" he groped for a safe and appropriate metaphor—"will go straight out the window."

I went to the press room as suggested and remarked on the missing authors of the "quirk" phrase. The labor regulars were in their places. The AP's Neil Gilbride remonstrated mildly about my remark, saying that while the unemployment rate had gone down in June, the number employed had gone down, too, thereby supporting the "quirk" conclusion.

Employment versus unemployment is not the two-part equation it looks like. When one goes down it does not necessarily follow that the other goes up, although the tendency for that to happen does exist. A third factor involves people not in the labor market. People withdraw from the labor market, or never enter it. They die, retire, give full-time to their home, travel, or sit on the front stoop. They are neither employed nor unemployed. They inhabit.

Every June, for example, a lot of young people join the labor force simply by looking for a job and so informing the government canvasser. If they don't get a job they are counted as unemployed. A scientifically-selected sample is interviewed every month.

Back to the AP man: "All right," I said, "if you are going to look at what's behind the number, look at the plus signs in this." The UPI man was within hearing. I dropped my marked copy of the release on the AP desk and left. I wasn't brassy enough to sit there and monitor reporters' dictation to their offices. The AP lead, it turned out, combined the plus and minus points of the release.

Remorse

I was instantly remorseful. I had made an honest case, but dishonesty was not my problem. I had, in effect, told two reporters how to do their jobs. That's offensive. I imagined my reaction if I were a reporter and a government press agent dogged me to my desk on a sensitive story. "I would have thrown him out of the press room," I told my nearest colleague.

Colson, after watching the White House news tickers, called within the hour to say I must have done a good job. I told him the UPI lead was unsatisfactory, but apparently he was not annoyed.

The same day Colson dictated a letter to "Dear Joe":

> I want to compliment you on the wire stories that came out of the BLS unemployment release this morning. They were distinctly positive and showed how effectively we can handle these things. It really did some good for you to talk to the wire services.

I preferred to believe I had no effect at all. His letter went on:

> This is the kind of thing that from time to time we should do. Although there were peculiar reasons why it was necessary here, it could be done periodically to insure that the wires reflect the points we consider important.

Even Colson took refuge in "peculiar reasons" to explain Nixon's behavior.

That same day, Secretary Hodgson talked to the White House reporters about unemployment. The questioning was tough, though not personally unfriendly: Jim was taking the heat for termination of the usual press briefings.

I rode back to the Labor Department with him. "Does the President feel he made a mistake in ordering the briefings suspended?" I asked.

"He thinks it's the best thing he has ever done," the Secretary replied with a laugh. He said he had tested the waters on that a few days earlier and quickly learned the President's attitude.

"I can't imagine Klein, or any PR man recommending that," I mused aloud. Actually I was appalled. Jim shook his head in agreement.

After a quiet weekend, the Secretary remarked that we seemed to have gotten by pretty well.

I told him of my conversation with Colson and my distaste for talking to reporters as I did. "That could be counterproductive," I said. "Reporters resent it."

"I guess there's not much sensitivity about that around here," Hodgson remarked.

More Colson

On the afternoon of August 17, 1971, I was summoned to the front office where I found Secretary Hodgson on the visitor's side of his desk slipping into a jacket for a meeting outside the Labor Department. He handed me a partly-edited statement and instructed me to polish it up and put it out over his name.

The statement came from Chuck Colson's churning brain. His secretary had dictated it to Hodgson's office. In sum, it berated George Meany's criticism of the President's

wage-price freeze, told Meany what was good for the American worker and what American workers wanted.

Hodgson had struck out a sentence saying, ". . . he has apparently jumped the gun on his Executive Council and in fact has acted rather prematurely . . ."

A sentence that stayed in said: "Mr. Meany sadly appears to be out of step with the needs and desires of America's working men and women."

I gave the statement a once-over and ordered its issuance promptly as a press release. My news judgment got the better of my political judgment. Rationalization told me I was acting under orders and I'd catch hell from the White House, maybe from Hodgson, too, if I interposed my judgment gratuitously.

I cautioned Colson that he was suggesting a delicate operation which, if not handled consummately well, could be counterproductive.

Silberman was not around to offer a judgment, nor was Bill Usery, Assistant Secretary, whose liaison with Meany and company made him a key man in this situation. I knew the Secretary barely had an opportunity to read the statement, much less ponder its implications for himself and the Administration.

A few minutes later Usery returned, saw the statement and headed straight for my office. He looked bug-eyed and obviously was restraining a fury. I owed no responsibility to Usery, but we enjoyed a mutual respect. He often consulted me and I often went to him for authoritative information.

Half-choked with emotion, Usery assayed the statement as a gross political error, saying that one of his missions was to protect the Secretary from the fury such a statement was certain to generate.

"This is open warfare," he mourned. The Secretary "has to live with these people." His judgment was that "somebody else should have issued the statement."

Now it was too late. I could see, with benefit of 20/20 hindsight, that Usery was right. I should have protected the Secretary from Colson's folly and his own hurry.

Predictably, Meany responded with a sulphurous statement, followed in succeeding weeks by snide statements about Hodgson personally.

Next day I ran into George Shultz at the White House. "That was a bad statement," he whispered to me as we waited for an elevator. Here was Hodgson again taking the heat for other people's poor judgment. A sense of humor is the only cushion that saves a person's sanity in these situations. Eventually the fracture was patched up by the tact of Shultz and Usery.

The incident illustrated a condition that had been developing at least since the administration of Franklin Roosevelt: high staff officials have usurped much of the Cabinet's authority and power. The staff is closer to the President, to be sure, but they are not as close to intricate problems as the Cabinet ministers.

My memory went back to FDR's meetings with labor leaders. Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins was not invited because AFL President William Green considered her appointment an affront. She was not a union official, though the Lord knows she was a warm and helpful friend of working men and women. In labor politics, FDR acted as his own Secretary of Labor and one could hardly fault his performance.

Administratively, though, he left questions that still nag. The growth in government was greater than he could cope with alone. He called for six new assistants with "a passion for anonymity." He got them and the growth of the White House staff went on from there. Anonymity diminished and the gap between the President and his own Cabinet ministers widened.

And More "Watergate"

A memo that carried unlawful intent (in this sea lawyer's judgment) and did not come to my attention until Senate investigators exposed it two and one-half years later, crossed the corridor from George C. Guenther, Assistant Secretary, to Laurence Silberman, Under Secretary, in June 1972, shortly before the renomination of Richard Nixon.

Guenther ran, among other programs, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, a new entity known as OSHA. He did not use the Department's information services, except for routine, inconsequential tasks. Everything else was cloaked in mists. Guenther himself was a hail-fellow, tall, handsome, cigar-puffing, a political pro through and through.

He barred centralization of statistics because (although he would not admit it) that might simplify the work of reporters who wanted to know what he was doing, or failing to do nationally about making the shops and mills safe for workers.

He was on the prowl for a PR man, though he had one on his staff in another building. Not until much later did I realize he was really looking for a person of proven party loyalty. That was more important than proficiency.

Guenther's memo, slugged "Confidential," assured Silberman that OSHA would not rock the boat before the election, especially with regard to small employers, and ended with this:

> While I have discussed with Lee Nunn [a Nixon fund-raiser] the great potential of OSHA as a sales point for fund-raising and general support by employers, I do not believe the potential of this appeal is fully recognized. Your suggestions as to how to promote the advantages of four more years of properly managed OSHA for use in the campaign would be appreciated.

Brennan to Labor, Loftus to Treasury

In January 1973, with the second Nixon Administration under way, everybody at the policy level was asked to sign *pro forma* resignations, to be picked up at times convenient to the White House and Peter Brennan, the new Secretary. Brennan's advance man telephoned for a termination date convenient to me.

I gave him one and then went to see George Shultz, who had become Secretary of the Treasury. He took me on in early February, as Special Assistant for Public Affairs. I don't think I lost a day. I had immediate supervision of about 10 professionals and nominal supervision of staffs at Internal Revenue, Customs, Secret Service, and other scattered Treasury Bureaus, the chiefs of which I brought into Main Treasury for weekly meetings to make the tie more binding.

Shultz also maintained a White House office as chairman of the Domestic Economic Council and chief economic spokesman for the President. My day started there at 8 A.M., sometimes as early as 7:30. He chaired a daily meeting at 9:00 with his Treasury staff. I went from there to my own staff meeting.

Everybody was considerate of the other fellow's feelings. Nearly everybody. Bill Simon, then Deputy Secretary as well as energy administrator, slaved at his work, outdoing even Shultz, and rarely took a lunch break from his desk. He demanded similar labor from subordinates and seldom expressed gratitude. He was enjoying himself and assumed everybody else took the same degree of pleasure.

One day he summoned me to his office and, with popping eyes, began complaining about poor service on the ticker cuttings he wanted.

"Oh, bullshit, Bill," I interrupted. One of his secretaries was standing by, but I figured now or never. The issue was petty. He eased off instantly and we never had cross words after that.

Finale

With monetary and trade problems, there was more international jetting than I needed. In September 1973, after a round trip to Tokyo and a laundry stopover in Washington, we headed for East Africa and a world monetary conference. A busy week in Nairobi (over a mile high) drained me and, on the final night there, I had a heart attack. The U.S. Embassy physician was not equipped to take a cardiogram, nor did he have the medication I needed. The Secret Service found some at Teheran and "flying blind," so to speak, I went on with the party to Russia, Germany, Yugoslavia and home, where my own physician confirmed the attack and put me to bed. After 10 days, I returned to the office but sent subordinates on three other foreign trips in my stead.

Simon is one of a breed who thinks that those around him share his psychic rewards.

This couldn't go on, so I took disability leave and resigned in May 1974, about the time Shultz decided to leave a failing government.

Simon consulted me about a successor. He mentioned the best known names in Washington financial journalism but I doubted they were available. He tried them, anyhow, and the first thing they did was call me. I gave them as detached an assessment as I could, but they turned down Simon.

There is a lesson in this. Simon is one of a breed who thinks that those around him share his psychic rewards. He didn't think much of the Public Affairs staff and assumed that if he snapped his fingers the best people would come running.

Why would a successful journalist abandon his page one byline and career to work for Bill Simon at Treasury, or anybody else, for that matter? Simon and his breed don't understand that those psychic rewards are something they couldn't share if they wished. To each his own.

Government won't get the people best suited for Public Affairs until there is a realistic reassessment of the rewards available.

In their book, *The Palace Guard*, Dan Rather and Gary Paul Gates write of George Shultz: "[He] knew how to hire and get work out of quality staff people."

One shouldn't take such criticism personally, but I do.

(This is the conclusion of a two-part series.)

Peter Lisagor 1915-1976

In recent years any reasonable list of Washington's best all-around reporters would have had to include Peter Lisagor. His death from cancer last December 10 came as a severe loss to journalism as well as to his family and many friends.

After a Nieman Fellowship in 1948-49, he covered the United Nations for the *Chicago Daily News*. He began reporting regularly from Washington for that newspaper in 1950 and became its bureau chief there in 1959, a post he held until his death. He appeared frequently on television, contributed to magazines and coauthored a book *Overtime in Heaven* about diplomats in dangerous or unusual situations.

Mr. Lisagor was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1939, then first joined the *Chicago Daily News* as a sportswriter. Later he worked briefly for United Press International. During World War II, he served as managing editor of *Stars and Stripes* in London and then as editor in Paris.

During his long and rich Washington tenure, he served as president of the White House Correspondents Association, the State Department Correspondents Association, the Overseas Writers Association, the Gridiron Club, and as a governor of the National Press Club.

His journalistic prizes included the Page One Award of the American Newspaper Guild, the National Headliners Club Award, the Peabody Broadcasting Award, the William Allen White Foundation's Award for Journalistic Merit, and Georgetown University's Edward Weintel Prize for Diplomatic Reporting.

He served on the Nieman Selection Committee in 1975, and was a past member of the Nieman Advisory Committee.

He is survived by his wife, Myra; a daughter, Meredith; and a son, Scott.

Following are some excerpts of tributes published or broadcast after his death.

From a commentary
By Louis M. Lyons
WGBH, Boston, Mass.

The day Peter Lisagor died was a Friday — December 10 — and so the day of his weekly public television program. He had been the bright star of "Washington Week in Review" since its start in 1966.

His colleagues gathered, as every week, for reporters' talk about the politics of the capital, turned it into a remembrance of Peter.

"We've lost the best reporter in town," said Charles Corddry of the Baltimore Sun.

"A no-nonsense reporter, witty, skeptical about people in power, but generous to all," said Paul Duke, the moderator.

"Always a working journalist, a plain man, a fun man," said Neil McNeil of Time magazine.

