Nieman Reports

September 1966

Nieman Reports

VOL. XX, NO. 3 SEPTEMBER 1966

Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor
Mary Ann Pratt, Managing Editor

Published quarterly by the Society of Nieman Fellows from 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138. Subscription $3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

The Pressures of News

By Louis M. Lyons

The press is a very human institution. It has all the dimensions and variables of human nature. The notions about it of anyone who has lived in, on, by, for and with the press are bound to be very subjective. So anything I offer you will take as one man's views.

But the press is also a very strategic institution on which we all depend for our day to day information of what is going on that concerns us about our public affairs.

Gertrude Stein once told a Nieman Fellow: "The journalist is too immediate to be immediate." This describes also a condition of all of us—the whole society in this age of communications. We are geared to rapid action and reaction. Reflection takes longer.

A recent book is called *"The New Front Page"* by Prof. Hohenberg of Columbia. Making use of the best of contemporary journalism, the entries for Pulitzer awards of the last few years, he makes the point that the pressures and complexity of our times—its tempo—have put new demands on the journalist, require indeed a new breed of journalist, equipped to deal with a world that has expanded explosively in all its dimensions. And the newspaper, on its front page, is called upon to put this expanding revolutionary world into some sort of perspective every day. It taxes reader as well as reporter, to keep up with the score, to be able to feel any sense of security that he knows what is really going on in the world he has to live in and cope with.

The Times of London has turned its front page to news and put inside the classified small ads that have been its outside format for 181 years. This breakthrough of the last static stronghold of journalistic restraint suggests the pressure of news, the urgency of information in the tempo of our times.

The first national magazine award announced the other day, to *Look Magazine,* is for their journalistic quality—notably their handling of the racial issue.

This is another dimension of journalism. Magazines generally have become more topical, exploring contemporary events, somewhat more selectively and in more depth than the Sunday newspaper review of the week.

Jack Fischer of *Harper's* once told the Nieman Fellows he was grateful to the newspapers for leaving so much to the magazines. But the magazine has time for perspective and analysis and background. Its increasing concern with current issues adds depth to our reporting.

Fred Friendly's resignation from CBS that made a nine-day sensation in the communication world was over the refusal of the network management to continue carrying a live broadcast of an all-day hearing on foreign relations. As news director he felt it compulsive to turn over the whole network program to the immediacy of such important news as concerned the adequacy of our foreign policy and whether the Viet Nam War was in our national interest.

Friendly lost his case but he raised the point whether television was failing its journalistic responsibility.

The elements of news, the factors in communication, are a very mixed bag. Leaving out for the moment the pressures of advertising and the subtleties of public relations, we have clichés about the nature of news itself, and, as is the effect of clichés, these have tended to fix and retain certain old grooves. Newspapermen used to say the surefire elements of news are conflict, money and sex. Too many still do. This rule is based on human instincts and curiosity. In an open society and a press uninhibited by authority, such news is the easiest and safest. Crime news rolls off the police blotter. It has only to be picked up, and

(continued on page 18)

History in the (Deliberate) Making: A Challenge to Modern Journalism

By Gene Graham

On August 1, 1965, a Sunday, the Atlanta bureau of Associated Press put on its national wire photo circuits a picture taken that morning outside a church in Americus, Georgia, population 13,472.

It is a remarkable picture. Kneeling in the foreground at the foot of eight steps leading to a landing in front of the church, backs to the camera, are five or six figures. All appear to be praying.

Halfway up the steps, arms folded sternly across his chest, his mouth set in a thin, firm line, stands a single bespectacled man of middle age. Behind him on the concrete landing at the head of the steps, I count nine other men ranging in age from perhaps 25 to 45. Several of them also appear to be praying; their heads are bowed. Together, the group facing camera forms a wall of flesh which the caption tells us was erected to bar the four kneelers from entrance to the church that Sunday morning.

It is indeed a memorable picture—for several reasons.

The vertical composition, split level, seems to symbolize the split level of moral-religious values being acted out before our eyes. I do not intend to judge those values here, if I could. It is probably sufficient to say that I am barely familiar enough with The Book to understand there are certain injunctions therein against the behavior of both groups. The second chapter of James begins with a few harsh words for those who play favorites in seating visitors to their solemn assemblies, and the sixth chapter of Matthew is quite specific about those who pray "at the street corners that they may be seen of men."

Here, then, one obviously has one of those situations from which he may pick his prejudice by multiple choice and feel justified by the alleged sins of the others. You may take *your* pick, then, while I dismiss the moral issues of this particular civil rights demonstration, or the whole movement indeed, so that its implication might be more objectively examined from a professional point of view.

The Contrived Incident

One need not be lacking in sympathy for a cause to understand its mechanics and by now almost everyone is surely aware that the major motive of any demonstration is to be seen of men, many men, and hence to arouse sympathy for the cause, whether it be voting rights in Selma or disengagement in South Viet Nam. In fact the motive is implied, if not spelled out, in the very meaning of the word "demonstration."

Though the precise ritual preceding such a demonstration may not have been followed in Americus that morning, since this Southern Georgia city had been through a long series of voting rights demonstrations and one major tragedy before this picture was taken, the general procedure is quite well known to newsmen today.

To obtain the desired effect, demonstrators must first make certain of the attendance of "the media," and newsphotographers representing the wire services and the local affiliates of the large national TV networks are particularly solicited.

The effect, after its repetition so many times over the past several years, is still a bit stunning to witness, even to veterans. In Americus, four people knelt while the cameras performed their function and by breakfast the next morning, millions had contemplated the barring of a church door to people because of their skin color. Because religion and morals were so directly involved, this particularly dramatic picture won unusually good play. Many saw it more than once. I am quite sure it was, a full week later, still receiving due attention in American pulpits.

We will not belabor the point, for every college student knows the technique by now. I say they do. Last spring, after calling news photographers and TV cameramen, two or three young men on the campus of the University of Illinois proceeded to burn their membership cards in the Young Democrats Club. The pictures and message got around and I'm not sure, but I believe this may have been the origin of the more serious rash of draft card burnings around the country—each, of course, in contrived view of the camera's eye.

Again we have three or four people, by utilizing the mass media, capturing the attention of 300 or 400 millions.

Pseudo-Event or Propaganda?

This sort of contrived occurrence is what Daniel Boorstin calls the pseudo-event. I take some exceptions to Boorstin but, in *The Image,* he has written an important book. His major shortcoming, I think, was trying a bit too hard to introduce a new term into the vocabulary. His strained effort, therefore, makes about everything that happens counterfeit or illusory except the strike of chance lightning. Like the late Rachel Carson, who was so worried in *Silent Spring* about the unbalancing of nature, Mr. Boorstin seems to overlook the Sixth Day, i.e. that the ultimate act of God was the creation of man. And man was, maybe unfortunately, given the power to unbalance Miss Carson's nature or to contrive Mr. Boorstin's events. This makes a man-made event or invention no less genuine than lightning, however, and his human nature no less a part of nature than the boll weevil.

> "We need not be theologians to see that we have shifted responsibility for making the world interesting from God to the newspaperman," Professor Boorstin observes.

Oh, come now, doctor. God made newspapermen, too! And the events they sometimes contrive, or have contrived upon them through use of their trade tools, are as real as the March on Washington or the tragic death of the young man slain in Americus, Ga. just a few days before this picture was taken.

Put another way, man was given enough kernels to *create* the mass media and it should not come as a complete surprise that he has now also discovered he is endowed with enough to climb up on this new housetop and holler when he wants to be seen of other men.

The difference is simply a matter of wider scope and new technique. The device—propaganda—is precisely the same despite Mr. Boorstin's pseudoish efforts to draw a distinct line between his verbal invention and plain, old-fashioned propaganda:

> "Propaganda . . . is information intentionally biased. Its effect depends primarily on its emotional appeal," writes Mr. Boorstin. "A pseudo-event is an ambiguous truth; propaganda an appealing falsehood."

He cites *Mein Kampf,* and one must confess that propaganda has taken on a latter day Hitler-Goebbels connotations. But *Mein Webster's* says the word still springs from "propagate" and means "any organized or concerted group effort or movement to spread particular doctrines, information, etc.—a plan for the propagation of a doctrine or system of principles." Few pseudo-events fail to meet this measure.

Past History Deliberately Made

Pseudo or contrived, there is nothing really new in "history in the deliberate making" by propaganda of course. And there is surely nothing new about newspapers and other vehicles of communication being involved in the process up to the neckline.

The late A. M. Schlesinger Senior's *Prelude to Independence: the Newspaper War on Britain,* 1764-1776 suggests that taxation-without-representation demonstrations against the Stamp act, terms of which fell rather heavily upon newspapers, may have been a bit more than spontaneous outbreaks by an enraged populace. And I have always suspected there was something contrived about the Boston Tea Party. Some cynics, moreover, have even implied that the saintly Abe Lincoln may not have made it up from "The Land Of" had it not been for the newsplay Horace Greeley gave the log house divided. The pragmatic Emancipation Proclamation, of course, since it was announced in a handout contrived to keep Great Britain out of the war, was simply a pseudo-event.

Unkind historians, moreover, have also been terribly insulting to newsmen by referring to the Spanish-American as Hearst's War. More lately, I have heard of references to Vietnam as Halberstam's War. But since Dave has been reassigned by *The New York Times* to Poland, married a capitalist-type movie star and gotten himself kicked out for Un-Communist Activities, I no longer hear that line from Buckley, Rusher and the John Birch Society. It is now, by the way, either Lyndon's War or McNamara's. Poor Dean Rusk seldom gets any pseudo-credit.

No, I am afraid history deliberately made—events contrived to be seen of men—is all too old since the evidence clearly points to its pre-dating the Sermon on the Mount.

Overspeed, Oversize, Overkill

Three new elements in the sophistication of the old arts of propaganda and history making are largely responsible for the problems and concerns we now encounter. To continue the biblical analogy, one might term these new patches on an old wineskin and label them overspeed, oversize and overkill.

The tremendous speedup of propaganda in an age that has sped its weapons delivery ability to matching degree obviously suggests grave dangers. Overspeed. And while the time lag between contrived event and message delivery has narrowed to near zero, the audience has exploded to include a world peopled by the disciples of Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, Sukarno or some now unknown prince in some outlandish principality where next the spider deigns to walk. Oversize. *Moreover, all these disciples can be overkilled by an oversize bomb oversped to the scene where some overemotive response has been triggered by some overblown event contrived to be seen of men.*

It is not really surprising, in such circumstances, if draft cards burned by two or three conscientious young men can stir Hanoi or a sanctuary blocked to four kneeling figures can roil the same-colored emotions of Ghana.

Newsmen live exceptionally close to this reality—much closer, I think, than any other group in the world, possibly excepting key public figures. Though traditionally quick to bridle at a hint of censorship and the first to demand the freest and fullest expression, we are a bit terrified by reality's implications, I believe.

Newsmen understand that only a tiny band eye-witnessed the first Buddhist monk's ghastly suicide. In fact, they probably constituted the largest single group present. There was a reason. They were called. And one of them duly recorded this contrived, but very real, event for the whole, wide world to view in horror and to re-view for many months to come.

Government Made

Newsmen know that not only private groups and individuals, but governments—our own included—today are adept at mounting the mass media housetop, there to act out a contrived incident in the quest to be seen of men, which in turn is intended for the larger purpose of shaping history. For example.

> "It is to serve the convenience of the President, not the convenience of the press," Bill Moyers has said, "that Presidential press conferences are held."

There are few higher housetops in today's world, and one begins to wonder, after a while, where the convenience of the *public* is served in the whole affair.

This is particularly true when cases arise, as in the Dominican affair, where government mouths pour sheer fantasy into the media pipeline through "briefings," "announcements," "releases," and similar housetops. Theodore Draper's well-documented account of how this was done while press representatives were denied access to the streets of Dominica is frightening. Time will not permit a full recounting, but one example from Mr. Draper's article in the December, 1965, *Commentary* will suffice.

He tells of the U.S. ambassador's "briefing" of April 29 to newly-arrived correspondents. The briefing contained references to "Communist takeover," rebel atrocities of the sort committed on Marie Antoinnette, and Castroite cries of "To the Wall" as innocents were shot down. It was said that 1,000 to 1,500 bodies were strewn in the bloody streets. One story officially told had it that the rebel leader, Colonel Caamano personally machine-gunned to death one Colonel Juan Calderon, aide-de-camp of Reid Cabral.

This was all duly and dramatically reported for fact by *Time* magazine and *U.S. News & World Report,* and some of the information even cropped up in official reports to the nation delivered by President Johnson.

Trouble was, reported Draper,

> "None of these atrocity stories turned out to be true. When the correspondents were able to see for themselves and talk to Dominicans in the street, they quickly learned that the mass executions and cries of 'Paredon!' (To the Wall) had never taken place. No one had ever seen heads on spikes. Colonel Calderon was found in a hospital suffering from a slight neck injury and was soon released. The 1,000 to 1,500 bodies turned out to be 6 or 10."

Reporting Dilemma

All these contrived events create dual dilemma for conscientious reporters, and there are many in this country. How do you report *actually* what's going on in a revolution—or maybe a non-revolution—while under guard and spoonfed events by a bureaucrat who at best knows no more than you because he hasn't left the next room? How do you know whether he's so terribly fearful of a Castro repeat on his beat, something that everyone knows would have disastrous political implications for any administration, that he climbs readily into bed with the nearest rightist general because he knows at least *this* guy is not Red?

How do you respond when fighting is in the street, the office cries "Copy!" and you suspect that what is given you, deadline ready-made, is one of those affairs contrived to be heard of men, and you the unwitting ear trumpet?

Or, when an incident is obviously cooked up in domestic streets, Americus or Berkeley, how do you report it? How do you keep from becoming a part—often the key part—of the story itself just by being there to get it? Newsmen know how exciting cameras can be, and with television you can triple that in spades. Bring out the teevee boys and the hams will surely congregate. Those who contrive such events naturally know this too. They count on it. So how do you keep from being used?

