Nieman Reports

September 1972

The Big Myth — *by John Quinn*

". . . Are press concentration and monopoly threats to editorial independence? No, they are not . . ."

The Challenging Role of the Newsman — *by Roy Fisher*

"For it is the mass media, these that serve society across the board, that give a mob the capacity to become a society, and a society the capacity to be free . . ."

Staff Participation in the Newsroom — *by Paul Ringler*

"Involving everyone in the newsroom, or even a sizable number of newsroom people, in . . . decision-making processes doesn't seem practical to me . . ."

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXVI, No. 3 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | September 1972

—Tenney K. Lehman, Editor—

Published quarterly by the Society of Nieman Fellows from 48 Trowbridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138. Subscription $5 a year. Third class postage paid at Boston, Mass.

Unforgettable Ralph McGill

by William S. Howland

(Reprinted with permission from the August 1971 Reader's Digest. Copyright 1971 by The Reader's Digest Assn., Inc.)

At a time when often strident voices are being raised in the struggle for equal rights for the black man, it heartens me to realize that one of the earliest, most effective and eloquent friends of the Negro was a soft-voiced white Southern newspaperman, my friend Ralph McGill.

McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, spent much of his last 30 years crusading for equality for the Negro. This, he felt sure, would improve all of the South. His dogged but reasoned crusade earned him the enmity of the Ku Klux Klan, White Citizens Councils and other racists. He was threatened and vilified. His house was shot at, garbage was strewn on his lawn and he was the target of endless obscene phone calls. Constantly, he had to worry about the safety of his wife and son. Yet when he died, in 1969, the South had become a vastly changed and better place, and certainly a good part of the credit was his. As a colleague put it, "Mac had guts when it took guts to have guts."

A chunky, husky man with a shock of unruly dark hair, McGill hammered away in his daily column, in editorials and in speeches, debunking the South's traditional doctrine of "separate but equal" treatment of blacks and whites. He pointed out that while it certainly meant separate, it just as certainly did *not* mean equal. He labeled segregation for what is was: an evil offspring of slavery. The fact that a distinguished Southerner took this stand, when almost all

(Continued on page 26)

Staff Participation in the Newsroom

by Paul Ringler

Mr. Ringler recently retired as Associate Editor of The Milwaukee Journal. He is a vice president of the International Press Institute, and made these remarks at the annual IPI Assembly in Munich.

The newsroom revolution was a lively thing in the United States two years ago. Then it slowed down. The major reason for the slowdown was the economic recession, which meant fewer jobs in the newspaper business. A man worried about keeping his job, or finding another, is less likely to be a revolutionary. Now conditions are improving and the demands for "reporter power" and "democracy in the newsroom" are heard again.

Before I get into detail, let me view today's newspaper scene in the United States.

We have 1,749 daily papers. There has been no significant change in this number in recent years. The trend to chain ownership continues. Half of our daily papers and 63 per cent of daily circulation are now controlled by 157 groups. Nineteen of these, controlling 216 papers, are public—that is stock is available in some public market. This does not mean public control—actual control in all cases is closely maintained by management. The biggest chains are Gannett, with 51 papers; the Thomson interests with 32; Ridder with 16; and Knight and Dow-Jones with 11 each.

The year past was a reasonably good one, financially speaking, for most newspaper organizations and 1972 looks much better. 1970 was not a good year. As conditions improved generally in the autumn of 1971, circulation and advertising figures bettered. Inflation slowed and prices steadied under President Nixon's wage and price controls. Wage controls worked particularly well for ownership not saddled with the expensive union contract settlements of early 1971. It should be noted that some newspaper organizations showed good profits because of subsidiary operations.

There are black clouds, of course. William F. Kerby, president of Dow Jones & Co., said in a recent speech: "Never in the history of this country has the press been under such consistent and widespread attack from so many sources."

The credibility gap continues with the press, as it continues with government, politicians, courts, churches, education and any force considered a part of THE ESTABLISHMENT. Louis Harris, the poll taker, recently told the American Newspaper Publishers Association that public respect for the press had fallen 11 points since 1966. His figures showed that 18 percent of those polled had a great deal of respect for the press, 51 percent had some respect and 26 percent had hardly any respect.

Youth, environmentalists, minority groups and women's liberationists continue their attacks. So does the Nixon administration, led by the strident Mr. Agnew. More serious are efforts of administration agencies to keep information from the press and public and their legal efforts to muzzle newsmen, in one way or another.

Two years ago this summer, in the Columbia Journalism Review, Edwin Diamond wrote that a determined movement was underway to establish reporter power. His article was titled "The Coming Newsroom Revolution." It was

accompanied by an article authored by our panelist, Mr. Schwoebel. It was titled "The Miracle Le Monde Wrought."

The Diamond piece told of reporters sitting on a rotating basis with the editorial board of the Gannett papers in Rochester, N.Y. It told of a journalists' committee meeting with management of the Providence Journal and Bulletin to propose specific staffing and policy changes. It reported formation of the Association of Tribune Journalists in Minneapolis and of demands by reporters on the Denver Post.

Today the Association of Tribune Journalists is inactive. So is the Providence committee. On the Denver Post, a staff ethics committee has been inactive and a staff human rights committee had had a negligible influence. In Rochester, reporters still sit with the editorial board. However, this system has not been extended to any other Gannett paper.

In no instance in the last two years has there been a surrender of power by management.

I said earlier that a scarcity of newspaper jobs as a result of the national recession was the primary reason for the slowing of Mr. Diamond's revolution. There were other reasons. Youth and minority unrest, of which the newsroom turmoil was a part, quieted. The recession played its part here, as did Nixon administration policies in Vietnam. Also, these groups decided that angry demands, noisy confrontation and violence were not helping their causes.

Some of the irate journalists found other outlets. There are now a dozen journalism reviews—some good, some bad—in which the unhappy journalist can criticize his paper, his publisher and his editors. He can, libel laws permitting, have printed in these reviews the articles that his editor rejected. To my knowledge, no reporters writing in or working on journalism reviews have been discharged or punished by their newspapers.

Protesting staff people have worked to establish press councils. We now have a formal working council in the state of Minnesota, informal councils in several cities and others in the formation. A few newspapers have established ombudsmen of one kind or another. Press criticism groups are appearing in many universities, with cooperation from reporters on local papers.

And, of course, when you have challenge you have response, out of which so often comes compromise that both forces can live with.

Many closed doors in executive and editorial offices suddenly opened wide. Complaints and suggestions were solicited, not rejected. Company secrets were discussed openly in staff conferences. In fact, conference and consultation became the name of the game on many papers. The lowliest reporter suddenly found that he could voice his views to the managing editor, the editor—yes, and even the publisher.

Other ways were found to damp any fire—ways familiar to us all. Reassignment, promotions, salary raises, trips can help to abort, avert or encompass a newsroom situation. Let us keep things in perspective: publishers and editors have long had experience in dealing with newsroom unrest and with rebellious and unhappy reporters.

So while our so-called newsroom revolution may have been quiescent, its advocates have unquestionably gained some of their ends. But they have attained no real power.

Now activity is picking up on many fronts:

Seven black reporters have petitioned the Equal Employment Opportunities commission to take action against the Washington Post. They charge racial discrimination, claiming exclusion from important decision-making positions.

Fifty female editorial workers have filed a federal suit charging Newsweek magazine with sex discrimination. They charge that women get only menial jobs on Newsweek.

The Chicago Newspaper Guild has received permission from the National Guild to bargain with management of the Chicago Daily News and the Sun-Times for a veto over appointment of department heads, a voting voice in news policy conferences and space on the editorial page to voice disagreement with editorials.

The Wire Service Guild voted unanimously to bargain for the right to be represented on the Boards of Directors of the Associated Press and the United Press International and to have a voice in local hirings.

The American Newspaper Guild, in line with trade union tradition in the United States, has limited its concerns to wages and working conditions. Under pressure of the young malcontents, the Guild has lately been approving demands by local units to invade management policy areas.

Perhaps you read about the Counter Convention in New York recently. It was run in competition, the sponsors said, with the annual convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. It was a remarkable assembly of active newspapermen, former newspapermen, students, publicity seekers and the curious. Sponsored by the New York journalism review [MORE], it was disorganized and disorderly. But it should not be brushed aside as unimportant. It brought together between 1,500 and 2,000 people. There were two days of talk about newspaper problems. There was much nonsense, trivia and personal bitching. But there was some serious talk about the mass media being preoccupied with inconsequentials, with failing to confront Americans with basic problems and realities and with squandering of newsroom talent. And the point was repeatedly made that journalists, rather than publishers and editors, should control what they cover and how they present the news.

There were few suggestions as to how the journalists were going to win such power, how they could use it effectively if they got it, and what it would mean to journalism. In

typical American manner, a committee was appointed. It is to draft a Declaration of Independence. We must wait to see what that amounts to.

It would be reckless, in times when the winds of change can blow President Nixon first to Peking and then to Moscow and see him presenting a shiny new Cadillac to Comrade Brezhnev, to claim any assurance about future conditions in American newsrooms.

But I will be reckless and offer a few personal opinions.

The campaigns of the young, the blacks and the women against white, middle-class, middle-aged male editors and publishers will continue. There will be more journalism reviews, more ombudsmen, more press councils.

Management will continue to bend, to compromise, to seek ways to give journalists a greater sense of understanding and belonging, to reform old practices.

On some few papers, ways may be found to give limited voice in decision-making to staff people, in whole or in part.

On most newspapers, there will be no real surrender of power to determine employment policy, editorial policy, staff assignment or general public policy.

Involving everyone in the newsroom, or even a sizable number of newsroom people, in such decision-making processes doesn't seem practical to me. Furthermore, it would go against the grain of the whole American private enterprise system. It is impossible for me to see how, as presented by most of its advocates, it could help a newspaper survive and prosper.

Newspapers always excite curiosity. No one ever lays one down without a feeling of disappointment.
—Charles Lamb

Definition of News

by Lester Markel

Former Sunday Editor of The New York Times and former Associate Editor, Mr. Markel has had a distinguished newspaper career. The following chapter is an excerpt from his latest book, *What You Don't Know Can Hurt You.*

In less sophisticated days this was the classic definition: if a dog bites a man, it isn't news, but if a man bites a dog, it is. Wrong on two counts. If the bitten man happens to be Henry Kissinger or Richard Burton, or if the biting dog happens to be Lassie, this is decidedly news (of a kind). Moreover, the old formula will not do in these days of complex and global happenings.

