Nieman Reports

September 1970

RONALD OSTROW

discusses Judge Warren Burger and the Press

REBECCA GROSS

reflects upon an interesting career in journalism

HERBERT KUPFERBERG

reviews THE NASHVILLE SOUND

KATHARINE GRAHAM

says the American Press is alive and kicking

STUART KEATE

cites the many strengths of our newspapers

GEORGE AMICK

tells of running his second Marathon

JOHN COLBURN

sees criticism as an asset to newspapers

EDELSTEIN & AMES

explain experiments with humanistic writing

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXIV, No. 3 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | September 1970

—Dwight E. Sargent, Editor— —Tenney K. Lehman, Managing Editor—

Published quarterly by the Society of Nieman Fellows from 48 Trowbridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138. Subscription $3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Mass.

Rebecca F. Gross Retires

Rebecca "Becky" Gross has retired as editor, director and vice president of the Lock Haven Express after 45 years of distinguished journalism. She was a Nieman Fellow in 1946–47. The following account of her career appeared in her newspaper at the time of her retirement.

A reporter who came to The Express city desk from a New York paper told this story:

He was interested in coming to Pennsylvania to work. He inquired of an experienced journalist about the "big" papers in Pennsylvania; and the "little" papers, where he might seek employment.

After recommending good "big" papers, and good "little" papers, the journalist friend said, "And there's one special newspaper in Pennsylvania—in a class of its own. That's the Lock Haven Express."

The reporter applied to The Express for a job.

What has made The Express a special newspaper, known far more widely abroad than its circulation might warrant, has been the indomitable spirit and journalistic enterprise of its editor since 1931, Miss Rebecca F. Gross, who retired on June 1, 1970.

The editorial bent was always present in "Becky" Gross, from her Lock Haven High School days when she was editor-in-chief of The Gazette. She worked part-time for the Clinton County Times after school and on Saturdays for $5 a week, and used her first week's pay to buy a stamp album, and the next week's pay for a book of poetry.

She went on to Temple University to study journalism, and continued part-time work on the Times, where one summer she scooped The Express on a poultry show. Frank D. O'Reilly, Sr., of The Express, didn't let that challenging

(Continued on page 23)

The Burger Court and the Press

By Ronald J. Ostrow

Mr. Ostrow covers the Supreme Court for the Los Angeles Times. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1964–65.

The Associated Press reporter and the Washington Star's man were startled when Chief Justice Warren E. Burger walked into the cluttered press quarters at the court. He glanced at the worn desks, examined several yellowing anti-Haynsworth cartoons taped to one wall and chatted with the newsmen for five minutes about their inadequate facilities.

Moving next door to the Supreme Court's main press room, the chief justice expressed dismay over the jammed cubicles assigned to the rest of the court's "regulars."

No one could recall if ever before any justice, let alone the first among equals, had toured the press quarters deep in the innards of the court building.

It was just as much of a surprise when Burger, in the midst of one of the tribunal's daily opening ceremonies admitting lawyers to its bar, sent a penned note to two reporters who were idly pondering the chamber's sculptured ceiling.

"Press—I hope you are getting some good, hard news out of all this! W.E.B."

That's one side of Warren Earl Burger and the press. There's another.

There is the Burger who called a magazine editor in New York to complain when the publication reported he had lobbied with senators for former Judge G. Harrold Carswell's nomination to the court. And there's the Burger who, flu-bound in a hospital, called a Washington news executive to protest a reporter's interpretation of an action by a judicial ethics committee.

There is the Burger who in February barred television sound equipment from a speech he delivered in Washington and went even further when speaking to the American Bar Foundation two weeks later in Atlanta. There he ruled out camera and sound coverage and later complained to CBS about the "outrageous conduct" of the TV crew who resisted his ban.

Burger defended his action on the grounds his speech was not a public event and that electronic media had no option on his face or voice because he was not running for political office.

In August, the chief justice reversed his field by allowing live television to broadcast his first "state of the judiciary" message. At the same American Bar Association meeting where he delivered the speech, however, Burger also barred cameras and tape recorders from most of his other public appearances.

This ambiguous attitude toward the press—woo reporters with one hand, go over their heads to editors to challenge their accounts and shut off their access with the other—is more than just a sidelight of the new chief justice's personality. The man at the top of the third branch has the capability to influence the tone and style of lower judges on a wide variety of matters, including the currently touchy issue of public disclosure.

During his short tenure, Burger has demonstrated that he intends to exercise power. His unprecedented joint program with the American Bar Association to create a corps of court executives, his pleas to the bar and other audiences for prison reform, his stand against judges overreacting to the concern over judicial ethics by becoming cloistered all illustrate his willingness to command.

Burger ascended to the chief justiceship just as the press was discovering how uncovered it had allowed the judicial branch to remain.

This blindspot of national journalism was pointed up by several developments, one on the heels of another. They included the disclosures that helped block the Senate vote on Abe Fortas' chief justice nomination and those that forced him off the court; Justice William O. Douglas' resignation as the $12,000-a-year president of a Los Angeles foundation with Las Vegas casino ties; the self-disqualification of Fifth Circuit judges after they disclosed they had investments in the oil and gas industry, the most litigious business before their circuit; and, of course, the ethics revelations concerning Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr.

It was during the Senate's consideration of Haynsworth's Supreme Court nomination that the press began to reassert its responsibility to disclose relevant as well as potentially relevant facts about members of the judiciary. The responsibility flowered in full during the battle over Carswell when a part-time, college student television newsman uncovered Carswell's 1948 white supremacist speech, an enterprising feat the FBI failed to match.

These disclosures combined to lift partway the velvet curtain that has separated the lifetime appointee judges from the public. After some obvious agonizing, the policy-making arm of the federal judiciary—the Judicial Conference—reacted by requiring judges publicly to disclose semi-annually their outside earnings and gifts exceeding $100.

(The reasoning behind this action, particularly what led the conference to favor limited disclosure rather than a flat ban on off-bench earnings which it had instituted under the prompting of former Chief Justice Earl Warren, remains somewhat obscured. Burger plugged the leaks that had characterized previous conference sessions by limiting attendance at the closed-door meetings to the 25 members, preventing other federal judges from seeing and telling.)

Nevertheless, as a result of the unprecedented public disclosure order, beginning with the initial reports filed July 31st, reporters have had a partial glimpse of federal judges' off-bench earnings.

The glimpse is only partial because the disclosure requirement is not comprehensive—it does not, for example, cover a judge's financial liabilities—and because some judges, principally on the West Coast, are refusing to comply. What steps the judiciary takes to prod the balking jurists into disclosing could indicate whether the judges are serious about policing themselves.

Aside from coverage of the judicial ethics question, reporting of court actions, particularly those of the Supreme Court, could be in for some significant improvement. It depends largely on Burger's willingness to implement some long overdue changes.

To be sure, Supreme Court coverage today is quite improved over 1964 when Anthony Lewis ("Gideon's Trumpet") of the New York Times and James E. Clayton ("The Making of Justice") of the Washington Post dramatized with their books the kind of good stories that were unreported or inadequately reported at the court.

Over the last five years, a steadily growing number of papers have assigned members of their Washington bureaus to pay at least partial attention to the court, and NBC has assigned a specialist. The newspaper that puts its own man at the court rather than relying on the wires is much more able to relate court actions to local and regional developments often of greatest import to its readers.

Critics of press coverage of the Supreme Court, however, have placed far too much blame on the wire associations. They have charged that under the pressure of meeting afternoon paper deadlines the wires have grabbed for the first readable summary they could construct within the framework of a lead. Too often this reaching results in an over-simplification that distorts the court's ruling as reported in hundreds of papers throughout the nation, the critics contend.

It is true that the wire associations' influence over public understanding of the court is pervasive—far more so than can be measured by the number of stories that appear with the AP or UPI slug. The wires are virtually the only news gatherers who throughout the court term read all the appeals filed in order to select the significant actions among the hundreds of denials and the few cases accepted by the justices each Monday.

With some shifts in emphasis, the cases picked by the wires for reporting to the public, except for cases of special local interest, are mirrored in the news play of most papers with their own court correspondents.

As for reporting of court opinions, the wires are first out with the story, and the newsman struggling with a murky court opinion while an editor screams for copy has been known to turn to the wire version for translation.

On close inspection, the allegation that wire coverage of the court is over-simplified and distorted falls apart. Those that make it usually reach back to the early 1960s and cite such decisions as the school prayer ruling to make their point.

A case can be made for the argument that under time pressure the first reports to emerge from the court are not

as clear and as fleshed out as later accounts. But this is a different criticism.

Underlying such a criticism is the fact that the court has the means to ease the extreme time pressure under which reporters try to unscramble sentences that sometimes are models of obscurity. The solution could be to impose a lid on release of the court's decisions and perhaps to distribute them to reporters behind a locked door two hours before the court session begins.

(On those decisions where even more time does not lift the fog, a modification could be to give reporters regular access to the primary court sources—the justices themselves —or secondary sources—their clerks. But when dealing with an institution that only this year moved to a 60-minute lunch hour rather than 30 minutes, that kind of change is at least a century away.)

There are other mechanical barriers to covering the court that Burger could remove himself or influence his judicial brothers to remove in the interest of better informing the public.

For example, reporters do not have access to correspondence between court officials and lawyers in cases pending before the tribunal. If the court requests more information on a crucial point, or if a lawyer informs the justices of a fundamental change in the status of his case, it could be news. But the press has no way of learning about it.

When a justice is missing from the bench, there often is no explanation. If it is Justice Hugo L. Black, his office probably will tell you candidly that he had to remain at home to oversee repair of his air conditioning. But the offices of most other justices will simply say they do not give out such information.

It is rare when a justice will disclose publicly why he disqualified himself from a case before the court, even though his explanation might help to resolve the current debate over when a judge should take himself out of a case.

The list of missing information could go on and on. Many gaps could be filled by Burger.

Some, like the explanation of an absent justice's whereabouts, are up to individual justices. Burger tried to set the way when he informed the press that he was checking into Bethesda Naval Hospital for a routine medical examination. This was in sharp contrast with the way that Black tried to play down the news of his eye operations and Justice William O. Douglas tried to hush up his pacemaker implantation.

The gaps that Burger might do something about as chief justice were called to his attention by the core of "regulars" that cover the court before the current term opened last October.