If you're an editor and the party on the other end of Bell's invention tells you, "There's going to be a demonstration," what should your response be? Should you tell your staff to sit tight in the city room? Or should you report in the news columns a full account of how the invitation to cover this incident arrived? Or should you simply lay it out straight and let an intelligent public draw its own conclusions, hoping the whole affair will be transparent enough?

The New News Managers

Let me warn you that the incident contrivers are wise nowadays; they know how to pressure the media. They are quickly becoming experts and specialists in media manipulation; they are the new news managers.

They depend heavily upon what they know is a natural inclination—almost a religious inclination with newsmen —to give all sides fair treatment. So skip a demonstration by two tired pickets and the letters and phone calls begin:

"What kind of a democracy is this?"

"We demand to be heard!"

"Is this what you call a free press?"

"The press is infiltrated by Commies." This from the Birch brigade.

"The press is a tool of the Establishment!" That from the beards on the left.

The press is burdened by its own masochistic inclinations, too. In Nashville, a few years ago, it was decided not to "play down" but simply not to "play up" repeated downtown demonstrations. United Press International got wind of the editorial decision and made some sort of suppression-of-news affair of what was, in my opinion, rightful editorial judgment. After all, if the same things go on day after day, the time arrives when the man has bit the dog so often, it's no longer worth the streamer coveted by dog biters.

There was considerable tongue clucking about this "suppression" by the way, in certain northern press circles. We are masochistic, you see, by sectional multiple choice. Since I have moved northward along with the civil rights revolution, I have been amused to watch Yankee press coverage take on a distinct Dixie hue. In Champaign, a racial incident in which a policeman was critically injured by a brickbat used in the usual way became, in the local press, "an anti-police near riot." (A Boston headline this past summer told how "Outside Agitators" were blamed for Cleveland, Chicago and New York riots.)

Attempts To Control

But I don't want to engage in the same masochism. I like all newspapers and newspaper editors. All, believe me, have enough problems. None is more challenging or more pressing today than how to handle all this history in the deliberate making.

It should be reported that newspaper, radio and television people are at work on this. While no rules can be made binding and retain a free press, professional journal and convention fare has centered heavily on the general subject since the Kennedy assassination cruelly underscored the degree to which newsmen can so smother a story that they almost become the story.

When an "incident" is promised or threatened today, I think most newsmen attempt to be as unobtrusive as possible in their coverage, especially photographic. Charles Puffenbarger, my colleague who was assistant city editor of the Washington Star before joining our staff last fall, says the Washington reaction to the familiar call now goes something like this:

"Planning a demonstration, eh! Fine. If you folks make news we'll be over there to cover it." This may be as noncommital and ambiguous as one of Holmes' Supreme Court slogans, but then maybe that's the purpose.

We could go on and on with the journalistic problems in all this, but let us turn for a moment to the implications for history and for modern historians. There may be many but we shall examine, briefly, only two which appear to be most obvious and of primary importance.

Instantaneous Journalism

First, as a journalist, I regret to advise you that in the sort of circumstances we have described, instantaneous journalism should seldom, if ever, be used as a primary source for historical research.

The other week, some of you may have noted, Theodore Sorensen, the late President Kennedy's confidante, complained of the "information gap" and the "feeling of isola tion" that has plagued him since turning in his White House staff key.

> "In the White House," mourned Mr. Sorensen, "I felt sorry for those who had to make judgments on the basis of daily newspapers. There's a large difference between reading diplomatic cables and intelligence reports and sitting in your living room reading the papers. Now I'm one of those guys sitting in his living room reading the papers and I'm even more acutely aware of the difference."

Almost identical feelings were confessed earlier by Arthur Schlesinger Jr. He said he could never "take the testimony of journalism in such matters seriously again."

"Their relation to reality," he told the American Historical Association, "is often less than the shadows in Plato's cave."

While there is room to regret that these two gentlemen got around to complaining of this matter only after they left positions where they might have done something to

rectify it, knowledgeable journalists will tend to agree, with certain reservations.

One of these might concern earlier days in Viet Nam, where an eager band of new breed reporters was able to give the public more reality than the White House got from intelligence reports which must have been filtered through Madame Nhu. Another would be the Dominican affair aforementioned. Here both the diplomatic and early press cables appear to have borne some relationship to the cave shadows complained of by Mr. Schlesinger. The independability of instant journalism for historical source material, in short, is not necessarily the fault of the newsmen who report it and write it.

If Messrs. Schlesinger and Sorensen could have persuaded their boss to give the whole truth—reality, that is—to the press, I know of few reporters who would have failed to record it with honesty. The same of course applies to the current administration.

Historians of Media Effect

The second is related. There is a field, I believe, for historians who do no more than constantly research the mass media, correct its instantaneous errors in somewhat more leisure, and appraise how the subtle and sometimes not-so-subtle use/misuse of this modern housetop contributes to history.

The mass media are not pseudo. Like the mountain, they are there. They will not go away. Men capable of thinking out ways of using the media are going to do just that. The sum of them, in a sense, is a history-making machine. Historians ought to be on top of it.

For illusory or real, who is to say Birmingham on the six o'clock roundup had nothing to do with passage of the Civil Rights Act, or that Selma at 10 p.m. was unrelated to enactment of the Voting Rights Act? Who believes the Great Society is anything but a response to the Human Rights Revolution?

Who is to suggest that the New Left and other critics of our Viet Nam policies were in no measure responsible for President Johnson's decision to stop the bombing for 40 days, to mount a peace offensive with round-the-world emissaries, to attempt to get the matter before the U.N. or take for himself an historic trip to Hawaii? Are these events, which will enter our history texts some day, less real because they were spurred to reality by events schemed out by men and pushed by propaganda?

I am wondering aloud, then, if we do not need an army of competent historians who are deeply lettered in communications, its modern techniques and how these techniques influence the making of history, deliberate or otherwise?

Finally, a major question arises over what the future portends for world peace and for the survival of American democracy under this system that funnels propaganda—true and false and half-and-half—into a fast-paced world.

Since the time lag for unemotional separation of truth from falsehood, and for calm judgment of motive ever narrows, the possibility of major tragedy is always nearby. I am reminded here of Mark van Doren's marvelous insight about the relationship of time, space and tragedy.

In drama, he says, tragedy always occurs where time and space are limited, comedy is always best set in light and air and out-of-doors. For the dankest deeds of men are born in dark and tiny rooms. The deepest tragedies happen where there is not enough time. We always have the feeling, after great tragedy, that had there been more time, *more time,* this terrible catastrophy would never have occurred.

And what about free media? We are reminded again of the Marxist theory which holds that our economic system contains within it the internal conflicts that ultimately must lead to its self-destruction. This theory can be modernized and applied to the free media, and indeed it has been by the Chinese, according to Bernard Fall in his *Two Viet Nams.* Professor Fall tells of the Chinese politician who believes free dissent, where all splinters have access to major channels of communication, will, by the constant rending and tearing of differing persuasions, cause the disintegration of our society. There is a question worth asking here: *Will our system permit so much internal conflict that consensus can no longer be formed in American life and democracy thus die at the hand of its own sophistry?*

I still have faith in the free system, but it is no longer a blind faith. Rather, I hope it is an open-eyed faith awake to realities and aware of the dangers. For democracy to survive, we must all better understand the contrived event, the force and motive behind each, the mass media which carries it along, and the capability of this combination grossly to exaggerate events and thus cause an altogether disproportionate effect on history in the deliberate making.

Mr. Graham was a Nieman Fellow and is now a professor in the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Illinois.

LBJ Should Hold Formal Conferences

By Richard L. Strout

I have been covering presidential press conferences, man and boy, for over 40 years. I thought I would say something about the present ones before this distinguished group of journalists. I could, I suppose, take a broader subject. I could discuss Journalism at Large. The big dispute today, as I understand it, is whether newspapers are bad because readers are ignorant or whether readers are ignorant because newspapers are bad. I shall leave that problem to you. I have taken a more limited and, I hope, easier subject.

My first White House press conference was with Warren G. Harding. I was so awed at being within touching distance of a live, American President for the first time in my life, that I have almost total recall. He was clad in what we used to call plus fours. He was the handsomest President America ever had. And the unkind reporters were asking him sharp, searching questions. How my heart went out to him! I remember his saying supplicatingly,

"Now boys, boys, do go easy! I have an appointment at Burning Tree and I don't want to be late . . ."

It was Harding who made the Presidential press conference into a regular and what we considered a permanent institution. After making a famous gaffe to an oral question that brought Charles Evans Hughes striding over from the State Department, his bushy whiskers a-quiver, the abashed Harding required written questions, submitted in advance.

His successor Calvin Coolidge, required written questions, too (as did Herbert Hoover). In memory I can see Coolidge riffling through the pile of written questions, deciding which he would answer. On one occasion Charlie Michaelson, I believe it was, got a dozen correspondents to ask the same question! Would Coolidge be a candidate in 1928?

Coolidge looked at the first question and put it aside. He looked at the next! put it aside. He went on from the third to the 11th. At the 12th he paused, read it, and went on dryly, "I have here a question on the condition of the children in Poland. The condition of the children in Poland is as follows . . ." He then talked for several minutes and concluded, "That's all the questions."

Let me explain why I think the "formal" press conference is important. In the first place, what is said is on the record. It cannot be contradicted or thrown down next day.

A press conference that is scheduled in advance brings in the reporters who are experts or specialists who have something special to ask, which only the President can answer.

A formal conference brings in somebody beside the White House "regulars." As you know, 20 or 30 newsmen are assigned to the White House at all times. They go with the Chief Executive on trips, they follow him to Texas or Honolulu. They include top notch reporters, but they are, willy-nilly, part of the family. They have to keep living with Mr. Johnson, no matter how sharp a question they ask. They are a kind of White House bodyguard. At a formal press conference as many as 300 correspondents may be present and the whole thing is on a more impersonal level.

Another thing: a formal question and answer exchange is a psychologically sound method of presenting complicated government issues in a way the public can understand it.

Now it is my contention that under present conditions something traditional and valuable is being lost in Washington. And it is my view that in this loss the press is being diminished, and the country is dropping a safeguard. I will argue, too, that President Johnson himself is a big loser.

Let me spell out some of these points. There is always the danger for any President that he lose touch. He can't always be out traveling, or campaigning. It is just when he is busiest, with a war on, that he may be most cut off. One way of keeping in touch is to let the big, awkward, variegated press corps into his presence. There is no other way for the American public, through the press, to tell the President, face to face, what worries it. Harry

Truman put it better than I can: The Chief Executive should meet newsmen once a week, he said, to find out "what's on the public's mind."

What's the good of a big conference if only a dozen or so reporters actually ask questions? There is something more than just asking questions. The press wants to know how the President looks, how he reacts, how he feels; the regular renewed revelation of his manner and mood; there are judgments to be made of his physical and emotional state prompted by spontaneous questions. Everything centers round the President—it's a Queen Bee democracy—we ought to know these things.

There is another point. All free governments have some means of subjecting their executives to interrogation. In Great Britain, for example, the executive comprises 40 men of ministerial rank. The Cabinet undergoes question time, an hour a day, four days a week, in parliament.

Every President of modern times has made use of press conferences, adapted them to his peculiar style, and carried them on. It was General Eisenhower, unfortunately, who changed their whole character by admitting live radio and television coverage.

I yield to nobody in my admiration of radio and TV. In their own field they are superb. But there are places where I would not admit live radio and TV coverage. The effect at White House press conferences is to make us all reluctant, unpaid, Hollywood actors, ending all intimacy and encouraging the exhibitionists. As every reporter knows, it is not the first question in a group interview that gets the answer, it is the second or third follow-up question. But with TV the question is asked, it is answered or evaded, and that's that. The reporter has had it.

Let me make my position plain about the relationship of the Washington press corps to the President. It is true that I have a jealous regard for the prestige of my profession. But I hope I am reasonably objective about it. I think more doors are open in Washington, and more information available in spite of carping and criticism, than in any other world capital. And I am aware, too, that the relationship of press to President is apt to be an adversary relationship: the White House wants us to have the favorable news, we are after *all* the news.

I do not find fault with this relationship. I do not want the press to be a smirking sycophant, nor do I want it to be a snarling, snapping, prosecutor. (In my lifetime I have seen it take on both characters in Washington.) But the Presidential press conference itself is very much what the President makes it. It is an honorable, a salutary and, I think, a necessary adjunct to our government, and I do not like to see our profession let it wither on the vine without a protest.

Let me at this point introduce some statistics. Franklin Roosevelt, in a little over three terms, had 998 press conferences: twice a week before the war; once a week during the war. Let me make clear that when I refer to a press conference I mean one announced in advance and held in Washington. I do not mean a sudden, spur-of-the-moment affair, nor yet an ambulatory press conference where the President strides around the flower beds and the puffing press pursues him.

Roosevelt had just under 1,000 conferences. Mr. Truman, if my figures are right, had well over 300; General Eisenhower cut the number down to 200, and President Kennedy in his bright 1,000 days had a conference about once a fortnight.

Alas, this tradition has not continued in recent days. President Johnson has been one of the most accessible men to the press of any President, that is, in informal gatherings, meetings with individual bureau chiefs, or tips to favorite correspondents. But as for *formal* press conferences, I can only figure that he had *nine* last year. So far in 1966 he has held only a few.

But in the U.S. the executive is all rolled into one. No other democracy has an elected leader with such enormous, such awful power. It is the power of peace and war. There is no question time in Congress. This is my chief argument—I think it is terribly important that somebody in behalf of the people meet the President face to face and ask him what he's doing. Not in a hostile or challenging manner. But just to make his position clear.

Where a modern President forgoes the regular press conference—and I acknowledge it has many faults and is time-consuming and even irksome—you are apt to get a substitute: (It's funny how all these metaphors run to hydraulics) government by *leak*, information by *seepage*, or let me call it *news-ooze*.