"News" now means more than the factual coverage of spot events; it includes the broader trends, the recording and appraisal of the currents that run in the far-from-pacific ocean that is the world today. The factual reports that sufficed in the time of simple journalism are no longer adequate to provide understanding; interpretation—that is, *background:* survey of the past and analysis of the present; and *foreground:* illumination for the future—has become essential.

A setting down of facts without a statement of the meaning of these facts is almost useless for understanding. "Interpretation" is the key word. Without clues and background material the reader cannot be expected to arrive at reasoned conclusions about such subjects as Vietnam crises, nuclear testing, inflation or pollution.

There is a great to-do in journalistic circles about interpretation. Some see in it Great Peril, others Great Promise. The debate takes place in an atmosphere of confusion; there is no agreement on terms, little meeting of the minds and, most of all, there is failure to differentiate between interpretation and opinion.

I find no reason for these difficulties. Interpretation, in my view, is an objective (as objective as human judgment can be) judgment based on knowledge and appraisal of a situation—good information and sound analysis; it reveals the deeper sense of the news, providing setting, sequence, above all, significance. It is an indispensable ingredient in the reporting of national and international news—fields which are, in most newspapers and on most TV broadcasts, under-developed areas. Opinion, on the other hand, is a subjective judgment and should be confined to the editorial pages of newspapers and distinctly labelled on television and radio broadcasts. Recognition of the distinction between the two is of the utmost importance. To take a primitive example:

—To report that Spiro Agnew attacks the press is news;

—To explain why Spiro Agnew makes the attack is interpretation;

—To assert that Spiro Agnew is a "radic-unlib" is opinion (even though that opinion may be justified).

The opponents of interpretation insist that to ensure "objectivity" the reporter must "stick to the facts"; that if he departs from "facts" and attempts interpretation, he inevitably moves into the area of opinion. In response, I ask: "What facts?" and I say there is no such thing as a totally "objective" news story. Consider the most "objective" of reporters. He collects, say, fifty facts and out of these fifty selects twelve as the important ones, leaving out thirty-eight. First exercise of judgment. Then he decides which of the twelve facts shall constitute the lead of the story; this particular fact gets prime attention because many readers do not go beyond the first paragraph. Second exercise of judgment. Then the news editor decides whether the story is to go on page one or page twenty-nine; if it appears on page

one it has considerable impact; if it appears on page twenty-nine, it may go unread. Third exercise of judgment.

So I ask the critics of interpretation: Is this "objectivity"? Is this "factual" reporting? Is the kind of judgment required for interpretation any different from the kind of judgment involved in the selection of facts and display of the news?

Now I am not in any way denigrating the ideal of "objectivity." Despite the difficulty of attaining it, objectivity must remain one of journalism's chief endeavors; there must be unflagging effort to prevent editorial judgment from influencing news play and to keep opinion out of the news columns in the form of "news analysis," "special correspondence," "exclusive stories." But I insist that interpretation should and can be as objective as a wholly "factual" presentation. (If there is to be crusading—and at times there should be—let it be done by the Knights of the Editorial Round Table.)

There is a broader area which should have increasing attention and to which interpretation should be especially applied—the trend story. To make the news comprehensible, long-range developments as well as daily happenings should be reported. The record should be set down, but the various elements must be pulled together so that there will be both synthesis and analysis. This means that reporters shall be expert researchers and that the deadlines for trend stories shall be set, not for tomorrow or for the day after, but for a time when the pertinent facts have been collected and the total situation has become clear and in turn can be clarified for the reader.

This type of story is usually the work of a team of reporters and editors who may spend weeks digging into records, conducting interviews, visiting areas in which developments have taken place or will take place—in short, providing a view of the forest instead of requiring the reader to piece the picture together out of the individual trees. Such a story might be one tracing the course of school desegregation under the Nixon Administration or describing the interaction between United States troop withdrawal from Vietnam and "Vietnamization" of the war or measuring progress in international negotiations toward the limitation of arms.

An excellent example of how a trend story can illuminate a subject for the general public is an article in The Wall Street Journal of May, 1970, which dealt with the Soviet Union's increasing involvement in the Middle East. The piece traced the course of Russian aid to the United Arab Republic—the military technicians sent to train the Egyptian forces, the installation of SAM missile sites, and Russian piloting of Egyptian planes. (Both the SAM's and the Soviet pilots, it was pointed out, jeopardized Israel's air superiority over the Arabs and threatened to upset the balance of power in the Middle East.) The Russians, it was suggested, in order to solidify their position in the vital area, were exploiting the preoccupation of the United States with Vietnam, thereby presenting a tough choice for Washington: on the one hand, aloofness, which could lead to further Israeli losses and strong political repercussions at home; on the other hand, increased aid for Israel, which could lead to escalation of the conflict and possibly to a U.S.-Soviet confrontation.

Another excellent example of a "trend story" is one that appeared in The New York Times four months after Prince Sihanouk had been ousted in Cambodia, and three weeks after American troops had been pulled out of the country. Ralph Blumenthal spent a week examining conditions there. Then, in a 2,000-word piece, he described the situation and appraised the future under the government of Premier Lon Nol. He found that, despite continued Communist attacks and disintegration of the economy, the Lon Nol regime was showing signs of growing self-confidence, stability and statesmanship that seemed to belie predictions that it would collapse. Political, economic and military conditions were discussed in terms of the American intervention, Communist control of many of the main transportation routes, development of the Cambodian Army and the presence of South Vietnamese troops. Looking toward the future, Blumenthal's article noted that the Communists dominated more than half the land and that the prospect of an early negotiated settlement between the Lon Nol government and the North Vietnamese was not bright.

Raymond Anderson's article on the Arabs in The New York Times of July 28, 1970, is another example of an excellent job of perspective. It included a review of recent events, among them the defeat of the Palestinian rebels by King Hussein of Jordan; the sharp reaction of the leftist regimes in Iraq, Syria, Egypt and Libya, generally sympathetic to the Palestinians; the disclosure by President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt of a plot to overthrow his government; the foiling of a coup by Army officers by King Hassan of Morocco, creating hostility between Morocco and Libya, which had supported the rebels; and a few weeks later the Arab world was split again when leftist forces, supported by Iraq, overthrew the Sudanese government, Libya and Egypt intervened and restored the regime to power.

The Anderson piece provided a thorough analysis. It pointed out the new cracks which were emerging in the Arab world, not only the traditional ill will between the conservative and left-wing regimes, but new tensions in the left-wing camp. All this was undermining the Soviet role in the Mid-East and the Arab regimes were asserting their independence of Communist ideology. Even the common animosity toward Israel failed to bring a facade of unity to the Arabs.

The Wall Street Journal is to be commended for putting emphasis on the trend article. Other newspapers, notably The New York Times and The Washington Post, are now turning increasingly to this kind of coverage. This means that less attention will be paid to spot news, a good part of which is a statement of what is going to happen tomorrow and a good part more a restatement of what was printed yesterday. The newspaper of the future, I am convinced, will put heavy emphasis on the trend story.

There is another objective of good journalism that has not had sufficient attention in the mass media: unflagging effort, when conflicting statements are made, to discover and indicate what are the facts. In these days of propaganda and of pressures of all sorts on the press; of manipulation through the modern techniques of communication; of classification (concealment) and censorship, overt or covert, it is not enough to present the news plus the meaning of the news; it is also necessary to differentiate, wherever possible, between truth and fiction. Questions:

- What do the reporter and the editor do when a United States Senator (Joseph McCarthy) holds up a list which he says contains the names of fifty-three members of the State Department who are also members of the Communist Party?

- What do the reporter and the editor do if the President of the United States (Mr. Johnson) says things are going well in Vietnam when the editor has had reports from his correspondents at the front indicating almost conclusively that things are going badly, both at the front and in Saigon?

- What do the reporter and the editor do when a President (Mr. Nixon) states that we are only peripherally engaged in Laos when the paper's correspondents have reported that we are heavily engaged with "advisers" and B-52's.

- What does a financial reporter do if he is told by high government officials that the budget will show a considerable surplus when he knows that the budget is precariously close to the red?

My answer is that the reporter and the editor should provide both versions and attempt to indicate which is the true one. I concede that this procedure is not always possible because deadlines often prevent sufficient investigation. But the truth or the doubts should be published as soon as possible, before opinion becomes cemented by falsehood, by juggling of fact or by concealment.

The answers, then, to the questions set out above are these: the first sentence of the McCarthy story should have stated the Senator's accusation, the second that he offered no proof of the charge; the first paragraph of the Johnson story should have reported his optimism about Vietnam, the second paragraph should have summarized the contrary reports of the correspondents; the first paragraph of the Nixon story should have contained the President's denial of involvement in Laos, the second paragraph should have stated that the dispatches from the Southeast Asia front indicated that we were on the way to becoming heavily committed in Laos; the first paragraph of the budget story should have reported the official optimism, the second the unofficial doubts.

There are editors with whom I have raised this question of truth-seeking who say that this is an ancient problem, that it was resolved long ago and that whenever it is at all possible to do so, they indicate what the facts really are. I disagree. I contend that only lip service has been paid to the concept of truth-seeking and that this phase of journalistic responsibility deserves much fuller exploration and much more frequent practice.

By this time the reader may have concluded that arriving at a definition of news is no easy chore. It isn't. Furthermore, the definition is often imprecise and often unobjective. On television the task of selecting and presenting information is a delicate and unscientific business; what is news is often dependent on what the camera sees or is able to see. As for newspapers, the definition may vary from day to day and place to place. Laurence Stern of The Washington Post cites this example: when three doves in the Senate announced their support of the antiwar demonstrations, this was "news" in The Washington Post and The New York Times, played on the first page. On the following day when it was announced that 355 members of the House had endorsed the President's position on Vietnam, this was considered lesser "news" and relegated to an inside page.

How, then, to define news? Certainly the man-bites-dog formula won't do. Allowing for technical difficulties and human frailties, this might be at least the beginning of a definition: news is the report of a contemporary event or trend—a report that supplies background and explanation, that avoids partisanship and propaganda and that indicates, as far as possible, the truth.

The Big Myth

by John C. Quinn

Are press concentration and monopoly threats to editorial independence?

No, they are not. In Twentieth Century Newspaperdom, there is no greater myth than The Great Monopoly—Diversity Debate.

The issue of newspaper monopoly and concentration versus editorial independence and competition is a state of mind. Its impact rests, like beauty, with the beholder.

