

# **NiemanReports**

---

September 1969

## **A Look at the British Press Council**

by John M. Harrison

---

---

**Edwin A. Lahey, January 11, 1902-July 17, 1969**

by Louis M. Lyons

---

**Ed Lahey, Reporter**

by John S. Knight

---

**A Nieman Fellow at Harvard**

by Edwin A. Lahey of the Chicago Daily News

# NiemanReports

VOL. XXIII, NO. 3

Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus

September 1969

—Dwight E. Sargent, Editor—

—Tenney K. Lehman, Managing Editor—

## Editorial Board of the Society of Nieman Fellows

Robert W. Brown  
Augusta ChronicleMillard C. Browne  
Buffalo NewsWilliam B. Dickinson  
Philadelphia BulletinTillman Durdin  
New York TimesWilliam F. McIlwain  
NewsdayRoy M. Fisher  
Chicago Daily NewsRobert B. Frazier  
Eugene Register-GuardThomas H. Griffith  
Life MagazineRebecca Gross  
Lock Haven ExpressAlan Barth  
Washington PostC. Ray Jenkins  
Alabama JournalJohn Strohmeier  
Bethlehem Globe-TimesE. J. Paxton, Jr.  
Paducah Sun-DemocratHarry T. Montgomery  
Associated PressDavid Kraslow  
Los Angeles TimesSylvan Meyer  
Miami NewsRobert Lasch  
St. Louis Post-DispatchRobert Giles  
Knight NewspapersSmith Hempstone, Jr.  
Washington StarGeorge Chaplin  
Honolulu Advertiser

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 Lahey Legend

The first section of this issue of Nieman Reports is devoted to the life of the late Edwin A. Lahey of the Knight Newspapers. Ed was a newspaperman of national repute, a human being of warmth and friendliness, and a grandfather as gentle with his grandchildren as he was tough in his dedication to the truth. He was one of nine journalists appointed as a Nieman Fellow in the first class at Harvard University in 1938-39.

No one is better qualified to write the history of Ed's Nieman year than his colleague in the inaugural group, Louis M. Lyons, a reporter for The Boston Globe and Curator of the Nieman Fellowships from 1939 to 1964. No one can assess more knowledgeably Ed's talents, personal and professional, than his close friend and boss for many years, John S. Knight. No one can reflect more poignantly on that first Nieman year—Dr. James Bryant Conant referred to it as “a dubious experiment”—than Ed Lahey himself, who helped to end doubts about this association between the world of journalism and the groves of academe. The editors

of Nieman Reports are pleased to present these comments on a brilliant career.

As Louis Lyons said in a letter accompanying his Lahey article, “. . . Lahey created a Nieman tradition, and his death closes a first chapter. This is a landmark.” Even as his death brings an era to an end, the memory of his life inspires a new one. Those associated with the Nieman program are especially proud of Ed's contributions to the development of the Fellowships, but we are equally proud of the Lahey examples of professional excellence that prodded reporters everywhere toward higher standards. We cheer his greatness as a newspaperman, and cherish his goodness as a family man and friend. A description of his life, like Ed's description of his Nieman year, “seriously taxes my store of adjectives,” but on the following pages, Louis M. Lyons, John S. Knight and Edwin A. Lahey relate with eloquence the legend and legacy of an extraordinary man.

—Dwight E. Sargent

# Edwin A. Lahey

## January 11, 1902—July 17, 1969

By Louis M. Lyons

Ed Lahey made an indelible impression on Harvard and left a legend that created a tradition for the Nieman Fellows. "The ivy's got me," he wired back to his city editor upon arriving in Cambridge the fall of 1938, one of the first Nieman group.

But it was the other way. In Lahey the academic community realized its romantic notion of the newspaperman: irreverent, skeptical, wise-cracking, his clipped speech redolent of the sidewalks of Chicago but expressing the wisdom of the street. A generation after Lahey's initiation of Harvard into the glamorous world of journalism, a distinguished Harvard professor, serving with Ed on a selecting committee, asked to be seated next him on the plane. "I want to hear him talk some more." It was always an experience to hear Lahey talk. Pungent, colorful, epigrammatic, he reduced situations to pithy sentences.

A pixieish figure with puckish expression and a beatific grin, he was disarming, irresistible even when outrageous Laheyisms persisted at Harvard. "Now if you could just sum that up in about 2,000 well-chosen words," he responded to Prof. Alvin Hansen after a comprehensive analysis of the state of the economy in 1938. When Prof. L. J. Henderson regally denied the right of Fortune Magazine to explore the inwards of private enterprise, Lahey innocently requested, "May I ask you just two questions, Professor?"

"Certainly."

"Where were you born?"

"Right here in Boston."

"And where were you educated?"

"Right here at Harvard."

"That's the payoff," Eddie murmured resignedly.

Having to talk to a Law School club, I found myself introduced as another of the Nieman Fellows. "You remember our last speaker, Mr. Lahey, told us 'The journalist is a prostitute by profession but a lawyer from choice.'"

Almost 30 years after Lahey's Nieman year I was interviewing Prof. George Wald on television on the day of his Nobel award. I told him the Nieman Fellows always said he made science exciting. George tried to suppress a chuckle. Afterwards he explained, "I had to laugh at your mention of the Nieman Fellows. It recalled Ed Lahey and the way he could puncture pomposity and get down to cases with the jolt of his quips."

Puncturing pomposity was a Lahey specialty. But underneath he was all sentiment, and he was sentimental about his own craft. Inveigled into a talk to a conference on journalism, he began:

"It is a time-honored custom for the out-of-town speaker to tell you what's wrong with newspapers. Forgive me for flouting tradition, but I don't think there's a goddamned thing wrong with newspapers. . . . If journalism had not rescued me from the working classes I would have today

about 40 years seniority on the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad. I have never for a moment regretted the day I had a chance to become a reporter. . . ."

Lahey became legendary for his scoops and for the originality of his leads. When Richard Loeb was killed by a fellow prisoner he had approached, Lahey reported: "Despite his erudition, Richard Loeb ended a sentence with a proposition."

Lahey went to work right after grammar school at 14. It is true that he wrote of his Nieman year at Harvard that "I was snatched from the very brink of illiteracy." But Lahey's life is so much entwined with legend that it is necessary to get back of this truth. He did not come to Harvard an uneducated man but a self-educated man. He had already developed a distinctive style and he was then, at 36, a foremost labor reporter. I asked him once how he trained himself to write. He said that as a freight handler, in the long spaces between trains, he used to read Dickens and then took to "trying to write sentences as long as Dickens's." That "as long as" was quite out of character with his succinct writing. But he had absorbed the color and vitality of Dickens.

When I mentioned to him a beautiful article in his paper by Donald Culross Peattie on the trees of Illinois, Lahey beamed. "Wasn't it great. I suggested that." Seeing my surprise that this man of the sidewalks would have such a feeling for trees, Lahey explained that when Washington politics got him down, he packed a knapsack and took a hike. Thus, resting once under a great tree, he looked up and realized he didn't know its name. Disgusted with himself, he said, "Lahey, here you are, 50, and you don't know the names of the commonest trees." Characteristically he made for a library to get a book on trees. With his unfailing luck the one he got hold of was by Peattie, who endows trees with all but human individualities.

It was 1916 when he started work as a 14-year-old errand boy. He was office boy, machine operator, construction laborer. In 1919 he got a job as rodman for a survey of a General Motors housing project in Pontiac. The next year he joined a crew for a valuation survey of the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad and traveled for six months over its whole system. That led to a job with the railroad as yard clerk and switch tender.

Now 19, he started at evening classes and outside reading for examinations at the University of Illinois. He continued with part-time classes at Lewis Institute for five years, when he had earned credits for two years of college. Newspaper work lured him. He tried for three years to get a newspaper job. When he did it was on a suburban weekly that proved to be a blackmailing sheet. He went out to St. Louis to work for the East St. Louis Journal there and covered police and

race tracks for a year, which would not have seemed an incongruous combination to him. He retained a skeptical affection for both. Mary McGrory says he gave his race track winnings to Dorothy Day for her Catholic Worker.

In St. Louis he transferred his part-time studies to George Washington University. The next year he got a job with the Associated Press in Chicago and he studied then at the University of Chicago and later at Loyola. So much for the brink of illiteracy.

In 1929 he got onto the Chicago Daily News where one of his early assignments was an investigation of a shakedown racket of Chicago contractors on Federal jobs. Then he covered the murder of Jake Lingle, Chicago Tribune reporter who proved to have gangland connections.

The next two years Lahey was reporting depression bank failures, the fall of Al Capone, the collapse of the Insull power empire. In 1934 John Dillinger was his story and in 1936 the prison murder of Richard Loeb.

Lahey moved by choice into labor reporting with a sense of pioneering when the CIO arose out of the steelworkers organizing committee in 1936. Phil Murray, first head of the CIO, became a close friend. Chicago was the scene of some of the most brutal strikes and strike breaking in autos and steel as labor fought for recognition in the basic industries.

Lahey covered bloody picket lines and learned the tactics and strategy of labor and anti-labor. He became one of the best informed of labor reporters and, to the office, his stories were noted for their objectivity. When Col. Frank Knox heard President James B. Conant of Harvard speak of the newly created Nieman Fellowships, the publisher immediately thought of his labor reporter and promoted Lahey's application. Ed planned to study economics, history and political science for a background on the future of the labor movement, he wrote in his application.

He did those things and other things. He embarked on Felix Frankfurter's course in administrative law and on Charles H. Taylor's intellectual history of the Middle Ages. He studied economics under Sumner Slichter and Edward Mason, European history with William Langer, and took a course in the Economics of Socialism with Mason and Paul Sweezy. Sweezy was a socialist and Mason otherwise, so, unlike Heywood Broun, Lahey was exposed to both sides. He discovered a reading course in American history, an extracurricular program that Granville Hicks was conducting at Adams House, with which Ed was affiliated.

Ed immediately went for this and with a convert's zeal insisted on his Nieman colleagues joining him. It became in fact a Nieman seminar, reading the great books, with Hicks' weekly discussions—Turner, Parrington, Beard, Marx. When Ed read a book that appealed to him he was never content till his friends had all started reading it.