For ten years they had joined him every Friday night to discuss what was going on in Washinton. They had made it the most informing, lively, entertaining program on public affairs. Peter Lisagor's contribution to these candid talks, besides his immense and intimate knowledge of national politics, was his refreshing irreverence.

[The response from national public television viewers at the news of Peter Lisagor's death was overwhelming. In the more than 3,000 letters received at WETA in Washington, Mr. Lisagor was praised again and again for his wit, his compassion, and his intelligence. Some wrote that his death had robbed them of an "old friend," or a "member of the family."]

From an article
By William M. Blair
The New York Times

Peter Irvin Lisagor was described once by the "senior official" of the State Department as a "strange phenomenon." That official continued: "You write for a newspaper that virtually no one in Washington reads. Yet you are one of the most influential newsmen in the nation's capital. You never make heroes out of public officials—that is perhaps an understatement—yet they respect you, they seek your advice, and consider you their friend. You are the Renaissance man of the Washington press—equally adept at writing, reporting, television and commentary."

Thus Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger shared a widely held view of Mr. Lisagor in the award in 1976 of the Edward Weintel Prize for diplomatic reporting at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.

Pete, as he was universally known by his news colleagues, heads of state and public officials of high and low status, gained as much attention from television as from his newspaper reporting. He was sought after as a precise questioner, combining a healthy irreverance for pretension and rank with charm and humor on network panel shows and as a regular contributor on such programs as the Public Broadcasting Service's Washington Week in Review.

He was equally at ease with Presidents and Chicago ward heelers and other public officials with whom he often thoroughly disagreed but many of whom were his close friends. From his standpoint, he sought only to give "the little people out there" an insight into national and world problems and politics.

From a column
By Martin Agronsky
The Washington Post

Peter Lisagor's death takes from the ranks of Washington reporters a professional of great value—a reporter's reporter, a working reporter. When he covered a story, he brought to bear on his work all his enormous energy, an experienced skepticism, an unfailing wit. He covered the *whole* story.

For Peter, the door was open to Secretaries of State, even to Presidents, because of their shared perception of his utter honesty, fairness and unimpeachable integrity.

Kissinger was wary with Lisagor. His usual greeting was the query: "Peter, what's the latest story you're telling about me?" There was a mutual affection between the two—both constantly at the ready for the clash of wits, the telling riposte.

Some months ago Kissinger asked me about Peter's illness. I told him about the cancer that Peter was fighting with such indomitable courage. The Secretary asked if it would help if he were to call, and I urged that he do so.

This was about the time that President Ford was being hard-pressed by Ronald Reagan and had decided to demonstrate he was as hard-line as Reagan with regard to the Soviet Union. It was then that Ford deleted "détente" from his campaign vocabulary.

Kissinger reached Pete at the hospital:

"Peter, I'm sorry to hear you're not feeling well. Can I help?"

"Henry, it's nice of you to call. It's true I've been pretty sick."

"What is it, Peter?"

"Henry, actually, the reason I don't feel well is that I've worried myself sick trying to think of a word for you to use now in place of 'détente.' "

The exchange was quintessential Lisagor.

From a column
By Martin F. Nolan
The Boston Globe

He might have scoffed at his friends mounting the ornate Gothic pulpit to eulogize him. As he surveyed the hundreds of Cabinet officials, big shots and ordinary folk from government and journalism gathered in the nave of the Washington Cathedral, he surely would have asked, "Who's minding the store?"

Peter Lisagor was the most unpompous practitioner of a trade given to pomposity. A mandarin of mandarins by informal rank in his trade, he spurned the role of oracle and remained a reporter's reporter to the end.

Those who gathered for his memorial service here yesterday appreciated the hymns and eulogies, but the real joy of knowing Peter Lisagor included private moments of hilariously outrageous profanity.

At the White House or at some solemn state affair, he would mutter something so ingeniously ribald that his companions would dissolve in laughter. As Carroll Kilpatrick said at the memorial service, his friends will remember "the happiness, even the intoxication which his humor brought to us."

John Chancellor noted something more valuable, that Lisagor had "a set of standards," that "while we valued his friendship, a lot of us valued his esteem. He was our conscience in many ways. . . . He still lives in our minds, an influence upon us."

Eureka! Free at Last!

(Continued from page 2)

names. That was a setback. I discovered that James came from Jacob, out of the Old Testament, and originally meant "supplanter" — the guy who outwitted his brother Esau and won the family inheritance. Some years of consorting with Freudians made me even more uncomfortable about the implications of the name.

There was always, however, the possibility of falling back on my middle name, as my father had done (I was a "Junior"). But that middle name was, and is, "Claude," and elicited raucous hoots from my peers in school.

Now that I ponder it, thanks to Mr. Carter, the predicament was unresolvable. Except for Jimmy Stewart — bless him — there was and, until recently, is no wholesome, powerful adult to use as an ego-ideal. Mayor Jimmy Walker? Jimmy Durante? Jimmy the Greek? Jimmy Hoffa? There may be baseball or football heroes, but that was never this China boy's forte, and I understood only soccer. To this day no names come to mind — though I do read about Jimmy Connors, who seems much too young.

Somewhere circa age 17 I settled for Jim, but not with great joy. It is still for me too terse and clipped, lacking in warmth, inherently monosyllabic — except in the South where it *can* become "Jee-um." It leaves one feeling less than loved.

Imagine, then, the new hope that the Carter presidency offers to me, and all of us, who have borne this burden so long. A Jimmy has come out of the closet and attained, *as Jimmy,* the world's most powerful office.

***Jimmy Thomson,** better known as **James C. Thomson,** is Curator of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism and teaches history at Harvard.*

Freedom for What?

ONLY A RESPONSIBLE PRESS CAN STAY FREE, HUTCHINS COMMISSION FINDS

(An abstract of the report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press)

Who today remembers the Hutchins Commission report? Probably a few journalists over fifty, also teachers of journalism.

This year — 1977 — is the 30th anniversary of publication of that report — a book entitled *A Free and Responsible Press,* subtitled *A General Report on Mass Communication: Newspapers, Radio, Motion Pictures, Magazines, and Books.* Its collective author, the Commission on Freedom of the Press, was chaired by Robert M. Hutchins, then Chancellor of the University of Chicago.

The Hutchins Report is said to have been either ignored or denounced by the press in 1947. And its central recommendation, that the media establish a private nongovernmental agency — a national news or press council — to monitor its own performance, is still controversial (despite, and also because of, the existence of such a council since 1971). Yet it was the Hutchins Commission that first made permanent — for better or worse — the linkage between "freedom" and "responsibility" in debates over the meaning of the First Amendment.

Nieman Curator Emeritus Louis Lyons originally recollected that Nieman Reports came to birth as a response to the commission's plea for better press criticism; but he later discovered that NR's first issue, in February 1947, antedated the Hutchins recommendations. It was the April 1947 NR — Volume I, Number 2 — that gave big play to the report.

Times and some things have changed (the advent of national television, for instance). But many issues remain, alive and unresolved.

We are therefore glad to reprint a précis of the Hutchins recommendations and Louis Lyons' commentary in this anniversary issue. Both first appeared in NR, April 1947.

J.C.T., Jr.

The Problem

The Commission set out to answer the question: Is the freedom of the press in danger? Its answer to that question is: Yes. It concludes that the freedom of the press is in danger for three reasons:

First, the importance of the press to the people has greatly increased with the development of the press as an instrument of mass communication. At the same time the development of the press as an instrument of mass communication has greatly decreased the proportion of the people who can express their opinions and ideas through the press.

Second, the few who are able to use the machinery of the press as an instrument of mass communication have not provided a service adequate to the needs of the society.

Third, those who direct the machinery of the press have engaged from time to time in practices which the society condemns and which, if continued, it will inevitably undertake to regulate or control.

When an instrument of prime importance to all the people is available to a small minority of the people only, and when it is employed by that small minority in such a way as not to supply the people with the service they require, the freedom of the minority in the employment of that instrument is in danger.

This danger, in the case of the freedom of the press, is in part the consequence of the economic structure of the press, in part the consequence of the industrial organization of modern society, and in part the result of the failure of the directors of the press to recognize the press needs of a modern nation and to estimate and accept the responsibilities which those needs impose upon them.

The Remedy

We do not believe the problem is one to which a simple solution can be found. Government action might cure the ills of freedom of the press but only at the risk of killing the freedom in the process.

The real remedies lie in a greater assumption of responsibility by the press itself and in the action of an informed people to induce the press to see its responsibilities and to accept them.

The problem is of peculiar importance to this generation. The relation of the modern press to modern society is a new and unfamiliar relation.

The modern press is a new phenomenon. It can facilitate thought or thwart progress. It can debase and vulgarize mankind. It can endanger peace. It can do it accidentally, in a fit of absence of mind. Its scope and power are increasing.

These great new agencies of mass communication can spread lies faster and farther than our forefathers dreamed when they enshrined freedom of the press in the First Amendment to the Constitution.

With the means of self-destruction now at their disposal, men must live, if they are to live at all, by self-restraint and mutual understanding. They get their picture of one another through the press. If the press is inflammatory, sensational and irresponsible, it and its freedom will go down in the universal catastrophe. On the other hand, it can help create a new world community by giving men everywhere knowledge of the world and one another, by prompting comprehension and appreciation of the goals of a free society.

Freedom of What?

Modern society requires great agencies of mass communication. Breaking them up is a different thing from breaking up an oil monopoly. Breaking them up may destroy a service the people require.

But these agencies must control themselves or be controlled.

Freedom of the press is essential to political liberty. Freedom of discussion is a necessary condition to a free society.

The press is not free if those who operate it act as though they had the privilege to be deaf to ideas which freedom of speech has brought to public attention.

Freedom of expression does not include the right to lie.

The principle of freedom of the press is not intended to render society supine before possible new developments of misuse of the immense powers of the contemporary press.

The aim of those who sponsored the First Amendment was to prevent the government from interfering with expression. The authors of our political system saw that a free society could not exist without free communication.

They were justified in thinking that freedom of the press would be effectively exercised. In their day anybody with anything to say had little difficulty getting it published. Presses were cheap.

It was not supposed that any one newspaper could represent all the conflicting views regarding public issues.

A Press Revolution

This country has gone through a communications revolution. The press has become big business. There is a marked reduction in the number of units relative to the population.

The right of free public expression has therefore lost its earlier reality. The owners of the press determine which persons, which facts, which versions of the facts, and which ideas shall reach the public.

The press has become a vital necessity in the transaction of the public business of a continental area. A new era of public responsibility for the press has arrived. The variety of sources of news and opinion is limited. The insistence of the citizen's need has increased.

It becomes an imperative question whether the performance of the press can any longer be left to the unregulated initiative of those who manage it.

Their right to utter their opinions must remain intact. But the service of news acquires a new importance. The citizen also has a right . . . to adequate and uncontaminated mental food, and he is under a duty to get it.

The freedom of the press can remain a right of those who publish it only if it incorporates into itself the right of the citizen and the public interest.

Freedom of the press means freedom of and freedom for. The press must, if it is to be wholly free, know and overcome any biases incident to its own economic position, its concentration and its pyramided organization.

The press must also be accountable. It must know that its faults and errors have ceased to be private vagaries and have become public dangers. The voice of the press, so far as by a drift toward monopoly it tends to become exclusive in its wisdom and observation, deprives other voices of a hearing and the public of their contribution.

Freedom of the press for the coming period can only continue as an accountable freedom.

What the Public Needs of the Press

The requirements of a free society:

A truthful meaningful account of the day's events;
A forum for exchange of comment;
A means of projecting group opinions and attitudes to one another;
A method of presenting and clarifying the goods and values of the society;
A way of reaching every member of the society.

Especially in international events the press has a responsibility to report them in such a way that they can be understood. It is necessary to report the truth about the fact.

In domestic news too, the account of an isolated fact, however accurate in itself, may be misleading and in effect untrue.

A flow of information and interpretation is needed.

The great agencies of mass communication should regard themselves as common carriers of public discussion.

The giant units can and should assume the duty of publishing significant ideas contrary to their own, as a matter of objective reporting. Their control over the various ways of reaching the ear of America is such that if they do not publish ideas which differ from their own, those ideas will never reach the ear of America. If that happens one of the chief reasons for the freedom which these giants claim disappears.

Identification of source of facts and opinions is necessary to a free society.

Concentration of Control

The outstanding fact about the communication industry is that the number of its units has declined.

In many places the small press has been completely extinguished. The great cities have three or four papers but most places have only one. The opportunities for initiating new ventures are strictly limited.

Only one out of twelve of the cities with daily papers have competing dailies. In ten states there are no competing dailies. Forty percent of daily circulation is non-competitive.