To the beholder outside the newspaper world, the monopoly-concentration psychosis has become many things, from the whipping boy for the frustrations of readers to a sanctimonious soapbox for the grandstanders whose words are more numerous than their deeds . . . and sometimes almost as empty.

To the beholder inside the newspaper world, the competition-diversity psychology has been used and misused as a plastic breastplate for the self-righteous, a false security for the self-conscious, a mantle of respectability for the irresponsible.

For the successful newspaper business executive and for the dedicated journalist, the monopoly-diversity syndrome is a phony issue. For them competence and integrity are the real benchmarks of a responsible and responsive newspaper. The attributes of a good newspaper, including its independence and its professionalism, cannot be measured just against its competition; nor do they go unaudited amidst monopoly.

These attributes must be measured by the dual principle of newspaper competence and journalistic integrity. A grand principle it is. Journalism professors dote upon it, editors gloat about it, publishers delight in giving speeches boasting about it. Even that does not mean it is not true. What must be true is whether these high-sounding words are matched by fact. Thus we have two questions: first, is the principle the practice?; second, is the practice of the principle affected by the circumstance of monopoly or diversity?

To the first question: is this principle the practice? Not always.

We know that. We know that many newspapers must work much harder to do a much better job before that eternal principle of competence and integrity becomes the universal fact. Too many newspapers in both monopoly and in competition just do not use all the independence they have and that is shameful. But it is indeed a fact far more often than it is just a theory and in far more significant ways than many students of the press realize and most critics of the press will admit.

To the second question: is the practice of the principle enhanced by diversity or threatened by monopoly? Certainly not always. Any good reporter can document examples pro and con . . . strong editorial independence flourishing in monopoly or floundering in competition . . . courageous editorial voices sharpened by competitive challenge or stilled by competitive crossfire . . . weak, timid news products sustained without competition or with it . . . many other examples proving whatever the beholder wishes.

Why? Because the monopoly-diversity ratio is the wrong scale of measurement for independence and excellence. It is not a quid pro quo situation today, if it ever was. There is plenty of good and, alas, enough not-so-good on both sides of the competition-concentration fence. Consider the experience of one of the most independent, most outspoken, most aggressive editors in northeastern United States. While his opinions flourished in independence, his newspaper's economics floundered, the victim of aggressive newspaper

competition. In this case competition threatened independence.

The newspaper went up for sale in search of the economic support to preserve its editorial independence. No takers. Finally, with anti-trust approval, it was sold to its competitor. That provided the economic strength for advertising and circulation gains. But what about the threat to editorial independence? The outspoken editor spoke out on this point recently to his colleagues: "I am just getting over the shock of discovering that I have, if anything, greater editorial freedom than I did before, when I was the co-proprietor of my own newspaper . . . I have no interference, no suggestions, direct or indirect . . . my staff and I are free to put out the scrappiest newspaper we can. . ."

This micro-study does not resolve the debate. Nor does any other individual case on either side of this issue. But it does focus on the real issue here.

The changing economics of newspaper publishing, the added dimensions of broadcast news, the expanding sources of information, the increasing education and awareness of a busy, demanding reader have combined to shift the balance of power.

No longer does the decision-making process of responsible journalism rest solely on the wisdom within the newspaper power structure, nor on whether that newspaper must find survival in competition or in monopoly.

No longer can the medium—if it is a local newspaper—decide what is the message and whether it should be hot or cold. No longer can publishers and editors cloak themselves in the security of a free press. They must, as our colleague, Barry Bingham, of the Louisville, Ky., newspapers has said, come down from Olympus and serve the reader.

No longer is the reader willing to be the silent victim of newspaper economics or politics or bad habits. No longer is the reader willing to be just the beneficiary of journalistic freedom and to accept as facts whatever the newspaper says are facts—or move to a competing newspaper if its version of the facts is more to his liking.

That reader recognizes that he has a proprietary interest in all news columns. He expects all news products to be responsible and responsive to his wants and his needs and he does not require the economics of newspaper competition to swing that ax for him. Thus, the element of monopoly and diversity is not the watchdog of independence nor the yardstick for excellence. The reader holds that franchise; he is smart enough, articulate enough and tough enough to exercise the franchise effectively in monopoly or otherwise.

Let us look at that reader. The most recent profile on the American newspaper reader came from pollster Lou Harris. He consolidated a variety of his survey findings on the reported disenchantment in the United States.

"Confidence in the leadership of American institutions has fallen off a barnyard wide over the past several years . . . but despite this fall, quite another phenomenon has occurred. The alternative to private sector leadership is no longer the route of the government take-over nor even a tightening of governmental controls, at least as far as dominant public opinion is concerned. . .

"It is fair to ask: what kind of solution does the American public envisage? The answer, for the moment, is that the people themselves do not have a program of their own, do not have anything resembling a doctrinaire nor consistent tack they are off on. Rather, the targets of their ire right here and now are the institutions which they feel have failed them. It is important to understand that they do not want to see many of the institutions abolished. To the contrary, due to the complexities of modern life, people would be deeply disturbed if any of the major institutions we surveyed were to perish or to disappear."

Harris noted that the people of the United States were far ahead of their government and the establishment in advocating changes in policies . . . on dealing with China . . . on cutting defense spending . . . on agreement with Russia . . . on the issues of busing and ecology and economy . . . and Harris found that a majority no longer view long hair, mod dress and rock music as prima facie evidence of decadence.

And then Harris concludes: "The answer to the disenchantment with the establishment, the press included, is that all people want is leadership which takes recognition of these changes and is willing to focus on the problems as they actually exist. People are not looking for panaceas. . . People still are seeking real answers to real problems.

"But they are more selective about what they will take credence in, more perceptive if you will about what the facts, events and reporting in their newspapers mean. They are more sophisticated and less prone to be talked down to. In short, the public really wants the chance to keep educating itself. But the reader needs the first-rate reporting and analysis that will give him the raw material with which to make his own judgments. The revolt against the establishment is basically rooted in the fact that the establishment has sold the people short—and that they won't take lying down."

Today's reader will not let himself be sold short by his newspaper, or by his newspapers, plural. He will not, as Lou Harris suggests, take lying down a newspaper product whose independence and excellence is determined by its ownership circumstance, whether it is a one-man monopoly, a concentrated group ownership or a toe-to-toe competitor.

Today's reader wants a newspaper that is responsive and responsible and the cumulative success or failure of a newspaper to meet this obligation will determine the degree of threat to its editorial independence and excellence.

Today's reader wants facts, all that he can get. He wants international facts, national facts and most of all, he wants local facts. He also wants sports facts, financial facts, family facts and even foolish facts. He wants facts which are significant and serious as well as facts which are humorous and human.

Today's reader is hungry for opinions on all sides of every issue, but opinions which are clearly labeled as opinions. These include the editor's opinions, frank and forceful opinions, as long as they stay where they belong—on the editorial page.

He wants the opinions of others—of the columnists, the thought leaders, the specialists. He wants to hear, too, the views of his neighbors and to share his own opinions in return. Hence, the explosion of letters to the editor on many newspapers in recent years. And today's reader wants a newspaper which can afford the talent, the technology and the space to bring these facts and these opinions to his doorstep everyday.

Many who are associated with newspaper groups believe that these reader demands still will be met and can be met better as a group. Newspaper consolidations may multiply anxiety over evil; they also increase the capacity for good. And a publisher's instinct for good over evil is not determined by the number of newspapers he owns.

A group can attract top talent so badly needed in our business from among the best young journalism school graduates as well as from a broad cross-section of experienced professional talent. A group can offer training under a variety of editors, advancement through a variety of opportunities, long-term careers on newspapers with a variety of size, geography, publishing cycle and readership needs. A group can invest in the research and development and nuts and bolts experience necessary to translate the theories of new technology into the practical production of better newspapers.

A group can muster news coverage and enterprise from the most able and diverse sources among outside services and its own talent within. A group can offer the expertise and the motivation which generates ideas, enthusiasm, confidence, prosperity and—to return to our premise—independence to serve the wants and needs of the reader.

But in no way should these group resources be implemented with concentration or group conformity. They must be available for the local editor and publisher to use when, as and if they see fit. They must decide with full local autonomy or independence just which, if any, might be used effectively to help them edit and publish a better newspaper. In reaching that decision, they use just one measure. Not what the competition is or does. Not what a monopoly might suggest. Not what is happening in other cities in the group.

The single measure is the local reader, the reader of that newspaper in that community and no other. And that is the same measure which must apply to any good newspaper, whatever the ownership circumstance.

No single concern of the publisher or of the editor is greater than their combined obligation to the community of readers.

Nor is any single concern of an advertiser or of a political viewpoint or of a pressure group greater than a local newspaper's responsibility to its total local readership.

Hence, concentrated ownership can provide great resources; only independent local judgment can use these resources to produce a responsible and responsive local newspaper. The exercise of these group resources and that local judgment measures editorial independence and excellence. That measure cannot be inflated by competition nor can it be diluted by monopoly.

Nor has competition or monopoly cornered the market on the ingredients of that measure—newspaper business competence, journalistic integrity, talent, Pulitzer Prizes and every other standard of excellence.

For the circumstance of diversity and competition or of concentration and monopoly is not the issue, not the deciding factor. It is a scapegoat, a paper tiger, a state of mind.

But it forgets the reader and for most of us, the reader will not take that lying down. His prime concern is not who owns the newspaper or under what circumstances. His concern is how well it does its job because he owns the rights and privileges of the free press. He places these rights and privileges in the custody of his newspaper and he expects them to be exercised with professional competence and integrity to fulfill the wants and needs of the total community of readers. A newspaper can fulfill this obligation only by fulfilling that dual principle for enduring excellence.

First, the newspaper competence to achieve a proper quantity of profit to pay the bills.

Second, the journalistic integrity to achieve a proper quality of product to serve the reader.

And to achieve these requires an editor-publisher team with guts and go in any circumstance. Then will a newspaper be sound. Then will its news columns be excellent. Then will its editorial voice be strong and independent. Then and only then will the reader be free from threats and that is what our work is all about.

Mr. Quinn, Vice President/News for the Gannett Company, Inc., delivered the above address at the Annual Assembly of the International Press Institute in Munich.

The Challenging Role of the Newsman

by Roy M. Fisher

Mr. Fisher, former editor of The Chicago Daily News and a Nieman Fellow in 1951, is Dean of the University of Missouri's School of Journalism. He made the following remarks to the Institute of Newspaper Controllers and Finance Officers.

I am asked to polish up my crystal ball and see into the future of our business. As a newspaper reporter, I always avoided predictions. It was enough, I always maintained, to be able to report accurately what happened yesterday. Let tomorrow fend for itself.