He found time also for a course in accounting. When I remonstrated at his using any of his precious fellowship time in such a mundane study he said, "I'm going to be able to squeeze the water out of a municipal budget." He was too. When the News was investigating a crooked State auditor, they brought Ed Lahey up from Washington to wrap it up. The auditor went to jail.

Lahey's early social life was the saloon and it was only after his Nieman year that he broke free of the journalists' traditional bane. Then he joined with dedicated zeal in Alcoholics Anonymous rescue work.

David Kraslow, his long time associate in the Knight bureau, used to be drafted on Thanksgiving and other holidays to chauffeur Ed around the bakeries of the district where he picked up bundles of day-old bread and delivered them to missions in the ghetto. On the way out Ed would furtively thrust a handful of greenbacks into the hand of the director.

His happiest association at Harvard was as a member of Adams House under David Little. He recorded the sense of belonging that gave him and also that he was "warmed and fortified" by membership in the Faculty Club, a stack card at Widener, and press box tickets to the football games "that gave me the same superior feeling I get from my season pass to the Cubs."

Felix Frankfurter and Archibald MacLeish, acquaintances of his Nieman year, became lifelong admiring friends. When Heywood Broun came up that first year to a Nieman dinner, he and Lahey disappeared for several days. Broun's next column opined that Nieman Fellowships should be awarded only to newspapermen who had never been to college.

Just as his Nieman year closed, the submarine *Squalus* sank off Boston and there followed rescue operations and a long business of trying to raise the sub. His office asked Ed to cover. He was ticked at this. It meant a re-entry on a professional note instead of a schoolboy's return.

With the New Deal, labor had become established, its goriest days over. The News sent Lahey to Washington. He called himself "a provincial" in the capitol. But the veterans began to notice that the new man from Chicago seemed to smell out the news breaks. This wasn't accidental. Lahey told me how he prepared himself for one of the great national steel strikes. Long before the start of negotiations which would freeze the parties into fixed positions and "no comment" attitudes, he arranged a series of interviews with the heads of the industry and of the unions. They would talk then and he got their points of view and a thorough survey of the situation that made both his background and his acquaintance for the crisis news later.

Lahey from his own work days saw the world from

labor's eyes. No outlook could have been further from his than that of Sen. Robert Taft. But Lahey sensed in Taft an honest candor and a basic fairness that he admired, and he found occasion to dwell upon it in several articles. Taft doubtless appealed also to his own strong individuality in perhaps the same way Granville Hicks had at Harvard. Hicks was a Communist and insisted on wearing the label which made him a target of vicious attacks during his one year at Harvard. Ed was a Catholic. But they were alike in basic characteristics: large tolerance, sweet dispositions, humaneness. Also Lahey had a feeling for the underdog, the put-upon. Actually Hicks' communism was an intellectual philosophy. When the Russians attacked Finland, Granville Hicks, in an open letter, repudiated communism.

Lahey had innate modesty and was embarrassed at such attention as brought him constant demands to serve as toastmaster. But he had also a pride in his own idiosyncrasies.

When Colby College awarded him an honorary LL.D. degree and its Lovejoy Fellowship in 1967, Lahey warned the student convocation against "the inner ring mentality—the inordinate desire for acceptance." The title and philosophy of this address came from an essay, "The Inner Ring" by C. S. Lewis who was Ed's favorite author. When he felt that one of his bureau mates was taking too seriously an association with a Kennedy or other influential figure, Ed would lend him Lewis' Essays and suggest that he read "The Inner Ring."

In Washington he long made a point of never attending a "backgrounds" conference where the informant's identity was hidden. His feeling for spontaneity was such that he never would write a speech. He had finally to break this rule when past 60 to meet the urgent demand for an advance manuscript of a professional talk that his own organization had set up for an Associated Press Council. Nieman Reports on publishing this claimed it as "the only prepared text of a Lahey speech in existence" (March, 1963).

That talk was revealing of Ed Lahey's sentimental feeling for newspapering. He had always counted himself "a working stiff," even as chief correspondent in Washington of the Knight Newspapers, and talked of managing editors as "little brothers of the rich" insulated in their suburbs, he said, from the reality of city streets.

When Jack Knight sold the Chicago Daily News to Marshall Field, he stipulated that Ed Lahey did not go with the deal. The Chicago Daily News bureau was then separated from the bureau of the Knight Newspapers. Ed said this exemption from the transfer of the paper made him feel like a third baseman on a Class B baseball team.

But when he wrote his talk to the men of his own craft his sentiment showed:

"We are the only business guaranteed by the Constitution. Shaken down, this is what it means: after we have filled the forms with ads, with the crossword puzzle and the bridge game, with recipes and the night police report and canned stuff from Hollywood and New York, we find a little hole remaining in the forms.

"That is where reporters find space to report an unjust conviction or evidence of stealing in high places or the posterous utterances of some politician suffering from delusions of grandeur.

"It's that little hole in the forms where we express

ourselves that the First Amendment was written about. The expressions of the spirit that go into that free space, sometimes noble and courageous, sometimes petty and self-serving, are the things that make the difference between us and other businesses."

Ed had a close call with death a few years ago from the emphysema that finally took him off. In the long days of uncertainty in the hospital, he learned how many people loved him, and he afterward admitted it changed his feelings about human nature "that so many people were praying for me from coast to coast."

## Ed Lahey, Reporter

By John S. Knight

---

(This tribute was written by the editorial chairman of the Knight Newspapers, in his weekly feature, "John S. Knight's Notebook," of July 20, 1969.)

---

During my time as editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News the only man of whom I stood in awe was Ed Lahey, the best newspaper reporter in my profession.

Admittedly, my feeling about Ed was touched with more than a tinge of envy. For what other writer could turn out a story on any subject and make it sing with Lahey's flair for facts and fluency? As an associate once remarked: "Ed was born with a silver phrase in his typewriter."

In time, my reverence of and respect for Ed Lahey deepened into a warm and understanding friendship. Though Ed held strong convictions on a variety of subjects,

his reporting was a model of accuracy. He sought to report the world, not to reform it.

As chief of our Washington bureau, Ed Lahey asked no favors from management. As he enjoyed saying, "I demand nothing of my publisher except that he be solvent."

Ed Lahey had no peers in the reporting field. He could spot a phony or a saint with equal celerity. Ed walked with the great and loved the lowly.

*His professional code was such that during the 1960 Democratic convention he rejected one of my stories because he did not believe it to be true. Not many men would do that to the boss.*

Ed Lahey was no ordinary man, as his record in journalism will attest. Nor was any Washington correspondent more admired by his colleagues for the quality of his work.

He died as he lived, with indomitable courage, and in later years serene acceptance of the inevitable.

We shall miss Ed, and in all probability never see his like again.

## A Nieman Fellow at Harvard

By Edwin A. Lahey

---

(The following article appeared in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin on May 26, 1939, as Ed Lahey and eight colleagues were completing the first Nieman year in history. Lahey was then with the Chicago Daily News, a newspaper owned by John S. Knight.)

---

A year which seriously taxes my store of adjectives is galloping to an end. While I can speak only as one of the first batch of Nieman Fellows to enjoy the largesse of the late Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of the publisher of the Milwaukee Journal, I think the other eight will agree that it has been the shortest, pleasantest, and most stimulating year in our collective experience.

We came here last September, to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, but with the larger purpose, as expressed in the Nieman will, of "elevating the standards of American journalism." A big order. Because it was and is a big order, the Fellowships were and still are experimental, and I have no doubt there are people in the land who entertain a low opinion of Mrs. Nieman's judgment in money matters, to say nothing of her judgment of newspapermen.

So go ahead and say it. Are the standards of American journalism about to be elevated?

To ask the question at this time, when the Nieman Fellows are absorbing their last bits of the atmosphere of the Yard, busily packing barrels, and wondering if they will be

suspect as Harvard men when they return to the hurly burly of their own back yards, is to imply considerably more forecasting than is done on the Kentucky Derby winter books.

One thing I learned at Harvard was to be self-assertive, and I am tempted to answer "yes," but I will content myself with the modest declaration that at least the groundwork has been laid to enable all of us to do a little better job, and in the case of some of the Fellows, to do well jobs that are generally being inadequately done in American journalism.

First I cite two "specialists" among the Nieman Fellows, Wesley Fuller of the Boston Herald and John M. Clark of the Washington Post. Fuller came to the University with the realization that scientific news, generally, has not been adequately presented to the American press, chiefly because of the lack of skilled reporters, and he set out to become one. During the year he has concentrated in this field, under the personal and interested supervision of Harvard's most eminent scientists, his range of studies embracing physiology, bacteriology, preventive medicine, the history of science, astronomy, paleontology, and atomic physics. Clark's interest was Latin-America, and with the vast facilities of Widener and the counsel of the History Department at his services, he has spent an intensive year studying the history, the diplomacy, the economics, and the language of Latin-America. Thus both have equipped themselves as experts in fields which not only are shockingly bare of experts, but are of increasing importance in American journalism.

Another example (and I trust my colleagues will not re-

sent my parading them on the platform) is Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., associate editor of the Paducah, Ky., Sun-Democrat. Paxton studied government, politics, administrative law, and American history under such eminent teachers as Felix Frankfurter, Granville Hicks, Former Chancellor Heinrich Bruening of Germany, and others. But he got more than stuff in books, and I think I am telling no secret when I say it is the consensus of his teachers and associates that Paxton returns to Kentucky with such clear ideas of his function as an editor that he will act on his community, and not the community on him, as is frequently the case with the small city editor.

The rest of us, Herbert Lyons of the Mobile Register, Osburn Zuber of the Birmingham News, Louis Lyons of the Boston Globe, Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Frank Hopkins of the Baltimore Sun, and myself, are probably destined to be mine-run hired hands on our respective gazettes, but each of us has followed his intellectual and professional interests in history, law, politics, and economics, and I do not think it brash to submit that somewhere along the line when we are doing our chores writing editorials, covering city hall, relief headquarters, or a picket line, we will, as one sometimes finds a welcome cigarette in an old suit, draw something from our year at Harvard.