Let me illustrate what I mean. In the Sunday New York Times, March 6, on the editorial page, appeared an article by C. L. Sulzberger. Sentence after sentence began "Mr. Johnson believes . . .", "Mr. Johnson reckons . . .", "The President is himself convinced . . .", "What deeply concerns the President . . ." The gist of the article was that Americans, in Mr. Johnson's view, tend to become more belligerent as war continues, and he is afraid of the hawks rather than the doves if frustration mounts.

Very likely this is true, but is this the right way to put such matters out: Scripps-Howard columnist Lyle Wilson, March 10, referring to quite another matter, cited "these faceless, perhaps irresponsible sources of vital news." Lyle Wilson's deduction was that we are in for a long war and "Mr. Johnson's choice evidently is to leak the news to the American public rather than to shock the nation with a bold statement of what must be expected."

News by osmosis may be successful for a while, but in time it produces, I believe, a credibility gap; the kind of gap which some think they see at present. General Maxwell Taylor, Presidential adviser, wants to mine Haiphong

harbor; we ought to be able to ask Mr. Johnson about it.

There are evidences that the President is of two minds about regular scheduled press conferences. On March 13 and on March 20 a year ago he promised "at least one press conference a month."

Why hasn't he held them? In a celebrated interview not long ago Bill Moyers attacked the radio-TV press conference as a "circus," "televised extravaganzas." Well, for heavens' sake, who made them that way? Who brought television into the press conference? I believe TV does a superb job (and radio, too, of course). But I think television should be outlawed in three places, anyway—in the Supreme Court, in the nuptial bed, and in White House press conferences.

Actually I think the thing goes deeper than Bill Moyers' explanation. President Johnson, in my estimation, does very well at formal press conferences when he has held them.

It is my judgment that Mr. Johnson wants to hold control in his own hands. His ideal is a private audience with selected reporters where he can talk and they can listen, and nobody asks too many unexpected questions. It is a habit, an approach, an instinct that he cannot break. He discovered in the Senate that when he disclosed his views he limited his freedom of choice, and his opponents thwarted him. He is a very complicated man. He is divided about the press: he affects to decry it, and reverences it; he patronizes it, and he writhes under it; he will overreact in an extraordinary way to woo some individual reporter.

Yet the President cannot leave it alone, what it is saying, what the polls are saying, what his rating is. Theoretically, I am sure, he has faith in the ultimate give-and-take of opinion in a free democracy, but he can't overcome a lifetime of trying to manipulate the scales in his favor.

And this brings me to my conclusion. A reporter in Washington can become a kind of dramatic critic to a tremendous show in which the President inevitably is the central character. Woodrow Wilson was one of our greatest Presidents, yet he had a tragic flaw, his Calvinistic rigidity which betrayed him in the end; By making concessions he could have crowned his life by having us join the League of Nations. He couldn't. We didn't.

And now President Johnson. I believe he has in him a mighty yearning for success, and unquestionable elements of greatness, but there is a testiness, a secretiveness, a sensitivity about him all expressed in his unwillingness to accept the normal discipline of a formal press conference; a perfect tool for him to fill the credibility gap, if he were prepared to use it.

Well, the time may come when he will be glad to use it.

Mr. Strout is Washington correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*. This is the George Polk Memorial Lecture he delivered in New York at the George Polk Memorial Awards Luncheon of the Department of Journalism of Long Island University.

The University Science Writer: Investigative Reporter, Matchmaker, Freelancer

By William K. Stuckey

After extensive dealings with the press, a university science writer might feel that few newspapermen are interested in a scientific finding unless it can cure cancer while in orbit. This could be called the "rocket-scalpel complex." And after a number of contacts with the professors, it becomes easy for him to believe that few academicians are interested in press coverage unless the facts are expressed in mathematical Latin and are heavily qualified to prove that nothing really important happened. This is, of course, the "scientific dignity-protective obscurity syndrome."

Consequently, there are several dozen university science writers in this country who are struggling to find some sort of rational middle ground.

Most of these writers are ex-newspapermen with exuberant interest but with little formal training in science. Editors often think of them as effete and overspecialized technicians interested principally in non-human phenomena. Scientists, on the other hand, even after approving a news release for factual accuracy, sometimes imply that the science writer is really an undercover correspondent for Keyhole, True Confessions and Whammo Stories. Plain English, though correct, is "yellow journalism."

Universities, however, hire science writers—and are apparently trying to hire more—for a variety of purposes. Many of these institutions are tired of having their contributions to intellectual excellence ignored because they are not in the Ivy League. Additionally, they feel they owe the public, the tuition-paying parents and faithful alumni an explanation about what is going on in those messy laboratories and ominous computer installations. Most universities already operate at capacity and are not looking for additional students, but they are constantly searching for the brightest ones, however, as well as for the best in faculty. Public reports on university scientific contributions are useful in this type of talent search. There is also an obligation to tell the taxpayer what is happening to those federal research dollars which finance the vast majority of university science activities in the U.S. today. The heavy majority of the $20 million in annual research support at Northwestern, incidentally, comes from federal agencies.

At Northwestern's public relations department, we are evolving a program designed to help the university achieve these goals while hopefully satisfying both the press and the professors.

There are many general types of science stories, but we rely on one type as the basis of this program. This is the story which reports either on completed research or on research which has reached some sort of definitive stage. The best time peg for this type of story is the mailing or publication date of a scientific journal in which the research results are reported, or the date on which the results are officially presented in a paper at a professional meeting. The subject matter might be either experimental results or the proposal of a new theory. At present the vast majority of all stories done by Northwestern's science writers are in this general category. We avoid the story about research which is just beginning—the new grant story, for example—unless the sheer size of the grant or the unusual nature of the research project is particularly newsworthy. We shun stories about the grant which has been applied for but not yet approved, and we try to do as few routine appointment, promotion or "small announcement" stories as possible.

This approach generally satisfies the scientists because it meets their protocol of reporting research first, or at least simultaneously, in a professional journal. The responsible science writers and editors of the press prefer it produces few of the "pie in the sky" or "wouldn't it be wonderful if" type of story. They also appreciate knowing that you are not deluging them with relatively insignificant stories of limited interest.

The Northwestern public relations program requires

its science writers to play three distinct roles—as investigative reporters, as freelancers with a sensitive feel for the story market and as matchmakers promoting more contact and understanding between journalists and scientists.

First and probably the most important is the role of investigative reporter.

Communication among scientists, even those belonging to the same university department, is often rather sketchy. The legacy of the ivory tower and of "academic freedom" is that the scientist may conduct his work in complete isolation and solitude if he chooses. Few if any universities maintain central sources of information on the status of research projects, on papers accepted for publication in professional journals or on research reports to be presented at professional meetings. Even the department chairman, who has his own research and administrative duties to look after, often does not have up-to-date information on what his faculty members are doing.

The surest way for the university science writer to overcome this, of course, is to contact each and every scientist personally to find out how his research is proceeding. This is a problem in a university such as Northwestern, however, which has about 700 faculty members in science, engineering and medicine. And occasionally faculty members are loath to volunteer such information to a non-scientist. We are trying to solve the problem this way:

With concurrence by the various deans involved, we asked each department to require one of its clerical employees to prepare a monthly list of every departmental research paper either accepted for publication or to be presented at a professional meeting. Of course, it's not always possible to judge the story possibilities of a research paper by merely looking at its title. But at least these monthly summaries keep the science writers from having to contact faculty members who are not yet ready to report their research.

We also check another source—the requests for travel funds filed by faculty members with departmental clerical employees—for tips on who plans to go to a professional meeting to present a paper.

Once he has found a story possibility, the science writer would ask the scientist to tell what he has found—then to state it again in plain English. Get his assessment on what the finding means within the historical framework of the science itself, then ask him what its social or technological implications might be. Ask the scientist who, in other universities or institutions, is doing the best work in his field or research. Then having implied that you intend to check his statement with other scientists, ask him what is really new about his finding, what has been discovered for the first time.

After writing the first draft, it is routine in every university to return it to the scientist to check for accuracy. Whenever possible, however, insist on your right to determine the style in which it is to be written. Otherwise, you might produce something which no editor would look at twice. This is a sticky business, of course, since all scientists have had the required English courses, have read a few books outside of their field and glance at the New York Times occasionally. Ergo, they feel they are writers too. One science writer, for example, was told by the scientist that the facts were correct but were somehow disgraced by being presented in the "juvenile American journalistic style." Why not be more dignified, suggested the scientist, and do the release in the style of, say, Thomas Hardy?

Finding the story, getting the proper type of information and writing it in a journalistically useable style are necessary first steps. The hallmark of the investigative reporter, however, is the checking out of claims made even by friendly sources.

The science writer can begin by keeping up with the science publications which aim for a relatively large and diversified scientific audience and which use reasonably recognizeable language. A general idea of the trends and accomplishments in many scientific fields can be obtained through reading Science, Scientific American, Chemical and Engineering News, Physics Today, the Journal of the American Medical Association's news section, Science Service's weekly bulletin, the various McGraw-Hill engineering publications, several major newspapers or mass magazines offering extensive science coverage, and press releases or periodic reports from government agencies, industries and other universities. It's also useful to have a network of scientific sources outside of the university. Other university science writers, for example, could put you in contact with various scientists who would be willing to give you a quick, objective evaluation of your man's findings and the claims involved.

A reputation for thorough checking is vital for the science writer's relations both with the press and the professors. This is more difficult for the science writer than for any other type of reporter, however. The political reporter, for example, has at least some access to public records, the society reporter has the social register, the sports reporter has the record book and the business reporter has Dunn and Bradstreet. The checkable record for the science writer, however, is often an obscure professional journal with facts hopelessly buried beneath jargon and equations. Besides that, there are literally thousands of these journals in this country but there is no national indexing system as yet to tell you what research has been reported or where.

The first step toward a checkable record for the science writer might be the establishment of a national committee

composed of both writers and scientists. The function of the committee would be to assess claims involving a "first" and to keep a record of the findings of such assessments. It might be informally referred to as a "Breakthrough Court." Hopefully it would be officially sanctioned by groups such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Science Writers Association, and would have a small, full-time staff to handle the checking of "breakthrough" claims swiftly. There would be many details to work out, of course. But establishment of such a group would go a long way toward providing essential information for—and protecting the reputations of—both press and professors.

The second role of the science writers at Northwestern is that of playing the matchmaker. The press often does not understand the scientist, and what is not understood is easy to hate. The professors often show a shallowly-disguised disdain for a press and a public whom they feel are more interested in violence and sex than in the advancement of knowledge. Resulting from these attitudes is a press which would just as soon continue its unofficial policy of ignoring most of science, and a body of scientists who feel that no mass publicity is indeed the best publicity.

The traditional tool for acquainting the nation with scientists and their results, of course, is the press release. There are other methods, however, which we have found useful in bringing press and professors together. Periodically, we prepare a list of the research specialties of every faculty member in science-oriented fields. We stay as close to plain English as we can in describing a scientist's past research accomplishments and his current projects in a few sentences. The list is sent to every U.S. newspaper with a science writer, magazines, radio and television news desks, science text book publishing firms, science film makers, freelance magazine writers with a science bias, and a selected list of international science publications.

Reporters often find themselves with an assignment and no sources. The research specialty lists are designed to steer them to university sources who are knowledgeable and who have solid credentials in certain scientific specialties.

In discharging the duties of matchmaker, Northwestern science writers also find it useful to substitute interviews between newsmen and scientists for a press release whenever possible. Some newspaper science writers are simply better than others, however, and it is to the advantage of both the scientist and the university to invite only the best to interviews. The interview generally applies only to the local press. However, a few national publications send editors and writers on tours from time to time in search of interesting and significant science stories. A solid list of story possibilities to such publications might result in your university being included on the next such tour.

Another means of avoiding misunderstandings between press and professors is to come to an agreement with both on exactly what constitutes a good science story. As I've mentioned, we at Northwestern prefer the story on completed research, reported at a specific time or place, to the "isn't that interesting" feature with no time peg, the grant, the appointment or the professorial promotion. Surprisingly enough, the press is not always clear about the elements of a good science story. One Southern newspaper editor, for example, thought he was fulfilling his duty toward science by printing a great number of stories about oil exploration. A mass circulation news magazine often includes stories about new weapons developments in its science columns. One large newspaper placed an article on the use of computers in basic scientific research on the business page. Such confusion is understandable, however, since there is relatively little discussion about what is good or bad in the science story world. As an example, I once asked a leading science editor what he considered a good science story to be and he replied only with this statement: "That should be obvious."

The matchmaking university science writer should also do what he can to bring press and professors together in social situations. An understanding of mutual problems, discussed in an informal atmosphere, can often clear up latent suspicion.

An essential element of this matchmaking is complete fairness to the press when stories involving unfavorable implications to the university occur. The "no comment" or "lock the doors" position can damage the university in the eyes of the press for long periods of time. Show them the records or pertinent correspondence. Give them the university position on the matter but don't attempt to force them to substitute it for the development which drew their attention in the first place. Treat the press honestly and nine times out of ten they will treat you the same way.

Then there is the other side of the coin, the professor. Many scientists are fond of proclaiming that they have no interest whatsoever in "educating the public" or in "reaching the strap-hanger." Trying this will often hurt them in the eyes of their colleagues, they say. They have a morbid fear of being called "publicity seekers" by their peers. One university science writer I know does not even mention the term "press release" when interviewing a scientist about his research. Instead, he says that he is preparing a "lay-language technical abstract."

To counter this professorial attitude, I can only advise you to begin a dossier of instances in which press publicity has proven helpful to the scientist professionally. The strongest example of this type in my case book involves

a chemist who was generally unimpressed with newspaper publicity. He did consent, however, to a news release on a principle of chemistry he had developed which had very broad scientific implications. Only one newspaper picked up the story. One of the faithful readers of this newspaper, however, turned out to be the editor of one of the nation's most influential scientific journals. The editor was a scientist but one who worked in another field, and consequently he had not read the original promulgation of the chemical principle in the Journal of the American Chemical Society some two years before. Consequently, he called the Northwestern chemist and asked him to write a major article on his chemical principle. Result? The article in the leading journal brought requests from fellow scientists for more than 700 reprints (versus 100 reprint requests in the chemical society journal). The press, we can now state, is useful to the scientist in not only reaching the "strap-hanger" but his revered colleagues as well.