For a brief period, the court tried to release the lengthy list of cases accepted and those denied earlier on decision Mondays to enable time-pressured reporters to clear away that portion of breaking news before decisions were issued. But the experiment backfired. In speeding up release of the list clerical mistakes were made, corrections had to be issued, news stories were written about the confusion and the experiment was dropped.

In August, Burger broke completely with precedent and called a "backgrounder" for two wire association reporters when the court agreed to hear a package of school desegregation cases. Decisions in the cases could rank next in importance to the 1954 ruling that outlawed public school segregation.

But because the wires were barred from attributing directly to Burger his explanation of why the particular cases had been selected, the reader could learn more from secondhand accounts that reported his meeting with the wire associations as a news event.

Perhaps the "backgrounder" has a useful role elsewhere in Washington. But in reporting about a tribunal where each member has an equal vote, the "backgrounder" obscures more than it clarifies. The non-attributed explanation of a court action may reflect only the view of the justice voicing it—in this instance, Burger.

The reader has no way to evaluate the explanation when the writer is prohibited from attributing it.

No one quarrels with the observation that court reporting could be sharpened and expanded. Significant improvements could be achieved, however, in short order by the court itself. The chief justice has yet to exercise his leadership effectively to help bring about the improvements.

Growing Threats Against Freedom To Dissent

By Katharine Graham

I am truly pleased to be here with the members of the American Jewish Congress and particularly with my old friend, Fred Friendly.

You have asked us to speak on a tough subject: "the growing threats against freedom to dissent, particularly as they affect the mass media."

Let me start by trying to define the terms of the discussion. We have to face and answer, I think, some very basic questions.

Are these threats real and "growing"?

What are the most serious forms they take?

How are they to be countered—and the freedom to dissent guarded?

And what are the role and responsibility of the mass media in this conflict?

In short, who is scaring whom—and with what?

The first question—are these threats real and growing? I think the answer must be that we don't know because the evidence is not all in. They have been real, and until quite lately, they seemed to be growing both in sound and fury and also in reality. Recent events are, at least, encouragingly ambiguous.

The Nixon administration took office thanks in large part to the voters of the South and the suburbs. These two groups of Americans are not famous for being sympathetic to dissenters. Now, the administration's political strategy seems to be to keep these supporters and to add the millions of people, still less tolerant of militant blacks and student protestors, who voted for George Wallace. You do not hold such a coalition together by Presidential acts of friendship for dissenters. So it is not surprising that we have seen no such acts.

Nor is it surprising that this administration should be seeking to stifle dissent on the one great issue that is causing so much of it—the war in Vietnam. Suppression of criticism about Vietnam is part and parcel of the limited war strategy which Mr. Nixon inherited from President Johnson—a strategy which obliges us to convince the enemy of our unified resolve. This, in all fairness, is not so much the fault of this administration, or of any administration, as it is a fatal flaw in a war strategy which requires, for its effectiveness, a conspiracy of silence in an open society.

What have we seen and heard in the last 16 months? Let us take the words of the administration first. There has been a steady escalation of official vituperation and invective. "Kooks," "oddballs," "rotten apples," "societal misfits,"—always there is, of course, the artful construction or the retroactive explanation so that it can be explained that the term of contempt was only meant to apply to a limited, out-of-bounds few. Certainly, the explanation runs, there is no intention of discrediting the motives of all young people, of dissenters generally, or of public officials who exercised their right to diverge from the official line. Yet these attacks seem invariably to be combined with broadbrush, categorical smears of critics and dissenters as a whole, all these "choleric young intellectuals", these "tired embittered elders", legislators, anonymous theys and thems among the media and the so-called "elite" who are trying to undermine the nation's strength and its values.

Well, this is strong talk. But we ought to remember that it has come mostly from one man, the Vice President, with occasional contributions from the Attorney General and others, and one remark about "bums", swiftly qualified, from the President.

And, of course, official acts must concern us more than words. The President has sworn to do something about crime in the cities and acts of violence and brutality in the name of protest. We ought to realize that Americans are

genuinely frightened by crime and that those who live in our cities have every reason to be. We here in the District are painfully aware of this problem and are desperately in need of adequate protective measures. However, the cheap solutions sought by the administration will, in the long run, turn out to be very costly: wiretapping, no-knock, preventive detention, mandatory sentencing, tampering with mail, and the flood of subpoenas issued to many of us this fall and winter. And if we need a witness to the ugly trend that is emerging from these disparate views and legislative measures and activities, we need only cite Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina, who rose not long ago to describe a House-passed, administration-supported crime bill for the District of Columbia as one which contained "some of the most repressive, near-sighted, intolerant, unfair and vindictive legislation that the Senate has ever been presented".

Let us now end this whole sorry litany of acts and words and try very briefly to put the whole scene in some rational perspective.

Let me—first of all—hasten to reject some of the more gaudy and extravagant inferences that might be drawn from all this with respect to the state of our mass media. To put it simply: despite all the snarling official din, the free press is alive, well—and kicking like mad. For one thing, there exists incontrovertible proof—from the time the first loud criticisms of the Vietnam war to the clamor of this moment—that America's dissenters can dissent more effectively than their suppressors can suppress. To cite one obvious instance close at hand, quite a few months have passed since the Vice President made The Washington Post a household name, but I have not ever noticed any muting or hedging of editorial judgments as a result. It is important to point out here that official words about the licensed media carry with them an implication of threat that doesn't apply to the unlicensed.

The fact is, I think, that the press sometimes has to guard against a recurrent and romantic tendency to picture itself in the role of a heroic and beleaguered champion, defending all virtues against overwhelming odds. This kind of posturing is tempting, to be sure, but it is irrelevant and misleading. And it is particularly so in these times. For the press is not the special or unique victim of today's repressive environment. The threats are too sweeping—and their targets too many—for the press to reserve special pity for itself. We of the press simply are affected, like everyone else, by the erosion of freedom, the encroachment of government, and the confusion of our people.

Let me, next of all, take fair and appropriate note of the apparently changed temper and conduct of the government in the days since the Cambodian decision. They have met with the young, they have lowered their voices. The President has also met with fifteen black college presidents. The Attorney General has affirmed his readiness to accept new legislation protecting the information and notes of newsmen from courtroom subpoenas.

So all these are heartening signs of perhaps saner and healthier times ahead.

Let us, again, try for some perspective—this time historically.

There was, for example, the spectacular witch-hunting immediately after World War I led by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer. Brandishing the powers of harsh wartime sedition laws, this Attorney General directed mass arrests without warrants, viewed labor strikes as Bolshevik conspiracies, and boasted of complete biographic files on 200,000 dangerous radicals. Interestingly, perhaps, he relished being called "the Fighting Quaker".

There was, then, of course, the ugly bitterness of the McCarthy period. It, too, claimed human victims, and the nation's air was acrid with the fumes of slander. But—I would have to judge even that period as less potentially dangerous than the present. For one thing, it was a one-issue conflict—the problem of Communist infiltration—whereas the issues dividing us today appear on all levels and run in all directions and trouble all regions of our national life. They are not issues, moreover, that can be resolved by courtroom prosecution or Congressional hearing. And—finally—the press itself, its integrity and independence and competence, was not then a central issue, as it surely is today.

And this brings us inexorably to the final question: how do we face the challenge of not merely recounting the great issues—but being made into a great issue ourselves?

I offer you, by way of answer, only a few general—but I believe critical—self-addressed exhortations.

Let us, most obviously, be realistic—shunning all melodrama, disdaining all mock heroics, and seeing the "news" of our own situation as clearly and calmly as we view any other news.

So doing, we have to accept the fact that we must live under some pretty withering cross-fires. Our political leaders may regard us as pernicious enemies, but the radical left no less passionately regards us as sycophants and tools of our political leaders. As surely as the first see us undermining the Establishment, the second see us buttressing the Establishment. So—the flak will keep coming at us from both sides, and we should not have time to waste in whining about it.

Let us—next—without any fatuous self-exaltation steadily and clearly keep in mind that we have an historical role and responsibility to meet as old as the Constitution itself.

The freedom of the press, assured by the First Amendment, was not a privilege or an indulgence conceived for the pleasure of publishers and editors. This freedom was defined and meant for the people, to help them watch,

guard, and enrich their freedom. The authors of the Constitution were profoundly practical about this. They knew that a press wholly independent of the government was utterly vital to nourishing wisdom in public policy, promoting governmental competence, exposing official incompetence, and encouraging national unity by the provision of an orderly outlet for all dissent. The fathers of the Constitution perceived, in short, that only an independent press would give the people the information they needed to be truly self-governing. In this sense, the free press has always been—and must remain—a vital part of the larger system of checks-and-balances making our free society work. In short, the freedom of the press stands to protect not the press's writers—but its readers.

Let us—next—quite simply show courage in filling this role, under whatever pressure.

We cannot serve as the arm or the agent of the political Right or the political Left. If this earns us the wrath of both, so be it. If official policy plainly appears deceptive to us, we cannot court favor—or escape abuse—by conniving in such deception. And if extremist agitation erupts into the savagery of killing and destroying, we cannot disguise wanton cruelty as merely warm dissent.

As we cannot be an arm of the Right or the Left, so, too, we cannot possibly be used as an arm of the Law. It is our position—and our conviction—that newsmen have an unqualified privilege to refuse to testify in court on any information obtained in their professional capacity. Our paramount interest must be to protect our ability to collect the news—because that is where the public interest lies. In exercising this privilege, we need never be arbitrary or capricious: we must refuse only in those instances which we judge would hurt our ability to gather the news

The heart of the whole matter is simple. Historically and Constitutionally, it is our job to be informers of the public—not of the police.

Let us, lastly, do our professional job better than we ever have done.

Intellectually and emotionally, this means keeping your head when all about you may seem to be trying to blow it off. If the din of criticism of the mass media includes much that is both ignorant and malicious, this still is no reason for us to declare a moratorium on self-criticism.

We have to be wiser, swifter, fairer than ever, because nothing less will serve the times . . . for two reasons.

For one thing, our whole constituency depends on both our integrity and credibility. In a society beset with factions obsessed with their own needs and wants, the press has no legion of friends to mobilize to fight the press's battles. As we serve the public, so will the public respect us—no more, no less. And no free society—no American public—is going to worry or care much about the freedom of a press that it does not much believe.