But there has been more for us in the year at Harvard than appears on our study cards. Our experience as newspapermen ranges from six to twenty years, and the therapeutic effect of getting away from newsprint for a while without worrying about the landlord has been incalculable. It has been a vacation, in the pure, regenerative sense of the word.

Thanks to the thoughtfulness of Archibald MacLeish, Nieman curator, Jerome D. Greene, secretary to the Corporation, and Arthur Wild, University news director, life at Harvard began smoothly and well, and continued that way throughout the year. Mr. Greene arranged that the Nieman Fellows should have guest privileges at the Faculty Club and the Harvard Club of Boston. Wild saw that we had football tickets and that we were generally comfortable, and (don't breath this to a soul) was frequently a genial person to touch a few days before the first of the month.

A happy and important function of our lives as Nieman Fellows was a regular weekly dinner in downtown Boston, where MacLeish presided over collections of guests whose talent and wit could not have been surpassed in the Golden Days of Cambridge, and which could hardly be matched in all Mount Auburn. On each of these nights we had one outside guest, usually a top-flight star of the newspaper business, and several members of the Faculty, who were nominated in turns by the Nieman Fellows themselves. In the course of the year, about everybody who is good in Harvard broke

bread with us in strictest confidence. The evenings were memorable.

Another boon was our status as House members, a thoughtful gesture of Mr. Greene's. Each of us was assigned to one of the student Houses, and this connection, more than anything else, made me feel like a part of the University. One of the House masters, I suspect, was pretty sniffy about this kind of association, but the Fellow who was assigned there nevertheless found companionship and valued friends in the tutorial staff. I was assigned to Adams House, where I had the good fortune to enjoy the association of David M. Little, Secretary to the University, and, if I may be permitted a parting impertinence, a great guy.

A tendency to carnality is running away with me in this article, for I feel the urge to go on talking about dinners, luncheons, teas, cocktails, and good old fashioned brawls with which the Nieman Fellows were generously showered throughout the year. What the hell, the reader inquires, no intellectual atmosphere?

Of intellectual stimulation there was abundance, by human association and use of the libraries.

Professor Frankfurter was the first of these, and the Nieman Fellows saw much of him, because of his interest in the human experiment which we represented. Several of us joined his seminar in administrative law, and there listened for half a year to such a distillation of history, law, economics, government, philosophy, and humorous "ribbing" as can be found now only in the Supreme Court, and hardly anybody goes there, more's the bad fortune.

Number 2 intellectual stimulant for me was Granville Hicks, counsellor in American history at Adams House. At considerable expense of his own time, Hicks had several of the Fellows in on a weekly seminar in American history, during which we read the Beard's "Rise of American Civilization," Turner's "Frontier," Parrington's "Main Currents in American Thought," and Hick's "Great Tradition." The discussions were informal, and the reading assignments agreed upon jointly by the Fellows.

Even at the risk of examination, I say that I learned something of the dismal science from Paul M. Sweezy, one of the more intelligible members of the Economics Department.

(Parenthetically, I might add that my readers will have to take me at my word that I learned something, because I did not take any examinations.)

Of impersonal intellectual influences, it is difficult to write. But no one who has sniffed the dust of hundred-year-old newspapers in a sub-basement of Widener need be told of the beautiful loneliness of it. And who, having crossed the Yard on a moonlit fall evening, on the way home from Widener or the Boylston reading room, does not experience something that seems to stay with him? And where can a

finer flight be taken than with a book on a spring afternoon on the bank of the Charles?

There, now I'm getting lyrical. I don't mean to say that I found Harvard College all ham and hominy. I've been saving the gripes for the end of the piece.

I came here innocent of college experience, and like all people of similar ignorance, I had a vague concept of a university, particularly Harvard, which I thought of as a sort of Olympus.

My first shock, therefore, was to discover the obvious thing, that a university, like any other human institution, is made up of human beings, the noble, the weak, the brilliant, the precieuse, and even an occasional cement-head, suffering from the same ambitions, the same passions, and the same allergies as the rest of us. One member of the Faculty summed it up beautifully for me.

"Out in the world," he said, "you get in a fight and punch one another in the nose, and it's over. In a university we don't punch one another in the nose, so it's never over."

Another shock to me was to discover what I suspect is a poverty among the social sciences. It may sound boorish to

say it, but I have frequently felt that eminent economists, for example, were special pleaders for certain sets of economic conditions, rather than the pale-cheeked, gimlet-eyed searchers after pure truth that I supposed they were. It was very distressing, believe me, to suspect that in many instances among the social scientists (and not economists alone) a lifetime of training might be used to vindicate, rather than examine, a hypothesis. This doesn't sound kosher to me, but, after all, I'm not a college man, nor the college type.

My last comment is men's-room gossip, and might well be omitted, but here goes.

I confess with some shame that I was frequently irritated with the smugness and preciousness of many of the Harvard student body. Whatever mystic reasons of background and training some sociologist might advance for this reaction, the only fact for me is that it existed, and that I leave with the rather sad thought that there are too damned many clean cut boys in Harvard.

Finally, may I ask my friends in Cambridge not to think me ungracious for having in this article looked down the ridge of my nose.

It is an acquired characteristic.



# A Look at the British Press Council

By John M. Harrison

---

**Mr. Harrison** is a member of the faculty of the School of Journalism, at Pennsylvania State University.

---

Many Americans have long been interested in the British Press Council, and with the publication of H. Philip Levy's *The Press Council* (St. Martin's Press, 1967) this interest has been stimulated. Levy, who is head of the legal department of The Daily Mirror Newspapers, Ltd., assembled an impressive mass of information, including a detailed summary of the Council's findings in the many hundreds of complaints it has heard since 1953. Almost 400 pages are devoted to what he describes as "The Press Council Case Book."

Does the Press Council work? Do the rulings it has compiled in 16 years comprise the beginnings of something akin to common law that may provide established precedents for the future? Does the Council afford a model for a similar body in the United States?

In search of answers to these and other questions, the writer spent several weeks last summer in Britain. The time was too short to permit arriving at definitive answers. Yet some strong impressions emerged from extensive examination of reports of Council hearings, interviews with its secretary, Col. W. C. Clissitt (since retired), and other Council members and officials, and with representatives of the press, the government, and the public.

One inescapable conclusion is that the Press Council's prestige has been enhanced in the five years since it was reorganized to include five public members in addition to representatives of various press groups. The single most important factor in this new prestige was the choice of Lord Devlin, a distinguished and charismatic jurist (perhaps best known in this country as the presiding judge at the trial of Dr. Bodkin Adams), as the Council's chairman. Devlin,

who has been described as "Sir Laurence Olivier playing the stern judge part," has brought to the Council both strong leadership and definition of objectives.

This is not to dismiss everything that went before 1964 as irrelevant or unimportant. The Council did get off to an inauspicious start in 1953, when it was established only after almost seven years of prodding by Parliament. The British press, like its American counterpart, resisted stubbornly any suggestion that it had institutional responsibilities in relation to either organization or performance. A Royal Commission, headed by Sir David Ross of Oxford University, studied these problems for two years. Its 1949 report rejected any notion of governmental regulation. It urged that the press establish its own central organization to consider, in Levy's words, "where it was going and consciously to foster those tendencies which made for integrity and for a sense of responsibility to the public."

The thrust of Parliament's original concern had been with a growing trend toward monopoly and chain ownership which, it was feared, might stifle free expression and lively debate of public issues. The Royal Commission found that trends in this direction were to some extent a result of irreversible economic forces, and that fear of their consequences was exaggerated. It did express deep concern with the performance of the press—specifically in relation to complaints of inaccuracy, political bias, sensationalism and triviality, and it found the British press "unduly complacent and deficient in self-criticism." Some kind of central organization was needed, the Commission suggested, to deal with these problems.

A Press Council came into being only after four more years of haggling among journalists and, finally, the open threat of action by Parliament to establish a governmental body. Through its first ten years, the Council had effective leadership—particularly from Sir Linton Andrews, former editor of the *Yorkshire Post*, who was chairman from 1954



to 1959. In this period, the Council did much to allay fears of repressive action through its emphasis on the affirmative aspects of its duties—protecting the press against unfair and unsubstantiated complaints and defending the widest possible interpretation of press freedom against efforts to impose limitations.

Yet, by 1960, the state of the British press was again a source of concern in Parliament and, in February, 1961, a second Royal Commission had been established, with Lord Shawcross as chairman. It came into being largely because the optimistic predictions of the earlier Royal Commission concerning the organization of the British press had been put in question by a continuing decline in the number of newspapers and further expansion of chain ownership. The report of the Shawcross Commission, in 1962, recommended establishment of a Press Amalgamations Court to review proposed consolidations.

Soon thereafter, the performance of some segments of the press in relation to scandals within the government—particularly those involving William J. C. Vassall and John D. Profumo—raised new questions in the public mind about ethical standards. A fresh storm of criticism blew up in Parliament and the stage was set for reorganization of the Press Council, with five lay members added, including Lord Devlin as chairman. They assumed their duties in January, 1964.

In the last five years, the British Press Council has seemed to come of age. Its standing with the press has continued to grow. It has gained increased confidence from both the government and the public. Lord Devlin has stood forth as a symbol of integrity—by no means immune to criticism, but representing a kind of quasi-legal authority which commands respect for the Council's aims and accomplishments.

\* \* \*

How has the Council gone about its work? Its procedures are at once simple and immensely complicated. Any person who has a complaint against the performance of a British newspaper (he need not have been personally involved) may present it to the Council, though he must first have tried to secure satisfaction from the editor. Failing this, he makes a representation of his case to the Complaints Committee of the Council, which may dismiss it as unsubstantiated or trivial (few complaints are so treated). This committee conducts hearings and makes recommendations to the full Council. In some instances, the Council accepts the adjudication of the Complaints Committee. In others, it may reverse their decision, or it may call for additional examination and testimony.

Two things about these procedures are especially notable.

One is the immense variety of practices complained against. The other is the thoroughness with which the Council explores each complaint—including many which strike the average American as trivial indeed.