In the latter stages of his development, the university science writer should find it useful to liken himself to the freelance writer whose daily bread depends upon his nimbleness in the market place. He should discard no information until he has assessed it for every possible use. If the research development will not make a story, perhaps it would be effective in a speech by a university official, or in a brochure.

Too often, the university science writer feels that the only thing left to do after writing and checking a story is to commit it to the mimeograph. The same story which goes to the Optimist Magazine will be sent to Nature. The story about DNA or Omega Minus or ultraviolet radiation from Alpha Centauri will wind up on the editor's desk at Electronic News. The science writer and the editor who already receive a terrifyingly large amount of "junk mail" tend to put those addressographed envelopes on the bottom of the stack—or in the waste basket. In many past instances, they have found the mimeographed contents to be of no interest either to themselves or to their readers.

The same medical story which is right for Medical World News might also interest those ladies magazines with the phenomenally large circulations. The laboratory anecdote, otherwise unusable, might be exactly what Reader's Digest is looking for. For inspiration, consider the example of the free lance journal writer who peddles essentially the same idea to 10, 20 or 30 separate editors by knowing how to tailor it exactly for each. It's also well to remember that the freelancer does not send his material out in mimeograph form.

There will be stories which are suitable for the mimeograph approach, however. For these it is essential to have an up-to-date mailing list (revised at least once a year.) For a starter, the mailing lists offered by the National Association of Science Writers and the American Medical Writers Association are good to adopt. You can add other writers as you meet them or contact them by letter. For science book publishers, Literary Market Place will give you a start. For science-oriented freelancers, the membership directory of the Society of Magazine Writers is helpful.

The freelance-oriented PR man also will quickly realize when it is time to stop writing releases and undertake projects with longer-ranged aspects. An example in this category is Northwestern's new report on highlights in science, engineering and medicine, "The Mid-Sixties" contains sixteen essays on educational programs and research findings in space science, environmental health, molecular biology, mathematics and other fields. Grouping the material under topic headings was a departure from the traditional university "annual report" treatment in which accomplishments are listed by department ("1966 was a particularly eventful year for the Department of Sanitary Engineering . . ."). The information was expressed in lay language. The audiences selected for "The Mid-Sixties" included not only the press but also the bright potential student, the potential new faculty member, alumni groups, foundations, government agencies, industries and other specialized audiences. We decided to use the title of "The Mid-Sixties" because it gave us the excuse to list not only current accomplishments but also those landmarks of two and three years before. By the time "The Late Sixties" is in the works, we hope to have an entirely new set of accomplishments to detail.

Investigative reporter. Matchmaker. Freelancer.

These are the three hats which Northwestern science writers wear in their efforts to bring significant scientific accomplishments before the right non-scientific audiences. Our goals are to enhance the press in the eyes of the scientists, and to show the taxpayers that scientists are worthwhile even if they are sometimes hard to like and understand. The university science writer can make a significant contribution in these directions if he is given adequate latitude by his university and if he realizes the many facets of his role. It's quite possible that he may become the fellow who accomplishes the difficult job of convincing the scientist to speak in English—and the public to understand and appreciate the language of science.

Mr. Stuckey is science editor in the department of public relations at Northwestern University. This is his address to the annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association, in Boston.

The Challenge of Newspaper Management

By Stanford Smith

Mr. Smith, General Manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, gave this address before the 18th Annual Conference of the Newspaper Personnel Relations Association in Denver.

The schedule makers were in rare form this year. I am not referring to baseball but to the newspaper business. In our own season of conventions, we allow for no rain-out days. In fact, we pack them in so closely that we have everything but double headers. Unfortunately, this usually means that anyone who is deeply involved with one convention, as I am with ANPA, finds it difficult—if not impossible—to visit others.

But this year the schedulers relented and I am a beneficiary. I was able to attend the editors' convention in Montreal last week and now I am able to fulfill a long standing personal wish to be here with you.

I am delighted. Mike Patrone and Clark Newsome are always enthusiastic about working with the NPRA. Speaking at the ANPA meeting last month, Gene Lambert informed and inspired many publishers. I am pleased and honored to be with you today.

In fact, I feel invigorated as I look upon this organization of 200-plus when we realize that it was formed 17 years ago with only 40 members.

The growth of NPRA is evidence of the increasing recognition by publishers that professionalism in the conduct of personnel functions is just as important as professionalism in writing, editing, production, advertising and circulation. In fact, without the professional techniques you bring to recruiting and training, newspapers would be hard pressed to maintain the high professional standards they have achieved in editorial, business, and production efforts.

Your increase in membership is also a reflection of the growth of the newspaper business as a whole. In this sense NPRA's growth perhaps was predictable, though few actually predicted it.

In 1947, American newspapers employed fewer than 250,000 persons. By October of last year they employed more than 350,000. Because the number of newspapers has remained virtually constant, the 39% increase in newspaper employment has meant a 39% increase in the average staff size. Unlike most industries, this growth has been most rapid not in the largest but in the smaller and medium size units. This means too that more newspapers are reaching a size where they must face the need for professionalizing their personnel management functions.

Employment growth is only one of many indices reflecting the health and vitality of the daily newspaper business. The ANPA-sponsored economic study published last August, "The Growth of the American Daily Newspaper" by Jon Udell, was a sellout at a printing of 35,000 copies. Even some newspaper people have gained from it a totally different view of their own business. In many cases confidence and pride have replaced defensiveness. Similarly, many influential people in business, education, government and civic affairs have gained new respect for the newspaper business after reading Dr. Udell's work or some of the many articles, speeches and advertisements based upon it.

Of all the indicators of the health and vitality of the newspaper business, I believe the one that *you* are most concerned with—employment—is in some ways the single most significant indicator. It is true that employment does not show the most dramatic curve on a graph. Advertising, for example has nearly quadrupled in dollar volume since 1946 and newsprint consumption has nearly doubled. But the growth in employment is particularly important for several reasons.

First, it is larger, in relation to the corresponding measurement for the economy as a whole, than any of

the other indicators. The 39 per cent increase in newspaper employment towers over the 25 per cent rise in all employment and the 16 per cent increase in all manufacturing employment.

Second, this indicator will make it easier for you to show prospective employees that ours is a growth business offering ample opportunity for personal development and advancement. This will help dispel the longstanding myth that the newspaper business is "declining" or that it is difficult to "break into" the newspaper business unless you're a friend of a publisher.

The third reason that growth of employment on newspapers is particularly important is the one that I want to discuss with you today. This factor—and what we can and should do about it—presents one of the great challenges to newspaper management. It is this: The fact that newspapers have increased their staffs by nearly 40 per cent in the last 18 years is proof that the bogey of automation has not lived up to its advanced billing as a destroyer of jobs, a creator of unemployment and the villain to snatch bread from the mouths of women and children. Some so-called "experts" are still perpetrating this myth. The fact is that we have not had too much, but too little use of advanced technology. If ill-conceived and short-sighted resistance had not prevented some big city newspapers from adopting new equipment and new techniques, there would be still more jobs—less demanding physically—with shorter hours and higher wages, paid by business enterprises that, healthy as they are for the most part today, would be still healthier.

We have been victimized by a word—automation—which is a complete misnomer, at least when applied to the newspaper business.

Here is how Webster's defines automation: It is (1) "the technique of making an apparatus, a process or a system operate automatically: (2) the state of being operated automatically; and (3) automatically controlled operation of an apparatus, process or system by mechanical or electronic devices that take the place of human organs of observation, effort and decision."

The key word, "automatically," is defined as "without thought or conscious intention."

Almost without exception, so-called automation is employed by business to accomplish only those tasks that, even when performed by human effort, require a bare minimum of observation, decision, thought or conscious intention. What the machines have done has been to permit application of human effort and skill to more constructive tasks—to free men and women from drudgery and routine, allowing them instead to perform more closely to their native abilities with greater productivity and greater job satisfaction.

The word automation, as applied to the newspaper business at least, is an improper term. It has strictly an emotional meaning, picturing machines replacing people and families going hungry. It is used as a rallying cry for those self-serving or at best, short-sighted people who, in the name of "protecting the future," merely seek to preserve the status quo and their own positions.

Certainly there has been technological change in newspaper publishing. Last year alone 30 new computers were installed in newspaper plants, bringing the total now in operation to 67, with many more on order. Some 50 daily newspapers changed to offset last year, bring the total to 230. Nine more newspapers adopted mobile radio systems. A newspaper in West Palm Beach in using an optical scanner, which reads typewritten copy and converts it directly into tape. And there have been many other changes.

Last year, in fact, daily newspapers in the United States and Canada spent more than $140,000,000 for plant expansion and modernization, the sixth successive year over $100,000,000. But these machines don't operate without people. They make it possible for the same number of people to do more work with less effort. The net effect, where new technology has been adopted, has been to enhance the competitive position of newspapers vs. other media. Increased volume in the long run means increased employment. The number of newspaper production workers, in fact, has increased in the same degree over the years as non-production workers. *Only in cities where union resistance prevented the use of new technology has the number of newspaper jobs declined.* Elsewhere the adoption of new technology has had its normal effect —beneficial to employers and employees.

This rise in employment concurrent with new "automated" machinery is not peculiar to the newspaper business, of course. For the nation as a whole, more than one million production workers have been added to the work force in the last three years alone. Nearly 52 billion dollars was invested in plant expansion and equipment last year. Since 1947 the economy has added 14.5 million jobs. It is significant that the greatest increases over the years have come in the industries that have installed the most modern machinery. We could run down industry by industry —automobile manufacturing, insurance, banking, electronics and others—that have installed modern machines and have, as a result, increased both volume and employment. In the last 15 years alone the banking and insurance industries, for example, increased their staffs by 70 per cent and tripled their business. Yes, some of the jobs have changed, but many of them are being handled by the same people—or by people who belong to the same unions as before.

Now I have not said that specific new machines have been responsible for specific increases in employment. We

have become far too sophisticated to believe that single factors or individual pieces of equipment can determine trends by themselves. In fact, as a recent supplement in the New York Times on "The Computer and Society" clearly showed (April 24, 1966), even the experts cannot agree on specific effects of computers and other new equipment. While the experts differ on what kinds of workers and jobs have been most affected by the new machines and on how best to retrain, redeploy and realign those who have been affected, they all acknowledge that both productivity and employment have been increasing and that labor has shared in the benefits in the form of higher wages, more fringe benefits and increased leisure time.

This, of course, is an old story to you. Keeping up with trends in labor, employment, hours, turnover and productivity is your business. But it is important for us to do more than just know about these trends and statistics, to do more than merely apply them narrowly in our own business. Our primary function in publishing newspapers is in rendering a vital service to the public. The challenge to newspaper management, therefore—and that includes the personnel director as well as the publisher—is to insure that our service keeps abreast, in all respects, of social and technological change in a complex world where the newspaper's unique contributions are more vitally needed than ever before.

You and I may know the facts. But that doesn't mean that they've been adequately communicated to all those who should know them. A Harris Poll about a year ago showed that among *unskilled* workers, only one in six felt *personally* threatened by "automation," but two out of three said that "automation" would do more harm than good. Among the population in general, only half felt that automation would do more good than harm.

The implications of this lack of knowledge are clear: *We have a job to do.* Unfortunately, it is partly our own fault because business in general—and newspapers are no exception—awoke too late to the need to communicate both to employees and to the general public.

Until the 1930's the businessman's world was simple as far as communications were concerned. Business as an institution was generally admired and respected by the public, stockholder relations had not become a problem and, except in particular industries, employees generally were not organized into unions.

To quote John L. McCaffrey, chairman of the board of the International Harvester Company: "The prevailing attitude conceived of business as an intensely private affair. Any inquiry by government, by the press or by citizens of the plant community into the policies or activities of a particular business was looked upon not merely as improper but as verging on impertinence. The average corporation president of those years would no more readily discuss his business affairs than his family affairs in public."

What has happened since then, of course, is common knowledge. The depression of the Thirties, the gigantic growth of government regulatory and investigative bodies, the rise of mass labor unions—active, vocal and frequently hostile—"shattered forever," in the words of McCaffrey, "the calm private world in which the earlier businessmen had functioned. The sociological changes affecting business," he notes, "have been ever more far-reaching than the technological."

Some executives discovered that *silence is not golden.* Others kept on thinking so, even though it was no longer true. But today few businessmen would deny that a business, like other institutions in a democracy, can progress only as far and as rapidly as it can hold the consent of the people, whether those people are acting in their capacities as voters, employees, shareowners, suppliers or neighbors. In some respect, newspapers, because of their unique position as leaders in community action, have always taken a lead in addressing the public at large. But you as personnel men certainly know the major adjustments that newspapers and other businesses have made in their relations with employees during the last 30 years. We have done a fine job in creating the things that are supposed to build employee morale and loyalty: lucrative pension plans, life insurance, health insurance, company cafeterias, coffee breaks and numerous other fringe benefits.

But have we done enough? Have we even been going in the right direction? We have done a lot to keep our employees "happy." But a recent NPRA Newsletter reported that studies consistently show employees, assuming they are being paid a fair wage, rate as the most important factors in job satisfaction: *appreciation of their work, understanding and feeling "in on things."*

Have we kept our employees "in on things"? Just last month your own president Gene Lambert spoke to publishers at the ANPA Convention on the need to have employees who understand the business and are enthusiastic about it. But have we told our employees the facts that will make them enthusiastic? When we install a new machine do they share our pride in its increased capacity? If we did share the facts with employees fully and frankly, I don't believe any union leader could successfully promote resistance to new equipment.