But it would be no great risk to predict that the role of the newsman in our society will be undergoing a period of intense challenge. I will talk about some of those challenges.

I begin with the premise that our industry—with all its defects and shortcomings—serves its society as well today as it ever has;

—that despite massive consolidations, it retains much of its traditional diversity;

—that despite an increasingly heavy hand of government, it is still essentially independent and private;

—and that despite a disturbing trend toward collectivism, the media at this stage in history is more strongly shaped and directed by the needs and interests of its readers and listeners than it is by the whims and personal objectives of its owners or regulators.

Our industry is moving into a hazardous period. On one hand it will be pulled irresistibly toward monoply and uniformity. On the other, it will be beset by technical and social forces that would shatter the mass media into so many pieces that the communications needs of our complex society could go underserved.

Let's look first at the forces toward collectivism. Dr. John Merrill, one of our professors at the University of Missouri School of Journalism, looks at some of these trends in his latest book, *Media, Messages and Men*. If present directions continue, he predicts that within 25 years most information disseminated by the mass media will be characteristically monolithic, controlled from a central source and designed to serve the interests of that source.

There have been, of course, strong economic forces pulling us in that direction. During my years as a Chicago newspaperman, I saw the number of independent publishing voices in this city dwindle from five to two. New York skidded from nine to three. I am sure that your own cities experienced a similar decline in the number of independent publishing voices.

Often overlooked, but also adding to the collectivisation of the American press, is the increasing tendency on the part of newspapers to let the wire services do their reporting for them. Less than a dozen American newspapers made any continuous effort of their own to cover the biggest story of the past decade—Vietnam. Of the four newspapers in Chicago, for example, mine (The Chicago Daily News) was the only one that bothered to maintain its own correspondents in Vietnam on a continuous basis.

Broadcasting, too, has been beset by the forces of collectivism. More and more, the national networks have become the prime movers of broadcast news. This concentration of control is not the result of any sinister plot. The networks have taken over the broadcast news business because they can do it better for less.

But regardless of how well they do the job, regardless of the many fine wire service reporters who covered Vietnam,

regardless of the conscientious effort monopoly newspapers make to present diverse points of view—regardless of all of those good intentions, there is something inherently dangerous about the control of the peoples' freedom to read and listen residing in the hands of so few individuals.

Through no one's desire has it happened that way. Not because Walter Scott at NBC wanted it that way, nor Punch Sulzberger at The New York Times. Not because Scotty Reston or even Walter Cronkite wanted it that way. But because society responds to its own forces, and these forces seem to be taking us further into the collective control of information—for these reasons, it is happening that way.

This is what Charles Reich is talking about in his *Greening of America* when he says that man no longer controls his own institutions, that his institutions now control him. Here is the root of so much of our youthful frustration, the seed of its protest.

For a brief moment, America's youth rose in an attempt to shake off the frustrations. They renounced conformity; they exalted diversity. And then—in just a few months—it was over—their purpose spent in a senseless violence. It was all over and we have left seemingly only the tamed and the weary. They have dropped out, many of them, no longer seeking the social reformation they talked and sang about so earnestly. Or they have resigned themselves to a more or less comfortable position within the status quo.

So Mr. Reich's greening America has turned brown again. And he didn't even give us a summer. Surviving all of the dissent of 1970 is the march toward conformity and collectivism—apparently only strengthened and polished by all of the abuse. The press becomes more monolithic and the broadcasters more apprehensive. Educators have receded quietly from the public scene, accepting their curtailed budget with scarcely a whimper. The minorities have gone back into silence. And the government moves in with a heavy hand to enforce standards of conformity the American people would never have tolerated before.

So much for collectivism, the first threat against American freedom. The youth were right in their effort to subvert it. But they failed because Charles Reich was, after all, correct. We do *not* any longer control our institutions. Our institutions control us. That is what makes it so interesting to see developing in the midst of the mass media a new force against collectivism, a new force that is giving birth to a new diversity—a diversity that will one day change the character of our media beyond our imagination.

While newspapers continue to consolidate, we find that for every established newspaper that disappears, two or three little papers pop up to take its place. Some of these are journalistic trollops, serving no useful purpose. But some have well-defined audiences and serve those audiences effectively. They add a new diversity to our media, and their mere existence provides a safeguard against an irresponsibility of collectivism.

Now this new diversity has no relationship to the campus protests, or the exhortations of the Weathermen. It is resulting from the evolution of printing techniques that bring the printing press into the reach of most everyone. So it seems that the technology that threatens to end individuality, bears within itself the seed of diversity as well.

Likewise, in broadcasting we are entering the age of diversity. Every meeting of broadcasters discusses the impact of the multiplying electronic channels upon existing broadcast media. The cassette, CATV, and God knows what other technological breakthroughs in the offing will sharply reverse the trend toward centralization of control. Our most serious problem may well be to maintain some semblance of a mass media amid all of the diversity that our future technology will make available to us.

It is possible that the mass media, which has been such a vital force in our development thus far, may someday be replaced by a host of special media, each serving its special audience and their special interests.

At our own University, we have in recent years seen a half dozen or so new publications make their appearance. One serves the non-conformist left, another the Republican right, another the Blacks, and another this group or that group, etc. And in the midst of all of these special interest newspapers, the official student newspaper sponsored by the Missouri Students Association as a means of serving the entire student body has run onto very bad times.

It is a case of the special-interest paper driving the mass-interest paper out of the market place. The editor's task of a special-interest newspaper is, after all, so much more simple. He doesn't have to worry about credibility; his audience already agrees with him before he begins to write. He doesn't have to worry about thoroughness, or completeness; his audience already has its mind made up anyway. He doesn't have to worry about balance, or fairness; his audience isn't interested in the other side.

In the midst of this new journalism, the traditional disciplines of objectivity get short shrift. Objectivity, after all, is no longer necessary, because the condition for which objective journalism was established is no longer relevant. You aren't trying to talk to society across the board; you're content with talking just to your own little portion of it.

As a matter of fact, the advocates of the special-interest media ridicule the very concept of journalistic objectivity. Everyone is biased in one way or another, they tell you, so let's just admit it and go about doing our own thing. They're right in a sense, I guess. If one is not interested in the maintenance of a truly mass media, it doesn't matter anyway.

Professor Merrill, to return to my colleague again, fears that the mass media could not be able to survive anyway in

the age when every interest group has its own medium. He fears that objective reporting is being eased out of the market place as too staid, dull, pallid, and non-committed for a generation raised in a climate of instant confrontation.

He suspects that *WHO* said something will someday carry more weight than *WHAT* he said; that few persons will much longer turn to the mass media for information—simply for entertainment and for those opinions that give them pleasure.

The credibility gap we hear about today, Merrill says, would then become a credibility vacuum, a fuzzy kind of opinion world of journalistic dialectic with no solid foundation of verifiable fact.

He asks rhetorically whether a fuller truth can then be expected to emerge from the cacophony of opinion—than has emerged from the clashing of many factual or objective stories in the past.

Of course, Merrill's excursion beyond the horizon of 1984 is a chilling experience that does not have to be—and must not be. Society needs its special-interest media, but its survival depends upon the maintenance of a responsible and independent mass media that can serve not just one interest group, but all society, across the board.

It needs a media that can be read and believed by the old as well as the young, the black as well as the white, the rich as well as the poor, the right as well as the left.

The existence of such a media in the United States provided this nation with much of its uniqueness. The ability to reach a mass audience cheaply became the basis for modern advertising, which in turn produced a merchandising economy and sustained America's and much of the world's industrial capacity.

But our society depends in even more important ways upon its mass media. Through such media, the diverse groups that made up our population were enabled to communicate effectively with one another: the Irish-Americans with the German-Americans; the Pole with the Swede; the laborer with the farmer; the Republican with the Democrat. The common media to which these various groups turned helped to forge one nation from the most diverse elements ever to live together under a democracy.

For it is the mass media, these that serve society across the board that give a mob the capacity to become a society, and a society the capacity to be free.

The discipline that permits such a media to talk credibly with conflicting ideas and convictions has come to be known in American journalism as objectivity. It involves certain attitudes, rules, and purposes that are measurable and can be taught—and can be learned.

These make up the disciplines of the newsman's profession. They include fairness and accuracy, but they go beyond both. They include attribution of fact and statement. They require an openness to viewpoints other than the writer's. And above all they require an awareness that the journalist's role in society, at its best state, is a reporter's role. That a good journalist may explain and interpret, but that he is first a reporter of facts—an extension of the reader's own reality.

It is—in this respect—a humble role, one that recognizes that the journalist is only the carrier of the message—not the message itself. He is neither judge nor preacher; he is the simple servant of the readers, or the listeners, or the viewers. I have known many arrogant people in our business, but I have never known an arrogant man who was a good reporter.

When the newsman steps beyond this limited role that I have defined, he undermines the validity of his function. And he hazards the survival of the mass media to which we all owe so much—and which in the coming era of diversity we will need so much more than ever before.

The Reporter and His Story: How Far Should He Go?

by Tom Wicker

The American press has been suffering hard times recently. First, there have been more attacks on First Amendment rights than we have been accustomed to. Notably, there was the government's attempt to prevent publication of the so-called Pentagon Papers; now the Caldwell case, in which the government seeks the right to subpoena reporter's notes, is before the Supreme Court; and we are all familiar with the critical remarks of Vice President Agnew and even President Nixon. It seems to me that all this adds up to a pattern of attempted inhibition of the press—not intimidation so much as inhibition.

Second, I haven't in my professional lifetime seen so much public antipathy toward the press as seems to exist nowadays. I think this is to some extent due to the administration's rhetoric and of course partially a result of the press's own weaknesses and failures. But it seems to me primarily a function of the fact that the press is usually the bearer of bad tidings which people don't want to hear. And there are a lot of such tidings today.

Then, there's the ascendancy of television and radio news, particularly television news. Every measurement shows that people now get the news first from television and radio. We see the trend given official status by the White House, where the President seems to be substituting television interviews, such as the one conducted by Dan Rather of CBS, for news conferences. On the recent trip to China, each network was allowed four reporters, to one each for the newspapers represented. As technology advances, a lot of reporters are asking themselves if the written word can survive television —if the newspaper, in fact, has a place in journalism's future.