A limited sampling of the topics of complaints includes the following: staged pictures; invasion of privacy; fabricated interviews; material offensive to racial and occupational groups (auto salesmen, in one instance); shortening of letters to the editor; use of labels in identifying individuals involved in criminal proceedings ("The Weasel," for example); sensational and gory pictures; publication of a poem including a reference to "God's sexy hands"; alleged lack of courtesy in replying to letters; use of subterfuge in obtaining a story; reports on conditions in hospitals; a controversial interview with a male "witch," and assorted advertising practices.

Once a complaint has been accepted for hearing, the Complaints Committee spares no effort to explore every aspect of the alleged breach of standards. The complainant is given every opportunity to present his case fully, and to call others in support of his allegations. The editor of the newspaper complained against is invited to make a full reply. Although action is not taken against individual reporters, those involved in a particular complaint are invited to offer testimony. The proceedings may continue over a period of several months—even longer in a few particularly complicated cases.

Hearings of the Complaints Committee are closed to the public and the press. Legal counsel is not permitted to represent any of the parties involved. These practices have brought criticism on the Press Council, which has held to them in the belief that since its hearings are not privileged (this assumption has never been tested) and since no sanctions are invoked, its proceedings must remain private and extralegal.

The Press Council has frequently emphasized that it has avoided, and will continue to avoid, promulgation of a code governing the conduct of British journalists. It has insisted that each complaint be judged on its own merits, and that out of a continuing series of findings will emerge the kind of guidelines that will give journalists some notion of how they are expected to perform—the kind of case law to which spokesmen for the Council, especially Lord Devlin, have often referred.

It should scarcely be expected, of course, that the Press Council would have been able to build in less than two decades a body of case law comparable to the English common law, which evolved over many centuries. In some instances, the complaints which come before it fall into convenient categories where a consistent pattern of ruling precedents has begun to evolve. In many other instances, it has become clear that in no two cases—even when they are

concerned with the same general problem—can the finding in one be applied to another.

Close study of those portions of Levy's book devoted to the Council's findings points up the problem. He has compiled summaries of adjudications under some 20 different headings. Something approaching an applicable case law is discernible in a few of these categories. In others, the Council has established only one consistency—that of complete inconsistency. Where matters of personal taste are involved, as they so often are, wide variations are inevitable. Perhaps Colonel Clissitt, the recently retired Council secretary, has summed up the essence of the problem in this observation:

"Good taste is a personal subscription to an arbitrary and changing code and not an immutable law, but my problem is to find a way in which I can convince my taste-conscious complainants of this fact."

The Council may have complicated the problem of building its own body of case law by appearing to have reneged on its pledge to refrain from prescribing a code of standards. It has from time to time published "declarations of principle," which possess many elements of fiat. A notable example is a declaration concerning what the British describe as "chequebook journalism"—agreements by newspapers to pay large amounts to famous, or notorious, people for their memoirs, often of a sordid or sensational nature. Just last year, the Press Council found itself compelled to backtrack from this declaration when confronted with a complaint against publication of the memoirs of Kim Philby, convicted of espionage. In some instances, it was conceded, the publication of such memoirs serves the public interest. Perhaps the temptation to generalize in these matters is irresistible. Even so, such generalizations represent a departure from the Council's repeatedly affirmed policy of staying out of the lawgiving business. But they hardly seem consistent with the principle of evolving a body of case law.

As a voluntary organization, the Press Council has no power to impose sanctions against the newspapers it censures. The impact of its findings is dependent on their publication in the press, based on general releases summarizing each adjudication. It is assumed that a newspaper against which a complaint has been brought will publish the Council's finding, and this has been done in all but a very few instances, though sometimes a reader must make a considerable effort to locate it. Other newspapers may publish these releases or not and only a few of the larger ones generally do, except in instances—like the Philby ruling—which have wide general interest.

\* \* \*

What has the Press Council accomplished in its first 15

years? There is no way to measure its influence quantitatively and one gets a wide variety of answers when the question is put to journalists, government officials, and observers of the British press.

The one major achievement, on which almost all seem to be agreed, is that the Council provides an effective escape valve to let off the steam of public criticism of press performance. In the words of a government spokesman, "the Press Council is an effective public relations instrument for the British press." This sentiment is echoed in the comments of journalists. The life of an editor apparently is made easier by the existence of an agency to which he can refer the complaints he receives—including those of the inevitable cranks—to seek an official kind of satisfaction.

This is not to make light of the function of the Council. In Britain, as in the United States, many complaints against the press are capricious and unsubstantiated. When this judgment is made by an editor, it is suspect. When it is made by an official body, including public representatives, it carries weight, even though it may not always satisfy the individual complainant.

There has been criticism of the fact that no appeal from the Council's findings is provided. Some journalists complain that their reputations have been damaged, or might be, by these rulings and that they should have some source of redress. On the whole, however, it appears to be accepted that since the Press Council is a voluntary organization, with no powers of enforcement, provision for review of its findings by the courts is not needed.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that not a single libel action has been brought against the Council. Many journalists who opposed the whole concept believed, and fervently hoped, that a wave of libel suits would inundate the Council. That no such action has been taken seems to suggest that the Council has established the right to comment unfavorably on the performance of newspapers and, in some instances, of individual journalists.

The degree to which the Council has effected an improvement in the performance of the press is a matter for speculation. To the casual reader, accustomed to American newspapers, much of Britain's popular national press still appears to be unbelievably trashy and sensational—certainly no mode of responsible and ethical conduct. Yet Philip Levy, who is in a better position to make a judgment than is an American visitor, insists that:

"Success is . . . confirmed by the practical test of comparing the Press as it is today with the Press as it was when the Press Council came into existence. The comparison shows an impressive change in the tone and the content of the newspapers, particularly of the popu-

lar Press. More space is now devoted to the news, the treatment of current affairs is more mature, social and moral problems are discussed with more frankness and generally there is a greater seriousness and sense of responsibility."

In this area, the influence of the Press Council is necessarily difficult to measure. It must be subjective in many of its ramifications and many variable factors enter into any assessment. Also, it would be optimistic to expect that a really significant improvement could be effected in 15 years. After 50 years, perhaps, some meaningful conclusions will be possible.

Recalling that the first concern of both Royal Commissions established by Parliament to study the British press was with its organizational aspects, it should be noted that this is the area in which the Press Council has been least effective. To some observers, it appears unlikely that the Council could or would exert much influence here. A variety of reasons for this skepticism are given.

The government spokesman quoted earlier, for example, suggests that it is futile to expect significant action from the Press Council in relation to this problem. "The Press Council are the industry's boys," is the way he puts it, adding that "they aren't going to stand in the way of consolidations the owners want to make."

Within the press itself, the prevailing view is that the Council could not deter this trend in any event. The editor of one of London's largest newspapers, which is a unit in a major newspaper group, insists that the economic salvation of the British press is tied to further extension of group ownership. "That's the only way the Times [not his newspaper] could have been kept alive," he contends. Besides, he believes, so long as the owners are men like Lord Thomson and his own publisher, there is no real threat to free and open expression of ideas and political points of view in the British press.

Press Council representatives insist they are increasingly concerned with organizational trends. The Council did support, in principle, legislation by Parliament in 1965 which established new procedures for dealing with proposed mergers, giving additional powers to the Board of Trade to refer proposed newspaper mergers to the Monopolies Commission. The major test of this new procedure to date occurred in 1966, when the merger of the Times and the Sunday Times within the Thomson Organization was approved on grounds that it would not lead to undue concentration of newspaper power.

If, on balance, the Press Council can be said to have established a place for itself in Britain, it has certainly not been free from criticism. And just as its chairman, Lord

Devlin, has had much to do with its increased stature, he has been a principal target of the attacks of those who want to get at the Council.

Devlin is a man with a finger in many pies—a kind of combination of Earl Warren, Averell Harriman and John Kenneth Galbraith, who is forever showing up in public positions. His reputation as a jurist adds to the aura of omniscience that surrounds him. His omnipresence in public life makes him an inviting target and it has been alleged that his role as chairman of the Press Council tends to discourage newspapers from criticizing him, lest his attitude toward them color the findings of the Council.

Some see him as a threat to personal and political dissent in Britain. Lord Devlin has, for example, taken a hard line in opposing the notion that the law never should interfere in private morals and against the use of the now familiar four-letter words in newspapers. When Kenneth Tynan's use of one of these on a BBC program stirred up a ruckus, Lord Devlin made this comment:

"The users of four-letter words have had to flee to the BBC, where they are apparently allowed to practise their arts without any undue interference."

Prudishness is one of the most frequent criticisms of the Press Council and an examination of its rulings provides at least partial support for this allegation.

Some journalists feel, too, that the Press Council under Devlin's leadership has sought to generalize about press practices that do not lend themselves to codification. Typical is the complaint of Peter Paterson, of the Sunday Telegraph, whose report on allegations by workers at the Woolrich Arsenal that some employees did "work on the side" was criticized as having been based on "too slight" information:

"The question surely is how the Press Council is qualified to decide that the information available to a journalist is 'too slight' to justify his writing an article. Should I have interviewed one person, or two, or three, or a hundred, or a thousand? Who, other than the journalist himself, is to judge these imponderables?"

... "I look forward to the Council's instruction manual laying down the minimum number of interviews required before a reporter puts pen to paper. Heaven help those who rely on 'Whitehall sources.' I found a dozen real people was considered to be 'too slight.'"

Paterson's complaint points up the kinds of problems that confront the Press Council, and it might be expected that some reporters would resent any attempt to measure the adequacy of their sources. Most journalists seem to be less sensitive and to accept the Council's right and competence to assess press performance.

Those critics who, on the other hand, insisted that the

findings of a group composed wholly of journalists must necessarily be prejudiced have largely been silenced by the addition of lay members—even though they constitute only 20 per cent of the Council's total membership. They have not, according to Lord Devlin, tended to constitute a "lay block" in the Council's voting. The net effect has been to create a broader base and to effect a greater degree of mutual understanding among press and public of the need to protect freedom of the press, while encouraging it to act responsibly.