I recommend that we adopt as one of our primary jobs the reestablishment of lines of communication with our employees. This does not mean merely publishing a company magazine or newsletter. That is not necessarily communication. As Mike Patrone recently commented: "It is one of the fascinating ironies that our business, whose reason for existence is to inform, abdicated the function of employee communications to the unions . . . As a consequence," he said, "publishers have paid heavily for the

loss of employee loyalty, a payment documented by the terms of your labor contracts."

The publishers have been paying a king-size bill for this abdication of direct communication with employees.

Communication works two ways. The listening end must be as active as the speaking end. We must turn the publishers' monologue into a dialogue. ANPA is prepared to assist any interested member to create and develop his own employee communications program. This area offers far-reaching opportunities for further constructive cooperation between ANPA and NPRA.

There was a time when direct talk to employees by management was viewed with suspicion, as an attempt to bust a union. The suspicion is not justified. No one, I dare say, would accuse the New York Times of attempting to do away with unions. Yet the Times recently retained a group of psychologists to find out how it can "establish greater rapport" with the 5,500 members of its staff. This is an admirable undertaking.

We must all establish greater rapport. We must help our employees to realize that their interests and the interests of their employers are inextricably bound. A primary consideration of every employee must be: If my company doesn't make money, it cannot continue to pay me for very long. Conversely, if I help it to prosper, I will advance too, with higher pay and a better, more secure job.

This is no more than elementary logic. Yet apparently some people are hard to convince—even with cold, hard facts such as those being displayed today in New York City.

If I can leave with you one thought today, I would like it to be this—that the challenge of newspaper management is not the unions or automation or communication —each narrowly construed—but rather it is to see these individual problems as part of a whole and to act as a team in working toward a solution.

We must cease looking at our labor and production and communications problems as individual problems with individual areas of responsibility for dealing with them. When a production foreman attends an ANPA Supervisory Training Workshop, he is taught communications because communications is an essential part of leadership in any department.

As personnel managers you occupy the key spot in meeting the challenge of newspaper management today. We must talk straight to our employees. We can thereby gain their confidence, cooperation and enthusiasm so that our recent study on growth of daily newspapers can be equalled or exceeded by our future growth.

The Pressures of News

(continued from page 2)

it can be followed up and exploited. The conflicts of law suits, charges, indictments, divorces, trials, are court records and privileged; that is, the newspaper does not risk libel by publishing them.

They are a part of the human condition and the contemporary scene. They have been of course overplayed for sensationalism and they have retained their disproportionate part of the news space by inertia, by old habit and lack of enterprise and imagination to initiate news of more relevance to what citizens need to know.

There's another old notion, that news is unpredictable. To a degree this is true. But only in degree. Shipwreck, flood, murder, tornado, may break out against any deadline.

But a great bulk of the news is predictable enough so that the newspapers and wire services can organize to handle it. They have reporters on "beats," where the news is predictable. That is, city hall, state house, Washington, the UN, the stock market, the shipping news, police, courts, school committee, and on and on. There is still an uncertainty as to whether stocks go up or down, how the legislature will act on the bill, who wins the ball game, how the mayor will meet his budget problem. But that these developments will need to be reported, and where and when, and will form the framework of the paper is known, and makes the schedule of the newspaper's assignments, the fabric of its operations.

More than that, you know the Supreme Court will have decisions on Mondays, that the UN Security Council is meeting today on the Kashmir issue, that the British election is being held today, that the Communist Party Congress is meeting in Moscow, that the Archbishop of Canterbury is meeting with the Pope, that the Foreign Relations Committee is hearing experts on China, that the Senate expects to vote on the tax bill, that Mrs. Gandhi is arriving. On the local scene, the trial of Councillor X is starting, a distinguished visitor arriving will need to be interviewed, a new play is opening, books have their publication dates. These are scheduled. The cable desk anticipates a big file from Moscow, a late story from London, that may lead the paper. And the cases the Supreme Court is expected to decide are pretty well anticipated. So you have not only a framework but one pretty well filled in on the night schedule of the news editor.

Yet with all this prearrangement for information that

will be available to all newspapers, there is a great difference in the range and dimensions of newspapers, in the quality of reporting, in the accepted responsibility to report adequately matters of public affairs that we need to know about, and to be alert to situations that only watchful reporting and persistent digging will uncover.

Some very significant information comes out almost by accident. We learn about an institution by a chance glimpse inside it. Consider the case of Professor H. Stuart Hughes. A new director of the security and consular office of the State Department last month discovered from the current files of his office that the passport division, which is at least nominally under his direction, had sent messages to Paris and Moscow embassies asking them to keep track of the contacts of Professor Hughes when he goes to Europe this fall—"a man of strong pro-Communist views"—the message stated. Professor Hughes is a man of strong anti-bomb views, anti-Viet Nam views. The new director told the passport division it was improper to send such messages except on request of an authorized agency, such as the FBI. It turned out the FBI had requested it. He cancelled the messages anyway and said in future such requests must be cleared within the department.

The New York Times got onto this, published it. Senator Edward Kennedy protested to Secretary Rusk that he was deeply disturbed at the messages, that our embassies were supposed to protect Americans, not investigate them. He also protested the characterization of Professor Hughes, who had been his opponent for the Senate. He had found him an honest and forthright man.

At a press conference next day, another predictable, scheduled news event, Secretary Rusk was inevitably asked about the intended shadowing of Professor Hughes. He said he felt the procedure was entirely improper and he was having it investigated. Meantime the passport division had stated this was a routine with passport-visa applications they had been following for 30 years. Professor Hughes said he had not yet even made a passport-visa application, and had no notion of going to Moscow. He was going to Paris and Rome, areas within his field of European intellectual history. The FBI had read in a newspaper of Professor Hughes' trip, and the notion that he was going to Moscow fitted their conception of his pro-Communist views. State has now changed its procedure and taken this away from the passport office.

This business of 30 years standing was smoked out by alert reporting of the discovery of a new man on the job in State.

The very same week two cases of industrial espionage exploded onto the front page. One was General Motors' harrying of their critic, Ralph Nader, with detectives prying into his private life; and the other a leading drug company planting a spy in a cut-rate drug store. Senator Ribicoff responded to General Motors' apology to his committee, which had had Nader as a witness on car safety, with "There's too much snooping in this country," a timely editorial comment.

This suggests also the role of investigations as news, and more than news, in the possible shaping and re-shaping of policy and public attitudes.

A truly phenomenal development has been Senator Fulbright's opening up the whole area of relations with China and the war in Viet Nam. Senator Fulbright for a long time has been urging that our foreign policy must be kept up to date by taking account of changing conditions. "We must be ready to think the unthinkable," he said. He began saying this a couple of years ago, in relation to the changes in the Soviet Union. He has recently opened up a fresh look at China and made it a public issue of challenge and defense within the Administration itself.

Fulbright started the debate on Viet Nam before his Foreign Policy Committee under the most adverse conditions. The Senate was blocked by filibuster, Dirksen's filibuster against legalizing the union shop nationally. This precluded Senate debate on the enlargement of the Viet Nam War. Not only that, Dirksen & Co., putting on maximum pressure, demanded the rigid application of Senate rules that no committee should hold hearings while the Senate is in session. So Fulbright began holding hearings before the Senate went in, and in the evening. The result of the revelation that the Viet Nam War could be discussed only in extra-curricular time was to exempt his committee from the rule.

Fulbright then brought in George Kennan, General Gavin and others who made headlines with their expert divergence from Administration attitudes on Viet Nam, and soon had Senator Robert Kennedy and others raising the questions of the limits on our willingness to negotiate and the conditions about elections in Viet Nam. Administration spokesmen Humphrey and Rusk and Bundy were brought into debate, on television.

Fulbright went on to bring in leading experts on China, pulling them out of the universities, for they had been purged out of the State Department in the McCarthy-Dulles regime, to hear Professor Barnett of Columbia all one day, Professor Fairbank of Harvard all another day, then going on, taking two experts a day, two days a week for a month, full seminars on China, its history, its historic conflict of culture with the West, its long submergence and humiliation by the West, its current policies, its military capacity, its economic condition. Every day a dozen or more senators explored their own questions with the China scholars. Senators and all of us, whose newspapers and television were on the job, enlarged our knowledge of China, its relation to the Viet Nam War and to our foreign policy.

After a couple of weeks Fulbright had made enough of a dent so that Senator Dirksen was demanding "rebuttal" witnesses. And Fulbright obliged by inviting them too. Dr. Walter Judd, who before his defeat for Congress was a stalwart of the old China Lobby, great supporter of Chiang Kai-shek, and other rebuttal witnesses joined the debate. For Dirksen complained that in hearing the university scholars of China Fulbright was getting only evidence from people who read books about China.

The books these China specialists had read, and written, including all the statistics and documentation that can be got out of China, were all the information we'd had on China in a dozen years since John Foster Dulles, under the McCarthy impact, had purged the China brains from the State Department, which has failed to cultivate any new generation of China expertise. Under Mr. Dulles we had a chance to get American correspondents admitted to China but Mr. Dulles vetoed it. Later, under a new regime in Washington, Peking vetoed it. So we had become dependent on those who read and wrote books about China. It remained for Senator Fulbright to open their expertise to all who would listen. And the Administration had to listen, like it or lump it. Whatever happens, we shall not be going it so blind on China.

A Fulbright in the right place can affect the whole pattern of public discussion. But the dynamics of his effort still depend vitally on the response of the public media. The response of the media was very uneven, and for the most part not very informing. A part of the reason was that we have no corps of journalists informed about China. Part of it was the inertia of the press, sticking to old clichés and old images, part of it the generally conservative nature of the press, which by definition is big business, controlled by those who control capital. We recognize this more easily in our domestic issues—in taxes, as a big taxpayer, and in labor relations as a big employer.

There is nothing sinister about this. Inevitably the big newspaper reflects the business mind of Main Street. Its financial support is there, its day-to-day business associations. The problem is the difficulty of its being a true forum, to represent the farmer, labor, the unorganized consumer, the inarticulate dissent from the business view.

It is quite remarkable that owners of newspapers leave them as free as they generally are. We demand more of a publisher than that he be a good employer. We expect that in effect he take on the role of trustee of so strategic an institution as the newspaper, that he protect its independence and integrity in the interest of the whole community. At the best this happens. Where it fails, part of the problem is the inertia and conformity inherent in institutions.

Robert Fulford of the *Toronto Star* describes what he call the built-in bias of the press. That is its conformity. He says it takes its cues from established Authority. Authority is whatever is organized, that has a name and gives speeches—industry, trade unions, government, chambers of commerce, cultural institutions. The newspaper is dominated by articulate opinion, he says. It is easier to accept conventional wisdom than to challenge it. In a country dominated by the middle class, the newspaper acts as a middle-class citizen. He cites as an instance the automobile. The automobile won out over public transportation in a no-contest, only one side articulate and organized. And the public accepted the automobile industry's monstrous cars, demanding ever wider highways and expensive public parking facilities, and car designs keyed to glamor instead of to safety. He doesn't mention the factor of subtle public relations. For example, that the auto industry itself organized the whole complex of highway safety committees, keeping the focus on the driver and off the design of the car.

The tendency to conformity in the press applies across the board. Our nationalist biases are in degree inescapable and we may not have them more than others, but our interests and involvements are more pervasive than any other. Our policy counts more than any others. This policy rests basically in the images we, the public, have in our heads. Bias in reporting from the most sensitive areas, Moscow, Cuba, on China, United Nations debates, may be largely unconscious by the reporters and unconsciously absorbed by the readers. But it is intensely important that our correspondents be disciplined and instinctively on guard to reduce their biases in such reporting to the irreducible minimum. This is not always the case.

A few years ago I attended a conference on communication in Canada. Cuba and Algeria were top news. The Canadians expressed some concern that their news on Cuba came through American news services. We were on one side of the issue with Castro. The one quite contented member of the conference was editor of a French language paper in Montreal. He said he has both Associated Press and Agence Francais and "I'd no more use AP on Cuba than Agence Francias on Algeria." He had a chance to use the more detached report. But mostly we don't have such a chance.

The responsibility of the American foreign correspondent is even greater than his home reader realizes. I realized it sharply last winter as consultant at the International Press Institute's Asian conference on the press in developing countries.

The focus of the conference was on the American foreign correspondent. Indeed the whole presentation of foreign correspondents was assigned to Americans. The Americans and their news services were subjected to sharp criticism. This is because American news services dominate the foreign news in much of the Asian press.

Every nation that can afford it has its own foreign news service. The Japanese do, the Indians. But most Asian lands cannot afford it. They are served by foreign news agencies, now mostly American. So they must see the world through alien eyes, chiefly American.

This is irritating to their journalists, their governments. It causes misunderstanding, arouses suspicion. The Asians at the conference in Manila could not understand the need of the American press to have American correspondents in their countries to communicate to Americans in meaningful terms. They suspected the American correspondent was reporting in the context of American foreign policy. Else why not employ a national of the country as correspondent?

After exploring the press in ten Asian countries, an American could understand this. Everywhere he could read in the local press more news from America than from the country next door. And American features, columns, comics. Their news from Viet Nam was chiefly from American correspondents.

These dispatches, written for American readers, returned on the world-wide circuit of the American syndicates and wire services to the very lands from which they reported, to come under scrutiny at their sources. This is a communication phenomenon whose consequences evoke little discussion and less concern.

It makes our foreign reporting inescapably a factor in our foreign relations. It makes it even more insistent that inescapable national bias be restrained to the irreducible minimum. It makes it more essential that a foreign correspondent be equipped with language and background for the places he must report. Too often that is not so.

It is impossible when a correspondent is assigned to cover the Far East from Hong Kong to Tokyo, or all Latin America, or Africa. It is only to give him a traveling assignment. He can't be expected to know the language and the ways of six to ten countries. He should be expected to know one and have a chance to stay there long enough to use it. Then perhaps his chief lesson is detachment in reporting on other peoples.

I have often quoted on this point Christopher Rand, himself an old China hand, now one of *The New Yorker's* star far-flung correspondents.