A few big houses own the largest magazines. Drastic concentration obtains in women's magazines: six have nine-tenths of the circulation.

Books show a broader competitive area.

In radio the networks lie outside regulation. Four networks grossed nearly half radio's $400,000,000 in 1945. Eight hundred of 1,000 stations are in chains.

Five movie companies own the best movie theaters.

Newspaper chains: 375 dailies — 25 percent are in chains; small chains increased as Hearst and Scripps-Howard shrank. One hundred and seventy-five places have combination; 92 percent of places have only one paper.

In 100 places the only newspaper owner owns also the only radio station. This creates a local monopoly of local news.

Great newspaper-radio ownership is increasing. One-third of radio stations are owned by the press.

"The Boiler Plate King," John H. Perry, provides insides of 3,000 out of 10,000 weeklies (survivors of 26,000 in 1900).

Three press services serve 99 and four-fifths percent of all daily circulation.

Syndicates are related to press associations and chains.

Besides economics and technology, other forces work toward monopoly. Personal forces — exaggerated drives for power and profit — have tended to promote monopoly. The means used vary from economic pressure to violence.

The Hearst-McCormick newsstand war was a factor in the gang warfare that has distressed Chicago ever since.

Monopolistic practices and high costs have made it hard for new ventures to enter the press field.

Has the press by becoming big business lost its representative character and developed a common bias — of the large investor and employer?

Economics calls for an omnibus product for a mass audience, something for everybody. The newspaper is as much a medium of entertainment and advertising as of news.

News of public affairs is even lower in radio — zero in some; 2 percent - 10 percent on some network stations.

Public affairs are often a minor part of mass media — shaped to a mass audience.

The Newspaper "Game"

So "news" has a special meaning. Its criteria are recency or freshness, proximity, combat, human interest, novelty.

Such criteria limit accuracy and significance.

The game played in press rooms often seems childish and sometimes cruel.

Unauthorized "scoops" at the end of the war produced much distrust of these news sources. It led to doubts about the value and legitimacy of a game that could be played with such irresponsibility and heartlessness.

The press emphasizes the exceptional rather than the representative; the sensational rather than the significant. The press is preoccupied with these incidents to such an extent that the citizen is not supplied the information and discussion he needs to discharge his responsibilities to the community.

Illustration — The San Francisco Conference.

So completely was the task of manufacturing suspense performed that when an acceptable charter was signed the effect on newspaper readers was one of incredulous surprise.

The Press is Big Business

The Press owner is a big business man. "He has the country club complex. He and his editors get the unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth." — W. A. White.

(Virginius Dabney and Erwin Canham are quoted on the big business character of the press.)

Evidence of advertising domination is not impressive in strong papers.

Incident: The American Press Association, advertising representative of 4,000 weeklies and small dailies, placed a United States Steel policy ad on the steel strike of 1945 in 1,400 papers.

Its letters to the papers in which it placed the ad urged: "This is your chance to show the steel people what the rural press can do for them."

Who Runs Radio?

Radio advertising is concentrated. Five companies accounted for nearly one quarter of the network income in 1945. A dozen and a half agencies place contracts and prepare programs. The great consumer industries which in 1945 gave the networks three-quarters of their income determine what the American people shall hear on the air.

The result is such a mixture of advertising with the rest of the program that one cannot be listened to without the other.

Sales talk should be separated from material which is not advertising. Public discussion should not be manufactured by a central authority and "sold" to the public.

The Failure of the Press

Criticism of the press in the press is banned by a kind of unwritten law. If the press is to overcome its own shortcomings this practice of refraining from criticism of the press should be abandoned.

Our society needs an accurate truthful account of the day's

events. We need a market place for the exchange of comment and criticism. We need to clarify the aims and ideals of our country and every other.

These needs are not being met. The news is twisted by emphasis on freshness, on the novel and sensational, by the personal interests of the owners and by pressure groups.

Too much of the regular output of the press consists of a miscellaneous succession of stories and images which have no relation to the typical lives of real people anywhere. The result is meaninglessness, flatness, distortion, and the perpetuation of misunderstanding.

When we look at the press as a whole we must conclude that it is not meeting the needs of our society.

This failure of the press is the greatest danger to its freedom.

Self-regulation Is Absent

The motion picture code is enforced. It sets standards of acceptability, not responsibility.

Movies go farthest in accommodation to pressure groups. This may thwart development of documentary films.

Radio stations are licensed. They must operate in the public interest. But the FCC cannot censure programs. The NAB code is not enforced.

FCC now says unless broadcasters deal with overcommercialization, government may be forced to act. So far it has produced little from the broadcasters except outraged cries about freedom of speech.

In newspapers there is no enforcement of codes.

The Guild does not seek professional standards but recognizes the right of publishers to print anything.

Professional standards are ineffective in the press because the professional works for an owner. His is the responsibility.

Schools of journalism have not accepted the obligation to set standards of the profession, as have law and medical schools. Most devote themselves to vocational training. That is not what a journalist most needs. He needs the broadest, most liberal education.

What Can Be Done?

The problem will not be solved by laws or government action.

But no democracy will indefinitely tolerate concentration of private power irresponsible and strong enough to thwart the democratic aspirations of the people.

If the giant media are irresponsible, not even the First Amendment will protect their freedom from government control. The Amendment will be amended.

If the press does not become accountable by its own motion, the power of government will be used, as a last resort to force it to be so.

There is nothing to prevent government participating in mass communication. It is not dangerous to freedom of press for it to do so.

Government should facilitate new ventures.

It should keep channels open — stop monopoly — invoke anti-trust laws to keep competition.

It should see that the public gets benefits of concentration.

Radio service should be supplied to the whole country either by radio industry or by government. We prefer the former.

Redress of libels should be expedited.

State anti-syndicalism laws should be repealed.

Government has a duty to inform the public. If the press cannot or will not carry reporting about government policies and purposes, the government should publish itself.

What the Press Can Do

The press is a private business but affected by a public interest.

The press has an obligation to elevate rather than degrade public interests.

The press itself should assume responsibility of service the public needs.

We suggest the press look upon itself as performing a public service of a professional kind.

We recommend that mass communication accept the responsibility of a common carrier of information and discussion.

The press should finance attempts to provide service of more diversity and quality for tastes above the level of its mass appeal.

Nieman Fellowships

The press should engage in vigorous mutual criticism.

The press should increase the competence of its staff.

The quality of the press depends in large part upon the capacity and independence of the working members in the lower ranks.

Adequate compensation, adequate recognition and adequate contracts seem to us the indispensable prerequisite for the development of professional personnel.

We should suppose three year contracts would be sufficient to guarantee the independence which the worker in the press must have if he is to play his part as a responsible member of the profession.

The type of educational experience provided for working journalists by the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard seems to us to deserve extension, if not through private philanthropy, then with the financial aid of the press itself.

Radio Should Control Advertisers

We recommend that the radio industry take control of its programs and that it treat advertising as it is treated by the best newspapers. Radio cannot become a respectable agency of communication as long as it is controlled by the advertisers.

No newspaper would call itself respectable which was dominated by its advertisers and which published advertising information and discussion so mixed together that the reader could not tell them apart. The public should not be forced to continue to take its radio fare from the manufacturers of soap, cosmetics, cigarettes, soft drinks and packaged goods.

What Can Be Done by the Public?

We are not in favor of a revolt and hope less drastic means of improving the press may be employed.

We have the impression that the American people do not realize what has happened to them. They are not aware that the communications revolution has taken place. They do not appreciate the tremendous power which the new instruments and new organization of the press place in the hands of a few men. They have not yet understood how far the performance of the press falls short of the requirements of a free society in the world today. The principal object of our report is to make these points clear.

Non-profit institutions should help supply the variety, quantity and quality of press service required by the American people.

In radio and documentary films, chains of libraries, colleges and churches should put before the public the best thought of America and make the present radio programs look as silly as many of them are.

Schools of journalism should not deprive their students of a liberal education.

For Press Appraisal

We recommend the establishment of a new and independent agency to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press.

It should be created by gifts, given a 10-year trial to:

1) Help define standards of press performance.

2) Point out inadequacy of press service in some areas and concentration in others.

3) Make inquiries in areas where minority groups are excluded from reasonable access to channels of communication.

4) Make inquiry abroad regarding the picture of American life given by the American press.

5) Investigation of press lying, especially on public issues.

Make appraisal of tendencies of press.

Make appraisal of government action on communication.

Encourage centers of advanced study in field of communication.

Encourage projects to meet needs of special audiences.

These are methods by which press may become accountable and hence remain free.

Make Journalism a Profession

The Commission was disturbed by finding that many able reporters and editorial writers displayed frustration — the feeling that they were not allowed to do the kind of work which their professional ideals demanded. A continuation of this disturbing situation will prevent the press from assuming effective responsibility toward society. As remedies we have urged the press to use every means that can be devised to increase the competence and independence of the staff. In many different ways the rank and file of the press should be made to constitute a genuine profession.

The Commission on the Freedom of the Press

Robert M. Hutchins
Zechariah Chafee, Jr.
John M. Clark
John Dickinson
William E. Hocking
Harold D. Lasswell
Archibald MacLeish
Charles E. Marriam
Reinhold Niebuhr
Robert Redfield
Beardsley Ruml
Arthur M. Schlesinger
George N. Shuster

A Free and Responsible Press

A REVIEW OF FREE PRESS REPORT

by Louis M. Lyons

In December, 1942, Henry R. Luce of Time, Inc. suggested to President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago an inquiry into the freedom of the press: both its present state and future prospects. President Hutchins selected a dozen scholars to serve with himself on a Commission on Freedom of the Press. Their conclusions now published mark an important event in the history of American journalism.

For the first time an examination of the performance of the press has been undertaken by a highly competent, independent body with adequate resources. They spent three years and $200,000 of Mr. Luce's money, then $15,000 more that President Hutchins dug out of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

The variety of experience of the Commission membership lends weight to its findings. Besides President Hutchins, they were: John Dickinson, general counsel of the Pennsylvania

Railroad; Beardsley Ruml, then president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Archibald MacLeish, formerly assistant Secretary of State; Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary; George N. Shuster, President of Hunter College; Harold D. Lasswell of the Yale Law School; John M. Clark, economist of Columbia University; Charles E. Merriam, political economist of the University of Chicago; Robert Redfield, Dean of Social Sciences at that institution; and three scholars of Harvard University, Zechariah Chafee of the Law School, Arthur M. Schlesinger, historian, and William E. Hocking, philosopher. As director of their staff they had Robert D. Leigh, former President of Bennington College, assisted by Llewellyn White.

Their extensive inquiry included all agencies of mass communication — books, magazines, movies, radio, newspapers. But with books they found little problem, and with magazines less than the other media. They are bringing out separate studies on the movies and radio. Their central report is largely concerned with the newspaper.

They considered freedom of the press in terms of a responsible press and they came out with the warning that only a responsible press can remain free. Failure of the press to meet the needs of a society dependent on it for information and ideas is the greater danger to its freedom, the Commission finds.

Its answer to the question "Is the freedom of the press in danger?" is a flat "Yes." But the reasons do not echo the familiar assumption of the publishers that freedom of the press is their proprietary right to act as irresponsibly as they please.

The Commission's reasons are:

1. As the importance of communication has increased its control has come into fewer hands.

2. The few in control have failed to meet the needs of the people.

3. Press practices at times have been so irresponsible that if continued society is bound to take control for its own protection.

The citizen also has a right . . . (to truthful information on public affairs), the Commission asserts. "No democracy will indefinitely tolerate concentration of private power, irresponsible and strong enough to thwart the democratic aspirations of the people. If these giant agencies of communication are irresponsible, not even the First Amendment will protect their freedom from government control. The Amendment will be amended."

This is an urgent warning to the interests in control of the press. It is going to be a hard one to brush off or forget as so many criticisms of less weight have been brushed off and ignored.

Mr. Lyons, Nieman Fellow '39 and Curator of the Nieman Fellowships for 25 years, has retired and is news commentator for WGBH, Boston's public radio station.

The Commission recites the communications revolution that has made the press big business and shows it acting increasingly like big business and increasingly in alliance with the interests of other big business. The vital necessity of the citizen to have access to clear channels of adequate information on public affairs has never been more painstakingly presented. His right and obligation to secure such information is insistently put.

Then the Commission comes to a sticking point. How to protect the public right to access to truthful information is a complex problem. The Commission's remedy is less convincing than its diagnosis. That has been true of course of all earlier criticism of the press. The Commission shies away from public regulation to make the press accountable, lest other freedoms be endangered. This is the dilemma of a modern society enormously dependent upon a press in private hands, inevitably controlled by large capitalists whose interests are not always the public interest.