We have to strive toward our unprecedented best, finally, because the very life of our society—its unity and its freedom—can fatefully depend on us.

As the generations split, as the races split, as the regions split, as the bigotries and the passions, the violence and the counter-violence tear and sunder us . . . where are we to look for a community of rationality . . . a dedication to truth . . . a commitment to equity?

How, in short, are our people simply going to be able to talk truly and honestly to one another—unless a free press supplies the substance for their speech?

Let us keep firmly in mind, then, a final solace—and a final challenge.

We have much to fight against.

But we have much more to fight for.

Mrs. Graham, publisher of The Washington Post, made these remarks at the national biennial convention of the American Jewish Congress in Washington.

Book Review

By Herbert Kupferberg

THE NASHVILLE SOUND: Bright Lights and Country Music. By Paul Hemphill.
Simon and Schuster, New York, 289 pp. $5.95

Country music is the one indigenous American musical form that hasn't produced a shelf full of books. Jazz, swing, rock—even the symphonies of Charles Ives—have all had their scribes and scholars, but the thriving variety known in the music trade as C & W—Country and Western—has somehow escaped literary treatment.

The gap has now been filled, once and for all, by Paul Hemphill in a compact, lively and informative volume called *The Nashville Sound*.

Mr. Hemphill, a Nieman Fellow (1968-69) and former Atlanta *Journal* columnist, was born in Birmingham, Ala., grew up on country music, and evidently has never been able to get the sound of it out of his ears. To write his book he's toured widely both in back woods and big cities, going straight to the sources, as a good newsman should. He's talked not only to the people who create and perform this far from simple music, but also to those who package and market it. For in its amalgam of folklore and finance, country music is a thoroughly American product that could flourish as it has only in an era of mass media and instant communication.

Nashville, Tenn., or "Music City, U.S.A.," as it modestly calls itself, is the center of the country music "industry," a $60,000,000 complex of recording studios, publishing houses, record-pressing plants, talent agencies, office buildings, theaters and restaurants where 3000 musicians and songwriters live, work, eat, drink and keep a wary eye on each other to see who's edging upward on the charts or being gossiped about in the trade papers.

But the music itself has roots that reach wider into the countryside and deeper into history. As a musical city boy, I must admit being abashed to learn from these pages that country music has its origins in the folk ballads of the British Isles, even though it has undergone considerable change—not to say adulteration—in the transplanting.

"Country music has always been the soul music of the white South," writes Mr. Hemphill. "It came over from Europe on the first boats, and the reason it survived in places like Appalachia and Canada and rural New England and East Texas and central California—and quickly died in places like Richmond and Boston and Philadelphia—is that the music, like the people who clung to it, was earthy and simple and conservative and, in its own peculiar way, religious."

Many sophisticates, Mr. Hemphill concedes, scorn this kind of song as "hillbilly" music; after all, such titles as "Everything's OK on the LBJ," "Are There Angels in Korea?" and "It Wasn't God Who Made Honky-Tonk Angels" are enough to make an effete Easterner head for the hills of Southampton or Bucks County. And, more often

than not, the songs reflect the narrow outlook of a good many of the influential people in the industry. In 1968, the author notes a bit sorrowfully, Nashville's Music Row was "practically a battlefield command post for George Wallace."

On the other hand, though, any musical style that can produce a song called "May the Bird of Paradise Fly Up Your Nose" can't be all bad. And lately no less an untrammeled spirit than Bob Dylan has come to Nashville to team up in a song or two with Johnny Cash, so who knows what sociological directions may lie ahead?

The *Nashville Sound* does a comprehensive job of presenting not only the music but the people who make it. Hardly anyone even remotely connected with the style seems to be missing from the index, and some of the best known names in American music are covered in depth—Chet Atkins, Glen Campbell, Buck Owens, and, of course, Elvis Presley.

Mr. Hemphill has a good deal to say about Elvis, both from the standpoint of his own individual style, and as the singer who, more than any other, brought about the blending of rock 'n' roll with Country and Western—a merger which has shaped the popular music of our time into more or less its present form. What was Elvis' appeal when he burst upon the scene in 1954 and became the voice of the young? Mr. Hemphill explains it as succinctly as any one ever has: "Elvis was saying to hell with Korea and the old folks. He was saying groove it because tomorrow you may die."

It's part of Mr. Hemphill's honesty of approach that he makes little attempt to glamorize or gild the daily routine of Music Row. Much of his book is devoted to Nashville's roster of failures, far longer than its success sagas. He deals with the country boys who can't read a note of music yet hitch-hike to town certain they have the next gold-record hit under their arm; the black men unable to succeed despite their natural talent (Charley Pride is the only Negro who's ever made it big in C & W); the stars who've climbed to the top but can't relax there because of all the competition around. For most people in Nashville, it's a short life and not an especially merry one.

Sometimes Mr. Hemphill gets just a bit fancy in trying to capture the accent and atmosphere of some of the people he writes about, as when, for instance, he reports that Tex Ritter's maid interrupted an interview with the announcement that there was a long-distance call coming in from "Cleveland, *O-hye-o.*" After all, how else could the poor girl have pronounced it?

But for the most part Mr. Hemphill depicts the speech and the flavor of the country music people with accuracy and flair. He knows how to convey his enthusiasm for a music that's finally being taken seriously as an American cultural phenomenon. Whether he's describing a Saturday night telecast from the Grand Ole Opry House, or the hectic drinking bout that usually follows it at Tootsie's Orchid Lounge, he unfailingly displays the reporter's gift for making places and people come alive.

The hills and woods are full of correspondents who know how to cover statehouses and diplomatic briefings, but those who can write about popular culture with insight and authority are a rare breed. Welcome to Paul Hemphill.

Mr. Kupferberg, formerly Lively Arts Editor of the New York Herald Tribune, is associate editor of Parade Magazine. He is the author of THE FABULOUS PHILADELPHIANS, the story of the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra and its conductors. He has written about music for the Atlantic Monthly, the New York Herald Tribune, and other journals.

Let Us "Go To Our Strengths"

By Stuart Keate

Recent circulation studies would indicate that newspapers are having a tough, relentless, day-to-day struggle just to keep abreast of our exploding populations. Old circulators used to tell us that it was important to "knock 'em off one at a time," and, prosaic though it may seem, it's probably as true today as it was when first enunciated.

Let us confess at once that there has been a dramatic change in social values. As youngsters, we were raised in the belief that modesty was a virtue, and that it was somehow vulgar to trumpet our own accomplishments.

Later, it became axiomatic in our business that it wasn't enough to have a good news service, but necessary also to tell the public that it *was good;* it wasn't enough to blow up a good picture; and if you had *only* a bad picture, it could be made better by enlarging it.

But we don't want to make the mistake that the old Texan did when he read one day of a New York manufacturer who was in the market for frog-skins.

The Texan wrote a letter, saying that he could fill any demand on request.

The New York firm, quite excited by this new source of raw material, wired him: "Send 10,000 immediately."

In due course, a thin letter arrived from Texas. Attached to it was a single frog-skin and a note which said:

"Doggone—that noise sure fooled me."

In today's increasingly strident and competitive society, we seem to be in danger of being press-agented and publicized and bullied to death.

Every hot-line yahoo, every flag-waving (and flag-burning) dissenter and every campus protestor is promoting a particular point of view—often under the protection of the honored banners of free speech and a free press.

The danger, it seems to me, is that the lines may become blurred between the valid and the specious; between the things of merit and the meretricious.

For of one thing we may be certain—it is impossible to promote a phony product.

The corollary to that statement is that you can never bury a really sound idea. Robert Townsend, the man "who tries harder," doesn't agree with this. He says that ideas are good for a limited time. In "Up The Organization" he cites as an example the British creating a civil-service job in 1803 calling for a man to stand on the cliffs of Dover with a spyglass. He was supposed to ring a bell if he saw Napoleon coming. The job was abolished in 1945.

On the other hand, I was interested, in going through some old family papers the other day, to run across a letter written by my grandmother, telling about a drive they had to raise money for her church.

The idea was to have women put their "age in pennies" in a sealed envelope and turn it in at the next church supper. It worked well. It was a good idea 100 years ago and I think it would work well today, too.

Certain verities endure, as we learned during our recent strike. The pollsters had recently been telling us that the stories which interested newspaper readers the most had to do with science, religion and education.

But what did people miss most when our papers were down? The funerals.

Readers wanted to know who had passed away. This was vital information which they could not get from radio or TV.

Let the market drop; let the war expand into Cambodia; let the university explode in violence; what concerned these people *most* was the basic information of who had been born, who had been married, and who had died in their own community.

We decided to tell them—even if it wasn't, in the strict sense, "news". So when we started up we printed a list, in five solid pages of agate type, of all the funeral notices we

could gather from February 15 to May 15. This was done without charge, as a public service.

Perhaps there is a lesson in this for all of us. Perhaps, in this computer age, we may have lost sight of the fact that the greatest technical advances of our times can be illuminated in terms of a single human being; that the arcane mysteries of outer space can only be made comprehensible to us laymen by the quiet voices of Jack Swigert and Jim Lovell saying: "Hey, we've got a problem here."

We've got a problem, too, calling for the highest journalistic art: to persuade readers, at the point of a pen, to enter our columns.

It's doubtful that the old techniques will survive. That hilarious stage play, "The Front Page," recently revived, is a sheer delight—but *that* world no longer exists. We have no Hearsts to start a war in Cuba so that James Remington would have some lively battles to sketch and—I confess a bit sadly—no editor with the promotional sense of Hugh Cudlipp, who once persuaded a bedridden British beauty to try to hatch an egg, all in the interests of the London Daily Mirror.

The public today, I suspect, is much too sophisticated for these shenanigans. No, I believe that the papers which will make the greatest gains in the next decade are the serious and responsible ones, with a highly-developed social conscience—whose great aim, in the phrase of The Guardian, is to "respect the news, the English language, and the reader."

Many of us who are clinging to the old promotional techniques are, in my opinion, perpetrating a genial fiction. We're a bit like the barker outside his tent, crying: "Hurry, hurry, hurry—the girls are just about to take their clothes off."

And what happens when they get inside? They get treated to a medical lecture.

So we dress up our front pages with beautiful art, handsome layouts, easy-to-read setting, to lure the customers in. Then we *sock it to 'em* with-in-depth stories on the new ecology, urban renewal and the hazards of the drug culture.