\* \* \*

Whether or not the British Press Council provides a model for a similar organization in the United States remains an unresolved question.

Some Britons—as well as many Americans—doubt there is need for a counterpart body in this country. Freedom of the press is a constitutional right in the United States, as it is not in Britain, it is argued. Nor has there been the kind of intense attack on the press in this country which erupted in Britain after World War II and again in the early years of this decade.

These are persuasive arguments on the surface, but they overlook the fact that not even constitutional guarantees are immutable when conditions arise in which their literal interpretation no longer seems to serve the best interests of a society. On issues of freedom of expression, the United States Supreme Court has continued to maintain a relatively firm line of defense against encroachment, even expanding the boundaries of freedom in some areas. But in some related matters—particularly those having to do with organizational considerations—there has been a marked bending in recent years. And decisions relating to the influence of the press in the areas of fair trial and, to a lesser extent, the right of privacy have suggested increased concern with the broader aspects of the role of the press in our society. These could be the first signs of a more basic reinterpretation of the First Amendment.

As for criticism of press performance by the public, if it has not been so raucous as in Britain, it is certainly to be heard in the land every day—occasionally rising to a noisy crescendo. One can scarcely have read the reports of the Warren Commission and the Kerner Commission without realizing that this criticism extends beyond Joe Doakes' complaints about unfair reporting of his choice for public office, or of his favorite football team.

It may be, then, that establishment of something like the British Press Council in this country would serve as a preventive against increasing concern about the organization and performance of the press. Whatever the public attitude

may seem to be, the press itself might examine this likelihood.

To think in terms of transporting the precise organizational mechanisms employed in Britain across the Atlantic may be unrealistic. One must doubt that a single group of people—located in Washington, New York, or Chicago—could function as the British Press Council does in London. A few newspapers of national circulation largely serve the British public; there is not even one real national newspaper in the United States, a few serve relatively large regions, but most are local. Britain is a small geographical unit; the United States is huge. The logistical problems involved in conducting hearings would alone present a major barrier. And there are other differences to be considered.

Thus, if the Press Council concept were imported, it must almost certainly be on some kind of regional basis. This imposes the limitations of a multiplicity of operating groups, each with its own inevitable variations in standards and unlikely to achieve the prestige a single national council might have. It might be difficult, for example, to find even a single counterpart of Lord Devlin in the United States, much less one for each of several regional councils.

There are alternatives, of course, which may be better suited to the United States. Harry Ashmore has long worked for establishment of a center—probably in a major university—to conduct a continuing measurement of press performance. Ben Bagdikian has suggested that schools of journalism—especially if they did not have to deal with the press of their own states, but could institute some kind of exchange—might become agencies for such continuing study. The Mellett Foundation has pilot local councils operating in several communities. A few publishers—Barry Bingham in Louisville and Houstoun Waring in Littleton, Colo., for example—have established community councils to get a reading on the performance of their own newspapers.

Whether the studies conducted by any of these have the same impact as the quasi-judicial findings of the British Press Council is, of course, arguable. When I put a proposal for establishment of some sort of agency to conduct a continuing study of newspapers to students in my journalism classes, their almost invariable response is "but what editor is going to pay any attention to the opinions of a bunch of outsiders?" And their seat-of-the-pants reaction may be valid.

A closer and more intensive study of the Press Council concept—now best exemplified in Great Britain—should be undertaken. It does directly involve the press. It does take advantage of a prevailing respect for full hearings and for specific adjudications, perhaps even to establishing case law. We do not yet know nearly as much as we should about the British experience, and even less about how it might be useful in the American situation.



# The New Curriculum at Carleton

By G. Stuart Adam

---

**Mr. Adam** is Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism at Carleton University, Ottawa.

---

Mapping out a program of studies for this generation of students is a hazardous process at best. From the mini-Che Gueveras to the button-down flannel, there is such an aggressive search of the "right" and the "relevant" that even some of the most esoteric scholars have been intimidated out of their ivory towers into the forums. Whether this struggle is new or old, whether it is generically different or the same, the fact is that many in the university are seriously searching for a rationale and sense of purpose which will satisfy the inner longings of a demanding generation.

Journalism schools are hardly immune from the pressures that the greater university is experiencing. Indeed, the added pressure of student restlessness now combines with the traditional skepticism of, on the one hand, a community of academics with a group of tradesmen in their midst and, on the other, a group of tradesmen with academics in their midst. The difficulty of coping with such a combination can be quickly imagined by simply thinking of the widely disparate character of the demands from each source: the students, the academic community and the trade.

Although they rarely express it this way, students are asking that the messianic age plant itself in the hearts of all

tomorrow. Within the framework of the academy, however, it seems to me they want the glibness removed from undergraduate work, substantial intellectual demands made on them, and perhaps a reorganization of knowledge so that its presentation is more intelligible.

Academics, by their own publicity, breathe an ethos of intellectuality and depth and they cannot help but make invidious comparisons between their work and the glibness of much of journalism. It is especially the ethos and to a lesser extent the invidious comparisons to which journalism educators respond. (I might add that the almost religious fascination social scientists have with technique should make journalism schools seem more respectable.)

The journalists have always been more interested in the technical skills. Those that hire seek to establish that candidates have the intelligence and literacy to adjust to the journalistic milieu, but once on the job it is the technical skills that are being examined. If he can spell, set up a lead, match the opposition or take over re-write, the journalism novice is bound to please his peers.

These kinds of pressure bore heavily on the minds of those of us who put together the program which, starting in the academic year 1969-70, will be the sole undergraduate route to a journalism degree at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. In a sense there is an attempt to appease the demands from each source. The speed with which the committee I directed (The committee also included T.

Joseph Scanlon, director of the School of Journalism, and Joel Weiner, assistant professor.) worked on a new curriculum was in many respects the result of the pressure put on us by the students who held a minor protest over course work during the fall semester. And its content reflects, I think, the self-conscious response of those who have lived at one time or another in both the academic and journalistic worlds and who inevitably seek, within the framework of an unconventional species of education, to effect a conciliation between both.

As a brief preface to the program it is worth noting several features of the Ontario educational system. Students from Ontario come to Carleton after they have matriculated from grade 13, a year later than students from the United States and some Canadian provinces where grade 12 is the terminal point. From the grade 13 matriculation or its equivalent, it usually takes three years to qualify for what we still call a pass degree—a Bachelor of Arts with a major field, or, in the case of journalism, a Bachelor of Journalism. Up to the time of the revision in the journalism program, 15 courses—five taken within the school of journalism covering such topics as reporting, the law of the press, journalism history, etc., and 10 taken outside the school of journalism in standard arts courses—would qualify a student for a pass degree in journalism. (For purposes of translation a credit at Carleton is given at the rate of one per course. A course usually amounts to three or four hours a week over a 32-week period which starts in September, includes the customary Christmas break and study week, and ends in late April.)

Although for a number of years it has been possible to extend undergraduate education in journalism over four years into an honors degree—an institution firmly maintained in Canadian universities—as mentioned earlier the honors route is now the only one. (One can still spend a year as a post-graduate.) The new program entails 20 credits (actually  $20\frac{1}{2}$  if the  $\frac{1}{2}$  course in careers is included) or courses computed in the same way as the pass program and bestows on the graduate a degree which lies midway between the bachelor's and master's—a Bachelor of Journalism with Honors.

From the point of view of those who teach novice journalists, the extra course work and time,  $20\frac{1}{2}$  courses instead of 15 and four years instead of three, allows new opportunities to refine and deepen their education. Although there were a number of administrative reasons for moving into a four year program—one of them being to rule out any possibility of allowing duplications in community or junior colleges in which there recently have been a proliferation of journalism, or more euphemistically, communications courses—the main reason was a concern for achieving both academic and pro-

fessional depth in our candidates. Thus our brief to the faculty board which approved the curriculum read:

“... we think it important to note that regardless of the nature of the mass media and its response to modern society, the fact is that the phenomena that journals and journalists are required to record and interpret are becoming more and more complex and less and less intelligible to modern man. We should be directing ourselves to the task of training the kind of journalist who can make the modern environment intelligible.”

The operative concept lies in those words: “... make the modern environment intelligible.” Although there is no willful attempt to be fancy, it is a theme of mass communications studies that journalism, like politics, serves an integrative function in society. The daily newspaper, to take one example, attempts to discover the meaningful events of the day and place them in some kind of relationship to one another. The result, as McLuhan would say, is a “daily book on industrial man”—a mosaic which correlates events and endows them with some kind of perspective. Whether or not this “daily book” is an accurate picture of reality, or simply the cumulative effect of a newspaper’s “natural history” as Robert E. Park would say, the fact is that news media do seek to organize the daily intelligence of a community, state or universe and make it cohere. Microcosmically, reporters and editorial writers, by organizing data from disparate sources, also perform the same integrative function.

What follows from that concept is by no means radical. A major stage in achieving intelligibility would be the development of communicating skills. Thus the first of four major themes in the curriculum which engages students in each of the four years they are in the school is one of technique—apparatus, writing and research. In the first year, while registered in five academic courses, students are required to take a six-week non-credit course which they must pass designed to teach fundamental skills such as typing, some shorthand, copy handling and the use of television and radio equipment.

In the second year, students will take a course we call the “Fundamentals of Reporting”. The calendar description reads: “the nature of news; how to recognize and collect news”, etc. It is a seminar course in which students stand in relation to the professor as general assignment reporters stand in relation to the city editor. In the third year, the process initiated in the aforementioned reporting course is extended and completed in a course called “Interpretative Reporting” which has the added dimension of editing problems, law of the press and management problems and policies. In the third year, students must also register in what we have called career seminars—in public relations, magazine writing, television production or film—but the



course is only worth a half-credit making third year 5½ courses. Here, as in the first year workshop which includes typing *et al*, there is an attempt to avoid encroachment on the more serious concerns of the university. We do not want to pre-empt Plato with shorthand, or, for that matter, public relations techniques.