It is easy to show that accountable service in communication is as essential as pure food, public health and fair trade practices. But these other needs are protected by law. If we accept the view that government regulation of the press is a danger to freedom, then the public is cut off from the traditional means of a democracy to protect its interests by public regulation.

That the Commission has not taken us out of that dilemma is both the weakness of the report and the riddle of the problem. If you refuse the public the sole public recourse to protect its rights, you haven't much left but hope and prayer. The Commission prays that the press may make itself more responsible. It urges that it restore the professional status of journalism, long a captive to the publisher's business. It wants professional standards applied to the performance of the press. It insists that the press cease shielding its own miscreants by the device of refusing publicity to the malpractices and libel suits of its fellow members. It asks a sense of trusteeship by publishers. These are indispensable reforms.

But the only means to these ends that it finds to recommend are public concern, public appraisal, public criticism of press performance. It proposes an endowed agency to supply continuing appraisal of press performance. This is a very mild poultice to apply to the organic and spreading disorder of irresponsible giantism which it finds in the institution of the press.

But the report is not to be judged by failure to find the cure. Its value is in alerting the public and warning the publishers of the failure of the press to meet the public need. The definition of "common carrier of public discussion" as the function that a responsible press must accept is one for all journalism to paste in its hat.

The great strength of the report is its penetrating examination of the performance of the press. It has the courage to challenge the whole rigmarole of press clichés as to what is news and the silly game of scoops and headline hunting. "The

news is twisted by emphasis on the novel and the sensational. . . . Too much of the regular output consists of a succession of stories and images that has no relation to the typical lives of real people anywhere. The result is meaninglessness, flatness, distortion and perpetuation of misunderstanding." It finds the press preoccupied with the sensational and trivial "to such an extent that the citizen is not supplied with the information and discussion he needs to discharge his responsibilities to the community."

Every newspaperman knows how generally this is so. With a few notable exceptions which the Commission might well have emphasized more than it did, newspapering in the United States is pretty sloppy business, casual, trite, almost ritualistic in its clichés, and so stereotyped that the individual differences among newspapers in widely differing communities are hardly more distinctive than among the different brands of canned corn. The easy flow of such stuff as comes from the police blotter gets so much of the attention of the press as to squeeze out most of the information on public affairs that makes any sense. The giant modern press has exploited our high literacy and the rapid technology of communication. But its own contribution in serving the one with the other remains for the most part as primitive as the hand press and post rider. It is directly because newspaper publishers as a class are among the most conservative groups in America that newspaper performance is as uninspired, as unoriginal and uninformed as it is. It makes its own definition of news which is often so peculiar and parochial as to exclude most information that has any use or any meaning. The value of this report lies in its jolt to the mentality of those who control most of the press to their own profit.

The honorable exceptions are easily identified. The public stake in the issue runs parallel to its stake in self government and peace, for both, as the Commission shows, are threatened by the frequently irresponsible and often false presentation of government activity and international relations. They are threatened even more by the usual absence of useful information on these vital areas.

The Commission might have, but did not, make note of those exceptional newspapers that operate on a very high level of responsibility to serve the reader with information essential to the citizen. But they are highly exceptional as every one knows who has tried counting them up and found fingers left over.

The Commission's recital of the increasing concentration of newspaper control and consequent contraction in the number and diversity of outlets for information and ideas is a twice-told tale. Morris Ernst explored it in his *The First Freedom.* But it will bear emphasis. Even as this report was in the press, the sale was announced of the *Philadelphia Record* to the *Philadelphia Bulletin.* That leaves the third city of America at this writing with one morning and two evening newspaper ownerships.

It underscores the Commission's point that: through concentration the variety of sources of news and opinion is limited. The insistence of the citizen's need has increased. . . .

True, but some instances would have been in order. With $215,000 and a research staff and three years to work, the facts about the press handling of such stories as the destruction of the OPA and the wrecking of the housing program would have illuminated the report. It was possible to measure how much the public was told of the lobbies and pressures and industry sit-down strikes to end price control and to muscle out Wilson Wyatt's program. It would have been possible to show how little attention was paid to the profits made out of the removal of price limits when the headlines were crying over strikes for more wages. Facts are the most telling evidence. Had the Commission been more journalistic in its own report, its conclusions would have more effect.

The report is a philosopher's summation of the state of the press. It would be more informative if it contained more research into instances. The Commission cites "charges" of

. . . Newspaper in the United States is pretty sloppy business, casual, trite, almost ritualistic in its cliches. . . .

distortion and says "bias is claimed" against consumer cooperatives, food and drug regulations and Federal Trade Commission orders on fraudulent advertising. "Many people believe," it says, "that the press is biased on national fiscal policy." The Commission had the means to run down these charges.

It is hard to believe that it did not. It heard 58 witnesses from the press and its staff recorded interviews with 225 others. The report is derived from 176 separate documents developed in the study. Some of the cautious language of the report is quite evidently a device to appease the more conservative members in the interest of the unanimous agreement which they present.

Very usefully, the Commission shows that radio rates far below the newspaper as a responsible channel of information. Public affairs take from zero to 10 percent of radio time. The Commission says bluntly that before it can be respectable radio must take control of its programs away from the advertisers:

> "Radio cannot become a responsible agency of communication as long as its programming is controlled by the advertisers. No newspaper would call itself respectable if its editorial columns were dominated by its advertisers and if it published advertising, information, and discussion so mixed together that the reader could not tell them apart."

It sums up radio programs with this: "The great consumer industries which in 1945 gave the networks three-quarters of their income determine what the American people shall hear on the air. A dozen and a half advertising agencies place contracts and prepare programs. The result is such a mixture of advertising with the rest of the program that one cannot be listened to without the other."

The devastating report on radio recalls the curious results of certain polls that have found more public confidence in news heard on the radio than read in the newspapers. There is no accounting for this except by the magic many people still feel in hearing a voice. Any newspaperman who at times performs on the radio has had the experience of receiving a charmed response from neighbors and acquaintances who never mention his familiar daily reports in his newspaper. Yet he knows, and so do they if they ever think about it, that he contributes far more to their information in the less restricted channels of the paper.

After reading its report on radio one can better understand the Commission's lack of enthusiasm for government regulation, though it doesn't offer that as a reason. Radio has been under regulation from the start, and obviously regulation has failed to result in adequate radio service. To say that the FCC has been prevented by the power with Congress of advertiser-backed radio pressures from ever trying real regulation does not add much comfort or increase anticipation of benefits from press regulation.

This is not the reason the Commission seeks to avoid governmental action to require press responsibility, but it is a consideration not to be overlooked by those who disagree with them about it.

The Commission finds the quality of the press affected by the fact that "wages and prestige of the working newspapermen are low and their tenure precarious." This is an understatement. The newspaper is a prep school for the fields of radio, magazines, movies, and public relations. The most talented of its staff are grabbed off by these competing enterprises often for an extra $20 or $30 a week and all the years of their development lost to press and public. This is one of the sorest points about American newspapering and one of its grievous ills.

Everybody else appreciates the value of a trained newspaper man except the newspaper publisher. So journalism is drained constantly of the men capable of operating at a level of public service.

It would have been easy to show this. Take the number of men in government agencies who left newspapers for a little more money. Take the whole personnel of radio and see how many were trained in newspapers. Take the salary levels of radio and compare with newspapers. Take the staff of a few representative papers of fifteen years ago and show where the featured reporters of that time are working now. This forfeiture of the press' own human resources has reached a point where even Editor and Publisher, the trade organ of the press, has been plaintively editorializing on it.

But a deeper disturbing note is the Commission's discovery of the "frustration" of reporters and editorial writers.

> "The Commission was disturbed by finding that many able reporters and editorial writers displayed frustration — the feeling that they were not allowed to do the kind of work which their professional ideals demanded. A continuation of this disturbing situation will prevent the press from assuming effective responsibility toward society."

As remedies, the Commission urges the press "use any means that can be devised to increase the competence and independence of the staff."

That is all very well. And very true. Better reporters and better paid reporters are needed. But to say this and stop there misses the central issue.

Can the Commission imagine a journalist being "independent" and working for Hearst, McCormick, or the paper controlled by the First National Bank?

What is it that turns idealistic newspapermen into frustrated cynics? It is the context of the job itself. It is the very irresponsibility the report complains of. The Commission is going around in circles to say that the press is irresponsible, that it should be responsible, that it requires professional standards, and that the press should develop professional standards in its staff. The newest tyros in the city room have the standards desired until they are conditioned on the job to something else that defeats and frustrates the best of them.

It is a very insidious thing. The Commission has sensed it, explored it, been revolted by it, but never quite come to grips with it. The Commission realizes that a profession has been taken over and exploited. There is no parallel for that in other professions. It clearly baffles a Commission made up of members of the professions of law, education, religion, science and philosophy. Any of their "frustrated" newspapermen could have told them more than they understand about the catch in the game. But their contribution is in describing the problem. That is a large contribution. They leave it as they must in the lap of the public:

> "We have the impression that the American people do not realize what has happened to them. They are not aware that the communications revolution has taken place. They do not appreciate the tremendous power which the new instruments and new organization of the press place in the hands of a few men. They have not yet understood how far the performance of the press falls short of the requirements of a free society in the world today. The principal object of our report is to make these points clear."

An Apology for Barbara

by Edward C. Norton

One evening a few months ago, over dinner with a newspaper colleague, I listened with amazement and some amusement while he berated the fates, and the American Broadcasting Company for its announcement shortly before that it would pay Barbara Walters $1 million to read the news on network television five nights a week.

"Just think," my friend moaned, "She'll get a million. Do you know any reporters who make a million? Or any editors?" he asked before taking another slug of red wine.

The colleague, my longtime friend George, has a keen wit, and usually an upbeat and scathing sense of humor. That night I at first thought he was making light of the ABC situation. He was serious, he informed me grimly. He could barely keep his seat, so great was his anger over Ms. Barbara's fiscal success.

"Oh, I don't know. I kind of like Barbara," I said. "I think she must have something on the ball to have survived all those years on the *Today* program. I mean, can you think of a more critical audience than 30 million Americans who have just been rudely launched from the sack, and who must face life in Cedar Rapids?" George took another slug of red wine. I tried to change the subject. George's reaction was mirrored later that week in my other print colleagues. I'm sure from talking to other reporters and editors on newspapers and wire services that it was almost universally reflected among print journalists. They were shocked at the news. And, they were against it.

It was a stunning psychological explosion—a time for us all to measure our market value and, despite one's talents and experience and responsibilities, to be depressed anew in 1976 that the dollars did not measure up.

The Walters contract shredded the psychological boosters we all had been provided by Woodward and Bernstein. They had shown that the pen is indeed mightier. Sure, the duo had made tons of money from their books and the movie—but that was all after the last take of the story had been sent to the composing room. Why, despite the money and the fame, Bob Woodward was back in the newsroom—reporting. But, Barbara Walters?

A hundred grand would have been bad enough, George said that night. Three hundred grand would have been a stronger insult. But a million? Both George and I work on one of the top paying newspapers in the nation, but our combined annual salaries would probably pay Barbara's tax for about a month.

Look, I told George, if you want to make the Big Bread, then get into television news. "If you have a face that won't crack the camera lens, and you can remember headlines and speak them convincingly—why you too can be an anchorman in Duluth. What we're talking about, I said, is show business, pure and simple. Why, I asked, doesn't George get upset when a Sinatra or Presley gets $100,000 for a week in Las Vegas. Why should he get into an uproar over Barbara? It's all show business. It still is.

Some months after the Walters' announcement, while a somewhat subdued Barbara was reading the headlines on the network news, the three networks quietly announced that they had cancelled plans for hour-long evening news broadcasts because their affiliate stations would not go along. On another front, NBC, which in 1975 had put together a $20 million nationwide FM all-day news service, announced it was killing the service in 1977. NBC couldn't sign up the necessary 150 stations to make the service pay its own way. Only 70 outlets across the U.S. signed up for the service.

"She'll get a million. Do you know any reporters who make a million? Or any editors?"

Yet, at the same time some radio news stations—in New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco—have been doing very well. They broadcast on the AM band, and design their programming for commuters—both mass transit, and car-type.

I believe electronic news has made great strides since 1948. I can remember when stiff former radio announcers with British enunciation pioneered the 15-minute nightly news on television in the late 1940s, complete with mispronounciations and holes in the stories they reported. There have been great gains, but an argument could be made that the amount of network television news in the 1970s has shrunk, or at best held its own, since the early 1960s.

The very important allied stations—the beads on the string from Duluth to Portland—put the kayo on expanded nightly news service because they wanted to keep control over the very valuable 30 minutes between the network news and the start of the network entertainment schedule at 8 P.M.