Finally, and less obviously, I think many newspapers have lost confidence in themselves and their craft. Some question, as I've said, the technological future. Many wonder whether we can preserve the First Amendment rights that give our calling its basic value. More insidiously, many of us fear that daily newspapers are too Establishmentarian ever to penetrate to and publish the truth about our society. We see the rise of the underground press, the increasing number of one-man publications, local magazines and weeklies, and journalism reviews; and we contrast that with the deaths of so many New York metropolitan newspapers, of Look Magazine, and the difficulties the conventional news-magazines suddenly find themselves in; the result is a sharp loss of professional confidence.

What can be done about all this? Well, of course, we can stand up and fight for our First Amendment rights, as The New York Times and other newspapers did in the Pentagon Papers case. There's no substitute for that, but I think there's much more we can do. I think we can strengthen even our legal position and certainly increase our public support by becoming a more vital and necessary part of people's lives. I believe we can make people need us, even if they don't like us. Instead of succumbing to television, I think we can take advantage of its challenge. At the same time, we can more nearly fulfill our educational function, which we've often neglected or slighted, and we can do a better job at our primary function of guarding the public welfare. And of course if we can do all that, we won't have much trouble regaining our professional self-confidence and our pride in our work.

The first thing we have to do to gain all these great results is to overcome or at least reduce and balance our reliance on official sources of news, which I regard as the gravest professional and intellectual weakness of American journalism. That's because the tradition of objectivity, as it has developed in our press, tends to give greater weight to official

sources than to any others. A chairman of the Democratic National Committee, speaking about the Democratic party, will—as an example—be given greater credence than some obscure political scientist or small-town reporter who might be speaking on the same subject. A President is automatically presumed to know more about foreign relations than a senator or an academic. A school superintendent is regarded as a more authoritative source on education than a parent or a student or a dropout. Any reporter, practicing the tradition of objectivity, almost has to think that way, and so do his editors. But their assumptions are not necessarily warranted.

Let me cite a few recent examples of what the objectivity tradition can do. When President Nixon went on prime-time television a few weeks ago, he said he had offered the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong the fairest and most forthcoming and far-reaching peace proposal ever put forward by an American government. For the most part, and in the crucial first following days, the press accepted that proposal at the face value the President had given it. Only later, as some academics, editorialists and columnists began to analyze the speech more closely, was it widely written that Mr. Nixon's proposal actually would have required North Vietnam to give up everything it had gained in a quarter-century of political and military struggle; I'm not going into the rights and wrongs of that, I'm just saying that they were not likely to do it, and therefore Mr. Nixon's proposal wasn't quite as generous and hopeful as he had billed it. The same proposal would have had elections conducted under President Thieu's governing apparatus, which the North Vietnamese have consistently rejected, although it would have had Thieu himself resigning a month before the election. Moreover, on close examination, the whole proposal turned out to be not greatly different from that of President Johnson at Manila in 1966; yet, the press generally allowed Mr. Nixon's own estimate of its importance to go unchallenged, at least until he had had time to convince a good many of the American people that he really had done a great thing.

As another example, the press has tended to adopt unchanged and unchallenged the rhetoric of the President and other official sources—numerous governors and congressmen and the like—about "forced busing" and "busing for the sake of busing." That last one is from the President's recent statement, and the press just parroted it without question, although I don't know of any court that's ordered busing for the sake of busing—just to put kids in a bus and run them up and down the highways. And we have let any number of official sources get away with pledging "quality education" as a substitute for busing when no one really knows what "quality education" is, other than a slogan, when the best evidence we have shows that integration is a vital part of educational improvement in America and when we know that we can't really have integration in our major cities without some degree of busing.

On the day after the President made that statement, he got tremendous headlines and was on all the front pages; but the same day he made it, the superintendent of schools of Harrisburg, Pa., was telling the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity that busing in his school system had worked to improve education for all the students, black and white. But that was buried in every newspaper I saw, if it was printed at all.

The most glaring and disastrous example of what I'm talking about was in the origins of the war in Vietnam. We let the official sources tell us, and we didn't challenge it, that bombing the North could win the war in the South. Then we let the official sources tell us, and we didn't question it, that there was nothing else for them to do but to commit American ground troops to that war. We let them tell us they were just carrying out President Eisenhower's policy, when they sent a half-million men over there. And we let them tell us that they had to do all that because of the aggression of some monolithic force called Asian communism. Well, the greatest irony of Mr. Nixon's visit to China is that he went to Peking, which the official sources used to tell us was the capital of Asian communism. And if there's no Hitler there now, there wasn't any when the war began, and when it was escalated out of all proportion. But not many of us challenged any of that; I ought to know, because at that time I was chief of one of the largest and most important news bureaus in Washington.

So I think the first thing we have to do is to work toward development of an intellectual tradition to modify our tradition of objectivity—not to replace it, and certainly not to replace the principle of fairness to which we all subscribe, but rather to make that principle real rather than illusory.

For that reason, I assert that reporters—who are at the heart of our profession—have to become more than transmitters. I began writing my New York Times column in 1966; gradually, over the years since then, I've phased out of writing news; and I think I can say that the transformation from reporter to columnist has been largely one of learning to think for myself. My job is not any longer to write down what others—largely official sources—tell me they think, or did, or plan, or believe; my job now is to think for myself and to say what I think and believe about events and policies and men. And it was only when I was forced, in that way, to begin to think for myself, I'm ashamed to say, that I began to see the war in Vietnam for what it was, a misbegotten mess; and it was only then that I began to recognize the trap of objectivity into which the press had fallen.

That trap, which derives from the greater weight "ob-

jectivity" always gives to institutions and their official spokesmen, takes at least four forms. The first is that institutions are inevitably self-serving, and therefore seek to use the press for their own ends, good or bad. When Mr. Nixon was making all those television speeches a year or so ago about the necessity for his Vietnamization policy, he referred repeatedly to the bloodbath that would ensue if the Communists took over South Vietnam. Finally, in a sort of grand climax, he said flatly that "millions" would die, in that event. As far as I know, I'm the only one in the metropolitan press that took him on about that; because I looked into it and I found that there wasn't any real historical evidence to suggest a bloodbath much less that "millions" would die, which would be one of the most incredible purges in history. In fact, the President was just using an uncritical press to bolster his argument that we couldn't let the Communists take over South Vietnam.

A second trap is that institutions, particularly in the fast-changing modern era, are often out of touch with reality; with the best of will, they just don't know what they're talking about. A lot of reporters, well-trained and conscientious reporters, found that out during the worst period of campus upheavals; they'd get in touch with the college president, or the public relations office, or the chief of campus police, even the president of the S.D.S.—and, like as not, it would turn out that none of these official spokesmen knew anything useful about the situation.

Moreover, a lot of what's happening in the country today, a lot of what is most vital in people's lives, isn't institutionalized so there's no official spokesman for it. If you stick to covering the official sources, inevitably you miss a lot of important things that are going on elsewhere. So, for instance, the press largely missed one of the great migrations of human history, the migration of black people out of the South and into the cities, until Watts blew up in 1965. And until Ralph Nader made something sensational out of it, we missed the rise in consumer consciousness; now, ironically enough, we've made something of an official source out of Ralph Nader. It's the way we like to work.

A fourth trap of objectivity, in my judgment, is that it tends to be a copout. If you've covered all the official sources and printed what they had to say, you can say you've done your duty. If the police in Detroit or Newark say they were fired at by snipers, it's a lot easier just to accept that statement as fact—a lot easier, and it means you can continue to get along well with the police, which most editors like to do.

I suppose the worst example recently of the reporter as transmitter was our coverage of the deaths of the hostages in the Attica prison revolt. Some papers, including The Times, printed without attribution even to official sources, the "fact" that the hostages had had their throats cut by the prisoners; others printed that "fact" but attributed it to officials. I don't know any that questioned or tried independently to verify the "fact" until the medical examiner said flatly that it wasn't so.

In fact, prisons generally illustrate the trap of objectivity rather well. Prisons are classically closed societies, and even the warden often doesn't know—can't know—what's going on behind those walls. Yet, the warden or his assistant is an official spokesman and we tend to accept their testimony like any other official's. I got in a lot of trouble last year when I wrote a lot of people wouldn't believe the official story of how George Jackson died at San Quentin; but I knew that people who knew the most about prisons, like the families of prisoners, would know there was no real way to tell outside the walls what had happened inside them.

So when I speak of an intellectual tradition to modify our tradition of objectivity, I mean that we should begin to measure official sources against verifiable knowledge, not merely against other sources, or not at all. Moreover, we shouldn't give these people the initiative just because they're official. When Hubert Humphrey announced his candidacy for the Presidency this year, he tried to make people believe that in 1968 he'd called for a halt to the bombing of the North and the withdrawal of American troops. Why should we let him get away with that? Why should we even let him say that and then a few paragraphs further down or on an inside page point out gingerly that it wasn't exactly that way? The real lead on that story should have been something like, "Hubert Humphrey opened his 1972 campaign today by misrepresenting his 1968 campaign." Because that's a verifiable fact.

By an intellectual tradition, I mean we should question assumptions by means of a reporter's own experience, intellect and study. In that way, incidentally, we could begin to do what we rarely do now—use a reporter's full ability, work him at the top of his capacity, rather than requiring him to operate at some level far below that capacity. It's a sad fact that when I was bureau chief in Washington, I used to have to advise some of our best people that if they wanted to get their best work into print, they'd have to write it for the New Republic or Harper's or Atlantic. Because it just wasn't in the daily newspaper tradition, it was too far outside the form, it went against too many clichés and taboos, not just on our newspaper, but practically all newspapers. Usually, it wasn't "objective" enough.

By an intellectual tradition, I mean, too, that we shouldn't merely challenge institutional spokesmen: I think we should move away from these people, most of whom are self-serving, and cast our nets far more widely—into documents, into study, into ordinary people reacting to the life around them, not least into the minds and experience of good, honest, sensitive reporters. A year or so ago, one of my colleagues went to Vietnam. I was out there not long after and had the

same Vietnamese interpreter, so I asked him who my colleague had seen.

"Oh, everybody," he said. I asked him who "everybody" was.

"Why," he said, "he saw President Thieu." And who else? Well, there was Ambassador Bunker. And who else? General Abrams.

But that was all. Now, plainly, interviewing "everybody" in that fashion won't teach you much in Saigon—not much you didn't know before you went there. I don't believe, for instance, that I. F. Stone has ever been to Saigon; yet, he's produced some of the most devastating reporting on the air war by the simple intellectual expedient of going back to the World War II Strategic Bombing Survey and measuring official claims against what we learned then was possible and not possible. In fact, Izzy Stone is one of the most assiduous document and fine-print readers in Washington, and that ought to teach all of us something, as we run from official source to official source.