"The chief difficulty of our correspondents," Rand says, "is the subjective American bias. The rule is to be as detached as he can, to learn to float free and almost denationalize himself, to let impressions come in unhindered.

"Yet I feel," Rand concludes, "that a reporter who reached this stage would be in for a bad time, with readers and editors both. He would be rushed home to be reindoctrinated. If he learned detachment his readers would think him cold and negative. They would be disappointed not to be stirred up one way or another, about things, and the reporter would be lucky to survive. So reporters are probably no more to blame than the man in the street, who above all values his dream world and wants others to help maintain it. Reporting, indeed, may not get better until everything else does."

So spoke Confucius. It brings the responsibility home to all of us.

To return a moment to the Fulbright hearings, we saw in the rift they caused in CBS a flaring instance of the all too familiar conflict between journalistic judgment and business control. Fred Friendly, director of CBS news, old partner of Edward R. Murrow, saw at once the importance of the Foreign Relations hearings on Viet Nam. This was as close as we would get to a great debate on the Viet Nam War. He ordered the hearings covered live by CBS. It preempted the network most of the day for two days a week of the hearings. At the third hearing day top management intervened. A new top executive countermanded the live coverage, said it would be enough to include such glances at the hearing as it could fit into the half hour news program of Walter Cronkite and other news intervals. Friendly quit in protest that his professional news judgment was overruled by the business office. Not only did they overrule his judgment, but their own was so bad that they cut themselves off the very day of the biggest story. The day CBS cut it off was the day that George Kennan's testimony—by the author of containment of Soviet communism—led all the papers and required full text treatment in the New York Times. NBC, which had followed Friendly's lead, had the all-day story alone that day.

Outside of New York it is hard to find a handful of cities with two separately owned papers. Los Angeles and San Francisco are both down to one independent morning paper and one evening paper. St. Louis, Baltimore, Denver, Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Miami, Houston, Ft. Worth have two papers, morning and evening, separately owned, Philadelphia three in two ownerships. In Nashville there are two that combine printing and business departments in a jointly owned publishing company. Newspapermen call this a common law marriage. They will need a new name for the New York triangle.

But almost everywhere else, there is a local monopoly, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Louisville, Birmingham, Kansas City, Toledo, Portland (Ore.), Providence, Albany, Rochester, Indianapolis, Springfield, Worcester.

This is the pattern.

This means an absence of competition, a loss of diversity of viewpoint, a lack of a clash of opinion. There is only one door to knock on for a cause, only one point of decision on an issue, no pressure for alertness to keep watch on city hall or the local utility rates.

The single paper or single ownership is alone in the field. It seeks to cover the whole market in its merchandizing function for its advertisers. It tends to neutrality on political and controversial issues. Not always. There are distinguished exceptions of retaining independent vigor, but the tendency is toward bland consensus.

There are some offsets to all this. One is the independent columnist, syndicated in many papers, contributing often informed analysis of events and sometimes a vigorous opinion and distinction of views, as in the case of Walter Lippmann, Ralph McGill, James Reston, a few others. The independent columnist is unique to American journalism and has gone some distance to balance up the inherent conservatism of publishers, dramitized in Adlai Stevenson's phrase of "one-party press." The independent column adds some dimensions to a local editorial page. But this only on large general issues. It adds nothing to the enterprise, alertness or diversity of the press on its local affairs.

But another offset that may prove of increasing importance is, paradoxically, the freedom that comes to the newspaper without local competition. It can follow its own best professional judgment in putting the news in perspective, unfretted by the way some competitor may yellow it up to exploit trivia or sensation for sensation's sake. This negative factor has proved a positive contribution to journalism where responsible publishers have availed themselves of its opportunity—Louisville, Milwaukee, Toledo, Minneapolis, are notable examples.

This tends to strengthen the professionalism of journalism and suggests a possible development of such monopoly papers toward becoming papers of record—that is, to feel an absolute responsibility to record what is of public importance, voting records of legislatures and Congress, enough explanation of legislation to make it mean something, factual reports of school committee, city council, planning board, urban renewal, etc., etc., not just to select the rows and charges and circuses of public board meetings.

We are dependent on the character and quality of the people who own and publish our newspapers. This cannot be guaranteed. Some communities are highly fortunate, some very unfortunate, and there is no discernible path out of this pot-luck situation in so vital a matter as the condition of our prime sources of information.

The Christian Science Monitor and Deseret News are I believe, the only endowed daily newspapers that have survived, both supported by dynamic religions—a curious fact in a land of so much endowment of education.

Over all, on balance, our press performs more adequately than in any period since mass journalism introduced sensationalism, still the bane of the press. We have better educated staffs, generally more responsible editors, more complete and instantaneous communications, increasing specialization, though not enough to keep up with the specialized areas we need to be informed on. The problem of the press is the pace of social change, of all change, the pressure of events. Its processes remain relatively static, not only in its enormously expensive capitalization, its burdensome distribution, strangled often in its local traffic, which pushes back press times to make the news less fresh and less up-to-date, leaving more for television to have alone, but also in its news patterns.

The interview was a novel technique more than 100 years ago. All we have added to it is masses of reporters so that nothing individual comes out of an interview—now converted to press conference, with sometimes more than 400 attending reporters at a presidential press conference, though the entire record is made available by wire service to their offices. The inevitable increase in the density of bureaucracy discourages individual exploration and investigational reporting. The beats of assignments follow traditional grooves. Yet most human activity falls between these fixed grooves and largely goes unreported. News assignments are still made and reporters' activities directed from desks by men who can't know as much of the conditions as the reporters, and the reports are edited on other desks by men who are not in touch with the actuality of the events reported.

It is an old story with reporters that the farther they get from the home desk the freer they are and the better their stories; for the home desk, if they are not entirely beyond its reach, is less able to give directives.

The more we turn reporters loose from the apron strings of a desk the more adequate their reports will be. I have a local instance of that in Boston. The Christian Science Monitor lets its men on beats determine whether and when they have a story. If I read a piece from the state house by Eddie Mills in the Monitor I know he has decided there is a situation developed to the point where he can add it up and make some sense of it. I read it. It has more dimensions than the other stories that reporters are harried by their desks into turning in every day. There isn't real news every day. Newspapers have developed in us a habit-forming indulgence of taking a newspaper every day. They cultivate it by their continuity strips, comics, cross word puzzles and all that. But news is episodic. An election determines events for a long time. When we know the result, that's it. But the newspapers keep on writing about it. A presidential press conference may make seven factual, concrete stories on page one of the New York Times. We get the news that day. There may not be another press conference for a couple of weeks. But columnists and correspondents keep writing about what they gleaned from the last one. We could get all this discussion and speculation and follow-up just as well, with more perspective, in a weekly review, as our

grandfathers did. The sports page of an evening paper is an extreme example of reporting with nothing to report. For no sports events have occurred since the morning editions. But they fill their full acreage of space with talk that is primarily for assiduous time wasters. I don't complain of the catering to time wasters. I like cross word puzzles with cocktails. But it has nothing to do with our information. Leave reporters alone to cover their fields and report when they have something definite to write.

The most encouraging changes I have seen in newspapers have come recently from a change of generations that has brought in a management more in tune with its times enabling it to take more seriously its responsibility to publish an informed newspaper. Where this has occurred it has made all the difference and it has occurred often enough to be significant. A new generation of more modern management has taken the lid off, got able staffers and let their professional instincts determine what is news and how to present it, to let the news flow freely on its own momentum.

That is the key to sound journalism, to take the lid off and let the full impact of the news control the front page. Of course the increasing pressure and volume of events makes it hard to do anything else.

When television grows up to it, it can provide competition in news. It doesn't now and it won't until it frees itself from the entertainment-obsessed sponsors of all programs, sponsors who spend $200 million a year on television advertising for cigarettes and comparable sums for drugs and cosmetics. They determine the programs. News now just leaks out over edges of an entertainment medium, more to be compared to Hollywood than to journalism. But they have shown what they can do, what Walter Cronkite and Eric Sevareid can do, filling in around the commercials for 30 minutes, less 10 or 12, every night. They have the resources beyond all dreams of newspapers. They have the mass audience in massive numbers. They have the dramatic impact of the visual image. The great networks, when they set themselves to it, can focus public attention on an issue with a vividness the printed word cannot match.

But for our local news, for what happens where we live, most of our local commercial stations are pathetic, about the equivalent of a shopping news sheet.

But the potential of television for journalism is beyond imagining when it turns from the phony commercials of glorified aspirins for five times the base price of equally effective unbranded aspirin, to mirroring our society, informing us of our public affairs, turning their so-called newscasts into reporting instead of performances.

I don't mean to suggest that television is going to be the answer to journalism. It may be a long time before it can even offer an alternative. Until it can deliver a recording in some form that one can play back when he gets home, he has to be at the set when the news comes on, which isn't always possible. And television presents its own serious problems.

The power of television is potentially greater even than the vaunted power of the press, through its dramatic visual impact. General de Gaulle's trouble in getting elected is credited to France's opening up TV for the first time to the opposition candidates. Harold Wilson avoided a TV debate in the British election so as not to risk rocking the boat of his convenient campaign about nothing in particular except to get some more seats.

In Massachusetts, last time around we had a good governor who was beaten, Chub Peabody, and it is widely believed he was beaten by TV. You can't prove it. He might have lost anyway. A reform governor, he had made enemies and alienated the business-as-usual pros in his own party who beat him for renomination. But the judgment of the state house reporters, widely accepted, was that the key factor in Peabody's defeat was television. They said he didn't project as a strong decisive executive. There was something fuzzy, uncertain, indecisive about the impression from the frequent TV press conferences and interviews with the governor. The thing is, it was a false image. Chub Peabody achieved a good deal for reform against a hostile legislative leadership, and a good deal for education and for transportation and some structural improvements in the state government. More than had been done before. This didn't project. The people who got only a TV image, like those who read only the headlines, didn't know the score. There is no answer for people who don't keep up with the score, in TV or press. Those who don't take the trouble to know what is going on are pushovers for the corruptionists, the lobbyists, the axe grinders.

I suggested that a problem of the press is business-minded control. But I don't want to leave it at that. The alternative of government control is no happier, as the Hutchins Commission concluded 20 years ago. By the way, the late Zechariah Chafees' contribution to the Hutchins Commission on a Free and Responsible Press has just been reprinted by the Archon Press: *Government and Mass Communication*. Here you have the most brilliant and dedicated advocate of freedom of utterance thinking out loud about the problem of an adequate press for a free society, his keen lawyer's mind clashing with his libertarian convictions, and his responsibility to keep the record straight leading him to disclose his own thinking and that of all his colleagues as they wrestled for three years over this problem, how their minds shifted from regulation by anti-trust law to conclude finally that there is no answer in law or regulations, only in education and persuasion, responsibility and self-discipline within the press,

under pressure of sophisticated and discriminating readers, demanding to be adequately informed on their public affairs.

This brings us back to the reader. Communications is a two-way street.

Walter Lippmann told the Washington correspondents they have to do the home work that people should do for themselves, to analyze and interpret the meaning of events. James Reston says the chief problem of the correspondent is to hold the reader's attention, with all his distractions, long enough to tell him anything. He must exploit the first flush of the news while it is on the front page. Tonight he might research it. Tomorrow he might have lunch with an authority. But tomorrow is too late; the news has gone off the front page. Reader interest has shifted to something else. This describes an impossible job that the correspondent must make out with as best he can.

But this leaves out the reader's responsibility. We live in a world of distractions, all our senses constantly assailed by a blizzard of words, in print, by air, direct mail. This is an age of communication, we are told. Indeed we have too much of it, so much that we are confused and overwhelmed by a bombardment that makes us feel like the atom and under comparable danger of disintegrating, losing our mental integrity to go into fusion with a lot of irrelevant matter that may disperse us as fall-out all over the lot. This is a threat to independence of mind and a purposeful life.

The only answer is to cultivate immunity to distraction. Life is too short for everything that anybody has to sell. We have to learn to be discriminating in what we give our attention to, in the paper we read, the television we listen to. To select from the news what matters to us, to develop callouses to sensationalism and to use the bits and pieces of events in day-to-day reports as clues to follow up in the greater depth that weekly reviews, serious magazines and topical books, now cheap in paper back, make more readily available to us than ever before.

In short, the reader too has a responsibility for the images in his head. It is after all his head.

Mr. Lyons, Curator of Nieman Fellowships until 1964, gave this address at the University of California, Riverside, in April, 1966. It is one in a series of journalism lectures sponsored by the Riverside Press-Enterprise.

Price Waterhouse Foundation To Sponsor Two More Nieman Fellows

The Price Waterhouse Foundation has announced that it will sponsor a Nieman Fellowship for a business and financial writer for the academic years 1967-68 and 1968-69. Newspapermen seeking these awards must file the regular application provided by the Nieman office at 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge. Massachusetts 02138, and be chosen by the Nieman Selection Committee appointed annually by Harvard University. Last year the Nieman Fellow sponsored by Price Waterhouse was Robert H. Metz, of the New York Times.

How the Better Half Sees Us

By Allison Stacey Cowles

When I left college 11 years ago, I had worked hard, had lots of fun, and made one firm resolution—after the Wellesley College News I would *never* be involved with another newspaper. The headaches I'd suffered! The deadlines missed by a staff of English majors who drank Coke syrup straight, and played Quotations all night! A printer who had just landed a contract with TV Guide for the whole Boston area and didn't have time for 2000 copies of anything.

And my greatest news scoop, when I was a sophomore, during the McCarthy hearings—it was when a Harvard physicist, who had decided to make a clean breast of it, told me, first of all the world, about his life as a Communist. Do you know what happened? Our editor traded it to her fiancee on the Harvard Crimson . . . "just as a friendly gesture." That's why they call it the Harvard Crime.