Everyone knows by now that television broadcast licenses are almost a license to print money. The corporations, or individuals who hold them, however, are never

Mr. Norton, Nieman Fellow '73, is assistant assignments editor of the New Jersey edition of the New York Daily News.

unaware that their business depends on a franchise from the U.S. government.

Despite this entanglement—somewhat contrary to the nation's vaunted free-enterprise system—national television networks have become the nation's central nervous system. A Fonzie can appear one night on a situation comedy, and within weeks every child not living on a sheep ranch in the wilder parts of Montana can ape the character's mannerisms.

The fads travel at the speed of light. And, fortunately they last about as long. Pollsters every few years depress newspaper editors with surveys which show that Americans get their news from television or radio. How did you learn Kennedy had been shot? Where did you turn to for more details in 1963?

More recently—at what medium did Spiro Agnew launch his most vitriolic blasts from his guided missile tongue? We tend to forget that in the early 1970s the Nixon Gang had bullied the networks out of the traditional, and time-filling, habit of commenting on Presidential speeches. Do you recall the congressional tumult that followed the broadcast of a relatively innocuous news special about Pentagon propaganda?

Push really came to shove in those years. The natural reluctance of business-oriented television corporations to engage in counterattack against a government that held the future of their licenses, was, and is, apparent. Licenses are seldom revoked. The fear, however, seldom leaves the executive suite.

Millions are in the balance. This fact, I believe, explains the state of commercial broadcasting, as well as network and local news programming.

For example, on a cost-per-thousand—the yardstick on which broadcasting and advertisers measure their impact—

This person is not a newsman. He is called "a talent."

it is very profitable to rerun 1956 Lucy shows to audiences too young to remember the original showings. It costs much more to put on an hour-long local news program. But surprisingly, since 1970 such local news programming has proved to be audience-gathering. There are old-fashioned circulation-news wars going on right now in many local television markets.

The differences in local news presentation between 1949 and today are not that much in substance, but vary a great deal in style. In 1949 the viewer got the headlines from an announcer who never covered a news story, and a voice-over on a bit of newreel film.

Today, the lone announcer has given way to an explosion of personalities, all grateful to the hair spray industry, without which most on-camera news readers would not be able to keep their hair out of their eyes to read cue cards. The sets are 35th Century, and Happy Talk has moved across videoland. Happy Talk is supposed to be an antidote to the usually somber, harsh news. The news is normally a flow of troubles—from Northern Ireland to Lebanon to that big

The Walters contract shredded the psychological boosters we all had been provided by Woodward and Bernstein.

fire that burned the family to a crisp on the other side of town. The news does not change much, and neither does the type now presenting it. Attractive, hirsute, well-tailored men and women face the cameras. They quip and giggle with each other, straining to get the best demographics—an audience from 18 to 34—the Buy Years.

These television types are in a competition—not to present the best story, the "beat," or an exclusive, or to become the most knowledgeable about a local problem, but rather to become so popular locally that scouts from the next bigger city, or even the nets, will send them on to greater glory. I have known electronic newsmen who started in the business at $15,000 a year, and within six years they were making more than $90,000 a year. All they had to be was watchable—attractive, believable—likeable on camera, and be ready to move on to a series of larger cities.

This person is not a newsman. He is called "a talent." He or she comes complete with an agent. Once, while doing a magazine story on the inside operation of a New York television news operation, I was amused to note that the program anchorman spent most of an afternoon on the phone with his stockbroker. He later complained to me that his contract would not allow him to cover a story. His face was too well known. He would be mobbed at a news scene. He would become the story. He was far from the ham anchorman characterized on the Mary Tyler Moore show, but the fact remained that this television news reader was and remains a performer.

Over the years, in four different newspaper newsrooms, I came across not more than 10 persons who could appear on television each night and tell you—coherently—what had happened that day. The reason there are not more is that the majority of print journalists are oddballs. They look and

sound like oddballs. To put oddballs on television is not good business. Newspapers may be the last refuge of oddballs.

Oh sure, print reporters do appear on local and national television public affairs programs, usually on Sunday, but with few exceptions they look like FBI Wanted Posters, and they sound like windup toys. Watch one of these programs. The print fellows and gals tend to be unsmiling. They tend to ask detailed questions. They tend to press. They would not last a week on a Happy Talk program.

Well, you ask, what about the successes, the stars who break the rules. Uncle Walter Cronkite was and is a newsman who has become a Public Figure of durability. Presidents come and go, Walter remains. Come to think of it, Cronkite may well be the real President—the symbol of stability, decency, knowledge, in a society where everything seems to get blurred. Cousin John Chancellor is also an experienced newsman. Somehow—and this is very important—neither of these two men becomes confused in the viewing mind with the bad news he transmits. They are stable, reassuring, rock steady in the turbulent world. Millions watch. Networks sell time, and they pass some of the profit to the anchormen. So what? Television news is an expensive proposition, even at the stations farthest out in the sticks. Consider the costs of cameras, sound equipment, trucks, color film stock, etc. All a print reporter needs is a pencil, his cuff to write on, and a dime for a call to his office.

My print colleagues decry television news, saying how terrible most of it is, and how narcissistic its deliverers are. I disagree, saying how badly much print news is slapped into newspapers, and how lazy most print slaves are.

Newspapers are a mosaic of stories and ads, and readers need a fund of knowledge to understand the news. Of all the fundamentals of news gathering and transmission, the "Why" is seldom explained. At the same time network television news, in my estimation, has gotten better in the

My print colleagues decry television news, saying how terrible most of it is . . . I disagree . . .

last 10 years. Someone in network news has decided that it might be more worthwhile to spend the 24 minutes of the 30-minute nightly program to do a couple of stories well, instead of trying to capture in words and picture every big explosion, wreck, and Kissinger non-event from Maine to California. The nets, thus, have been breaking news—investigations into labor unions, the effects of chemical and industrial pollution on us all, and the toll of lives stunted by age, inflation, crime and the decay of culture.

. . . The newspapers that are most closely read and stable . . . contain information that will never make the nightly television news.

Few of the papers I read (from Los Angeles, Boston, Miami, New York and Washington) have treated these subjects with page-one seriousness without an obvious news peg. Most print news is still chasing fire engines, or press conferences, or city council meetings. This is wrong at a time when a chilling stagflation has destroyed much of the middle class's insularity to adversity. The papers are not reporting these effects, and that contributes to the middle class's lowered respect for the press.

Newspapers are insular as only a 19th century industry can be in the 1970s. True, the green eye-shades are mostly gone, and just about everyone in the newsroom has a college degree. But newspapers are still a business that waited until the 1970s to jump into the electronic age of printing. Musty, fusty banks were there 20 years ago.

American newspapers have been losing circulation. Many in the industry blame it on television. It takes too much attention to read, they say, adding we are a post-literate society. Yet, the newspapers that are most closely read and stable, are weeklies and dailies which contain information that will never make the nightly television news. It seems foolish for newspaper editors to gear headlines to the reader who has already heard the headline two or three times via radio or television before he ever gets a paper. At the same time too few papers push for a local reputation—an implied promise to the reader that no medium will get the full story to him better, more colorfully, more entertainingly than the paper.

So, Barbara Walters hands us the headlines nightly—for a million smackers, minus taxes, and her agent's fees. So what? She's worked for it, all those years of having to get up at 4 A.M. to be ready for camera at 7 A.M.

Rest assured, I told my pal George before we parted that night, if Barbara doesn't draw the audiences, and high ratings, the network will get another Barbie Doll, someone like Farrah Fawcett-Majors, dress her in a bikini, and hand her a script. Miss Walters will find herself teaching broadcast journalism at Columbia, or doing the weather on Channel 8 in Fargo.

Some Misconceptions About South Africa

by Hennie van Deventer

Editor's Note: Readers may recall that the autumn-winter 1975 issue of NR focused on South Africa, and that publication was delayed for a promised response to John Corr's reportage from South Africa. That journalist broke his commitment at the last moment, so we are especially grateful to ***Hennie van Deventer****, news editor of* ***Beeld****, Johannesburg, and Nieman Fellow '77, for his willingness to correct that omission, and we are glad to present the Afrikaner position.*

South Africa is the victim of a fierce propaganda war. A psychological climate has been created in the outside world in which no mass media can present a true picture of this country and retain its credibility. The militant, extreme voices of protest and dissent are shuttled from one capital to another, with the air waves put at their disposal to poison public opinion.

As a result, the picture of South Africa in many American minds is not pretty: a vicious white regime clinging desperately to its power by brutal suppression, tyranny and torture. It is an image of a white nation motivated by fear and hate and sadly lacking in human qualities such as decency, morality and compassion. The Afrikaner has emerged as "Public Enemy Number One," the supreme racist of the 20th century—a stereotype which he finds both incomprehensible and deeply distressing. Looking at the imperfect world around him, he fails to conceive why the imperfections of others are accepted as facts of life; his, as crimes against humanity.

The Afrikaner is faced with, perhaps, the most awesome challenge of our times: to create a fair and realistic political and social order in a country which in itself is a miniature version of the diverse and confused world we live in.

People are apt to make mistakes in the sensitive area of human relations. The Afrikaner is no different and accepts that criticism is often valid and justified. But he cannot see the justification for all the distorted stereotypes and the persecution based on misconceptions, or even a disregard for the truth.

A recent example of the Great Lie is the complaint by Lesotho that South Africa had sealed a part of the border between the two countries in an attempt to force Lesotho to recognize Transkei. The Security Council, true to form, was quick in its censure and unanimously called on South Africa to reopen the border.

Only one foreign newspaper, *The Observer* of London, investigated the allegation. Its Africa correspondent, Colin Legum, took only one day to go to the rugged frontier between Transkei and Lesotho to establish that the border was never closed down. "The Security Council's unanimous decision demonstrates the extent of world hostility to the Pretoria regime," Legum wrote, "but on this occasion shows a total disregard for the truth."

It would have been easy for the United States—or, for that matter, Britain or France—to ascertain the truth. Their embassies have better facilities than Mr. Legum has but, obviously, preferred not to be bothered by the facts—a sad reflection on a world opinion that constantly condemns South Africa for a lack of morality.

South Africa allies itself strongly with the West and respects the United States as the leader of the Western world. This makes it particularly painful to perceive the lack of understanding in this country of the unique qualities and the complexities of the South African situation. Many Americans seem blind to the major differences between South Africa and the United States of a generation ago. Priding themselves on their achievements, they insist on judging South Africa against the background of racial experience in America, and decry South Africans because they have not followed suit.

This demonstrates a superficial insight into South Africa's problems. South Africa is *not* a reincarnation of the Deep South of the 1950s or even 1960s. Its problem is *not* simply one of human attitudes, an archaic belief in white superiority, or a stubborn refusal to share the good life with people of a different skin color. It is, at the core, a problem of conflicting nationalisms, divergent cultures and great disparities in development and political ideology.

In the United States desegregation is being accomplished by absorbing a black minority into a vast political, economic and cultural melting pot without basically changing the face of the nation or altering the structure of society and government. Life goes on in much the same way.

In South Africa that is impossible because the whites are outnumbered by more than three to one. What is demanded of them, then, is not sharing but capitulation. Thus, a proud nation that has shaped the country and its destinies—its political, economic and cultural character—for more than three centuries will become an impotent minority in a totally new structure. The Afrikaners will indeed become a nation without a country.

It must be remembered that the Afrikaner has origins older than the white Pacific nations of Australia and New Zealand, and claims his African nationhood on the same grounds as the whites in the United States and Canada. The first white people arrived on African soil in 1652, a generation later than the Pilgrim Fathers in America, and about the same time as the present black nations migrated into the present Republic from the north.

The black nations settled in different regions where they established their own social and cultural systems and tribal organizations. The land that they

selected then, because of an abundance of surface water for their livestock, forms the nucleus of today's homelands. The first appreciable contact between the two cultures took place 120 years after the arrival of the whites, and occurred more than 600 miles from what is Cape Town today. Since then the boundaries were determined as they have been through the ages everywhere: long periods of undisputed possession, conquest and treaty. The Afrikaner did not destroy or eliminate a native population as the United States did in its quest for territorial superiority on the North American continent.

Today, South Africa harbors a wealth of nations and nationalisms: 12 major languages, 1,200 religious sects and groups representing all the main racial divisions of mankind, with marked inequalities in the distribution of wealth and resources. In fact, all the world's social, religious, racial, economic and political problems can be found in this country to a greater or lesser degree.

Life styles range from Western sophistication to tribal simplicity. South Africa has scientists who lead the world in their fields, but there are also many who even to this day prefer the abracadabra of the medicine men to the surgical techniques and drugs of modern medicine.