In addition to developing an intellectual tradition to modify the tradition of objectivity, so that reporters can stop being mere transmitters of self-serving institutional information, I believe also that it's vitally important for newspapers to stop pretending that they bring the news first. I don't know many editors or publishers who wouldn't concede that, in fact, television is where people hear and see it first; nevertheless, newspapers are still organized and presented as if we were the ones who bring the news first.

This is the cause, for instance, of all sorts of headline anachronisms—indeed, for headlines themselves, and headlines serve a purpose, if any, that seems to me to diminish all the time. One newspaper I see regularly runs a big eight-column banner every day; once they had one that said, "Nixon Flies to Florida." And I saw a gem just recently: "Nixon and Chou Agree Many Issues Unsettled."

Worse, the notion that we have to rush into print as if we still brought the news makes us easy prey for clever spokesmen. I remember when Pierre Salinger handed out the first government press release announcing federal support for the S.S.T. I was The Times' White House correspondent and I was sitting with the White House press corps in the football stadium of the Air Force Academy, listening to President Kennedy make a speech. As soon as he had finished, we were going on west, so in a few minutes, we had to file some kind of story on a complex technological and financial story like that. Salinger knew we couldn't do any more in those circumstances than rewrite his self-serving press release, which is what we all did.

The illusion of being first also produces newspaper dilettantism—the belief that any good reporter can write any story. What that usually means is that he can turn out something fast, on short study, and never mind how many clichés or how little understanding. When President Kennedy outlined to the Economic Club of New York the plans for what became the great Keynesian tax bill of 1964, I happened to have a seat in the press quarters right beside a wire service colleague. In a matter of seconds, he had picked up the phone and was dictating a smooth, readable, professional story on a difficult subject; it was only when I really got into the thing myself, and got some analysis from experts, that I realized that smooth, readable, professional wire service story had ill-informed—or at least poorly informed—millions of Americans who had to rely on it for most of what they knew about the tax bill.

So the illusion of being first encourages us in numerous ways to rush into print with ill-formed and ill-understood stories. It encourages formula writing and discourages intellectual considerations and substantive analysis. It puts a premium on the kind of hand-out journalism we're too often guilty of. I can remember, in my White House days, hearing reporters ask the press secretary, when he'd handed out some long speech or document: "Which page is the lead on, Mr. Secretary?" And he could always tell them which page he wanted them to think the lead was on.

Worst of all, the illusion of being first makes us focus on what happened yesterday, rather than on the substances of things. We saw that work in the recent China trip, when what happened yesterday was a catalogue of schedules, menus, routings, and meaningless protocol. Yet, that's what most of the reporters kept on writing, even if most of the world had already seen that side of the trip on television. I'm happy to say that one exception was my colleague, Max Frankel, who not only wrote what happened yesterday but also produced each day a fascinating "reporter's notebook" about what *he* saw and heard and felt, how the whole thing struck him, what he thought it meant or might mean. Wasn't that the real story? Not yesterdays' formal events, but how a strange world looked and felt and reacted, how intelligent and observant men reacted to it.

I recall another example from my own experience, years ago. I was called in to work late one evening, in order to cover President Johnson's sudden speech announcing the air attacks on North Vietnam, following the supposed naval battle of the Tonkin Gulf. At that hour of the night, I had no alternative and neither did The Times, under prevailing journalistic practices, to repeating straight down the line everything the President said about the necessity and justification for that grave step. It was one of the most controversial, perhaps the least justified action of the war, but one which came to be the essential basis for all that followed in 1965 and 1966—yet in the rush to get the news in print, even though it had already been carried to the millions by television, we did no more than parrot the President without any challenge or question.

That's why I say the time has come to take advantage of the challenge of television news. TV, after all, spreads the news to more people in more places than ever before. That means it has created an enormous hunger, greater than any we've known, for the meaning and consequence of the news; because the fact is that television has really done no more than absorb the old front-page function of our newspapers.

Television tells the people what happened yesterday, and that leaves newspapers the opportunity created by this vast new demand for background, understanding, meaning and consequence—a demand not for what happened yesterday but for the interrelated truths of many events, many policies, many lives. That's what we ought to be doing with our space, and with our manpower; that's the form daily newspaper journalism ought to be taking. The opportunity to concentrate on answering people's real needs—the necessity to abandon to the experts of television the old front-page function and the illusion that we still fill it—is the best means we have of once again becoming, then remaining a vital part of people's lives.

I'm well aware that there are dangers of abuses in this approach to journalism, but I'll rest my case on the question whether those abuses could be more damaging than the lapses and malfunctions we have today.

And while it's often said that Adolph Ochs was the greatest American publisher, I don't think his real contribution was the specific form he gave The New York Times three-quarters of a century ago. His real contribution was the recognition that a newspaper should serve the needs of its time, as his did; and I think what we need now are newspapers that will serve *their* time, our time, as well.

Mr. Wicker, a Nieman Fellow in 1958, is Associate Editor and columnist with The New York Times. He made these remarks at the University of California in Riverside, and was the seventh annual lecturer in a series sponsored by the Press-Enterprise Company in Riverside.

Walking On the Potomac

by Allen H. Neuharth

This has been a fine working convention, a great gathering of the outstanding talent in the journalism of today, and of tomorrow. These discussions now are nearing an end:

—discussions of the Pentagon Papers, and what the people shall know;

—discussions of the image makers and what the people shall think;

—discussions of the White House view of the press and vice versa, and what the people shall learn;

—and, very important to all of us, discussions of new careers in journalism for campus SDXers—the professionals of tomorrow.

As newsmen and newswomen we cannot now turn off these important issues after three days of talks. They are with us every day and they are not about to go away, whether we are covering White House proclamations in Washington, D.C.; or the breakdown of the town pump in Pumpkin Center, S. D.; or a draft debate on the campus of Duke in Durham, N. C.

But for those who leave here tomorrow, and for those who stayed behind, I hope the issues of this convention will be just a beginning toward a new perspective on our way of life. Not just the way of life here along the Potomac, but life beyond the Potomac.

To that end, I'd like to turn now to a few words and perhaps a little wisdom culled from a variety of signposts of our way of life today. Join with me in scanning some of these signposts—some old, but with new meaning; some new, but reflecting old hopes.

First, the words of the late Justice Hugo Black: "In the First Amendment the founding fathers gave the free press the protection it must have to fulfill its essential role in democracy. The press was to serve the governed, not the governors."

Or, the words of CBS newsman Walter Cronkite, in the popular and successful SDX careers film: "That the People Shall Know."

Mr. Justice Black called them the governed. Walter Cronkite calls them the people. No matter what you call them, they are all of those folks out there—not just the government types along the Potomac; not just the press types on Capitol Hill; but all the people beyond the Potomac. To them, as well as to you and me, belongs the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press. . . ." Familiar words. Important words. For you, and for me and for all the governed, the people of our nation. And they may be among the most abused, the most misused and the most underused words of our day.

Abused by some leaders, in and out of government; misused by some of us, in and out of press coverage; underused by many of the people, the governed.

Do not misunderstand me.

This is not meant to be more rhetoric about the press.

Nor another fashionable attack on our institutions or our government.

Nor another dose of self-flagellation.

We have had more than enough of that. We have had enough demagogues peddling derision and profiting in division.

We are journalists, and we need only facts. And the fact is that our nation is served by the best—and the biggest—government in the world. Many of the most able, most dedicated men and women of this nation are part of that government here in Washington.

The fact is that our nation is served by the biggest and the best press in the world. Many of the most talented and most effective members of that press are among the 2,000 newsmen and newswomen here in Washington.

But the fact is that that government and that press can even better serve the governed, the readers—all the people—if we here and now on the banks of the Potomac come to a full realization that there is life beyond that Potomac.

The fact is that the government of this country and the free press of this country must realize that the real strengths of both lie not here along the Potomac, but in the states and cities and towns and villages and farms across this land. The fact is that both the government and the press can better serve the people if both put less emphasis on "outflow" of news from Washington and more on the "inflow" of thoughts and ideas, hope and despair, dreams and ambitions from America's crossroads and byways to the nation's capital.

Let's return to the late Mr. Justice Black. On the very week of his death Sept. 25, endless copy and comment from Washington dealt with speculation on what this health plan or that one would do—not for the ailing or the dying—but for politicians and potential presidential candidates sponsoring the bills.

That same week, in Covington, Ind., the folks launched a memorial fund to try to pay more than $20,000 in medical bills and replace 37 pints of blood for Karen Shelby, a 19-year-old girl who lost a three-year battle against cancer.

And residents of Ransom, Ill., 80 miles southwest of Chicago, still were without a doctor and still hunting.

And a bumper sticker in Ransom read: "Be Someone Special . . . Be a Nurse."

The next week, Sept. 29, news columns reported in detail —as they should—Cardinal Mindszenty's departure from his asylum-exile and his safe arrival in Rome. Then endless comment from Washington dealt with futile theories concerning his recent years.

The same week Mrs. Katherine Guins of Okemos, Mich., wrote these words to the editor of The State Journal at Lansing: "I'm tired . . . I am a 53-year-old woman who, with the help of my husband, has raised five children. We tried to raise them according to the rules and concepts of this society.

"Now I am forced to tell them that ours is a culture of violence.

"I am tired of having tried so hard.

"I am tired of hearing the same answers to problems by people who do not even know the proper questions. Let us join together to save the only world we have."

And a bumper sticker in Okemus, Mich., read: "Our God Is Not Dead. Sorry About Yours."

The first week in October, most Washington copy and comment speculated on what the government and what big business and what labor might or might not do during Phase II of the current economic program. At the same time in Chino, Calif., Jean-Paul Arretche, a Basque immigrant whose ancestors have been sheepherders for centuries, was speculating in his local newspaper on what he, Jean-Paul Arretche, would do about the falling prices for his flock of 700 crossbred ewes.

And a bumper sticker in Chino, Calif., read: "Spend Your American Wages for American Products."

On Oct. 13 much Washington copy and comment concerned President Nixon's plans to visit Moscow in May for talks on "all major issues." At the same time, a major issue in Bismark, N. D., was a warning in the local newspaper from the boss of the state highway patrol. More vehicles travel more miles over more roads every year, but his manpower is the same size it was in 1959, he said, and "we have to stretch hell out of the 40-hour week."

And a bumper sticker in Bismark read: "Help Your Troopers Fight Crime."