The tabloid New York Post, which has the evening field all to itself today in that great city, has had complaints from its staff because it has been delinquent in these areas. Concurrently The New York Times, with its continuing emphasis on thoroughness, accuracy and editorial integrity, has been making some of the most impressive gains in the industry.

The calm, even tones in which The Times addresses its audience seems to me to be carried over into its promotion. There is about it a sense of style, and of taste, which imparts an aura of authority.

You have all seen the full-page ads in which The Times features managing editors around the country studying the paper—at one and the same time projecting its national appeal and its usefulness as a journal of record.

What they are selling, I suggest, are the old-fashioned virtues of character and reliability.

I am more than ever convinced, after our harrowing three-month shutdown in Vancouver, that we should—as the athletes say—"go to our strengths." Let's concede that television will always be the prime entertainment medium. Let's admit that radio has the edge on us in projecting bulletins. If they can be useful to us, let's use 'em.

But let's also recognize—as Huntley-Brinkley and Cronkite have recognized in recent speeches—that there are dozens of areas in which newspapers are unassailable.

I have referred to the vital statistics. There's the stock quotes, full pages of them, and vital to a bustling exchange. There's the editorials; the political cartoons; the opinion columns; the box-scores; the church pages; the backgrounders; the tide-tables; the great market-place of the classified section with its news of ships, and shoes, and sealing-wax.

These are our strengths. They are in our hands every day. The best advertisement we have is *right there in front of us,* in black and white.

I always liked the remark of the old country doctor who was asked to comment on the harsh public relations problems of the medical profession. "The best public relations", he said, "is to do good, and be good."

Something of the same, I feel sure, applies to our industry. The best public relations weapon at our command is a good newspaper. It's out there selling for us, every day.

To produce it, we need an amalgam of skills and a high degree of co-operation between those who write and those who edit; those who research and those who market; those who produce, and those who deliver. And we, who are charged with the direction of their affairs, must always remember that we are dealing not with "personnel," but human beings.

Together, we can work wonders. And in the process, we may take quiet pride in the fact that we have, as Henry James put it, "spent our lives for something that outlasts it."

This is the text of comments made by Mr. Keate, publisher of the Vancouver Sun, at a meeting of the International Newspaper Promotion Association.

Boston Marathon Revisited

By George Amick

Last year, Nieman Reports carried an article by George Amick, Associate Editor of the Trenton Times and a Nieman Fellow in 1969, telling how he finished a course unique in the annals of Nieman history. Below is the incredible account of how he did it for a second year in a row, and challenges others to join a unique society.

I could hardly believe it. Last year, carrying the figurative Nieman banner at a painful lope down the home stretch of my first Boston Marathon, I had promised myself, "never again." But there I was on the afternoon of April 20, 1970, somehow back on Heartbreak Hill, soaked by a cold rain, ankles in pain, six long miles from the finish line.

What was I doing, a 40-year-old YMCA jogger, slogging through a New England shower toward the fame and glory of a 777th-place finish? Why, in fact, were there more than a thousand other citizens similarly occupied in self-flagellation that afternoon?

Pheidippides, the original marathon runner, had a plausible reason; he was carrying to Athens the bulletin of victory over the Persians. None of the explanations I have heard since has been wholly convincing.

Novelist-Professor Erich Segal, who has run in 14 Boston Marathons, says it is an "affirmation of suffering," whatever that means.

Another running professor says to take part in the Marathon is "to make a positive statement in an ambiguous time."

Even Ron Hill, the Britisher who broke the course record this year—running the 26 miles, 385 yards at a pace of less than five minutes per mile—admits to puzzlement. "I have no solid answer because I don't really enjoy punishing myself through the last five miles of a race," he said.

Aha, Ron—for you and a handful of other supermen up front there is the chance for the laurel crown, the medal, the newspaper and television pictures. For the rest of us there is only a certificate for our den walls if we break four hours (yes, I did manage that again) and a free bowl of beef stew at the end.

That overstates the case, of course. There are other compensations and though they may seem small return for a case of total exhaustion, they add up to something worth remembering afterwards. There is the sense of being part of an authentic sports happening.

The scene at Hopkinton gym, where the runners suit up and get their perfunctory physicals on Marathon morning, is a rich addition to anyone's experience. The gym is wall to wall with runners ranging in age from 18 through the 60's. Their running gear comes in all types and colors—not excluding street clothes—and a cold, rainy day brings out even more variety in the form of sweatsuits, sweaters, jackets, globes, caps, plastic garment bags worn like ponchos.

Some prepare for the ordeal ahead by lying supine without fluttering an eyelid; some do brisk calesthenics or jog in place; some sit and brood. It is a bit of Woodstock with oil of wintergreen instead of pot, with the Scottish baying of Jock Semple instead of rock music.

For a while after the race begins, even the running itself is fun. The early miles, at the gentle pace favored by us of the rear guard, are pleasant, before the lactic acid level begins to build and the oxygen debt to accrue. This doesn't wholly apply to days like this year's, which old John Kelley called "one of the coldest Marathons ever, with the rain." But even this time there were a few blithe spirits, like the three runners who bounded through Ashland singing: "Raindrops Keep Fallin' On My Head." ("Wonder if they'll still be singing at 20 miles?" muttered a fellow next to me.)

The spectators, the adults and kids, are another compensation. They give you water and oranges and Gatorade, but most of all they give you enthusiasm. Sportswriter Hal Higdon says anyone who has gone through life feeling unloved ought to try running the Boston Marathon.

There are a handful of wise guys along the way ("Yaaah, Number 393. You feel tired?") But 99 percent of the onlookers want you to do well. At Wellesley College the girls traditionally turn out and cheer wildly, and somebody in every cluster of runners always puts on a sprint there for their benefit. On the first of the Newton hills this year, an hour after the race leaders had swept by, people were still standing in the rain clapping for us poor also-rans toiling along the pavement. And I'll always remember a little girl in Natick, dressed in a raincoat and holding an umbrella, who called out as we went by: "We're proud of you!"

The Marathon is addictive, it seems, and I suppose I'll be back next year, my never-agains forgotten, trying for some reason to break four hours.

Whether any of this has made the Marathon sound appealing to other Nieman Fellows, ex-Niemans or newsmen at large, I don't know. If it has, remember, it's not too soon to begin getting in shape for 1971. But don't expect to run the Marathon only once. Chances are you'll get hooked.

Humanistic Writing

By Alex S. Edelstein and William E. Ames

Professors Edelstein and Ames both are former newsmen who did their graduate work at the University of Minnesota. Professor Edelstein initiated an experiment in humanistic writing in 1968. Professor Ames joined the project as a resident humanist in the Spring of 1969 and has been associate director of the project this past year.

A Seattle reporter began a quarter at the University of Washington School of Communications in a skeptical frame of mind. She was one of three newsmen and women taking part in our experimental project in humanistic writing for newspapers.

In her final evaluation of the experience, she wrote:

> "To my surprise, the ideas we three held about the subject at the end of the quarter were very similar to those expressed to us at the beginning. Somewhere along the way we started understanding them and adopted them as our own."

Sue Hutchison is responsible for the quote. She is an environmental reporter for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Others in the group were Alf Collins, real estate columnist for the Seattle Times, and Bill Asbury, managing editor of the Bremerton (Washington) Sun.

All were recipients of a tuition grant and award from the university made possible by support from the National Endowment on the Humanities. In addition to taking coursework, they participated in seminars to consider approaches to humanistic writing.

The consensus of our reporter participants was that humanistic reporting, like news itself, is easier to demonstrate than to define. More important, humanistic reporting is being demonstrated increasingly on good newspapers.

Consider two leads to a story on an important legal decision in California. The first presents the essential facts in standard newspaper style. The second was written by a humanistically inclined reporter on the Los Angeles Times:

I

> "The California State Supreme Court today ruled that Section 403 of the state constitution was not applicable in the case of four Mexican-American farm workers who disrupted a Fourth of July celebration last summer and were sentenced to four months in prison."

II

> "Brown-skinned mourners at Big Jim Caswell's funeral near Indio last November sang "Venceremos"—the Spanish equivalent of "We Shall Overcome." Caswell did not live to see that claim come to pass. But his conduct in support of Mexican-American farm workers of the Coachella Valley has now been vindicated by the State Supreme Court."

The first story is institutionalized. It went on to quote legal experts and to recount legal precedents for the judicial decision.

The second story is told in human terms. It describes the feelings of the individuals involved in the case and shows their reaction to the court decision. By recreating a specific emotional experience, the reporter helped the reader to share the feelings of a Mexican-American farm worker and to understand a social movement of great significance.

By our own process of consideration and review, we came to define humanistic reporting as that which is concerned with the impact of news on the individual. It is individualized and personalized in the hope that the reader

will see common threads of experience between his own life and that of another person.

In developing criteria for the humanistic story, reporters in our experimental program were able to isolate a number of characteristics, many of which questioned traditional journalistic practices.

Humanistic reporting asks the reporter to become a more sensitive and detailed observer who can recreate an event in terms of individual human beings. *His role is to select.*

An example is this story in the National Observer about a highly sophisticated legal problem which was written by a reporter with a sympathetic eye for human implications. It is not "objective" in the usual sense, but it does not "editorialize":

> "Edward Briney, who raises corn and livestock on a 200-acre farm near Osakaloosa, Iowa, a few miles south of [Des Moines], was having trouble with prowlers breaking into an unoccupied house on his property.
>
> "He rigged a 20 gauge shotgun in a bedroom of the house to fire when the door was opened. The gun was set so it would strike an intruder in the legs. Mr. Briney originally had aimed it higher, but Mrs. Briney talked him into lowering it.
>
> "The night of July 16, 1967, Marvin Katko, now 30, of Eddyville, Iowa, broke into the house and was wounded in the legs by the gun. He said he was in search of old bottles.
>
> "Even though Mr. Katko was fined $50 on charges of larceny in the nighttime, he sued the Brineys for damages. Subsequently, he was awarded $30,000 by an all-woman district-court jury.
>
> "The Brineys were shocked. So were some of their friends and neighbors, who contend the jury took money from an honest man and gave it to a thief.
>
> "The Brineys' story is gaining wide attention because it raises questions about how far a person can go to protect his property and about *whether human life is more important than property*. [Our italics.]"