Many Americans seem blind to the major differences between South Africa and the United States of a generation ago.

This is another drastic difference between South Africa and the United States, where the black minority has the same aims and life styles, and at least the same language, as the white majority. In South Africa the black ethnic groups often cannot communicate with each other because of widely different languages. And the different black nationalisms are a harsh reality. The way in which Soweto's Zulus marched violently against the young rioters last year is a single example of what could happen if the hidden tensions all over the country should erupt. Fatal faction fights are not rare in South Africa and, once, 109 Asians were killed in a fierce conflict with the Zulus.

Africa has numerous examples of this—the most recent being the massacres in Uganda under President Idi Amin. There was also the destructive civil war in Angola and friction in Mozambique. In Rhodesia groups with common interests fail to close their ranks. Even Kenya, while stable on the surface, seethes with potential conflict should the dominant Kikuyus ever feel their position threatened by one of the other tribes. And who can forget the bloodbath in Nigeria when the Hausas and Ibos clashed with fearsome violence?

Apart from its divergent nationalisms, South Africa also has other conflicting interests which could get out of hand easily. Recently, the Chief Minister of Qwaqwa homeland threatened Transkei with violence over the citizenship of 40,000 South Sothos. And in Bophutatswana—well on its way to independence—six schools were recently shut down over differences whether the language of instruction should be Tswana or North Sotho.

This poses a real problem for those advocating integration in South Africa: how does one begin to integrate an education system in a country with a dozen different languages? How does one teach Afrikaner and Venda children in the same classroom, or the children of an English-speaking industrialist and a Shangaan farmer?

No one of sound mind can suggest that the boundaries of Western Europe be removed, that Frenchman and German bury their differences of identity and look upon themselves as citizens or Europe. In South Africa, the cultural differences run deeper and are more numerous, yet many regard the erasing of national identities as the Great Solution for the country's ills. It is the solution clamored for by black Africa, keenly supported by the West and angrily demanded by the United Nations.

Did the world then learn nothing from the break up of British India first into India and Pakistan, with the latter splitting further into Pakistan and Bangladesh; or of Malaysia (which expelled Singapore into independence after only two years of an attempt at federation)? And what about the shattered dream of the Central African federation, Cyprus, Northern Ireland or even the present tensions in Canada? It is a hypocritical world that accommodates two Germanys, two Koreas, two Chinas, a Bangladesh and a Pakistan, but recoils in horror of a divided South Africa.

The Afrikaner has emerged as . . . the supreme racist of the 20th century — a stereotype which he finds . . . incomprehensible and . . . distressing.

President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania said of Biafra: "Regional or continental unity cannot be enforced arbitrarily or procured artificially since it would mean that people would have to sacrifice their identities to a point of extinction . . ." Surely, if these wise words were true for Biafra, they must also be true for South Africa.

It is the basic philosophy of separate development to prevent a "sacrifice" of identities "to a point of extinction." But now critics of South Africa say the

whites divide the country with diabolical unfairness, that the worst 13 percent is designated homelands while the best 87 percent is retained for the white minority. This is not true. History shows that no land was ever designated as homelands, that the homelands are, and have always been, the traditional *lebensraums* of the different black nations. That it is not a bigger slice of the sub-continent is the result not of white greed but of the original pattern of settlement.

Since the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910 not a single hectare was taken away from the blacks. Indeed, in 1936 they were given an extra 6.3 million hectares—an increase of nearly 70 percent. At the time there were only 6.5 million blacks with an area larger than England and Wales where 50 million people live today. Moreover, the homelands are situated in the most fertile regions of the Republic and can support populations far in excess of their present inhabitants.

Some homelands have large mineral deposits. The North Sotho homeland of Lebowa has reserves of chrome, vanadium, platinum and andalusite estimated at $150 billion. Bophutatswana's reserves are estimated at $75 billion.

Transkei's land area is larger than that of Switzerland, Israel, Belgium, Wales, Lesotho, Swaziland and others. The density of the residential population is 46 per sq. km.—in Great Britain it is 211, in the Netherlands, 365.

It is said that Transkei can never be viable economically. However, the United Nations is densely populated with economically dependent Third World states, inferior to Transkei in many respects. Transkei has a budget that exceeds by several millions those of African countries such as Botswana, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Lesotho and Swaziland. Its per capita income is higher than that of Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Malawi, the Sudan and Zaire, to name just a few examples.

One can only speculate how the world would have embraced an independent Transkei if independence were achieved by bloodshed and violence.

* * * * * * *

When one hears South Africa described as a tyranny, it is hard to believe people are referring to the same country whose black population enjoy the highest standard of living of any working class in Africa, one of the highest growth rates in the world, and medical and educational facilities second to none on the continent. More than four million black children (or 80 percent of the blacks of school-going age) go to school, and compulsory education will begin next year. There are more than 12,500 black schools and more than 69,000 black teachers. Of the total black population 19 percent go to school as opposed to 17.4 percent in Europe and 9.7 percent in Africa. (The figure for white South Africans is 22.1 percent.)

The high black growth rate of three percent testifies to the excellent medical facilities at their disposal. There are 105 hospitals in the homelands and the Baragwanath hospital, which serves Soweto, is the largest and most modern black hospital in Africa. It employs more than 200 doctors.

The living conditions for blacks in South Africa are much better than in most independent African countries. The Associated Press correspondent Larry Heinzerling, in a recent report from Zaire, said the unplanned cities of black Africa "are sprawling slums and anthills of humanity crowded into ramshackle shanties surrounding downtown skyscrapers." In contrast, Soweto provides 130 schools, 1,500 shops, 102 sports fields, 12 clinics and 39 children's playgrounds.

The average industrial wage for blacks is 80 percent higher than in Ghana which is near to the top of the ladder in Africa. The standard of living is such that South Africa attracts 500,000 migrant workers annually from its independent black neighbours. Many more slip into the country without legal documents.

It is a hypocritical world that accommodates two Germanys, two Koreas, two Chinas, a Bangladesh and a Pakistan, but recoils in horror of a divided South Africa.

It is a strange tyranny whose previous five year plan for the homelands cost nearly $700 million and whose next five year plan is likely to involve more than a billion dollars—more than the entire Gross Domestic Product of all but a handful of affluent African states. In ten years South Africa spent more than double the amount on the development of its 16 million blacks than the United Nations did on the development of 130 million people in the 38 "poor" countries of the world.

Critics say the policy of separate development is rejected *in toto* by the masses. Yet in the last general elections in Transkei and Bophutatswana a vast majority of the 5.25 million voters who cast their votes by secret ballot, supported parties favouring separate development. Transkei's Prime Minister, Kaiser Matanzima, now commands 95 percent of the seats in Parliament. A total of 67 percent of the voters voted in that election; this compares favourably even with the recent presidential election in the United States. And there is no question about President Carter's legality!

* * * * * * *

In its present stage of evolution, South Africa imposes a series of lamentable restrictions on its black people which limit personal freedoms. The discrimination on race and color must be abolished at a faster rate. But it is only fair to acknowledge that South Africa is at least moving toward greater personal freedoms; more than can be said of a large part of a world in which only 19.6 percent of the people live in freedom.

Some of the countries that have recently been down-graded from "free" to "partly free" or "non-free" by Freedom House in New York include El Salvador (partly free) and Argentina, Kuwait, Madagascar, Paraguay, Thailand and Uruguay (all non-free). In Africa there is a chain of one-party states

Did the whole world, then, learn nothing from the break up of British India . . . ?

stretching from Cairo to Lusaka in which, all too often, power resides in only one of several tribes or power elites—the result of more than 30 *coups d'etat* in twelve years.

South Africa's 16 million blacks do not vote for the white Parliament, but they elect their own homeland governments and will in future also control their urban interests on a municipal level. This is in contrast to the majority of independent Africa's 300 million blacks who have no vote at all under their various forms of dictatorship. The problems there are such that, as Stuart Aurbach wrote in a recent *Washington Post* article, one in 130 adult Africans has fled his country because of religious, political and tribal persecution. This gives the African continent the worst refugee problem in the world.

Press freedom on the South African scale has always been rare on the continent. There are precious few African newspapers that enjoy the level of freedom of Johannesburg's black paper, *The World*. Critical comments on the South African system in editorials in *The World* are even reproduced by the government in official publications and distributed overseas. In Nigeria, which the United States assiduously courts, *The New York Times'* correspondent, John Darnton, was recently expelled for his despatches which the government alleged "put the country in a bad light." This leaves Agence France-Press as the only Western news medium represented there.

South Africa's population of 20 million has a police force of 34,000, of whom about half are blacks, or 1.48 policemen to every 1,000 of the population—hardly the popular image of a police state. The South African police, a favourite target of the protagonists of distortion, are constantly portrayed as an evil force of terror and torture, the cruel oppressors of the black man. The other side of the coin is conveniently ignored.

It is not news for the American media when the same police risk their lives to save and protect black people from disaster. Recently, Soweto was flooded in an overnight deluge and 2,000 people were evacuated with helicopters and boats. The black newspaper, *The World*, commented: "The one bright ray to come from the flood disasters in Soweto is the sight of policemen fighting side by side with residents to alleviate the plight of many who were trapped. . . . They were not only working together but they were talking and joking together. That's the way it should be. And so say all of us." This small episode is not illustrative of a country torn apart by racial hatred and violence.

* * * * * * *

A misconception with dangerous implications is that the Afrikaners will yield or retreat if enough pressure is exerted on them. This is naive and unrealistic. The Afrikaners will not retreat for the most compelling reason that they have nowhere to retreat to. They are not temporary sojourners in Africa with real homes in some far-off land across the sea. After more than three centuries the Afrikaners are firmly established as a nation of Africa with their roots deep in the soil for which they fought two bitter anti-colonial wars.

This nation is not going to disappear in thin air. People who cultivate that expectation are not promoting the much desired peace in that part of the world. Instead, by whipping up black nationalisms against the whites, they are creating the climate for a violent confrontation of conflicting cultures.

What is at stake for the Afrikaner is nothing less than . . .survival.

What is at stake for the Afrikaner is nothing less than his survival. If that is threatened, he will defend it with all the means at his disposal, with dire implications far beyond the borders of southern Africa.

No solution offers any hope if it endeavors to bypass the immovable object of white African nationalism. And no lasting peace can be achieved if it is not built on an understanding of Afrikaner history and the complexities of South Africa's plural society.

Even if world opinion refuses to accept this fact of life, it must recognize the grim symbolism to be found in the story of Samson who, in the process of being destroyed, flexed his muscles one last time, and brought the walls of the temple thundering down on his destroyers.

The Missing Nieman

by William Montalbano

Heriberto Kahn had lived too long at the razor's edge. He knew too much. He wrote it too forthrightly. In Buenos Aires, his home and his love, Kahn's life was forfeit.

The stature of an elf masked the courage of a lion. Against mindless violence, that is not defense enough. Argentina's savagery-to-nowhere would one day claim Heriberto Kahn. That seemed certain.

Kahn's Nieman for 1976-77 came as doubly good news. In repairing an intolerable oversight—there had never been a Latin American Nieman—Harvard had chosen the best. Kahn was accustomed to being first. At Harvard he would be as much of a pioneer as he had been in Argentina.

The other Niemans would repair jangled nerves, absorb, think. Kahn would do that too. But it would be different for him. Luxury beckoned. In Cambridge, for the first time in years, Heriberto Kahn would go to bed with a reasonable certainty that no intruder would come in the night to kill him.

On a fine November day in Buenos Aires, when Isabel Peron still sat in the presidency and tumult built around her, Kahn came later than usual to lunch.

"Funny the kinds of things people say about you in Argentina these days," he said with the wry twist of humor that never deserted him, even when he was frightened, even at the end.

Kahn tossed onto the table a message clipped from newspaper headlines, a word at a time, straight from a bad old movie.

"Rusito, comunista, judio, estás muerto . . . AAA."

"Little Russian, Communist, Jew, you are dead . . . AAA."

It was Kahn's second death threat in as many weeks. The first had come in a right-wing Peronist magazine under the heading "the best enemy is a dead enemy." Probably only Kahn himself knew how many times he was threatened. If he took a particular threat seriously, he would fuss loudly; to the congress, the government, the armed forces, the police; even when reason told him the threat had originated within the ranks of the agencies to which he protested.

Sometimes he would write about the threats. It was his way, a newspaperman's way, of fighting back. Sometimes, when the tensions were particularly high, he would sleep in a different place every night, vary his schedule. But he was the only number one target in Argentina to eschew protection. He would not flee. He did not employ a bodyguard. He carried no gun. Words in print were his sanctuary. They were the only refuge Heriberto Kahn would seek.