In the fourth year students are required to write a kind of mini-thesis, a major study on a current public issue. Since they must be written on the basis of interviews as well as bibliographical and documentary research local and national (Ottawa is the nation's capital) issues are the major source of topics. Ottawa valley air and water pollution, draft dodgers in Canada and a study of Rene Levesque, separatist, from this year's crop of graduate students would be typical.

In a fourth year tutorial students also look at the uses of the computer as an aid in mass media journalism, thus completing the technical component of their journalism education. A technical component runs through all four years of the curriculum. Its goals are simply to transmit the skills required in the news media and to develop them as far as possible within the framework of the university without encroaching too extensively on the scholarly preoccupations of the university.

We have called the second major theme in the new curriculum "professional-requisite". Taken as a whole the courses under this rubric should explain the framework within which journalism is conducted and serve to examine the problems and dilemmas that afflict the journalist. An examination of communications theory, media studies including history, public opinion, propaganda, philosophies of the press, law and so on, make up the so-called "professional-requisite" component. On this point the brief says that an attempt should be made to refine "the journalist's understanding of the processes in which he is participating. We feel it is fundamental that the journalist knows objectively the meaning of these processes so that he may understand the limits and potential of the craft."

In the first year, therefore, a course is turned over to the study of communications, semantics, a profile of the mass media and the philosophy and goals of journalism. In the second year, one course is dedicated to an examination of the problems of the media including ownership structure, monopoly, government control, freedom and secrecy, ethics, propaganda, censorship and so on. An attempt is made to examine these problems through the study of journalism history. That part of the third year reporting course which includes the law of the press and management problems belongs under this rubric and that part of a fourth year research tutorial which examines media technology also belongs.

The third component of the new curriculum was given

the label "interdisciplinary studies," not to be in vogue but because there was little else we could call it. A look at the bibliographies would demonstrate that the course work cannot be placed in one discipline alone and although it would be unfair to say that we have usurped the academic preoccupations of our colleagues in the more conventional departments of the university, we have extended ourselves beyond the traditional limits of journalism education, at least at Carleton. We have already done so experimentally in the graduate year and the new curriculum incorporates the interdisciplinary component on the basis of its success. In doing so, we feel we provide background for journalists which will give them added depth. The brief reads:

"The desire for interdisciplinary studies and the need for them are not simply expressed in the journalism school. The university as a community is witnessing, we think, a demand by students to discover the tools to make the modern environment intelligible. Feelings of powerlessness and despair expressed in the dropping out phenomenon as well as the extraordinary zeal of student activists suggests to us a crisis in either the intelligibility of the environment or a crisis in the nature of the environment as it is understood on the basis of solid and intelligible analysis. If the latter is the case, then the university has performed its function well and there is no need to try new methods of studying the profile of modern society—its communities, beliefs, economic system, technology—indeed, the goals of human life. If, however, the former is more or less true then it seems courses designed to render the environment and its issues more intelligible are justifiable."

It also says in the brief that in either case journalists should be tuned into the tensions and issues regardless of how they feel about them.

Under this rubric two courses will be given, one which in view of the preceding bears the likely name of the "Modern Environment" and entails the examination of such descriptive works on modern society as Galbraith's *New Industrial State*, Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man*, Ellul's *Technological Society*, Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*, Cox's *Secular City* and much more. In fact it is an extensive list of modern literature around the concepts of man, community, belief, and technology. In a sense it could be regarded as current intellectual history, but it is more an attempt within the framework of a seminar to allow students to cope with the eclectic concerns which are similar in substance to those of editors and editorial writers, politicians and sidewalk revolutionaries who are attempting to organize knowledge and prescribe remedies for social ills. The course is offered at the third year level.

The other course is called "Basic Issues" and is offered in the fourth year. The content of the third year course is the requisite for the fourth, but the basic issues are, of course, those that are endemic to Canadian society and include a study of our two brands of nationalism—French-Canadian and Canadian which account for most of the hangups of Canadian life and which we deal with separately from foreign ownership of the Canadian economy to dominion-provincial relations, foreign policy, and leadership. In both courses there is an attempt to relate the role of the media in the phenomena we are studying.

All this may sound somewhat glib. Certainly it is eclectic (as is journalism). But the academic rigour which remains a goal of the university despite journalism schools, is sought if not in the school, certainly within the framework of the fourth and last rubric: courses taken outside the school. The course work described above accounts for eight and a half credits out of 20½. In some cases it will amount to seven and a half because the "Basic Issues" course given at the fourth year level will be offered as an option. In any case, the balance, 12 or 13 courses, are taken outside the school of journalism.

The first year is straightforward and attempts to lay a solid basis in the Humanities. After that, with the exception of a compulsory course in Canadian history the choices are open. Students will be asked to develop a specialty like economics or political science. If they exploit their opportunities, they will end up with something like seven courses in one discipline—equal to the requirement for major standing in a pass degree—and an assortment of courses from within and without the school of journalism which will provide a general base for their special studies. The undergraduate program summarized by the year looks like this:

#### *First Year*

1. Journalism (Introduction to Mass Communications)  
Journalism (non-credit workshop)
2. English (Introductory)
3. A language course, preferably French
4. An approved course in History
5. An approved course in Philosophy, Humanities or Religion

#### *Second Year*

1. Journalism (Problems of the Mass Media)
2. Journalism (Fundamentals of Reporting)
3. An approved course in Canadian History<sup>1</sup>
4. An introduction to the study of society:  
one of: Anthropology  
Economics  
Political Science

Psychology  
Sociology

5. An approved option.

#### *Third Year*

1. Journalism (The Modern Environment)
2. Journalism (Interpretative Reporting and Editing)  
Journalism (Career Seminars, ½ course)
3. An approved option.
4. An approved option.<sup>2</sup>
5. An approved option.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Fourth Year*

1. Journalism (Honors Tutorial)
2. Journalism (Honors Research)
3. Journalism (Basic Issues)

or

- An approved option.<sup>2 3</sup>
4. An approved option.<sup>2 3</sup>
5. An approved option.<sup>2 3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Students who propose to practice Journalism in another country may be advised to choose a different History course.

<sup>2</sup>These options must be continuing courses in fields already begun.

<sup>3</sup>An honors student must take at least four courses in a field other than Journalism. One of these courses must be at the third year level or equivalent or higher.

The overview of the whole program reveals that students start with the Humanities and then are likely to develop through the social sciences. A judgment is involved here.

There is no doubt that the modern journalist is pre-occupied with current phenomena, the stuff of social science. Its tools and vocabulary are indeed useful to him. But social science has a tendency to generalize in a manner rarely found in the Humanities. In many respects, for example, journalists as "chroniclers" share the research particularism of history, seeking the contextual essence of events rather than the operation of sociological laws. Journalists should be interested in what happens rather than what hypothesis is confirmed through their research. Thus we introduce novice journalists to the study of man through the Humanities rather than the social sciences in order to avoid the dangers of a strictly social science education. In the long run we realize his expertise will probably be in the social sciences without which he would find it hard to cope with modern phenomena.

When John Hohenberg of Columbia University's School of Journalism asked rhetorically in the *Saturday Review* (Dec. 14, 1968) "What are we to teach?" I was tempted into

the impertinence of trying to answer a sage. I recognize now that there is very little new that I can say on the subject. As should be clear, all we have done is extend the principles on which journalism education has been built into a longer and perhaps more rigorous program which provides greater development outside the specifically journalistic content of the program.

Certainly, the content of journalism is man and his civilization. And it follows, therefore, that man and his civiliza-

tion should be the content of a journalism course. But educators must realize that it is a difficult task tutoring young people, particularly the current crop, into the present without stealing from them the opportunity to acquire the kind of classical depth a university can offer. We'd that depth to a professional self-consciousness and sense of responsibility, and provide the technical skills to expedite the craft's goals, and the university-trained journalist will be useful to men as well as media.

## Press Freedom Suffers Losses

By Antony Brock

---

**Mr. Brock** was, for many years, the editor of IPI Report, the monthly bulletin of the International Press Institute.

---

Ironically, during 1968, which was designated as Human Rights Year, and the first half of 1969, the people's right to information, which is what press freedom means, has suffered losses.

Apart from dramatic encroachments on liberty of the press such as arrest of journalists, expulsion of correspondents and closure of newspapers—and there have been many—there has been a widespread whittling away of the press's ability to fulfil its role, springing largely from lack of appreciation of what the function of the free press should be.

Just what the role of the press entails was strikingly illustrated by the dramatic demonstration of press freedom in Czechoslovakia.

The Moscow "White Book", which set out to justify the Warsaw Pact intervention in Czechoslovakia, makes the importance of a free press abundantly clear by the mere weight it gives to press reports inside and outside Czechoslovakia and by the lengths to which it goes to prove that the press contributed to "counter-revolution".

Even without this doubtful evidence, the role of the Czechoslovak media—particularly radio and television—in the Prague Spring shows how vital press freedom is to other human freedoms. When the movement to "give Socialism a human face" began, the mass media were at the forefront, encouraging, criticising, urging and even leading. When the tanks moved in, the underground press became the main

force of resistance. Even now, during the period of so-called normalisation, it is the press which is bravely maintaining the peoples' right to decide their own destiny.

It would be naive to pretend that the press movement did not begin much like any other political movement in which the pressure of opinion is used to achieve political objects. What is remarkable is the way the journalists of Czechoslovakia, with no experience of free reporting and open criticism, found both the means and the skill to bring the facts to the people. How well they succeeded is attested by the startling rise in newspaper circulations before the invasion and by the trust the people showed in the underground press afterwards. The appetite for truth is not altered by political systems and the courage of the Czech and Slovak journalists showed that the theory on which press freedom is based is not out of date. If truth and falsehood are allowed to grapple, truth will prevail. Journalists in the rest of the world are indebted to their Czechoslovak colleagues for having so convincingly demonstrated the reality of the cause of the free press.

In such a year it would be futile to look for advances in Europe in countries where the Marxist-Leninist theory of the press requires newsmen to be propagandists and exponents of Communist Party policy. In one of the most liberal, Yugoslavia, the year saw the editor of a Zagreb Catholic magazine sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for publishing "an untruthful account of the position of religious communities in Socialist countries".