The Briney story illustrates another criterion of humanistic reporting. A traditional version of the story would rely heavily on quotes from lawyers and jurists. Our view is that more reporters should be encouraged to place greater dependence on their own skills as observers. A corollary is that they might consult a greater number of sources, but quote fewer of them.

Sue Hutchison raises the question of the sense of involvement a reporter should feel in a story. Because of her two years as an environmental reporter, Sue has developed a substantial background of knowledge. But she believes, and we agree, that the humanistic reporter must have some sense of identification with the people who are affected by [environmental or other] decisions.

"Involvement in the story is dangerous if it is too deep or too frequent," Sue points out, "but every once in a while a reporter ought to really feel his story."

In talking about humanistic writing, Times reporter Alf Collins stressed the importance of providing the reader with a sense of the continuity of events. He called it a sense of "process."

We adopted as an ingredient in the humanistic story Alf's view that the reader should be told what led up to an event, what the likely result might be, and most important, at what point the process stands.

To relieve his own frustration as well as that of the reader, the humanistic reporter will develop a "what-it-all-means-to-the-reader approach to the writing of news."

We also concluded that humanistic stories are neither feature stories nor human interest stories. The feature story focuses upon the unusual event. Humanistic stories are more qualitative, personalized versions of the same event.

The human interest story focuses upon the person, but it points out his uniqueness. It tells how he is different—older, more heroic, or kookier than you or I. Or it may stress commonness—the inevitable beauty contest, the annual daffodil festival, or a cat and a dog up the same tree—the usual, unusual things. The humanistic story expresses special—not unique—qualities of individuals in the news that have special meaning to special kinds of readers.

Bill Asbury provided an example of this in some of the practice writing that was done during the project. It was an account of a man who lost job and family because of his addiction to pinball machines. Asbury was able to see the special meaning to other human beings of this personal weakness.

"He was sick about his failure and ashamed of his weakness, but he could not control it," said Asbury. "Few people skid as far as this man has gone, but everyone who has fallen off a diet or gone back to cigarettes will have some understanding of his problem."

Many thoughtful reporters and editors are deeply concerned about the need for more personal writing. One editor told us:

"Our problem is that we are not being read. I don't know why. Are we dull? I think that's a part of it. We're not writing about what people really are interested in."

Faculty members discussed the humanistic approach to reporting and writing with editors and reporters in a number of seminars. The more we talked, the better each began to understand the other.

Editors from the Times included managing editor Henry MacLeod, assistant managing editor James King, project coordinator Lawrence Anderson, city editor Mel Sayre, and assistant managing editor Lane Smith. The Post-Intelligencer editorial staff included managing editor Louis Guzzo, as-

sistant managing editor Jack Doughty, editor of the editorial page Charles Dunsire, and city editor Dick Lyall.

Faculty members worked directly with newsmen, serving each paper as a "humanist in residence." In addition to Ames, they were Professors Lawrence Schneider, communications; Victor Steinbrueck, architecture and urban planning; and Ernest A. T. Barth, sociology.

Ames also was active as a contributor of articles and head of a student team that worked with the Times. A cluster of articles written by Ames and by the students occupied a full page in the Times. A story on the busing of school children —written from the point of view of the children—evoked widespread comment. The story touched a chord of isolation felt by youngsters that went beyond the question of race.

The undergraduates had spent the previous quarter in a special class taught by Professor Edelstein. They adopted the humanistic approach quickly, but they had to engage in a good deal of practice writing. Several wrote stories that were accepted for publication by state dailies. In evaluating their experience, some called it the most stimulating of their undergraduate program. It gave them a fresh concept of news and a new dimension to their role as reporters.

A student story described the reactions of a family—his family—as they faced the sudden and serious illness of one of their members. It began:

> "He is sixty-five years old. He awakes at ten minutes to three on the September morning. He cannot breathe. With difficulty he sits up in bed, and the weight on his chest eases somewhat.
>
> "He has had a two-year history of high blood pressure that has responded poorly to the prescriptions given him. Before that he had suffered nothing worse than a serious head cold, but now a sense of panic and helplessness grips him."

The program was broadened during the winter to include John de Yonge, education reporter for the Post-Intelligencer, and Alice Kling, a freelance writer. Additional newsmen will join the group during the spring.

As a result of the work done thus far, we are engaged in a labor of love, the assembling of a book of essays on humanistic writing for newspapers. The collection will include critical essays written by the participants, each illustrated by examples from newspapers.

DeYonge has written an essay tracing the development of humanistic thought from the Renaissance, when intellectual leaders first advanced the notion of man-as-the-measure of things. The humanistic tradition focuses on man, and men, as its primary concern.

Miss Kling is doing an essay on the battle in Seattle over the preservation of the farmer's market and the waterfront ecology. The area includes some of Seattle's most memorable architecture and evidence of Seattle's history as a lumber and shipping center.

Newsmen who are joining the project in the Spring will add historical and contemporary perspectives to the collection of essays.

Newsmen have looked through daily newspapers searching for stories that reflect the humanistic criteria that have been developed. As expected, the best examples are found in the best newspapers. And these tend to be the larger papers. But participants are convinced that if sufficient attention is paid to the concept of humanistic reporting, any newspaper can achieve the same results.

There is no format for the humanistic story, but some principles can be summarized:

Reporters can avoid institutionalizing the story; they can personalize it; they can think in terms of the impact of an event upon *individuals;* they can become more sensitive and participant observers; they should "feel" a story occasionally; they should become less dependent upon single news sources and jawbone treatment of events; they can inform the reader at what point the event stands as part of a process; they can avoid the unique and the common and search for the relevant.

In this concept of reporting and writing, the reporter takes on a larger role. He becomes a link between people and between people and their institutions. In short, he becomes more of a humanist.

Journalism Credibility in the Complex 70's

By John H. Colburn

When Spiro Agnew takes off against the news media he isn't doing anything that politicians haven't done since our founding days. What should concern us, though, is the favorable response he gets from a substantial segment of the public. This public disenchantment with various aspects of press coverage could jeopardize our freedom to preserve one of the great legacies of responsible journalism—the pursuit of truth.

Therefore, it is encouraging that the Blue Pencil Club of Ohio and such others as SDX, ASNE, APME and the broadcasters are concerned about our public rating on believability or credibility. This age of Aquarius also is the era of the pseudo or staged event, of complex problems, violent revolt against authority and a moral revolution. There are plenty of frustrations for everyone and the press is a convenient scapegoat and a target for attack from all points of the political compass. We mirror the troubled times and television takes the sight and sound of them into the living room in living color. The impression it leaves slops over on the print medium.

A Louis Harris survey for Time magazine last year, an APME survey, a Gallup poll and a recent sampling by CBS graphically illustrate the credibility problem. Harris found that two out of three persons in his sample felt television was more fair than newspapers, but by a ratio of three to one they believed the TV camera could lie. The APME survey ranked the major causes of public distrust as (1) inaccuracies in elementary facts; (2) evidence of editorial prejudice by placement of stories or size of headlines; and (3) half-told or misleading stories due to inadequate research and background. Dr. Gallup reported that only 37 per cent of the American public believes that newspapers "deal fairly with all sides." The CBS random telephone poll showed a majority favor restrictions on press criticism of government and other limitations on the freedom of the press.

The APME check of the public and editors disclosed that what really bugs the public most is a belief that the press overly emphasizes sensational news of violence and gives too little attention to serious news of community-wide interest. Seventy-five percent of the public respondents felt that way, but only nine percent of the editors agreed—a wide disagreement that goes far beyond the so-called generation gap. By a wide margin, too, the public felt we're too defensive about criticism. They've struck a raw nerve that we can't ignore. We have no difficulty dishing out criticism but our audience questions whether we can take it.

People are frightened, angry—even a little despondent—about the disorder in our society; also about the bankruptcy in values or ideals they once esteemed. But I'm sick about all this talk of a sick society. People are confused and who wouldn't be confused by the avalanche of change that has engulfed us in the past 25 years. Our leadership may be weak, even ambivalent in setting objectives, but a sick society? No! Their confusion, though, brought the press directly into the crossfire of suspicion and distrust generated by critics whose views are accepted—even applauded—by people who do not understand the implications of their acceptance.

I don't think that people want us to gloss over unfavorable news when it is significant news. What they seem to be saying in the APME survey is that we're doing some sloppy reporting and presenting a lopsided picture of the news,

especially at the local level. For instance, we do a superb job of explaining the ramifications of man's exploration of the moon or the dramatic rescue of astronauts from near-disaster. Yet, how many of us explain adequately—and dramatically—why local and state taxes are spiralling at a time when there are appalling weaknesses in our school systems, in the maintenance of our streets, in the handling of racial problems, and in the growth of crime and the use of drugs?

Today, much of the public regards the press as negative or abrasive, or both. They don't like the importance we attach to the Black Panthers, the Chicago Seven or people like Jerry Ruben or Rap Brown, because those people haven't directly affected most families—yet. Those events and personalities are viewed by many people as ugly, overplayed incidents. The press cannot ignore such characters, but what we must do is report in better perspective their relationship to our curent social revolution. This will require fundamental new modes of reporting, analysis and writing.

Otherwise, we will become more vulnerable to proposals for restrictive legislation. The public attitudes of confusion and discontent, spawning for years, have inspired all sorts of proposals for legislative or regulatory action. They include demands by outside groups to the "right of access"; application of the broadcast medium's "Fairness Doctrine" to newspapers; Congressional proposals to give a federal bureau power to screen broadcasts, state proposals to investigate the press, and one, in Idaho, to require that editorials be signed. None of the proposals has been successful, but we haven't heard the last of such efforts.

Dr. Walter Menninger, as a member of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, wants to license reporters—a la Lawyers, Doctors and Teachers—and he says this would professionalize them and weed out the inept. Parenthetically, I would note that inept doctors, lawyers and teachers have not been weeded out by licensing. What prompted this famed psychiatrist to help reform journalism was his belief that publicity given violent actions of dissident groups led to more violence. The National Commission, itself, came up with a task force recommendation for a Media Study Center. It would consist of a governing board, advisory board and a research board, all members of which would be named by the President.