There is one direct way of explaining why death stalked Heriberto Kahn: He was to Argentina what Woodward and Bernstein were to the United States. He challenged the unchallengeable. The difference is that the United States has its rules of the game and Argentina has its rules. In Argentina, letters to the editor are delivered by machine gun.

In the past few years, political violence has claimed more than one thousand lives a year. That is the official figure. It includes a dozen newsmen, including at least two of Heriberto Kahn's colleagues at the newspaper *La Opinion*. It is hardly a comprehensive count.

The spirit world in which Heriberto Kahn worked, bizarre and deadly in equal measure, is difficult to understand for anyone who has not experienced it. Argentina is a land of immense wealth and seemingly limitless possibility. It is the only country in Latin America where all major national problems are man-made.

Sometimes he would write about the [death] threats. It was his way, a newspaperman's way, of fighting back.

The man who made more than his share was named Juan Domingo Peron. He ruled Argentina from 1946, when it was one of the richest countries in the world, until 1955, when it was bankrupt. For nearly 18 years he lived as a supreme conspirator in opulent exile. His improbable and uncomprehensible maneuvering lent new meaning to words like fantastic, incredible, tragic, and comic opera. In the end Argentina summoned Peron home for another orgy—more hate, unprecedented violence and corruption, renewed national penury.

When Lazarus came back he brought with him wife Isabel, an ambitious one-time cabaret dancer of grade school education and intelligence. He also brought a one-time police corporal and bodyguard who had become a trusted friend, a confidant, an advisor, and the Peron family astrologer. His name was Jose Lopez Rega.

Peron, a master at seeming all things to all people, won election easily in 1973 as President. Isabel was his Vice President, chosen as a running mate less

Mr. Montalbano, Nieman Fellow '70, is Latin America correspondent for the Miami Herald.

for her skill in statesmanship than because she was the only Argentine Peron seemed to trust. Lopez Rega moved into the palace with them.

When Juan Peron died on July 1, 1974, Isabel became *La Presidente*, the first woman president in the Western Hemisphere. The government was hers in name. Lopez Rega ruled as Peron's *de facto* heir.

Lopez Rega manipulated and dominated the shrill, unstable, inept Mrs. Peron. He progressed in breathless pursuit of wealth and power as smoothly as though it had been stars-

[Argentina] is the only country in Latin America where all major national problems are man-made.

ordained. Peron left a vacuum. Lopez Rega filled it with Isabel as his foil. To spearhead his conquest, Lopez Rega created the Triple A, a killers' band of current and former policemen. They patrolled the streets in Ford Falcons without license plates, dispatching in ritualistic murder those "subversives" —the term enjoyed wondrously broad definition—who had roused the ire of Señor Lopez Rega.

We know all this because Heriberto Kahn put it in the paper. In a series of scoops, one after another, bedrock solid, Kahn described the cancer of an unproclaimed dictator. Every morning's *La Opinion* became a great new adventure in audacity. With the noble exception of the *Buenos Aires Herald*, Argentina's gallant English-language daily, the rest of the Argentine press watched in mute apprehension at first, waiting for the axe to fall. Finally, Heriberto Kahn's aria grew to a national chorus: Lopez Rega fled to Europe, millions in his pocket and his tail between his legs. Mrs. Peron's nominal presidency survived him by nine tumultuous months. Heriberto Kahn chronicled her death throes.

Kahn had a great reporter's knack of inspiring trust in a nation where trust is not lightly given. He stood just over five feet and weighed little more than 100 pounds. He had a plan, Kahn used to joke, for the night the Triple A came pounding at his door. He would appear in his pajamas and politely explain that his father was not home. Indeed, people meeting him for the first time would occasionally inquire if he were the son of the famous Heriberto Kahn of *La Opinion*.

Kahn developed the best sources in Argentina. He had them at all levels and of every stripe. In a society where journalism is another name for politics, Kahn etched a new dimension. Argentines came gradually to understand that Kahn had no personal political philosophy to advance. He was interested in facts. If the facts were critical of the Peronists, so be it. If they did not reflect well on the military, that was all right too. For Argentina, that was a novel concept. Although Kahn infuriated his sources regularly, he never lost one. Generals and labor leaders alike excoriated him for backing the other side. He would listen patiently, mine some nuggets from the aftermath of anger and wander off about a reporter's business.

We met last March on the day after the military had deposed Mrs. Peron. Working hard, I had assembled a good picture of the behind-the-scenes maneuvering. He talked. I had a biplane. Kahn had the Concorde. He gave me everything he had, which was just like him. I took it all, which is not like me. I am the kind of reporter who keeps a mental file on the guys who can beat him. I study them, the way an ondeck hitter will record the mood, rhythm, and pattern of the pitcher, looking for a flaw, waiting for a secret. My study of Heriberto Kahn concluded with distress and realism. In Argentina, Heriberto Kahn could beat me seven days of any week he chose.

Soon after the *coup* Heriberto Kahn fell ill. His knee hurt. He felt weak. He needed an operation on his knee, the doctors said. Usually the surgeon operated on injured soccer heroes. Kahn thought it was funny when the surgeon told him he had never seen a less athletic knee.

Before long he was in pain all the time. The doctors said he also suffered the lingering effects of malaria he never knew about, or perhaps he was troubled by a congenital cellular malfunction. Maybe the doctors didn't know. Maybe they simply never told him.

In mid-September, Kahn talked an afternoon away with his friend Bob Cox, the editor of the *Buenos Aires Herald*.

In a society where journalism is another name for politics, Kahn etched a new dimension.

"We talked about the future. He was as interested as ever in politics—and almost as knowledgeable as he was when he was courted by ambassadors wanting to know what was going on," Cox wrote. "We talked of his Nieman and how his wife Monica and young daughter Alejandra would go with him to Harvard. I even asked him if he would like to write some think pieces for me, but he said his first loyalty lay with his own newspaper."

A week later, when he should have been furnishing an apartment in Cambridge, discovering the stacks of Widener, witnessing the beauty of the New England autumn, Heriberto Kahn died in Buenos Aires. The doctors said it was tubercular meningitis. He was 31.

BOOKS

Body, Mind, Behavior

by Maggie Scarf

(The New Republic Book Company, Inc.; $9.95)

Why do human beings behave the way they do? What are the biological, social, psychiatric, and anthropological reasons for their actions?

This book is an examination of the variety of approaches that have been taken to answer that question. Or, as Maggie Scarf says in her introduction, it is about "the behaving human being."

It is not an organized approach to the subject. The twenty articles in this book are an eclectic ramble through the fields of sociology, psychiatry, psychology, ethics, anthropology, and related areas. Their single link is that most of them are about work going on at the frontier of each discipline.

Other than that, there is no single viewpoint, no logical progression of time or subject matter. Simply, the articles are a sampling of whatever subjects happened to strike Maggie Scarf's fancy during the first eight years of her career as a free-lance behavioral science writer.

And so the subject matter, originally published in The New York Times Magazine, Cosmopolitan, McCall's, and Redbook, is about:

The hangover, its cause (unknown) and cure (time); the infant field of sleep research, and the diagnosis and treatment of sleep disorders; the ethical issues surrounding fetal research and the question of when a fetus becomes a person; well-known "maverick" psychiatrists like Thomas Szasz, author of *The Myth of Mental Illness*; the origins of emotions like fear and anger; new therapies for mental illness; Transcendental Meditation; attempts to control human behavior through electrical stimulation to the brain.

— And other things. It's a pleasant and sometimes fascinating ramble. Scarf has no obvious axes to grind, she has a solid understanding of the subjects she writes about, and she writes well, aside from some mildly irritating habits of style (an awful lot of people she interviews "shrug" in response to one or more questions. Do people really shrug that much?).

Scarf's didactic method is the same in almost all the stories. She takes the reader along on her researches, and describes and explains the subject as it is explained to her. The chapter on behavior modification opens with Scarf lying on the marble floor of a psychologist's office, learning to relax her muscles and her mind. Her portrait of psychiatrist and sometime cult figure R. D. Laing ends with a description of him in her kitchen after an interview, his arms filled with fruit that he has taken from her refrigerator, apples and oranges bounding over the floor.

Some of her most absorbing articles have little to do with actual clinical research. "On Anger" describes our present understanding of the origins and importance of that emotion and of the curious things that humans do to suppress or express it. There is an illuminating description of the tricks people use to disguise their anger in order to "disarm" their victims and render them less able to retaliate in kind. The "appeaser" who begins, "I think for your own sake you ought to know . . .", the "helpless" individual who makes his victim's angry response seem inappropriate with his pathetic, "I'm glad you're so happy with your new house and car, and I guess now you don't have time to visit your father and mother."

And there is "Terror in the City," a portrait of a young woman who lives in fear in New York City, who walks the streets with a concealed billy club tied to her wrist, always on guard, always afraid, always on the brink of disaster.

Articles like that don't easily become outdated. Unfortunately, other kinds of articles do.

For example, the description of Joseph Delgado's brain research and his attempts to locate the sources of aggression, and other emotions in various parts of the brain, and his suggestion that aggression and other "unwanted" behaviors could be controlled by electrical stimulation of the brain via permanently-implanted electrodes. The article, written in 1970, makes no mention of the subsequent debate over whether aggression and anti-social activity are really "diseases" caused by specific malfunctioning brain cells; of the court cases that later arose over attempts to test Delgado's theory on patients confined in hospitals for the criminally insane. It's not that the information in the article is no longer correct, but that the issues have expanded and become more complex.

Why do human beings behave the way they do? What are the biological, social, psychiatric, and anthropological reasons for their actions?

The articles are still valuable as easy-to-read introductions to behavioral science and as descriptions of the scientific frontiers of the past several years. But the reader should remember that frontiers are transient, and that descriptions of them usually end up by being profiles more of what was, than of what is.

— Dolores J. Katz

A Time to Die
by Tom Wicker
(Quadrangle/New York Times Book Company; $10)

Caged:
Eight Prisoners and Their Keepers
by Ben H. Bagdikian
(Harper & Row, Publishers; $12.95

In a dozen years as a journalist, I have done a lot of writing about prisons, usually because of circumstance, not preference. I spent most of those years near what I considered one of the worst prisons: Parchman, in Mississippi.

Since then, I've toured prisons in a half-dozen other states, from Louisiana to Maine, talking to the officials who run them and the inmates who inhabit them.

I've reached an unsettling conclusion, based on that reporting and writing: When we lock guards and inmates in prison, and in effect suspend the laws that govern how men treat one another, we turn both groups into animals.

Before a person can go to prison, society has provided a sequence of procedural safeguards to make it unlikely that any great injustice will be done: strict rules governing search and arrest procedures, right to counsel, to fair jury selection, to appeal. But when those prison doors clang shut, justice stays outside.

Tom Wicker, writing about an uprising at Attica state prison in New York, and Ben Bagdikian, writing about a strike at Lewisburg federal prison in Pennsylvania, do a chillingly thorough job of recreating the injustice and inhumanity that characterize American prisons. Behind bars, justice is what the government — represented by the guards and prison officials — wants it to be. The government's agents secure it by intimidation, violence — even homicide, in some cases. And seldom do the decent men who run the prisons, or we decent citizens whom they serve, intervene.

Brother Flip Crowley, quoted by Wicker, expressed it well. He was convicted of armed robbery. "I did it, I'm in here for doing it," he told Wicker. "Fair and square, no complaint. Paying my debt to The Man. But, brother, you got to understand that's just the way it *ought* to be, not the way it *is*. That Man is committing crimes against me every day I'm here. And nobody's saying shit about that."

Brother Flip listed the crimes committed against him and his fellow inmates: getting beaten, being robbed and ripped off, given swill to eat, cheated out of what were only slave wages to begin with, thrown in the box with no chance to argue or appeal, buggered without anyone raising a finger to stop it.

Bagdikian describes similar crimes the government permits — even commits — against its wards. He tells how an associate warden at Lewisburg instructed an inmate on the facts of prison life: "When the judge raps that gavel down on you, boy, you lose all your rights. Anything you get after that is a gift."

Lewisburg in effect had no rules except those the prison officials chose to enforce. A prisoner knew he had broken a rule when he was punished for it. Ignorance was no defense. If an independent investigation found no truth to the charge, the prisoner's innocence was taken into consideration by prison officials and he usually received a lighter punishment, one associate warden told a federal judge; but when a prison official said an inmate was guilty, the inmate was more severely punished.

The Wicker and Bagdikian books are invaluable contributions to our understanding of the inhumane and insane institutions to which we send offenders to be "rehabilitated." Journalists, especially, should read them. Not simply because they are sensitive and well-written, although of course they are. And not just because they show the injustice and malevolence at two prisons, and the official attitudes that permit it, although they do.