So, when I was in graduate school at Radcliffe, I hardly read a newspaper at all. Well, in fact, I did read the Sunday New York Times, but that's really sacred literature at Harvard. Actually I hadn't read any other paper since the New York Herald Tribune discontinued the comics when I was about 8, and I *never* read the Wellesley College News because by the time it came out, I was sick of it.

And then I met Bill Cowles, a handsome law student from "somewhere near Seattle." I fell in love with *him* because he subscribed to a Sunday paper that had funnies; in fact, the World's Greatest Comics in Color. And since they came to Boston on Thursday from Spokane, I could read them while he and his bachelor roommates cooked dinner Friday night—martinis, 29¢-a-pound hamburger stroganoff with all the fat left in, and flaming peaches. Combine that with Dondi and I was so weak I couldn't resist him.

Bill, on the other hand, fell in love with me because, as one of his friends confided, he came from pioneer stock and, after 14 years away, he had to find a wife before June when he was going home to work. I don't really believe that. As Bill points out, after all, he still had seven months to go.

With that kind of basis for marriage, imagine how our bonds were strengthened when we reached Spokane and I discovered Ann Landers and comics twice a day! To say nothing of Dr. Alvarez, with fascinating skin diseases and free booklets on polyps. It was wonderful!

One of the first things we did in Spokane was to tour the newspaper. It took almost three hours, and I must have shaken hands with every employee. Well, actually, we only whispered "hello" to the Photon machine, not to appear *too* friendly.

Then I had an interview with my new father-in-law in his office. This was only fair, because Bill had had one with my 22-year-old brother, who was the head of my family. I never did find out all that transpired in that interview, except that after several awkward drinks and silences my brother asked, "How the hell did you do it?", and my bride price was fixed at a Sunday subscription to the Spokesman-Review and the stroganoff recipe.

The interview with Father was very different, very serious, and is the basis of how I see the newspaper business. I emerged from his office dazed by the implications of joining a publisher's family. We discussed the United States government and the Constitution, and proper respect for its elected officers. We went on to the Supreme Court, checks and balances, and how Freedom of the Press is absolutely essential in a democracy. Then we discussed Responsibility to the Spokane Community, and Education of its Citizens, and their Right to Know. We talked about my ability to keep privileged information to myself, and reviewed each plank of the Spokesman-Review platform. After that, I think we had the ASNE code of ethics.

Well, it may sound silly, but every newspaperman knows

that side of publishing, and if you know Father, you know how deeply concerned he is, and how very impressive and inspiring. In fact, that interview was one of the most inspiring moments of my life.

A little later that year, I realized that the newspaper business is not only a responsibility, but a dangerous game. As an historian, I should have known that wherever men have power, the stakes are high, and so are the risks. It just wasn't that way on the Wellesley College News. When Father was president of the Inter-American Press Association, we attended a meeting in San Francisco during which a South American publisher described how he and his family had fled, and government police had hung his son by the thumbs for six hours and then put him in prison, where he is still. I learned that La Prensa, in Buenos Aires, has an executive pistol range in the basement. Father told me about an IAPA meeting in Uruguay where the Peronistas brought their guns as part of their membership credentials.

And just this spring Mr. L. H. Walton of the Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, South Africa, winner of the ANPA World Press Achievement award, told how government police searched his offices for the names of persons who helped the paper with its articles about living conditions among black South Africans.

Here at home the threats to newspapers take a more subtle turn. The United States government tries to disparage the authority of newspaper stories from Viet Nam, as Wes Gallagher so clearly explained in his recent article. And in Spokane we had our own problem of $2,750,000 worth of law suits this winter, when 22 firemen and policemen each asked $125,000 damages for libel in news stories about a local election. When the first six plaintiffs' suits came to trial, the jury decided in favor of the newspaper. Physically—financially, the newspaper business *is* dangerous.

And like anything dangerous, it's never dull. "You'll never be bored," women told me at the ANPA meeting we attended two weeks after we were married. In fact, that's what everyone said, except Red Motley, who, having asked how long we'd been married, learned it had been two weeks, and said only, "My God!".

The newspaper business really is interesting. My idea of Bill's office is something between an all-day party and a TV marathon—celebrities and accomplished people streaming in and out, talking about their favorite subjects. Fitted around this parade of fascination are the run-of-the-mill managerial problems—theft of the mail, molasses in the ink, homosexuals on the staff, and does anyone have an idea of what to do with the old cuspidors? I should confess that this idea of office routine developed while the children were sneezing strained carrots into my hair and I was waiting breathlessly for Dick Tracy and intellectual stimulation.

Combine all that fascination with the weight of responsibility for impartiality, truth, desire for progress in the community, and informing the readers, and you get what I call "Editors and Publishers Syndrome." It's an occupational thing in the newspaper business along with firing squads, Congressional investigations, libel suits, and vitamin deficiencies from attending too many civic dinners.

Like brick layers' callouses and professors' chalk dust, "Editors and Publishers Syndrome" is a physical look—it means a smooth forehead, wide-open eyes and a sincere, attentive, and thoughtful countenance which expresses interest, but no emotion whatsoever. I'm sure it is the result of a parade of partisans, and a real effort to be fair; it comes from trying to see both sides of every problem before exercising a sound judgment, based on great principles. And if one's mind is already made up, naturally, there is no sign of prejudice!

At the AP annual luncheon this year, while Vice-President Hubert Humphrey was speaking, I looked around the ballroom for a facial expression that would indicate disagreement. Not a snort, a raised eyebrow, or a curled lip in the crowd. Even Don Maxwell's cigar puffs could never be interpreted as punctuation. The only indication I saw of emotion that day was an older man who fell asleep, his facial syndrome intact. He was betrayed when he nearly toppled from his chair.

My husband is rapidly developing another characteristic of newspaper people—the ability to see problems in terms of Great Principles. Just last week our five-year-old son and his little friend Cece put on a puppet show on our front lawn, in a cardboard box made into a theater. When I went outside, I discovered that the children were charging 2¢ to see the show and all their little friends were hurrying home to get their pennies. Our son was the banker, Cece was the hustler, and they split the take, which was 24¢. Not bad for five-year-olds! As I proudly waited for the curtain, trying to decide from whose family his talents came, I only hoped the audience wouldn't want its money back at the end.

When the curtain went up, to my astonishment, our three-year-old daughter was the show. And what a show! There was our blonde angel, holding a puppet and gleefully reciting things that prompt other mothers to say, "You can't play with *those* children!" The kids got their money's worth, all right. And mine got a lecture on suitable content for public entertainment. But when my husband came home and had stopped laughing, he remarked, "It's a real parental dilemma, to weigh a daughter's reputation against the censorship of a son's free enterprise." You have to admit that's a special way of looking at a problem.

When I told Bob Myers I would talk about how the

better half sees you, I didn't intend to be so personal, but I really have very little to do with the business. My two contributions so far have been to keep quiet about what I know, and to plant some gladiolus bulbs that the Farm papers gave as a premium to new subscribers. Someone in a position of responsibility had to see if they came up!

I do have one serious criticism of the business, though. I enjoy polyps and Oriental sores as much as the next person, but do we have to have the President's picture *every* day? And all those stories about Ladybird and Luci and Bobby and Jackie? I think if half of the stories were eliminated, the public would be just as well informed, perhaps not on the President's incision and his pets, but about foreign news, developments in the courts, or other areas, like what is happening on the frontiers of human knowledge.

One of my Walter Mitty dreams was to climb Mt. Kennedy right after Bobby Kennedy did, only with a group of housewives, just to prove that the climb wasn't so hard. We were going to have French cooking and we even had a name—"Operation High Camp." We hoped (the girls and I) that our satire would put a stop to all those silly publicity tricks, but our husbands wouldn't let us go, and *mine* said he wouldn't even cover it. You know about newspaper wives. The only way to get your name in the paper is to go through a red light.

I *do* respect the elected officers of our nation, and I get gooseflesh just like everybody else when the President walks in and the Marine Band plays "Hail to the Chief." But the twelve-year-olds for whom newspapers used to write are now building science projects I don't understand. They may not know who Giotto was, but they know about Cezanne and Jackson Pollock and they want to learn more. They *have* to learn more, and not about Presidential barbecues and Kennedy vacations.

What's more, even adults like to think. A wonderful example in Spokane last winter was the censoring of a library exhibition. The Washington State University Resident Artist, a bearded individualist, was asked to hang a show at the Public Library. He put up about 150 drawings, and the librarian took down 20 (including one of a motorcycle!) on grounds of obscenity. The artist, indignant, removed the whole show to the Unitarian Church, where, because of front page newspaper articles, almost everyone went to see for himself. And the city is still arguing, not so much about the artist, but about the principles which were involved. What should the librarian have done? No two persons agree, yet.

Well, there it is. Except for the Birds, Beagles, and Kennedys, I think newspapers, editors and publishers are great. It's a rare business which has power, danger, responsibility, fascination, and a philosophical justification for its existence. It's a rare breed that run it, and I love them!

Mrs. Cowles is the wife of W. H. Cowles, 3rd, general manager and vice-president of the Spokane Statesman-Review. These remarks were made at the Idaho-Utah AP Members Association meeting in Park City, Utah.

How Good Are the Newspapers of Canada?

By Stuart Keate

Mr. Keate is publisher of the Vancouver Sun and is president of the Canadian Press wire service.

How good is the press of Canada? "No good at all," say the labor leaders and the cognoscenti of the campus. "Too good for the average reader," says a high school teacher, after attending a journalism seminar, and adds: "The people of this country don't really appreciate what a job their press is doing."

In fact it's impossible to say how good it is at any given moment, because the press lives in a constant state of ferment and change. Newspapers are made by men and women; as they flare and fade, so do their papers. Thus, a paper like the Saint John (N.B.) Telegraph-Journal—once stodgy, timid and suffused with ancient crotchets—can be rejuvenated overnight by the arrival of a publisher who is young, imaginative, progressive, and eager to give his community a thorough shake by the scruff of the neck.

The job of the press, simply stated, is to be a useful nuisance; as Mencken said, "to comfort the afflicted, and afflict the comfortable." Popularity is none of its business. One of the most frequently-heard complaints following the recent demise of the Vancouver Times was that it tried to please everybody and ended up pleasing nobody.

In his valedictory speech in 1964, Lord Beaverbrook noted that no industry in the world is as heavily criticized as the newspaper business. And, he added, the loudest critics have a very simple code: "Don't ever print anything about me that I wouldn't want people to read."

Nevertheless, if mere *acceptance*—the willingness of citizens to pay for a product—is the touchstone, then the press of Canada is doing very well, indeed. Its readership, already great, is growing every day.

There are today 109 dailies in this country. Together, they sell 4,310,370 copies a day, or an average of about 40,000 apiece. Since surveys show that the average newspaper is read by three persons, it would appear that almost every Canadian old enough to read, or literate enough, examines a Canadian daily on a regular basis.

Further, with net advertising revenues in 1964 of $191 millions, they far out-sell the 222 private radio stations ($63 millions) and 58 private TV stations ($78 millions). Add to this the income from newspaper circulations (another $80 millions) and it will be seen that Canada's dailies produce almost twice as much revenue as their competitors.

Maybe "competitors" isn't *exactly* the right word. Most sophisticated newsmen agree that television and radio have actually *helped* newspapers to grow by whetting readers' appetites for the full story that TV and radio can tell only with snapshots or bulletins. This factor has somewhat changed the role of the daily newspaper. While it can no longer be first with the news, it can flesh out the detail and provide the background information in a way that television and radio cannot hope to match. For example, a full 15-minute newscast would take up less than two columns of a newspaper.

It appears then, if measurable statistics mean anything, that Canadians like their daily newspapers. What of their character?

If Canadian newspapers are not always as literate as the Manchester Guardian or as comprehensive as the New York Times, they do not run to the excesses of good and bad which characterize the presses of Britain and the United States. We have in Canada no "penny dreadfuls" and no lurid daily scandal sheets; nor do we have those pallid handbills, so common in small American cities, which appear to be compounded of ready-mix and blotting paper.

In general, it seems to me, the daily press of Canada is characterized by a calm and level-headed tone, and thus accurately mirrors a calm and balanced nation.

The character of a newspaper derives from that strange alchemy which fuses the inanimate (ink on paper) with the animate (the ideas and ideals of its men and women). Newspapers go into the home each day with a backlog of tradition, the accumulated wisdom and technical skill of past generations of editors and production men. Thus, over a century or so, it's a poor paper that doesn't develop

something of a personality, a distinctive flavor, or a character.

The late C. P. Scott, the renowned editor of the Manchester Guardian, put it this way:

"Character is a subtle affair, and has many shades to it. It is not a thing to be much talked about, but felt. It is the slow deposit of past actions and ideals. It is for each man his most precious possession, and so it is for the latest growth of time, the newspaper."

The character will include all the things we admire in attractive friends—integrity, intelligence, a sense of humor, good taste. But most of all it will include courage. Nothing can fail more swiftly, as William Allen White once remarked, than a cowardly paper—unless it is a paper that mistakes noise for courage.

The honest editor goes to the parapets every day. And nothing pleases him more than to have an irate reader take his hide off in the letters-to-the-editor column.

You don't always, of course, get the reaction aroused by that editor of a country weekly, who, to fill up space ran the Ten Commandments one day, without any editorial comment. The next day he got a letter from one of his oldest subscribers, saying: "Cancel my subscription. You're getting too damned personal."

But if it is the job of the editorial page to jar the civic conscience, to stimulate discussion and defend the right of unorthodox opinion, it is equally the job of the news columns (and this underlines the curious schizophrenia of newspapers) to be completely objective, dispassionate and nonpartisan in their reports. Any person who has something to say should be entitled to a fair report of his remarks. This includes opinions which the editor may abhor, and blatant propaganda which is recognized as such but printed because it emanates from supposedly responsible officials.

"Why do you give the mayor so much space?," irate citizens demanded in one Canadian town. "You know he's a nut."

"Of course he is," replied the editor, 'and if we quote him often enough, the voters will find out." They found out, and duly retired him.