Such proposals for government control—and that would be the eventual result—came at a time when the government, using its subpoena power, launched a fishing expedition to try to uncover the confidential sources of newsmen. Attorney General Mitchell backed off of the pressure move, which brought into Congress bills to permit newsmen, with certain exceptions, to refuse to divulge confidential information. Support for such legislation has come from the Dean-elect of the Yale Law School, Abraham Goldstein, who says a more sensitive law covering confidential communication is long overdue. Only 17 states now have such laws.

Proposals to license, and our problem of protecting confidential sources, are occupational hazards. But they now have a certain acceptance among the people because of journalism's credibility gap. Our reputation as the protector of the peoples' freedom and the guardian of the underdog has become tarnished. To many of the young generation, we're the pet of the top dog—the establishment. These are the people who talk about "right of access," an idea introduced two years ago by Jerome Barron, associate professor at the George Washington Law School. He contends the First Amendment guarantees the people access to newspaper space, and he says that "if the right of access is not constitutionally prescribed, it would be well within the powers reserved to the states by the Tenth Amendment."

The "right of access" proposal would not only affect the news columns, but one Federal court has held—in the case of a student newspaper—that advertisers have a "right of access." Another Federal court in Chicago held just the opposite. Undoubtedly, the issue eventually will reach the United States Supreme Court. If a "right of access" test is successful, we will be faced with the government and judiciary helping us determine what is to be printed as well as what is broadcast.

We in the print medium cannot ignore press criticism because it is directed at some commentator or network. We must be concerned also with efforts to shackle broadcasts even though radio and television are regulated in ways incompatible with freedom of the press as applied to newspapers. Congress never intended that the Federal Communications Commission or any other agency have authority to censor broadcasts. On this point, the Supreme Court has said, "The Legislative history of the Communications Act, both prior to its first enactment in 1927, and subsequently, shows a deep hostility to censorship either by the Commission or by the licensee." But there are members of Congress and members of regulatory bodies who propose imposing restrictions on what is broadcast and what is printed—a clear violation of the First Amendment.

Under its regulatory power, the communications commission established the "fairness doctrine." In the Red Lion, Pennsylvania, radio case, Justice Byron White held last June that the commission had the authority to impose this rule. He made clear that his decision dealt only with broadcasters, not newspapers. However, a commission member, Kenneth A. Cox, proposed before the American Bar Association in Dallas that the rule be applied to newspapers and magazines. He said: "It seems to me that the publisher, even though he does not use the public spectrum, owes the same moral duty as the broadcaster to USE the medium to help fashion a better society."

And *USE* the media is what articulate, activist people in larger numbers are doing with increased frequency to try to influence society. They want part of the action, and are *demanding* that their image of the action be reported—not just the image as seen by professional newsmen.

What is causing all of this ferment? One keen observer of politics and our national scene, Theodore H. White, views mass education as the incubating force in tearing apart much of the fabric of our political and social structures. He feels that not at any time since the founding of our Republic has America questioned itself and its purpose as it is doing today. In another context, an eminent historian, Daniel Boorstin, sees the current "put down" of ourselves—or self-flagellation, as he calls it—as part of a natural cycle that could start a revival for setting new goals for society. America has been deluding itself, because of what Boorstin terms the public's extravagant expectations of what the world holds, and our power to shape the world. We have used, he said, our literacy, our technology and our progress to create a thicket of illusion which stands between us and the facts of life.

Some of the extravagant expectations that concern Boorstin have led the people to expect new heroes every season, a literary masterpiece every month, a dramatic spectacular every week, a rare sensation every night, compact cars which are spacious, luxurious cars which are economical . . . to eat and stay thin, to be constantly on the move and still ever more neighborly . . . everyone to feel free to disagree, yet everybody to be loyal . . . our national purpose to be clear and simple . . . something that gives direction to the lives of nearly two million people and, *yet,* can be bought at the corner drug store for a dollar.

Those expectations have created for many a form of self-hypnosis or self-deception. It may explain why people are cynical about truth in labeling, truth in lending, truth in advertising—and truth in news. Perhaps, in recent years, publishers and top editors have been so mesmerized by our new technology to remedy production deficiencies that they have failed to give sufficient attention to better ways to report, write and broadcast about a world that has changed vastly in a generation.

With the press being buffeted from all sides, one observer remarked that almost anybody in or out of government these days, no matter how weak his leadership, can create a temporary impression of being a veritable St. George by denouncing the press for crimes fancied or real.

When Spiro donned the mantle of St. George, he followed a path to control press utterances that Hamilton and Jefferson pioneered in their feud over the Alien and Sedition Laws, and there were many other prominent press critics before Spiro—the New Deal era criticism of Harold Ickes, and the "give them hell" hostility of Harry Truman. Remember, too, the loud reception given to Dwight Eisenhower's blast at the press at the 1964 GOP convention. John F. Kennedy banned one newspaper from the White House and LBJ had a "hot line" to broadcasters and editors when he didn't like the flow of the news.

In an administration that has had a mistrust of the press going back to 1960, the Vice President was doing only what comes naturally in politics when he uncorked his shank shot. Wayward may be Spiro's golf—you may recall that his sliced ball popped his partner in the head during the Bob Hope classic—but his political aim scored him a hole in one. Nevertheless, we can't write off his criticism as a mere political tactic. He has provided the needle needed to prick the press to intensify a self-appraisal it has been debating since 1947.

There can be no disputing the comment of the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence when it said: "Few American institutions are as free from responsible and systematic analysis as the American press. The press, which performs the role of reporter and critic for other institutions has been reluctant to undertake self-analysis." The self-analysis that now is underway is a vital debate—vital to our future. If we are to avoid a form of government control, we must better police our own house—crack down on and eliminate sloppy reporting and editing, explore new techniques for balanced and accurate reporting and take more interest in the primary source of our talent—the journalism schools. They now are at a crossroads in their handling of curriculum and professional instruction. They need our help.

At a time when people are reading more and more and understanding less and less, too many journalism graduates reveal crucial weaknesses in the exploding fields of sociological, economic and political problems. Too few have any real command of the humanities or basic sciences and too many editors are living in the stone age as far as applying the knowledge of behavioral sciences to their readership and their staff. Perhaps we have not demanded more or been more perceptive because too many editors and journalism educators still are afflicted with an overemphasis on crime and violence, as the APME survey showed.

Then there's the new generation of students. The more creative ones are activists. Some want to cover events on the basis of their intellectual commitments—not on traditional news value. Many regard traditional reporting as sterile, objectivity as obscene and, while they advocate telling it like it is, they really want to influence rather than inform. In our news rooms, we can expect more efforts by activists to try to influence policy—as the student staff attempted when it struck the Ohio State Lantern recently.

But the activists and the Vice President do have something in common. They are shaking us out of our lethargy about journalism traditions—making us re-examine what we must

do to make American journalism vibrant, exciting, stimulating—and believable. The activism can be good for us if we harness it in constructive ways. Young people are concerned with ethics and responsibility—some more *concerned* than many of their elders. We need committed, concerned newsmen to report fairly, honestly, accurately and in a balanced and positive way the complex subjects facing society. We must convert the activism into creative professional journalism to explore new ideas and to better understand and satisfy the far-ranging interests of a better educated public. We also must convince the activists that knowledge must have priority over free expression.

Many newspapers are doing a better job—reporting in depth, digging into subjects ranging from the pill to pot. But more must abandon obsolete coverage patterns, find new ways to be more interesting in their writing and the display of significant material. Our newspapers must provide impact to stimulate action that is planned, not crisis-oriented. We must convince people who leave problems to others that they're involved, too. Our computerized society has become too impersonal and the press is no exception. We must show that we really care about the people and their problems and that the "hot line" columns are merely a starter.

Space is tight, I know, but adding 16 more columns would only compound the problems of obsolete journalism. Better utilization of space is the answer. Take a hard look at the next half-column story you see in your newspaper. Couldn't the public interest have been satisfied with three or four inches, or a mention in the daily record? Then examine that dull story on the City Council meeting. A summary of most of the action taken could have been carried in agate type and the reporter would have had space to put the big issues into lively perspective. Take a look, too, at the play we give stories and the headlines we use. Often the headline is unintentionally misleading because of limited space. We need to junk our conceptions of headlines and of story display and redesign a package that will entice the subscriber to look forward to reading the newspaper every day. And the content must give him confidence in the product. We must do more to probe the questions that disturb our audience and more to research their interests. We can't be namby-pamby in our approach, nor can we print only good news. But we should ascertain how much the public interest is served in today's society with an unbalanced diet of crime and violence or dull statements that have no real significance.

Our better educated reader—or viewer—like the student groups is no longer satisfied with tired formulas. They are more perceptive about the way the press is being "used" in our handling of pseudo events—from the White House down to the local unit of the teachers' association. We are a news media for distribution of information, but our control of what goes through the information pipelines is being manipulated more and more by forces outside of *our control.* Some of this has come about by abdication of our responsibilities; some by *pressure* on the grounds that most information outlets are a monopoly operation; and much of the manipulation of information comes from government sources or groups propagandizing a private cause.

As James McCartney wrote in the winter issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, a "used" press is in many ways a passive and timid press whose staff members take the statements, explanations, rationalizations, handouts and background sessions, *passes* them along to the reader or viewer and then go home to the suburbs to watch Laugh-In. In Washington where McCartney works at the Knight Newspaper Bureau, Franklin D. Roosevelt pioneered the staged event thirty-five years ago. Today, McCartney and others say that *IF* the media are to avoid being used, they must recognize that those who would use them, in or out of the government, have developed as an art the staged or pseudo-event by which a statesman, a militant, or a salesman for a cause may present his case. Our problem for the complex 70's and a revolutionary society is to learn how to give hundreds of these pseudo-events a perspective that bears a direct relationship to their importance. We are not serving the public interest if we publish or broadcast only the views of pleaders of causes or the dramatized happenings staged by promoters who should be contributing their talents to the destitute field of the theater rather than trying to mould public opinion.

Maligned as it is, the press still is a vital moulder of public opinion—if the cause strikes the public's fancy. Take Vietnam, would Lyndon Johnson really have stepped out of the Presidency in 1968 if he had not escalated the war in 1965 and the press had not reported the consequences? Where, but in the press, would you have gotten a real picture of our involvement in Vietnam or the frailties of the F-111? Not from the White House or the optimistic statements of Robert McNamara when he was Defense Secretary. Nor would we have been told about Cambodia or Laos if the press had not been aggressive.