Journalists should read the books because they describe what's going on today in every prison I know anything about—and, I say with little fear of error, in every prison near you as you read this.

I am no soft-hearted patsy for an inmate's tearful story. Far from it. My experience has been that virtually everybody in prison is there after a fair trial because he is guilty as charged. With rare exceptions, prisoners chose to commit crimes, and they should be punished for them—rehabilitated, too, if that's possible, but punished for sure. Although I think we send far too many lawbreakers to prison when some other punishment would do more good, and we keep most of them behind bars far too long, I believe justice requires punishment for wrongdoing.

That punishment, however, is supposed to be only loss of freedom, not denial of human rights. The principles of simple justice should apply inside the walls as well as outside. But they do not.

You don't have to go to Attica or Lewisburg to find that out. Go to the prison nearest you. Or come with me to a prison less than a fifteen-minute drive from my office. I can show you an inmate who is now threatened with an additional month behind bars for barking like a dog as a truckload of dogs passed by. Since a prison employee was driving the truck, officials considered it "showing disrespect toward a state official." Disrespectful barking. For that he could spend a month of his life behind bars. Would any court send a free man to jail for a month on that charge? No, but prison administrators can keep a man there for it.

... When those prison doors clang shut, justice stays outside.

Or I can take you to Central Prison in Raleigh, a 92-year-old edifice so crowded that 10 men occupy a 15-by-15 room in which a bare lightbulb burns all night because, as one occupant explained, "the roaches would eat you up if you turned it off." The prison is so crowded, says Warden Sam Garrison, that officials have only "perimeter control." Inside, inmates are at the mercy of other inmates, many of them hardened felons jammed together in open dormitories where the young and weak are fresh meat for the tough guys.

The best gauge of a person's true character comes when he holds absolute power over others. The same is true of a nation. Regarding slavery, Thomas Jefferson once remarked, "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just." My trips to America's prisons have aroused similar trembling in me. Read what Wicker and Bagdikian have written and you'll feel it, too.

— Edwin N. Williams

The Messenger's Motives: Ethical Problems of the News Media

by John L. Hulteng

(Prentice-Hall; $4.95)

John L. Hulteng has undertaken that unenviable task—one more look at the ethics of America's mass media. He doesn't dally much with broad philosophical considerations, disposing of these with a few pages. From there we march through a number of troublesome ethical issues—such questions as press junkets, the perils of PR, instances of bad taste, deceptive editing, absentee ownership, dubious use of photos, and, of course, William Loeb. (Press critics would have to invent Mr. Loeb if he didn't exist.)

A Nieman Fellow in the class of 1950, Hulteng is Dean of the University of Oregon's Journalism School and a frequent commentator on press issues. All told, *The Messenger's Motives* comes off very well. Hulteng is blessed with a sense of humor, an easy writing style, a willingness to name the bad guys, an obvious distaste for windy abstractions, and a clear dedication to a good press. He provides a bucketful of press faults, but not in a preachy fashion. And he is an optimist.

Not surprisingly, he has few tidy answers. He puts this well in closing chapter nine: "It is frustrating for the reader, I know, to find the subject we are discussing slipping away elusively just as some sharp, clear benchmarks seem to be emerging. But that is exactly the problem of journalistic ethics, and that is why so extended a discussion is necessary, case by perplexing case. For it is in the instances that come up day by day that ethical principles meet their ultimate tests." In other words, the price of a good press is eternal vigilance.

Hulteng is especially sensitive to the use and misuse of language—demonstrating how, for example, one or two little words can stack the deck. He chides one publication that allegedly promotes its favorites by having them speak "warmly" or "with a happy grin," while "those out of favor respond 'curtly' or 'flushed with anger.' " Such deck-stacking, of course, can be done with malice. But it can also be a pitfall of the trade—which is amusingly (and innocently, no doubt) demonstrated by the author himself. He describes the recent Florida case in which a political candidate, feeling himself abused by the *Miami Herald*, unearthed an old statute requiring the paper to print rebuttals. At this point Hulteng does not write that the aggrieved man "went" to the *Herald*. Rather, he "trotted down" to the *Herald* office. The reader is left with the impression that the man was a crank, charlatan, or worse.

Most readers will probably nod in agreement with the majority of Hulteng's ethical judgments. Yet some might take exception to his strong criticism of the press in the "late stages" of Watergate, a section he entitles "With Malice for One . . ." (deck-stacking?). After all, if we cannot label Nixon a criminal (by virtue of the Ford pardon), we can note without fear of libel that a House committee found that he abused his sacred trust and that the disgraced President is a self-admitted liar.

. . . It is in the instances that come up day by day that ethical principles meet their ultimate tests.

Introductions or prefaces usually make dull reading. But they often help with that vital question: should I read this book? Hulteng has no introduction, but on page three he offers his hope that a clearer understanding of ethical problems will result in a "wider adherence to responsible standards" by journalists and an "enhanced respect for the media among the consuming public." Later (p. 228) he describes his work as "devoted largely to an examination of cases involving ethical shortfalls of one degree or another" and to the "wide range of problems and decisions the journalist is expected to face and resolve with the urgent deadline limits of the working day."

None of these quotes is likely to move *The Messenger's Motives* to the top of reading lists of seasoned, busy, and (presumably) ethical journalists. Fortunately, in the closing pages, Hulteng provides the essential clue: "It is evident that a case book such as this one would have been all but impossible to put together without generous reliance on such in-house monitors as *Nieman Reports* and *Columbia Journalism Review*." In short, if you've followed these reviews and steadily absorbed the writings of Bagdikian, Witcover, Rivers,

Epstein, *et al.*, then Hulteng's book will sound overly familiar. If you haven't, then it should be a treat and a "quick-read" about a lot of good material. This, of course, is another way of saying that *The Messenger's Motives* would make a first-rate introduction to down-to-earth ethical issues for college students or others about to take the journalistic plunge.

Finally, "alternative" journalism adherents will doubtless find this work disappointing—or worse. If I understand Mr. Hulteng correctly, he does not dismiss them as wrong so much as irrelevant. He is, in brief, a hard-core believer in objective journalism—and let's have no nonsense.

— Donald W. Klein

Assault on the Media: The Nixon Years

by William E. Porter

(University of Michigan Press; $11.95)

We are awash in Watergate books. In William E. Porter's *Assault on the Media*, he claims that "for the most part" the "Watergate affair is outside the scope of this study." Yet Watergate must be seen on two levels, as J. Anthony Lukas demonstrated in his masterful and insufficiently heralded book, *Nightmare*. There is the "narrow" Watergate, which was, in fact, a third-rate burglary. The second is the "broad" Watergate, that is, the entire five-plus years of Nixon's administration, which devoted so much time, energy, and money to the destruction of various malefactors—the media, of course, being one of them. Porter deals with the broad Watergate, but as his title indicates, the media are his main focus.

Porter, who teaches journalism at the University of Michigan, has a solid framework. The opening chapter, on Nixon's attitude toward the press (and vice versa), is followed by five chapters chronologically covering the Nixon years, an assessment of the "assault," and, finally, "documents of significance."

Porter's *Assault* is not an assault in the sense that Nixon and Company are merely fair game in what is now, after all, a fairly easy hunt. The author is more subtle and perceptive. The first chapter, for example, reminds us that presidential-press relations have always been testy to one degree or another. But didn't Nixon always have bad press relations? Not so, says Porter. In a few pages he dents the conventional wisdom that dates the bad relations all the way back to the famous Nixon-Jerry Voorhis campaign for a House seat in 1946. There was some "Eastern establishment press" hostility dating from then, but for the most part it was favorable, neutral, or simply indifferent. One is stunned, in fact, to read this head in *The Washington Post* (of all papers) on the day following the famed 1948 Hiss-Chambers "pumpkin papers" story: **NIXON CONSIDERED RESTRAINING INFLUENCE ON OFTEN-SPECTACULAR HOUSE COMMITTEE,** plus an accompanying photograph of Nixon captioned "Truth-seeker"!

The major portion of Porter's book is a case-by-case, chronological account of Nixon's unending confrontation with the media. Large chunks of this may be too familiar to engage many readers in the mid-1970s. But as time wears on, and the facts dim in our minds, this will serve as an information mine that will be tapped time and again.

The best part is the long, thoughtful, and balanced final chapter which assesses the overall impact. A bit surprisingly, Porter does not see the effects as solely negative. He notes, for example, a "new willingness to admit error" by the press, with the accompanying growth of press ombudsmen and similar self-correcting devices. Yet too much should not be made of the "positive" responses. For the most part this closing chapter is darkly pessimistic, fully in keeping with Porter's earlier statement that Nixon's assault damaged the "media and the cause of free expression" as in "no other stretch of time."

The media... have not paid heed to some self-destructing situations.

Porter's assessment goes over such familiar ground as the "chilling" effect and the press credibility problem. But he is perhaps best in describing and assessing the legal implications. His lucid discussion of legal issues, utterly devoid of lawyers' jargon, will endear Porter to many readers. He writes convincingly, for example, that the Supreme Court decision on the Pentagon Papers was anything but a clear-cut press victory.

But if, for whatever reasons, the media have inaugurated some self-correcting devices, they have not paid heed to some self-destructing situations. Reviewing, for example, two 1971 Baton Rouge press cases*—both with ominous implications for the press—Porter notes the poor media coverage, documenting again "the willingness of vast institutions to contribute to their own destruction." He also rightly notes that the William Farr case received fairly substantial coverage mainly because it was linked to the sensational Charles Manson murders. But similar and equally important cases "received little more than local mention, as the media let themselves be nudged, almost without protest, down the path

*In these cases, two reporters were cited for contempt by a U.S District Court for printing trial testimony—even though this testimony was given in open court. In 1972, the Court of Appeals declared the lower court's action to be unconstitutional, but ruled that the newspapers should have obeyed it until the appeal procedure was completed. Further, it allowed the contempt citation to stand. A year later, the Supreme Court refused to review the case.

of suppression by institutional authority."

My own impressions coincide with Porter's. It always seems that stories about reporters trying to protect their sources, for instance, are buried on page 43 of the second section—even if jail bars and a striped suit await them.

Porter also deals briefly with the impact on the smaller papers. Or, as he might have put it, has all the fuss and bother been confined mainly to Michael Novak's "supercultural seven" (CBS, *The New York Times*, *Time*, etc.)? Or has it filtered down to the smaller papers? Rather than answering this enormously complex question, Porter turns over his pages to Robert Boyle of the Pottstown (Pa.) *Mercury*. Boyle's article originally appeared on *The New York Times'* Op-Ed page on March 24, 1973, under the title "Big Time Pressures, Smalltown Press." Boyle's piece, in the best tradition of Tom Paine, begins: "The bee stings in Washington and the pain is felt in Pottstown, too." It is, as the saying goes, worth the price of admission.

The documents at the end of the book consist of a few court decisions, speeches by Agnew and Clay Whitehead, and, most valuably, a flock of juicy (and frightening, even in retrospect) memoranda from Nixon aides (Haldeman, Magruder, Higby, et al.) which, in the sordid language of the Nixon White House, might well be entitled "how to shaft the press."

Porter did not index these memoranda. That's too bad, because for all of Porter's sprightly prose (sample: "Agnew took again to the provinces with lance and thesaurus"), nothing can quite capture the words of the Magruders of the world. They shouldn't be lost to posterity for the lack of an index, a shortcoming that can be corrected if this worthy book comes out in paperback.

— **D.W.K.**

Notes on Book Reviewers

Dolly Katz, medical reporter with the *Detroit Free Press,* is a Nieman Fellow in the current class.

Donald W. Klein, a China Watcher in the political science department at Tufts University, is also a Press Watcher.

Edwin N. Williams, Nieman Fellow '73, is editor of the editorial page at the *Observer*, Charlotte, North Carolina. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1972-73, and spent several months as a consultant for the Correctional Information Service, a study of prisons financed by the Ford Foundation.

(Editor's Note: The following is a statement of the mission of Nieman Reports, a quarterly founded by the Society of Nieman Fellows in 1947. The statement was written by Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Foundation from 1939 to 1964, and Chairman of the Society of Nieman Fellows, in his book, *Reporting the News.* This is a Belknap Press Book, published by the Harvard University Press in 1965.)

"It is intended to publish a quarterly about newspapering by newspapermen, to include reports and articles and stories about the newspaper business, newspaper people and newspaper stories.

". . . It has no pattern, formula or policy, except to seek to serve the purpose of the Nieman Foundation 'to promote the standards of journalism in America . . .'

". . . It was the one place a speech or lecture could be published, and, if important enough, published in full. To provide full texts, if significant, was accepted as one of its functions."