A labor leader, speaking at a conference on the press in Canada, argued that its greatest flaw was that it was too prosperous and therefore "too complacent." It cannot be denied that this is a continuing daily peril. Any sensible publisher knows that, as in baseball, today's hero is tomorrow's goat and he is only as good as his last edition.

But labor leaders also continually charge that the press slants the news. A cursory survey of labor papers in Canada today reveals that they are the worst offenders in the country in this respect. If they took an honest, dispassionate look at their publications they would realize that this is one of the main causes of their low circulation.

The Vancouver Sun has gone through five labor reporters in the past decade. A study of the high turn-over revealed a common complaint: ninety per cent of labor officials were impossible to work with.

"If you delete as much as a sentence from their latest release, you're a capitalist tool," the most recent drop-out from the Sun's labor beat remarked, sadly. (He is, incidentally, a strong union man and official of the Newspaper Guild.)

"If you say to them: 'Okay I've got your story; now I'm going to talk to management,' they regard you as hostile to labor. Print a few paragraphs from the other side and you're slanting the news.

"In other words, they believe in freedom of the press as long as it doesn't cast them in an unfavorable light. Management is worse, because *they* won't talk at all."

Most papers chew over their sins of omission and commission at daily post-mortems. The Canadian Press wire agency, a non-profit organization sustained by the newspapers, indulges each year in what it calls Criticism Week, when the file of news is subjected to minute examination by the men who know it best: the news editors. Complaints are then aired at a series of five annual regional meetings, which CP general manager Gillis Purcell describes as "the most useful and productive way we have devised to improve our performance."

Yet Canada is not without its journalistic titans. When the mighty Times of London was hailing Neville Chamberlain's journey to Munich as a diplomatic masterpiece, John W. Dafoe was asking in the Winnipeg Free Press: "What's All the Shouting About?"

When Canadian journalists are thrown into direct competition with their opposite numbers from Britain and the United States they come off remarkably well. During the war years Ross Munro (now publisher of the new weekly, The Canadian) contrived to scoop at the best talent in the world at Dieppe, in the landings at Sicily, and at Normandy. When Harold Morrison of the Canadian Press was diverted from a routine junket to cover the Lee Oswald arrest in Dallas, he emerged with a clean beat within 24 hours of his arrival at the jail.

Many detached observers regard Duncan MacPherson of the Toronto Daily Star as the best political cartoonist in the world today. The Royal Society of Arts in London, seeking a first winner of its silver medal for the best journalist in the Commonwealth, voted for Bruce Hutchison of Victoria.

The New York publisher, Alfred A. Knopf, once remarked that Robertson Davies, the Peterborough editor and educator, was "the finest book critic in North America." And Nathan Cohen of Toronto, while by no means the most popular critic of the arts in Canada, at least rejoices in the pleasure of spurning offers to bring his silver-headed cane to Broadway.

By any journalistic standards, international or local,

The Globe and Mail of Toronto is a superior newspaper, much admired across the country. Its national and foreign coverage is perhaps the best in Canada, although the Montreal Star would have reasonable grounds for challenging the assertion. The Globe and Mail's columnists (Bruce West, Scott Young, Richard Needham, Dennis Braithwaite and Herbert Whittaker) are men of wit and perception; its editorial page is not only attractive but courageous; and its general tone is one of good sense, taste, and discernment.

The Toronto Daily Star, which enjoys the top circulation in Canada (350,000), seems to me to be at the peak of its powers, and well deserving of its commanding position. The flamboyant hit-and-mop-up tactics that characterized the paper under the late, famous Harry Hindmarsh now seem, in retrospect, part of the growing-up process; what we have today is a paper in which liveliness has not been foresworn, but content remains crucial; a more mature, literate journal, full of opinions which it advances with imperious vigor.

The Telegram is like neither of the others; brash; outgoing, it must certainly be the most non-conservative Conservative paper in Canada today. But in its coverage of politics and show business, with its makeup similar to that of the London Daily Express, it offers a lively alternative to the other two and thus helps make Toronto one of the most interesting newspaper cities on the continent.

In Montreal, the Gazette and the Star occupy different fields (morning and evening) and hence the competition seems more remote and polite. Unlike the papers in English Canada, their competition is from the old-established French dailies; and it is a mark of their appeal that each has attracted thousands of French-Canadian readers. Many Canadian newsmen regard them as the most improved dailies of the past decade. The calm and level-headed way in which they have handled themselves, as minorities at the epicenter of the "two cultures" debate, has won widespread admiration from French and English colleagues alike.

The French press, like Quebec itself, seems to be in a state of ferment. La Presse, largest in Montreal (236,000), the bellwether of French-Canada's press, recently suffered a wrenching strike and shortly after resuming publication dismissed its moderate editor, Gerard Pelletier, on what appeared to be an hilarious charge: he had permitted an "inaccurate" headline to be published.

On the day *that* story was carried across the country by CP, it was posted on the Vancouver Sun notice-board with a heading that read: 'Look out, boys!'

It is obvious that French Canada's dailies are more journals of opinion than their English counterparts; an estimate supported by the large number of signed editorials and "think pieces" they indulge, notably in the small but influential Le Devoir. If more super-charged, and less objective, than the English-language press in its reporting of hard news, the French dailies have done a superior job in their coverage of the arts, and recently strengthened their wire service reports by persuading CP (which is 90 per cent English in its membership) to bring in the well-written Agence France-Presse file for the French dailies.

The political spotlight on Quebec has tended to obscure the contribution made by more than 100 independent ethnic newspapers to Canadian culture and traditions. Published in dozens of languages, often mixed with English, they enjoy a combined paid circulation of about 500,000 and serve two million readers.

While it is generally accepted that competition is the lifeblood of the industry, the fact remains that some of Canada's most highly-regarded dailies are published in one-paper cities. Indeed, there is considerable evidence to show that the so-called "monopoly" publishers recognize that their domination imposes on them a special responsibility to put out good newspapers.

Thus the Windsor Star and the Brantford Expositor consistently carry off awards for typographical excellence, the Star adorning its pages with engravings which look capable of speech. The Kitchener-Waterloo Record, the Peterborough Examiner, the St. Catharines Standard and the Brandon Sun are medium-sized Canadian dailies which regularly publish more foreign news than their British and American counterparts and have been acclaimed for their contributions to community life. The smallish Orillia Packet and Times (7,000) produces editorials which are more widely quoted across the nation than papers ten times its size. The Hamilton Spectator and London Free Press have never been intimidated by their proximity to Toronto and, by dint of generous coverage, good art, and progressive editorial-page leadership, have won a firm hold on the loyalties of their readers.

But there are complaints. Serious criticisms of the Canadian press, which reached a fine frenzy in 1962, before passing on to flay the doctors in 1963, the undertakers in 1964, and now seems directed at the church, can be summed up in three charges:

- It is not competitive enough; mergers are killing the business.
- The press slants the news.
- The press is not keeping pace with the technological revolution; it is unreceptive to new techniques and new ideas.

How valid are these charges?

Many false statements have been issued about the "dying" press in North America. The fact is that a dozen new dailies have started in this country in the past decade, five of them in British Columbia. More will appear as the northern frontiers are pushed back. Membership in the Canadian press is the highest it has been in 40 years.

Much of the criticism concerns the growth of chain

operations, charging they tend to restrict competition and create monopolies.

Actually there is no such thing as a newspaper monopoly. A newspaper lives by news and advertising, and it has a monopoly on neither. News is where you find it, as the Victoria youngster discovered a few years ago when he set fire to his father's barn in Saanich and collected $2 for 'phoning in 'the best news story of the day.'

Advertising, even in a one-paper town, is a fiercely-competitive business. The newspaper publisher, while enjoying the basic outlet, must still offer a cost-per-thousand rate which compares favorably not only with radio and TV, but with weeklies, magazines, business and farm papers, directories, catalogues, direct mail, billboards, car-cards and neon.

Today there are three main newspaper chains in Canada: the Thomsons (27 dailies); the Southams (eight wholly-owned, plus two in which they hold a minority interest, at London and Kitchener); and FP Publications Ltd., sometimes known as the Sifton-Bell group (eight dailies).

The Thomsons tend to be small-city papers, where the population can sustain only one daily—places like Nanaimo, Moose Jaw, Kirkland Lake, etc. While largest in numbers, the Thomson papers are smallest in circulation of the three groups.

All told, the Southams control about 20 per cent of Canada's daily circulation and FP about 18 per cent. The Thomsons account for approximately seven per cent. The three group operations control 43 of the dailies in Canada and 45 per cent of the circulation. It follows that 60 per cent of the daily newspapers are privately-owned or independent.

What standards should Canadians seek in their daily newspapers? How, in fact, do you judge a newspaper?

Let me suggest a few yardsticks:

- First, the editorial page. Has it got character? Is it well written? Does it make cogent arguments? Will it take a stand in favor of the things it believes in—or, more importantly, *against* the things it cherishes, when they get off base?
- What about news services? Does it buy any wire service besides the predominant CP-AP-Reuters file? Does it give readers a choice—United Press International, New York Times, the new Times-Post service, Chicago Daily News? No daily can possibly print all these, but a fine newspaper will offer its readers a selection.
- Consider local, hard-news coverage. Is it vital, compelling, well-written? Does your newspaper know what's going on in town?
- Pictures and cartoons—how good are they? Are the photographs imaginatively displayed and handsomely engraved? How often are the cartoonist's drawings reprinted across the nation?
- Layout. Is the newspaper attractive in its presentation of the news, using type and white space with boldness, so that the eye is invited into the story? Is the ink fast, or does it stain your fingers?
- How about special writers—news analysts, columnists, and so on? Is an attempt made to report the news "in depth," with interpretive pieces to help the readers understand the daily flow of events? Are the columnists bright, lively, and provocative? Do their publishers afford them freedom to say what they want?
- Has the paper got a heart? Has it campaigned recently for the needy, the sick, the hungry? Has it tackled problems like air pollution and urban renewal?
- Finally, does the newspaper reflect the spirit of the city in which it is published?

To the charge that newspapers have not kept pace, the industry has only to point to the record—and to some special problems. At Christmas last year, Vancouver opened a new, $12 million plant which produces more than 250,000 copies of the Sun and 100,000 of the Province every day. Regina's Leader-Post, the London Fress Press and Brandon Sun have occupied new premises. The Montreal Star, La Presse, Toronto Telegram, both the Herald and the Albertan in Calgary, the Tribune and Free Press in Winnipeg and the Hamilton Spectator have recently installed, or ordered, multi-million dollar presses and Le Soleil in Quebec has expanded and modernized.

But the inevitable shift into the electronic era of computers and automatic typesetting cannot be achieved until a way is found to work with the unions, as the unhappy strike in Toronto is so clearly demonstrating. But Canada is doing better in this respect than the United States. The setting of news from tape is an old story in this country; but a year ago the New York Post walked away from these cost-cutting techniques rather than incur the wrath of the International Typographical Union's tough-talking Bertram Powers.

Speedier techniques, better color and finer reproduction, while necessary and important, will not alter the basic job of the press: to produce newspapers of character, dedicated increasingly to public service.

The newspaper of the future will have essentially the same format as it has today; although pictures will be sharper, body type larger, color more life-like, and layout more artistic. The difference will be in the writing (*vide* Tom Wolfe of the late New York Herald Tribune), and the content. As our universities turn out more graduates, the literacy level will rise, and so will the demand for better writing, more background, and greater specialization. The newspaper that meets these demands will cost more money. Many Canadians today pay more than 50 cents for the Sunday edition of the New York Times and feel it's worth every cent. In my view, the day of the 25-cent daily may come as early as 1975, if costs continue to rise

as they have been doing for the past 25 years.

But whatever else its critics may say, the press of Canada today is free, honest and independent.

It is free (at least for this generation) to say whatever it likes about politicians.

It is honest in the sense that Canadians cannot buy their way into the news columns of their paper; and what is even more important, they can't buy their way *out* of them.

As Prime Minister Jean Lesage of Quebec observed in a recent speech to the National Newspaper Awards dinner, Canada's press is getting tougher. If more scandals seem to be turning up in public life, it may be because Canadian reporters are digging harder, enjoy more freedom, and are writing with verbs that curl the paper.

This is their job. It involves a running battle with authority, to seek out what others would hide, to report what others would suppress. The man who voiced that deathless maxim: 'You can't fight City Hall' was never a reporter.

Nieman Notes

1940

John Crider, 60, former editor of the Boston Herald, winner of Pulitzer Prize for editorials in 1949, former staff member of Time, Life and the New York Times, died July 8, 1966.

1945

Houston Waring, former editor of the Littleton Independent & Arapahoe Herald turned control of the Arapahoe County Colorado newspapers over to the newly formed Independent Printing Co. He will remain as editor-manager for a transition period.

1946

Jack Foisie, who has been chief of the Los Angeles Times Saigon bureau, opened a new Times bureau in Bangkok September 1.

1949

John L. Hulteng, Dean of the School of Journalism of the University of Oregon, was elected President of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism at their meeting during the Association for Education in Journalism convention August 28-31.

1955

Julius Duscha became associate director of Stanford University's professional journalism fellowship program September 1.

1958

Dean Brelis, NBC correspondent, returned from Vietnam recently to be anchorman of "Vietnam Weekly Review" (Sundays).

Howard Simons was recently named Assistant Managing Editor of the Washington Post.

1961

John D. Pomfret was named assistant to the director of the industrial relations staff of the New York Times.

1962

Bernard D. Nossiter, foreign correspondent for the Washington Post, received the Fairchild Award from the Overseas Press Club for the best business news reporting from abroad. His book, THE MYTHMAKERS: AN ESSAY ON POWER AND WEATH won a Hillman Foundation Award in 1965.

1964

Ray Jenkins, managing editor of the Alabama Journal was named editor of the editorial page of that newspaper.

1965

Hodding Carter III was named editor and associate publisher of the Greenville, Mississippi, Delta Democrat-Times. His father (Nieman Fellow, 1939) continues as publisher.