When the press is aggressive, accurate and reliable it is superb. When it is timid, passive, giving a lopsided view of occurrences, serving as a vehicle for special causes or when it advocates simple solutions for insoluble problems it is in deep trouble.

Personally, I think we can and will profit from the criticism and the extensive self-appraisal currently underway in journalism. Ethics or grievance committees and press councils have been proposed. Are we willing to recognize our sins and correct them? Should we appraise ourselves or share the soul-searching problems with others who may be less biased in their orientation? Since 1947, when the Commission on Freedom of the Press, headed by Dr. Robert

Hutchins, took a look at such questions, the press has faced this problem: unless we can provide a professional self-discipline of our means of communication, we will invite government control, which inevitably will be too restrictive. In today's confused atmosphere, such a move might well be endorsed by a majority of the people without their being aware that their freedom was being chipped away. You need to look only at Cuba, Russia, Red China, Czechoslovakia—even South Vietnam—as to what happens when licensing is required and where freedom of expression is suppressed. To supporters of press liberty, this comment of deTocqueville nearly 200 years ago is still pertinent:

"In order to enjoy the inestimable benefits that liberty of the press insures, it is necessary to submit to the inevitable evils it creates."

Now, supposedly, we are more sophisticated, more professional and we should have a better reading as to the evils created by a free press. We also must keep in mind that one man's evil is another's virtue, but that the most precious asset of a newspaper is its believability. We must have the confidence of the people—we must convince them by our performance of our news and editorial integrity.

Whether we have a media center, licensing, a press council or government control, the press will survive and prosper. But any type of control, legislative, or regulatory, will dilute information or result in its manipulation and thus deprive the people of news that is basic to maintenance of a free society. Pernicious forces are at work to undermine authority on every level, public, private and parental, that is essential to a free society. They are at work sowing seeds of distrust, especially among the 50,000,000 people in the 18 to 34 age group.

In summary, we have a problem of accountability to the people and a problem of making our newspapers believable. Our citizens today spend more adult hours trying to digest mass communications than in any other activity except employment or sleep. We must be more responsive to criticism and we must convince both the silent majority and the rabble minority that a free, responsible press is their protector . . . their advocate in the maintenance of liberty. And, to convince them we must fulfill their expectation—one that is not at all extravagant—that the press is responsible, reliable, accurate . . . and believable.

The prognosis is easy. The cure is difficult. From obsolete journalism practices have emerged a din of voices, more confusing than truthful or informative. Such old habits are hard to break and the urgency of the deadline is just one curse that must be banished. But I'm optimistic enough to predict that from our self-appraisal and from the self-flagellation that may be a bit too excessive on occasion, the American press will accept its public responsibility and convince the people that government control is unnecessary and unwise. Our young, activist journalists will carry on the pursuit of truth and "tell it like it is" within the framework of the canons of ethical journalism—and, as Walt Seifert says, instead of licensing journalists we may want to certify their professional competence through a periodic accrediting program. Such a renewal and enforcement of our ethical and professional standards will enable the press to superbly cope with its challenges and responsibilities and to achieve a performance that will refurbish its image and enhance its historic role as a pillar of our free society.

From the pre-revolutionary days of Peter Zenger, the American press has been under continuous challenge. Because it has been bold and aggressive, it has faced and fought off controls such as the Alien and Sedition Acts. Now, we cannot afford to become timid, smug or complacent. Today, as never before, we have unexcelled technological capacity to serve the public. By using this technology and better professional talent to report aggressively and to channel believable information to the people, we not only can win their confidence, but their respect, and faithfully serve as their guardian of that cherished hallmark of freedom—the First Amendment.

Mr. Colburn, editor and publisher of the Wichita Eagle & Beacon, delivered the above address at the annual meeting of the Blue Pencil Club of Ohio.

Halt Word Pollution!

By Robert H. Estabrook

Mr. Estabrook is United Nations and Canada Correspondent for The Washington Post. He is a founder and former president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

The study of Latin lamentably has gone out of fashion, like the electric automobile and the Stanley Steamer. It is a great pity. Just as a revival of the conveyances so prematurely abandoned might be useful today in reducing the air pollution spewed from millions of internal combustion engines, so a revival of Latin might be useful in combating a particularly insidious form of verbal pollution spreading forth from speakers' rostrums and over the air waves.

These poignant thoughts are occasioned by the increasing practice among persons in high places of referring to newspapers, magazines, television and radio as "the media." Often, no doubt, this is a device intended in the friendliest and folksiest spirit to demonstrate that the speaker was once one of the boys himself. Unhappily, the frequent inability to decide whether "media" is singular or plural conveys the impression that the user doesn't know whether he is coming or going. If I hear the phrase "the media is" just one more time, I fear I shall be tempted to do something desperate like shooting my typewriter.

Lest you think I exaggerate, let me say that I have heard it with my own ears from Herb Klein, President Nixon's director of communications, so I know it is the currently approved linguistic line. I have read with my own eyes a similar reference in an address by Norm Isaacs, the immediate past president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. And though I am reluctant to hang yet another one on Vice President Agnew, if I am not mistaken he also has mixed his "medium" and "media."

Now, I don't suggest that a mere high school course or two in Latin is a sure cure for all verbal pollution. Personally I owe what little I know of English grammar to my own rather agonized pursuit of Latin; and I have found it immensely helpful with word derivations as well as with the study of modern Romance languages. It is a valuable guide, too often overlooked, the correct sequence of tenses "If I go, I shall" or "I may"; "if I had gone, I should have" or "I might have"; "if I should go, I would," etc). For that matter, it also is always good for a display of instant erudition.

But only a purist would contend that a course in Caesar or Cicero is as gripping in terms of contemporary student interest as, say, an exposure to the Thoughts of Chairman Mao or to Applied Political Anarchy. Besides, even a broad acquaintance with Latin origins doesn't guarantee proper pronunciation (i.e., there is always someone who insists on referring to the "newkewlar" non-proliferation treaty).

Yet even if it is a forlorn hope to repopularize the study of Latin (if, indeed, it ever was popular), certainly we ought to insist on a few derivative benefits in the study of English. It isn't really necessary to know that "media" is a neuter noun of the second declension to know that it is the plural of "medium." While we are at it, we may also want to try to instill the realization that "data" is the plural of "datum." (It probably is too much to hope that anyone except editorial writers will keep abreast of the permutations of "alumnus," "alumna," "alumni," and "alumnae").

Who knows, if we were to succeed with this exercise, we might even get across the recognition that there are a few other etymological criteria and that Greek also contributed to the development of English. "Kudos" and "hubris," for example, are not plural forms as commonly supposed; whereas "criteria" is the plural of "criterion." Perhaps, in view of his ethnic background, we could even get a little help from Vice President Agnew. That would indeed be a singular phenomenon!

Rebecca F. Gross Retires

(Continued from page 2)

gal do it a second time. He hired her as a new reporter for The Express.

When Mr. O'Reilly bought the Kinsloe interests in The Express in 1931, he became publisher. His reporter bought stock in the company, and began her distinguished career as editor and officer in The Lock Haven Express Printing Co.

All newspapers, small or large, bear the same responsibility for bringing complete, factual, dynamic news coverage to their readers, Miss Gross believes. She has followed this philosophy through 45 years of journalism, through the ups and downs of the Depression, floods, war years, economic boom and growth, and the personal tragedies that confront all of us.

"There was something about a newspaper office, the noise, the looks, the smell—I don't know what—" that had always attracted her; and still does.

She has worked hard at her trade. On page 24 an amusing sidelight she wrote several years ago gives a personal glimpse of what it has been like to sit at Miss Gross's desk in the editorial office of The Express.

A neighboring newspaper, The Grit, used an excellent descriptive headline some years ago, in a story about Miss Gross, then president of the Associated Press of Pennsylvania, the first woman to hold that position.

It said, "State and community benefiting from the talents of Rebecca Gross." More and more as the years have advanced, the broader community has been enjoying the leadership Miss Gross is able to direct toward any project she undertakes.

Look back and forth over the years to some of these positions of leadership, and one gets an idea of her capabilities, her energy, her devotion to news, newspapers, welfare, the cultural concerns of the people among whom she has lived and with whom she has been a close personal friend all her life.

It was April 1937 when Becky Gross and a friend called together some Pennsylvania newspaperwomen in Philadelphia's Ben Franklin Hotel, to form a professional group.

Her editorials have been widely quoted. One of them, in the early World War II days, struck a responsive note in an Ohio paper which headed it "Rebecca says so." What she said was, "We do not think the war will be won by defense. We think the war must be won by offense, by attacks, by determination to beat the enemy, not merely to beat him off. We think 'defense' is out of date."

Much that she has accomplished in the community, for welfare, for Ross Library, where she is president of the board, in recreation, in her yeoman work as chairman of the Lock Haven State College board of trustees committee to seek a new president, is defined and delineated by that word "attack."

It has been with vim and determination that Miss Gross has moved to accomplish what needed to be done.

She once said, "I was shy as a girl. It has taken determination to make me go out and do."

During World War II she served on active duty in the Navy, as editor of "Firepower," a Naval Ordnance Bureau magazine. She left the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander, to study for a year, in 1947, at Harvard University, as one of the first two women chosen for the Nieman Fellowships for newspapermen.

In 1953, she was among a group who were the first Americans to visit Russia, a trip that marked a change in Soviet policy. As part of an editorial group, she has since visited Castro's Cuba.

Pennsylvania has honored her as a Distinguished Daughter. She was named to this group in 1964 when Governor William W. Scranton was in office.

Pennsylvania's Distinguished Daughters have the pleasure of once-a-year dining with the governor of the Commonwealth. The custom of naming Distinguished Daughters, "women of importance who could be helpful to their country," dates from 1949.

In May, 1968, Miss Gross received the Pennsylvania Press Distinguished Service Award, as one "whose journalistic career has been marked by many firsts."

She was recognized as having been president of the Pennsylvania Women's Press Association, the only woman ever to head the Pennsylvania Society of Newspaper Editors, and president of the Pennsylvania Associated Press Association in 1966. She was also, it was noted, active in the work of the AP Managing Editor groups at the national and state level.