In Britain, the media have made small though welcome advances but have suffered from the low priority which the needs of the press have in the minds of legislators. It is sig-

nificant that when a non-governmental proposal to change the law of libel was made in Parliament it failed for lack of support. It is now hoped that another attempt to revise this law will succeed but the most important advance in this field has been a court ruling extending the concept of fair comment. Another new definition needed by the press is one of the concept of confidentiality. This was exposed by a case in which the Sunday Times was prevented from making disclosures it claimed necessary in the public interest. Despite press opposition the Criminal Justice Act, which restricts the reporting of court evidence in some circumstances, remains unaltered. Its worst features have been rectified as a result of press action, but the press, which represents the public, is still at a disadvantage compared with the institutions representing the state. In this respect the move at long last to recognize that the press reports Parliament by right and not by favour is thoroughly to be welcomed.

In Portugal, the censorship which has been in force for 40 years has not yet been abolished, nor is there yet the press law for which demand has been increasing. But by recognizing the need for better communication the government of Dr. Marcello Caetano encouraged a more open-minded attitude from both press and censors. Articles, criticism and cartoons appeared which would have been unthinkable earlier last year. While there is plainly a long way to go before the press of the country can begin to play its proper part in society, there are signs at last of a dialogue between governors and governed.

The situation in Spain is just the opposite. In April an Official Secrets Act extending the number of forbidden topics was added to the already repressive Press Law of 1966. This law abolished censorship but made newspapers responsible for what they publish to the Ministry of Information which can make fines and suspensions effective before a court has considered them. Measures instituted against those taking advantage of relative freedom since the press law came into force average nearly one a day—the Ministry's own figures show that measures were taken against in 339 cases in the 12 months up to July, and fines were imposed in 180 cases. Fines can be severe—the evening newspaper Madrid was fined a total of 500,000 pesetas (\$7,150)—and prison sentences long—the editor of Destino was sentenced to eight months' jail for "illegal propaganda". But the suspension of Madrid for four months shows that the government is prepared even to ruin a newspaper in order to silence it.

Unrest in France in May and June last year had its effect on the mass media. Copies of some papers were destroyed and others were unable to publish because printing plants were occupied by demonstrators. There were several attempts to interfere with editorial content so that, for example, *Parisien-libéré*, which refused to give way to a demand to change an

article, was forced to miss a day's issue. The events had a later effect on the journalists of the French broadcasting system which, in contrast to French newspapers, has for some years only been able to operate in close liaison with the government. More than 100 radio and television journalists who had gone on strike in support of their claim for greater editorial freedom were dismissed from their posts, the reason given being the necessity to rationalize staffing. It is not insignificant that use was made again of an 1881 law protecting the President of the Republic from press comment which would be quite legal for other persons.

Violence in Federal Germany also affected the press, the papers of Axel Springer being at one time the chief target. In the violence, during which an agency photographer was fatally injured, newspaper vans were set on fire, office windows smashed and thousands of copies of newspapers destroyed. To the credit of other German papers, to whom the Springer concern is a powerful competitor and whose political attitudes they by no means share, they recognized the danger of this attack on freedom of expression and in general condemned it.

In Switzerland, there were signs that the obligations of recognising the role of the press were not fully appreciated. A law protecting journalists' right not to reveal their sources of information in cases of administrative inquiries was passed in October, but in the same month the parliamentary reporter of a tabloid was barred from the Federal Parliament for six months for a comment which, while true, was held to be offensive.

Journalists in Turkey are attempting to encourage self-discipline in the press through a press code. It is hoped that a balance between responsible journalism and liberal legislation will end the rise in prosecutions of newsmen (there were 152 in Istanbul alone in 1967). If found guilty under the Penal Code, newsmen face heavy sentences, such as the two years' imprisonment imposed on Mahmet Sevkiet Eygi and Hasan Hilmi Karabek, who were sentenced to two years' imprisonment in February for advocating a religious constitution. It must be recorded that such sentences can be set aside on appeal, and that Mrs. Leyla Cambel, who faced five years' jail for an article published in a German paper, was finally cleared in July after a 17-month trial. However, a non-journalist Sadi Alkilic, fared much worse. His essay advocating socialism, entered for a competition and published by the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* in 1962, infringed the Penal Code and made him liable to six years' jail. Although he had been freed after various appeals, the High Court decided that he must serve the full sentence.

The saddest case among European countries with a free press tradition continues to be that of Greece. The "cat and mouse" policy of intimidation against newsmen by which



they were held without trial and then temporarily freed, appears to have tapered off. But arrests have continued, as has the expulsion, harassment and even mishandling of correspondents whose reporting did not suit the ruling junta. Relaxations in control in January gave newspapermen at least the freedom to choose the position of items in their own papers, but discussion of many subjects was still forbidden and the inclusion of items officially regarded as important remained mandatory. The paragraphs of the new constitution guaranteeing freedom of expression, in fact, are largely taken up with limitations on this freedom. How free the Greek press is today can best be judged by its reporting of the case of Alexander Panagoulis, who was sentenced to death on November 17. The military court ordered that the sentence should be carried out within three days unless he were pardoned: in the next three days, appeals for clemency were made by the Pope, by Norway, Federal Germany, Austria and Italy. The Greek press did not report them.

One of the ironies of our time is that it is precisely in the Third World where good communication is most necessary that conditions for the press are often at their worst. For example, in no less than 14 of 27 South American countries and islands south of the US-Mexican border, press freedom is either non-existent, subject to restrictions which make it difficult for journalists to fulfil their role, or limited by the use of pressures.

Even in the Bahamas, where both press and democratic government have followed sound lines of development, the press has been alarmed at what it takes to be a move to curb its freedom. This is a law which has been proposed making parliamentary reporting the subject of privilege and misreporting an offence punishable by parliament without reference to a court of law. Newspapermen regret the recourse to archaic forms of control, particularly since the Bahamas has no official record of parliamentary debates.

Blackest spots in the hemisphere continue to be Haiti and Cuba. There newsmen are in prison, the means of expression closely controlled and visiting correspondents, when allowed in at all, subject to expulsion. These are extreme cases, but they illustrate the situation of the press in a continent where political power is all too often sought and maintained by force. In Peru, the immediate consequence of the coup d'état of October was the suspension of two newspapers, one periodical and two radio stations. In Panama, where there was a coup the same month, seven papers were instantly suspended and one television station was silenced. It is to the credit of *El Mundo*, a consistent critic of the deposed president and one of the two papers free to appear, that it used this freedom to condemn the suspension.

In other Latin American countries the press is hit by emergency regulations designed to protect internal security.

In Uruguay, Argentinian newspapers have been seized and local papers suspended for breaking such regulations, the latest being the Communist paper *El Popular*.

In Nicaragua a law of 1967 which restricts freedom of expression and under which newspapers may be closed, is still in force but has not been applied against newspapers. Guatemala also has emergency laws prohibiting the press from publishing material which might "cause panic or confusion". Under these laws papers are subject to warning and in the year under review, although the Spanish edition of *Life* was banned, only one warning has been given. In Honduras the application of emergency laws has been harsher: *La Prensa* and *El Pueblo* were closed by decree and only reappeared again after the intervention of the Inter American Press Association. The suspension of *La Prensa* was a particularly short-sighted reaction: since it was the country's largest newspaper and backed by wealthy proprietors it was not so much subject to the venality which is endemic in the South American press.

In Africa too, the demands of national security have produced laws which severely hamper journalists in their profession. And where there are no repressive laws as such, journalists are subject to a multitude of pressures to keep out what is unacceptable and to publish what the government thinks is right. The attitude is understandable: the press as a force in public life is hardly known (according to UNESCO figures some 15 countries in tropical Africa have no newspapers of any kind); where the press is known, it is often the successor to the expatriate press of colonial days whose policy was rarely in line with nationalist aspirations. And to governments whose main efforts are directed at building national unity, any criticism can appear destructive. The double task of African editors of winning confidence both from readers and authorities is a hard one.

In most of the broad band of Arab countries in the north of the continent, the press is regarded as a principal instrument of government and no change in the policy of press control is likely in the immediate future, despite several calls for freedom of the press which have been made in Egypt. Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria have continued to seize foreign publications, to suspend their own and to bar foreign correspondents, while even in a country like Kuwait, whose diversified press reflects its independence, there have been warnings to the press not to attack public authorities and pressure has been put on two papers to suspend publication for reasons of state. In Iraq a small advance was made in the rescinding of censorship and the authorising of privately-owned newspapers.

South of the Tropic of Cancer press freedom has made little progress apart from the ending of censorship in Rhodesia. Togo began the year without its only independent



paper, Kurie, which was banned after 15 issues. Mali imposed censorship after a military coup in November. In the Sudan two papers were suspended for publishing "news without foundation" while in Sierra Leone the opposition newspapers Express and the People were banned and their editors arrested.

In Congo-Kinshasa, one of the first papers to make a name for itself as a voice of the Congolese themselves, *Présence Congolaise*, has been twice suspended. The second suspension, imposed in November for two years, was a grave shock, following as it did a meeting between editors and government called to clear up differences between them. The two-year ban came after the paper had complained of the treatment of a provincial journalist being held in jail for libelling prison officials. Tanzania, which has recently banned Kenyan newspapers, began the year by arresting the editor of the Swahili paper Ulimwengu who had criticised arrests without trial.

Another arrest in Africa is the cause of particular concern. In Uganda Rajat Neogy, an Asian editor with Ugandan nationality had made *Transition* a magazine with a reputation extending far beyond its country of publication. He has now been accused of seditious publication in printing a letter from an Opposition MP. Both Neogy and the author of the letter were arrested under Ugandan emergency regulations which permit detention without trial. At a preliminary hearing in November they were sent for trial this month and were both released on bail. But on leaving court they were rearrested under the emergency regulations.

In South Africa, attention was focused on the trial of the eminent editor of the *Rand Daily Mail*, Laurence Gandar, and his chief reporter, Benjamin Pogrand, who were convicted of publishing false information in contravention of the South African Prisons Act.