By the third week in October, the trial balloons and political speculation over the Supreme Court candidates came to an end with the nomination of two whose names had figured little, if at all, in the advance Washington copy and comment. And immediately, most Potomac copy and comment dealt with a new hassle over who leaked what information about the qualifications of which candidates, to whom.

And on the very same day, in the town of Ramapo, N. Y., a 12-year-old girl named Lisa complained to her local newspaper that the small dam in her favorite park had gone unrepaired for over a year . . . "the lake is half empty . . . the fish are dying . . . the town officials said they would fix the dam last year but they are too busy calling each other names. Only the birds are left for us to weep and comfort each other. Only the birds."

And a bumper sticker in Ramapo, New York read: "America, You're Beautiful."

And then came the last weekend in October. Most Washington copy and comment concerned these developments: Red China Wants Full UN Role . . . Soviets Deliver New Jets to Cuba . . . UN Cut Fails . . . Foreign Aid in Doubt . . . Heath Wins Market Vote . . .

And on that same weekend, 17 young folks were grabbed in a Rockland County, N. Y., drug raid . . . a newspaper office in Williamsport, Pa., was fire-bombed as promised during a drug raid . . . a narcotics agent in Rockford, Ill., warned that drugs were flooding into town from Detroit and Milwaukee and Madison and Chicago.

And a bumper sticker in Rockford, Ill., read: "Praise the Lord Anyhow."

The first week in November, most copy and comment out

of Washington concerned the underground nuclear test at far-away Amchitka, Alaska, with endless speculation about the imminent disasters it might cause. At the same time, on the sands of not-so-far away Waikiki in Honolulu, pretty Ingrid Nygren, an alien from Stockholm, Sweden, appealed to visiting Bob Udick, publisher of Guam's Pacific Daily News: "Please do all you can to settle the dock strike, so that I can find work here and continue to enjoy this Pacific Paradise."

And a bumper sticker in Honolulu read: "Smile!"

From the advice of Mr. Justice Black . . . to the tears of Lisa and her birds in Ramapo, N. Y. . . . to the despair of Jean-Paul Arretche over the price of his ewes in Chino, Calif. . . . to the hopes of Ingrid Nygren for a job in Honolulu, Hawaii . . . The words of the First Amendment apply to all these.

The rights of a free press must be dedicated to all these. The responsibilities of a government must include an awareness of all these. The people of this nation must find more relevance and more responsiveness from their government and from their press than they get from bumper stickers on their superhighways.

Isn't it time for the press to write more for and about the governed of this country and a little less about the government?

Isn't it time for the governors to listen a little more to the governed, and spend a little less time talking to them?

Shouldn't the President of the United States and the key members of his administration and especially the director of communications and the White House press secretary concentrate more on ways and means of regularly and systematically and truly measuring the pulse of the people, rather than working at how to pace those pulses?

Wouldn't the members of the capital press corps develop more balanced and more interesting and more useful copy and comment if they spent a little more time listening to the readers across the country and a little less time observing each other's vibrations along the Potomac?

I submit that all of Washington could get a far better feel of the mood of this country by reading the newspaper letters-to-the-editor columns from such places as Burlington, Vt., or Boise, Idaho; Pierre, S. D., or Pensacola, Fla., than it ever will get from the editorial columns of The Washington Post or The New York Times.

And why hasn't such a perspective on the way of life of the governed, the people, the readers, developed among those along the banks of the Potomac? I believe it's because of a special kind of "Potomac fever"—a fever which makes some members of the government, and some members of the capital press corps feel that once here, they actually can walk on the water, walk on the Potomac, and solve the nation's ills.

I say to them, and to all of us: Go forward, not on the Potomac, but across it. There is life beyond the Potomac. That's where the people are. That's where our real strength lies. That's where we can fulfill the challenging role outlined in those immortal words of Mr. Justice Black: "The Press is to serve the governed, not the governors."

Mr. Neuharth, president of the Gannett Company, gave the above address at the National Convention of Sigma Delta Chi in Washington.

New York Times Pentagon Papers Case Similar to Investigation of the New York Herald in 1848

by John Behrens

Mr. Behrens is coordinator of Journalism Studies at Utica College of Syracuse University, New York.

If New York Times Washington Correspondent Neil Sheehan had read about Herald Correspondent John Nugent's troubles with the United States Senate in 1848 he might have left town after the Pentagon Papers appeared.

Sheehan, considered by some as former Pentagon aide Dan Ellsberg's contact on the Times and one of the writers who assembled material for the publication of the Pentagon memoranda, was among the 22 editors and writers named in a federal injunction prepared by the Justice Department to stop the paper from printing the documents.

Nugent, on the other hand, was the only person subpoenaed to appear in the Senate chambers 123 years ago when his paper, the New York Herald, published the peace treaty and related correspondence between the United States and Mexico. Like Sheehan, Nugent was a Washington correspondent for his paper and an intimate of government officials.

President James K. Polk, a Democrat whose administration began and ended with tension and strife with Mexico, was probably more upset about the disclosure than Presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon were more than a century later about the publication of Vietnam strategy and contingency plans, some of which were more than a decade old.

Polk had frequently noted in his diary complaints about the premature release of information by newspapers and he had been especially critical of flamboyant New York Herald publisher, James Gordon Bennett. He probably had not forgotten the editorial that appeared in the Herald during the Presidential campaign of 1844 which called him a 40th rate lawyer not fit to hold the Office. Nor had he forgotten that his Secretary of State James Buchanan, who he considered an overly ambitious man, had defended the paper from time to time and was known to be a close friend of the Herald's man, Nugent.

Polk did not choose the courts to investigate the secrecy violation as the Nixon Administration did, however. Instead, he took his case to the Senate. His political power base was there. Unlike Nixon, Polk could call in a number of influential Senators, tell them of his displeasure at the violation of a secrecy injunction (even though there had been an attempt to remove the injunction several days earlier) and get them to act. It was a political matter, Polk believed, not a legal problem as Nixon decided when Pentagon security was breached.

Within days the Senate established the machinery; an Investigating Committee was created to hold a hearing to look into the premature release of the treaty and correspondence. The committee's first witness was Herald Correspondent Nugent. The reporter complied with the request and spent five hours in the first day refusing to

answer most of the questions put to him by a trio of senators.

He admitted that he was (1) the Herald's Washington correspondent, (2) that he knew the person who showed him the documents, (3) that he copied them in his room on G Street in Washington and (4) that no one connected with the Senate or the State Department was involved. The answers did not satisfy the Senators, however. By the end of the first day, the committee had charged Nugent with contempt of Congress, confined him to the Senate chambers in the custody of the Senate sergeant-at-arms.

During the next four weeks, Nugent was held first in the Senate chambers and later, in the home of the sergeant-at-arms as he steadfastly refused to answer the committee's questions. He was allowed to write letters and, as a result, during his second week of confinement, he asked for a writ of habeas corpus. The District of Columbia Circuit Court first granted the request, investigated it and then turned it down. The court said the Senate had the right to hold and prosecute a person on contempt charges in open or closed chambers.

Following the court's refusal to release the reporter, Herald Publisher Bennett attempted to intervene, announcing that he would go to Washington to release his correspondent. No sooner had he arrived in the capital after a well-publicized trip than he was informed the Senate planned to summon him, and further, it might investigate his actions as well as Nugent's. Bennett promptly dropped plans to stay, boarded a return train to New York and told reporters that he would fight the case from the Herald editorial office.

After nearly a month's confinement of Nugent, the Senate Democratic majority, still unable to obtain information about the party who had leaked the materials (Polk, of course, was convinced that Buchanan or his emissary had given the papers to Nugent) tried to find a way to end the investigation quietly. One Senator proposed that the reporter be turned over to the U.S. marshal in the District of Columbia and jailed. Another believed he should be set free without comment. Finally, Nugent was released on the pretext that he was "indisposed" and unable to continue the inquiry.

Certainly no two periods of history are identical. Yet, the similarities between America's war with Mexico and its military intrigue in Vietnam will perplex historians for decades to come. Some may argue that the United States officially declared that a state of war existed with Mexico in 1846 which made such security measures practical and logical while in 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution merely gave the President power to prevent further aggression and armed attack against U.S. military forces but did not declare the country in a state of national emergency.

Pursuing such an argument further, the New York Herald's violation of a secrecy injunction involved a peace treaty, not a classified report on government decision-making as was the case in the Pentagon Papers published by the New York Times. But the following comparisons of the two cases certainly demonstrate how history does, at times, offer a colorful view of the present.

1. The periods were, in fact, quite similar. The Mexican War was nearing an end and the government and the public were weary. There was sporadic fighting but most officials and citizens were convinced the war would soon end. There was sharp debate among expansionists (hawks of the time) and supporters of the administration (Democratic Party members and doves) about the kinds of demands to be made of Mexico to end the war. Virtually the same conditions exist today over Vietnam.

2. Both the New York Herald and The New York Times first printed portions of the documents before the government took action. The Herald, for example, publicly claimed it had information about the peace treaty and offered an analysis of it two weeks before it was published. The Times traced three decades of American involvement in Vietnam and announced it was beginning a series of reports on government decision-making when it first published the data.

3. In both cases, other newspapers published the sensitive material within days after the Herald and the Times printed their stories. In 1848, the New York Journal of Commerce reprinted a portion of the information the day after the Herald released it. Professional ethics, copyright and the lack of a new angle probably caused the Washington Post to delay publication of the Pentagon Papers until four days later. And, if Ellsberg's comments to news media were accurately reported, he, in fact, may have supplied the Post with new materials when he learned that the court ordered an injunction against the Times.

4. The two newspapers, the Times and the Herald, were suspected of obtaining the secret documents from government officials but neither newspaper was accused of "checkbook journalism" or purchasing the data for commercial gain. Though a formal investigation was conducted by the Senate in 1848, no government aide was accused of the leak. President Polk was known to be suspicious of Buchanan while others speculated that the Herald had obtained the documents from foreign agents. Ellsberg's admission that he released the Vietnam data to the Times is generally accepted although the Times has refused to comment on the subject. Ellsberg has also indicated that others helped him disseminate the material.

5. Polk—like Presidents Johnson and Nixon—had dissenters within his cabinet. Some were openly opposed to

Polk's plans. They included such close associates as Secretary of State Buchanan and Secretary of Treasury Robert Walker. Johnson was opposed by his first term Attorney General Robert Kennedy and some advisers from the John Kennedy Administration. Nixon, of course, has had opposition on the war issue from former Secretary of Interior Walter Hickel among others.