Other organizations, including the American Association of University Women, and Delta Kappa Gamma, honorary teachers society, have recognized her with Woman of the Year awards, or membership honors. In addition, she has lectured at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, and at the Pennsylvania State University Journalism School.

Last year Miss Gross was the first editor to participate in an editor-in-residence program at Kansas State University. There she met and discussed phases of the newspaper business with students. She came home saying, "I've learned more than I taught them."

Governor David Lawrence appointed Miss Gross to the State Board of Public Assistance, and the appointment has been renewed under subsequent governors.

The by-line of Rebecca F. Gross, on Associated Press stories, and in national publications, recounting her experiences with an editorial group while visiting Russia appeared nation-wide in 1953.

When the headlines of an automobile accident, on New Year's Eve, 1953, in which the crusading editor lost both legs, flashed across the nation, expressions of shock, and hope for her recovery came from everywhere.

Her determination, in learning again to walk, and in returning to a full schedule of editorial work by August following the accident, made her a source of encouragement to handicapped people around the world.

This courage has inspired others through the years since then. Miss Rebecca F. Gross has attended to editorial, community, and state-wide interests, has journeyed abroad, and to professional meetings with the same indomitable will as before the accident.

Associates have known what it has taken, in courage and fortitude. The editor of The Express has taken the tensions and pressures of work on a newspaper desk in stride, making few concessions and asking absolutely no quarter.

She retires fit as a fiddle, and will be about her work as college trustee, library board president and in state advisory positions.

She has added a new job to all the others, by accepting an appointment on the executive committee of the advisory board of the State Department of Health, for comprehensive health planning.

"My Day" in the Life of a Working Editor

By Rebecca F. Gross

(Written in July, 1967)

There is no doubt in my mind about how I prefer to write editorials for The Express.

They should be timely, informed, concise, clear, witty in spots, expressed in terse but graceful prose, and buttressed by irrefutable facts to justify their courageous conclusions.

To prepare these essays in the conscientious molding of public opinion, I would like to start my day in a well-stocked library, where, in an hour or two of leisurely research, I should establish the historical background, check the contemporary views, pro and con, verify every aspect of the problem under discussion, and dig up a few fitting literary allusions to strengthen the impact of my words.

Then, I should like an hour or so to write a rough draft, polish it with tender, loving care, and have it ready for the composing room by a late lunch time. During lunch, which would take about two hours, I would meet some one from state university, or invite an erudite citizen of the community to spend the period of physical refreshment in intellectual conversation, looking to the editorial demands of the future.

In the afternoon, I should drop in on other estimable members of the community, from union stewards to bank presidents, to maintain my contacts with life at every level and learn what the readers want to know. I'd go back to the office to read the proof of tomorrow's editorials, before calling it a day.

I'd go home mulling over several matters for later discussion, to make sure that, in the course of a week, the editorial column would contain scholarly but hard-hitting, rational but passionate comments on all local, state, national and philosophical concerns of current interest. There would be two or three short but brilliant essays daily, interspersed with occasions when one lengthy, but sparkling disquisition would deal with a major topic "in depth."

Now, let us see how well I measure up to this pattern, as of today.

On my desk when I arrive at the office is the day's crop of new picture mats, a column waiting for a head, and two newspapers to be checked. I throw out half the mats, write the head, dig out two stories that need updating and update them.

Then the phone rings—a strike at the clay plant. I knock that story out and tackle a new pile of mail, meanwhile dispatching a reporter to cover the Fourth of July at the hospital, and checking on three other news assignments.

In the midst of the mail, a messenger delivers the review of the opening performance of the new play at the summer

theatre, so I put a head on it, and shove it off my desk as the phone rings again.

The composing room reports that they can't find The Washington Merry Go Round. I dig it out of the copy file, check the head and send it on. Another phone call—angry lady reports her husband was fired by the XYZ Corp. three weeks ago, for coming late to work once too often, and she cannot get any money for her three children from the relief office, unless she throws the husband out—and what would I do about that?

When she gives me a chance to talk, I recommend that she sees her husband's union steward and the Child Welfare director at the Court House. She says she wants to write a letter to the Editor that would burn up the paper. I say OK, but sign your name and remember that we will extract the libel.

Another phone call—publisher wants to know the first name of the executive vice president of the Lock Haven Trust Co. It's Clayton, but people call him Buck.

Wire editor arrives for daily powwow on front page. We layout together.

Proof arrives of today's editorials. I mark three new corrections (two of them show up duly made, when the paper comes out).

Phone rings again; friend reports a stray cat captured in his back yard catching baby birds; we should put on an editorial campaign for an animal refuge where such feline criminals could be humanely confined. Write feature story about cat, subsequently restored to owner.

Wedding report arrives, addressed to me; reroute to Society desk. Bowling report arrives, addressed to me; reroute to Sports. Friend calls with personal about Fourth of July visitors, easier to write it myself than pass it on.

It's time for lunch—indeed, ten minutes after, and I have not had a second to mull over my editorial opinions.

After lunch, the local representative in the state legislature arrives to tell about his trip to the Nevada test center of the AEC, where he has been looking into the safety factors of a proposed underground explosion in our wide woods for the peaceful purpose of creating a deep hole for storage of natural gas. There is an editorial or two in this, so the talk must cover the background as well as the news.

Three phone calls interrupt the chat and a telegram arrives from Senator Joe Clark, announcing a $500,000 grant from HUD to build a housing project for the elderly in the town of Renovo—too late for today's deadlines. One of the phone calls is from the executive director of the Housing Authority; he's had a telegram too, and he wants to tell me what he has just finished telling the radio station.

The legislator leaves, depositing four pamphlets and ten pages of notes for me to read before tomorrow when he wants to pick them up.

I call the architect on the housing project to get some facts he has not yet given the radio station, and write that story.

Now I knock off an editorial, rejoicing that nobody was killed in our territory in the Fourth of July traffic, and another suggesting that the proposed state law increasing automobile registration fees should bear down more heavily on trucks and less on private drivers.

It is 4 p.m. when I start and 4:30 when I finish, just as the phone rings to say I'm late for my weekly hair appointment.

Nieman Notes

1950

Clark Mollenhoff, Chief of the Washington Bureau of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, is writing a column for the Register-Tribune Syndicate. It is called "Watch on Washington." Mr. Mollenhoff describes the purpose of his column as follows:

"It is my purpose to expose the major problems of government mismanagement and corruption in a manner that will help pinpoint responsibility and force correction. The emphasis will be on people in government and politics, and the backstage maneuvers and personalities that rarely get into print. . . .

"I took the job as 'presidential ombudsman' because of the belief that good government could be good politics in any administration. It was my responsibility as special counsel to the President to get the facts and analyze the problems for the President in a nonpartisan and nonideological manner.

"I expect to do for the readers the same thing I did for President Nixon and the thing I have been doing for the Des Moines Register over a period of the last 29 years.

"I would hope that my year of experience as what the President called 'the first presidential ombudsman' will be helpful in understanding the operations and intrigue of government at its highest level."

1952

John Harrison, Professor of Journalism at Pennsylvania State University, is spending the 1970 fall term doing research and writing a continuing criticism of the news organizations in the United States.

1954

Richard Dudman, Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was captured and then released by the Cambodians.

1960

Tom Dearmore has joined the Washington Evening Star as an editorial writer. For the past 23 years he has been Co-Editor of the Baxter Bulletin at Mountain Home, Arkansas.

1962

David Kraslow has been appointed chief of the Washington Bureau of the Los Angeles Times. He succeeded Robert Donovan, who has been named Associate Editor of the Times. Kraslow, who formerly worked with the Knight newspapers, joined the Los Angeles bureau as a general assignment reporter and became Washington News Editor in 1966.

John Hughes, Managing Editor of the Christian Science Monitor, has been appointed Editor to succeed DeWitt John. Hughes won the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of the Indonesian crisis during the toppling of Sukarno in 1966. John was named to the Monitor's Board of Directors.

1962 (con.)

Murray Seeger writes the following:

Fellow Nieman Alumni:

Many former Nieman Fellows have expressed interest in organizing a regular series of seminars to be held at Cambridge with members of the Harvard Faculty. These alumni, based in Washington and many other cities, feel they could benefit greatly from meeting with faculty members to discuss major issues and to hear current intellectual thinking. In this way, the alumni feel they could continue the valuable relationships developed with Harvard faculty members and freshen the knowledge gained during their academic years.

The first step is to determine the interest among Nieman Alumni for such a seminar program. If the interest is great, a formal approach will be made to the university to see if a program could be arranged in the near future.

We would be pleased to hear from any interested Niemans who want to support this project or who have ideas for improving it. Address your responses to:

Murray Seeger
Los Angeles Times Bureau
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

1963

William J. Eaton of the Washington Bureau of The Chicago Daily News is one of two authors of REUTHER, the biography of the late Walter P. Reuther of the United Auto Workers. The other author is Frank Cormier of the Associated Press in Washington. Prentice-Hall considered Labor Day the appropriate occasion to bring out the book. Mr. Eaton won a 1970 Pulitzer Prize for his investigation into the background of Judge Clement Haynsworth.

1964

Thomas B. Ross has been appointed chief of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Sun-Times. He succeeded Carleton V. Kent, who served the Sun-Times in Washington for many years. Mr. Kent will remain in the capitol and will continue to cover and report on national politics for his newspaper.

Dan Wakefield, whose first novel GOING ALL THE WAY has recently been published by Delacorte Press, spoke in September at the Annual Boston Globe Book Festival.

1965

Smith Hempstone, Chief Editorial Writer of The Washington Star, has been named Associate Editor. He succeeded John H. Cline who retired in 1969. Hempstone has been Chief Editorial Writer since his return to Washington after a tour of duty as The Star's European correspondent.

1967

Dana Bullen, who has been covering the U. S. Senate for the Washington Evening Star for the past two years, has received a Gavel Award from the American Bar Association. He was cited for an eleven-part series of articles reporting serious problems facing the trial courts in the nation's Capital and its suburbs.

1970

Robert C. Nelson, American News Editor of the Christian Science Monitor since 1965, has been appointed to the Monitor's London staff. His work will include coverage of major news and special projects in the British Isles and on the international scene. Mr. Nelson previously was the Chief of the Monitor's Midwest News Bureau in Chicago.

The Nieman Foundation
announces a change of address
to
48 Trowbridge Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Telephone: (617) 495-2237 or 2238