On this, Mr. Sean MacBride, Secretary-General of the International Commission Jurists, has written (in a letter to IPI Report): "Inevitably, discriminatory laws lead to the erosion, one after the other, of the elements of the rule of law, including those which are unrelated to the policy of Apartheid. We fear that the Gandar trial represented a further step in this process of erosion, this time directed against the freedom of the press. The *Rand Daily Mail* criticized the policies of the South African Government and dared to publish information which displeases the authorities, hence it must be silenced. Instead of suppressing it openly, an attempt is being made to prosecute it out of existence. In this manner the *Rand Daily Mail* will be effectively silenced and the rest of the South African press will be intimidated into subservience."

In Asia the press has a long history and has often been intimately associated with the struggle for independence, so

that it can look for more acceptance, struggling more against economic forces than repressive governments. In authoritarian regimes, however, this is not the case. In Pakistan, a member of IPI, Shorish Kashmiri, was arrested under the Defence of Pakistan Rules in April. His paper, the Lahore weekly *Chatan*, was closed under the rules. Although IPI has since been assured that Kashmiri was arrested on account of a speech he made and not on account of the article for which his paper was suspended, no information has been received of his release or the ending of the paper's suspension. It is however a hopeful sign that journalists in the country have again demonstrated in favour of a free press.

In India, there is anxiety over two laws being prepared to restrict publications which might inflame feelings between communities. Although the Indian press generally accepts the good intentions of the laws drafted by Andhra Pradesh and by the Central Government, responsible journalists are concerned that these intentions should not be achieved by repression of newspapers.

The press of Burma remains rigorously controlled but the last of the IPI members held by the government of *Ne Win* were released early last year. E.M. Law Yone, former editor of the *Nation*, was freed after being held since 1963 and U Sein Win, former editor of the *Guardian*, was released after being held since 1965. As far as is known, no members of IPI remain under detention but there is no news that they will again be able to publish their papers freely.

Elsewhere in Asia, the treatment of the press has reflected government nervousness. Thailand, Laos and Cambodia have been restrictive of foreign correspondents and South Vietnam, engaged in a bitter war, has pursued a policy of direct repression. Since censorship was officially lifted, suspension of newspapers has been frequent under provisions prohibiting publications regarded as Communist propaganda. By the month of November, 13 newspapers had been closed. One paper came under the ban for having given too much prominence to American criticism of Saigon's refusal to join the Paris talks and too little to the Saigon Government's reply. Nguyen Thanh Tai, a photographer for United Press International, was jailed for two years on a charge of producing pictures detrimental to the public interest. The pictures were alleged to have been faked to show ill-treatment of prisoners, although the agency accepted their authenticity.

Four correspondents were murdered in the streets of Saigon by the Viet Cong. Their tragic and pointless deaths illustrate the risk which newsmen take to provide information and underline the need for an international convention which would give them recognition and a minimum of protection. A draft convention, prepared by the International Federation of Editors and the International

Commission of Jurists, is in existence and its acceptance has been urged by IPI (at the Nairobi Assembly). So far no country has taken steps to adopt it.

Such a convention would not remove all risk from news gathering and it's debatable what protection it would give to Anthony Grey, the Reuters correspondent held in Peking in conditions amounting to solitary confinement. Appeals to the Chinese Government by the news agency, by IPI and other press organizations have been ignored or refused. In this heartless use of a journalist as a pawn in a political game, Grey has been detained in cramped quarters since July 21, 1967, although he has never been before a court or indeed accused of any crime. It was at first indicated that he was being held as a hostage for journalists arrested in Hong Kong after last year's disturbances, but since they have been freed this line has now been dropped. The claim made now is that he is held as a reprisal for the detention without trial of Chinese under Hong Kong's emergency regulations.

In the United States, where journalists have long enjoyed a special position compared with colleagues elsewhere, a disquieting development has been noted. Despite disproof of any direct connection, it has been felt that the media by publicizing violence and (particularly in the case of television) by being present during it, in some measure incite the violence they report. The American media are not alone in this. In Germany, in France, in Britain, in Brazil and elsewhere the media have found themselves both blamed as the real instigators of violence and sometimes in clashes with police the object of it. Even in Switzerland, a country with a peaceful tradition where press freedom is guaranteed under the Constitution, a press photographer who was injured by police while covering a demonstration has had his case dis-

missed by a court and been told that he must accept this "professional risk".

In the United States the media's loss of acceptance was strikingly illustrated by the response to the riots in Chicago during which 34 newsmen were injured. Public opinion polls found wide support for the police action and little for the newsmen, whom it was apparently felt were as much to blame for what happened as those who struck them. Newspapers, it appeared in surveys, were no longer trusted by their readers, who felt that they lie, manufacture news and sensationalize what they do report. In Germany, where the charge was that certain papers manipulate the news to achieve the effect the publishers wish, a similar reaction has been noted. Above all it was felt in nearly all the countries concerned that the media could expect no protection during violence since they were partly responsible for it.

Early this year, the US President's Commission on Civil Disorders was specifically charged to investigate what effect the media (and particularly television) had had on the preceding year's race riots. While clearing the press in general of any intentional distortion of news which had contributed to the violence, it found evidence of a deeper failure which had. As the Commission report put it: "Disorders are only one aspect of the dilemmas and difficulties of race relations in America. In defining, explaining and reporting this broader, more complex and ultimately more fundamental subject, the communications media, ironically, have failed to communicate".

For the press of America and elsewhere its own communication problem of re-establishing the trust of the readers may prove harder to solve than the technical and economic problems which beset it.

# Nieman Notes

1939

Edwin A. Lahey died in Washington, D.C. on July 17th. (See special section.)

1944

Lawrence Fernsworth participated in the Harvard-MIT colloquium on the Spanish Civil War. He recently returned from Spain, where he was a correspondent for the Times of London. Fernsworth is the author of SPAIN'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM, published by the Beacon Press.

1950

Clark R. Mollenhoff was appointed deputy counsel to President Richard M. Nixon. Mollenhoff, investigative reporter for the Cowles publications, won a Pulitzer Prize in 1958 for national reporting.

1951

Sylvan Meyer, editor of the Miami News, has been named to the Advisory Committee of the Ralph McGill Fellowship Fund. The Fund was created to provide financial assistance to journalism students in Southern colleges and universities. An initial grant of \$100,000 has been made by the Atlanta Metropolitan Foundation.

1953

Kenneth E. Wilson, assistant news editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, taught at the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, in the summer program to train members of minority groups.

1954

Robert C. Bergenheim has been elected manager of the Christian Science Publishing Society. Mr. Bergenheim, who has been an assistant manager for four years, succeeds Bruce G. McCauley who resigned to become general manager of the New York Daily News. Bergenheim started on the Monitor as a copy boy in 1941.

## 1956

**Richard Mooney** has been named assistant to A. M. Rosenthal, who became managing editor of The New York Times September 1st. Mooney, who joined the Times in 1957 after working for the United Press, previously was assistant to James Reston, executive editor, who has been named vice-president.

## 1957

**Robert F. Campbell** has been named executive director of the Race Relations Information Center. This organization was formerly the Southern Education Reporting Service.

**Hale Champion** resigned as the administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. His resignation became effective September 1st. He now is vice-president of planning and operations at the University of Minnesota.

**William Worthy**, a correspondent for Afro-American Newspapers, whose headquarters is in Baltimore, is director of instruction for the Frederick Douglas Fellowships in Journalism. This program, sponsored by Afro-American Newspapers and the Virginia Council on Human Relations, and supported by a \$123,000 Ford Foundation grant, is aimed at training minority group members for careers in journalism. Recipients of the 15 Fellowships are recruited in prisons, slums, military services, Job Corps centers, and college campuses. The Fellows will spend three months in Richmond, Virginia, learning the fundamentals of reporting and editing. They will visit Washington, D.C. for six months to be instructed on the coverage of the federal government, and then go on to Baltimore to learn about newspaper production, managing and editing.

## 1959

**Mitchel Levitas** is the author of *AMERICA IN CRISIS*. It was published in June by Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

**John Seigenthaler**, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, has been appointed board chairman of the Race Relations Information Center in Nashville, Tennessee.

**Norman A. Cherniss**, associate editor of The Press and Daily Enterprise of Riverside, California, has been appointed Visiting Professor and Editor-in-Residence at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism. Cherniss has been a university lecturer on two occasions in the past: the first, at the Graduate Department of Journalism at the University of California in Los Angeles in 1965-66, and later, at the University of Southern California in 1968-69.

## 1961

**Thomas H. Joyce** has joined the Washington Bureau of Newsweek Magazine where he will specialize in labor and related affairs. Joyce had been with the Detroit News for 15 years, eight of them in Washington.

## 1964

**Roy Reed** has left the Washington Bureau of The New York Times to become chief southern correspondent, and is living in New Orleans.

## 1966

**Charles A. Ferguson** has been appointed associate editor of the States-Item in New Orleans. He previously was editor of the editorial page.

1967

**Philip Meyer** of the Washington Bureau of the Knight Newspapers was a member of the faculty of the third jointly sponsored ANPA-INPA newspaper research workshop in July. It was held on the University of Ohio campus in Columbus. The first two workshops were conducted at the University of Colorado in Boulder.

1968

**H. Brandt Ayers** has been named editor and publisher of the Anniston Star. In that capacity he is serving as the principal operational officer.

**Jerome Aumente** of the Detroit News joined the faculty of Rutgers University on August 1st. He is associated with a new college, Livingston, where the emphasis is on urban problems, and a high proportion of students is from black and Puerto Rican neighborhoods. He is setting up courses in the communications phase of the Division of Urban Studies, teaching, and completing a book.

1969

**Henry S. Bradsher**, chief of the Associated Press Bureau in Moscow for four years, has joined the Washington Star to cover the State Department.

1970

**Carl M. Cobb**, medical writer for The Boston Globe, was presented the Rudolph Elie Award by the Boston Press Club for the best series of feature stories. The award was made at the club's annual dinner last spring, and cited Mr. Cobb's more than 80 articles which called attention to problems at the Boston City Hospital and attempts to improve patient care, organization and hiring practices.

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

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

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

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