6. Presidents Polk, Johnson and Nixon appeared convinced that the government should guard against public disclosure. The Pentagon Papers revealed that Johnson attempted to mislead the public by appearing not to change policies when policies had, in reality, been changed in 1964–65. The Nixon administration's feverish efforts to block the publication of the Pentagon Papers—even though Justice Department attorneys were hard-pressed to find precedents—indicates its belief that secrecy was vital. Polk displayed similar vigor in denying the public access to the Mexican Peace Treaty. The President commented frequently in Cabinet meetings and in his personal diaries that newspaper speculations were harmful to national interest. He assailed the Herald in 1847, for example, for publishing a story about the secret peace mission of a State Department clerk, N. P. Trist, two days after he left Washington for Mexico.

7. Neither newspaper was punished for its act. In 1848, the Herald was virtually ignored by the government. Although its reporter was confined, the newspaper was not publicly censured or rebuked by the government. The Times was taken to court and forced to pursue its argument to the Supreme Court where it was upheld in its right to publish the Pentagon Papers.

Unforgettable Ralph McGill

(Continued from page 2)

Southern leaders and legislators were staunch segregationists, made McGill all the more special. He became the conscience of the South.

McGill was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1959 for his editorial writing—particularly an editorial on the bombing of a synagogue in Atlanta and a school in Clinton, Tenn. "Let us face the facts," he wrote. "This is the harvest. It is the harvest of the defiance of the courts and the encouragement of citizens to defy the law on the part of many Southern politicians. This, too, is a harvest of those so-called Christian ministers who have chosen to preach hate rather than compassion. For a long time now it has been needful for all Americans to stand up and be counted on the side of law, even when to do so goes against personal beliefs and emotions."

I first encountered McGill in the early 1920s, when we were reporters on two violently competitive Nashville, Tenn., newspapers. I was a Yankee, born in New York. He was a loyal Southerner, born on a backwoods farm on the Tennessee River and educated at Vanderbilt University. Despite the fact that we worked on rival papers, we became good friends. There was something singular about McGill even then. He had been a tough guard on the Vanderbilt football team and a Marine in World War I, but he loved to recite poetry and could, and frequently did, quote Shakespeare at great length.

In 1929, Ralph became sports editor of the Atlanta Constitution. Soon afterward I took a public-relations job in Atlanta, and we continued to go on assignments together. Oddly, he never learned to drive, so I did the chauffeuring. Ralph was a wonderful traveling companion, by turns amusing and serious, uncompromising and tolerant. He was a fascinating raconteur, with a fund of colorful stories about the Tennessee hill people he had grown up among.

He was interested in almost everything. He knew the South as few others did. As a boy, he had talked with aged Negroes who had been slaves. Driving around the South together, we saw firsthand the hurt inflicted on the land and the people by the boll weevil, the Depression, the denial of Negro rights. I often saw that hurt reflected in his face when we drove past abandoned cotton fields and empty cabins, their open doors swinging drunkenly, or passed some gaunt sharecropper or ragged Negro following a swaybacked mule. McGill had a strong face and firm jaw, and when pained or angry he looked like an aroused bulldog. "I knew the South would always be in my blood," he wrote later. "But I never wanted to be 'Southern' as the word applied to those at the top of the caste system who would exploit their own people so callously."

Nothing deterred Ralph when he was working on a story. He covered Franklin Roosevelt's first Presidential inauguration, and got soaked to the skin when he had to walk from the Capitol to downtown Washington in a pouring rain. Undaunted, Ralph went to an office in the National Press Club building, draped in his sopping clothes over a radiator, and wrote his story in the nude.

When he became editor of the Constitution in 1942, he did not lose his reportorial instinct. In December 1946, the Winecoff Hotel in midtown Atlanta caught fire. Ralph leaped out of bed at 2 a.m. to rush out and cover the conflagration. I watched him struggle through smoke and water to reach the burned-out floors and get a firsthand account of the holocaust. The blaze turned out to be the worst hotel fire in American history, killing 119 persons. McGill's story, capturing all the horror and terror of the inferno, was the most vivid chronicle of a disaster I have ever read.

Ralph wrote as he spoke, always to the point. "If you're going to be a newspaper writer," he once said to me, "you've got to put the hay down where the mules can reach it." One day we went looking for a monastery that the Trappist monks supposedly had established near Atlanta, but couldn't find it. Finally, we spotted a little black boy walking along a dusty road. "Son, do you know where those fellas are who dress like Ku Kluxers?" Ralph asked, referring to the monks' flowing white robes. "Right over that hill," the lad answered—and that's where we found the Trappists.

In 1938, McGill began writing a page-one, seven-day-a-week column on any subject that struck his fancy. The column became a yeasty blend of crusading and nostalgia, of poetry and humor. Ralph described himself as a "conservative fellow with a mortgage and a Presbyterian conscience." One day he would chide the South for its racial discrimination; the next, he would express his love for its "acrid, nostalgic smell of wood burning beneath the weekly wash-day pots, the pine and oak smoke from chimneys of farmhouses fighting with the scent of wet plowed earth." The column soon became the most widely read, ardently praised, bitterly hated newspaper feature in the entire South.

One of McGill's favorite targets was Eugene Talmadge, the rabble-rousing twice-elected governor of Georgia, who estimated that McGill's opposition cost him 100,000 votes in each election. At every stump speech some of Talmadge's followers would yelp, "Tell 'em about Ralph McGill, Gene." Talmadge, glaring through his spectacles, and snapping his red galluses, would launch into a sizzling denunciation of "Rastus" McGill and "them lyin' Atlanta papers." McGill disliked everything Talmadge stood for, yet he was too tolerant to dislike the old rogue personally. "And to be honest about it," he said, "I've had a try at it."

Through the years McGill kept pounding away against

racial injustice. In one editorial, for instance, he attacked the city of Atlanta for spending $50,000 for a horse ring in a white park when there was no park at all for Negroes. He contended that, by holding down the Negro, the South was only harming itself. "The South put down the Negro," he wrote. "It denied him equality of justice, education, jobs and a share in being an American citizen. The Southerner thereby makes himself, his politics, his institutions, his attitudes, a semi-slave to the Negro."

All this earned him the bombardment of bigots, but there were poignant rewards, too. An unknown Negro waiter in a restaurant, serving him, would whisper, "Thank you for what you write." This touched him more than anything.

He maintained a frenzied schedule: writing, speaking, helping to run the Constitution, serving as an adviser to President Roosevelt, who vacationed at nearby Warm Springs. I'd see him from time to time, though. When things got especially busy around his old rolltop desk, he would slip over to my office and borrow my secretary's typewriter to write undisturbed by phone calls or visitors.

Gradually, McGill began seeing the correction of some of the wrongs he had so tirelessly fought. In 1947, President Truman eliminated segregation in the armed forces. In 1954, the Supreme Court unanimously decreed segregation in the public schools to be unconstitutional. Ralph, who a year earlier had predicted this eventuality, was in a London hotel when he heard the news. He lay awake half the night, reliving memories of the long, uphill battle to achieve elementary justice for the Negro. "In all America," he wrote, "no one was so lucky as the Southerner who was part of this social revolution—of this determination to reaffirm the principles of what we have called the American dream."

In the extended aftermath of that Supreme Court decision, Atlanta, where McGill had so long preached reason and respect for law, was not torn by strife. In Birmingham, however, a Negro church was dynamited, killing four little girls, and Safety Commissioner "Bull" Connor unleashed police dogs and fire hose against peaceful protestors. "Ralph McGill was the difference between Atlanta and Birmingham," wrote author Harry Golden. "It shows you what one man can do."

As McGill's stand for law and decency won broad support, many honors came his way. He became a friend and adviser to Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. President Johnson awarded him the Medal of Freedom—the highest honor that can be given a civilian. He was upped from editor to publisher of the Constitution. His column was syndicated in more than 100 U.S. newspapers. He traveled and spoke around the world, although he avoided civic-club appearances when he possibly could, explaining that he "could never trust men who get together in the middle of the day and sing songs cold sober." He wrote a prizewinning autobiography, *The South and the Southerner.*

When his friend Adlai Stevenson died, Ralph said, "What a good way to go, quickly, on a pleasant street in London, on a walk with a beautiful woman." His own death came in a way that I think would have pleased him. He had just had dinner with a Negro educator whose work in Atlanta's ghetto McGill admired. They had a pleasant meal and much good talk. After they had finished, Ralph's heart failed, and he died peacefully.

McGill was eulogized by President Nixon and other national leaders. But the tribute that might have meant most to him came from former Atlanta NAACP president Albert M. Davis. "He was the only voice we had for years," Dr. Davis said. "If anyone brought the South back into the Union, it was Ralph McGill. We call Martin Luther King a prophet, but McGill was a greater one because he didn't have to be."

After McGill won the Pulitzer Prize, Richard Tobin, associate publisher of Saturday Review, asked him how he felt as the most famous journalist in America. "Frustrated," Ralph said. "Frustrated and sad that in a lifetime I've been able to change so little with so many words." Yet when Ralph McGill died, a black man sat on the Supreme Court, there was a black U.S. Senator, and there were nine black Congressmen. There were black mayors in Washington, D.C., Cleveland and Gary, Ind. There were Negro representatives in six Southern state legislatures, including ten in Georgia. And many schools were integrated in Georgia and elsewhere in the South.

Ralph McGill's 30 years of crusading had helped create the climate that brought about these changes. He would have wanted no greater epitaph.

William S. Howland, a professor at the University of Miami, was for 17 years head of the Southern bureau of Time and Life magazines in Atlanta. He has also served as an assistant to the mayor of that city.

Advertising and the Ecological Revolt

by George Chaplin

My premise is that the ecological revolt will contribute to profound changes in American society, with those in the advertising profession substantially involved.

This revolt is based on the ethic—in the words of Robert Disch of the Pratt Institute—that "one is not entitled to desecrate earth, air, water or space merely because he happens to own, control, or occupy some portion of it."

But the ecological revolt is not a phenomenon standing alone. It is, instead, part of a much broader revolution encompassing youth, race, education, religion, sex, communications, life styles in general.

This has largely been brought about by the accelerated speed and expansion of technological change, which in this country among others has produced a larger, a more urbanized and a more affluent population.

It also has produced "future shock"—for change is swamping us, spinning us around, and in the midst of more affluence creating more anxiety and alienation. The individual often feels lost in a nation of lonely crowds.

We are crowded in our housing, on our highways, in our shopping places and on our campuses. We are bombarded by noise. Since we are able to buy more, we waste more.

Two researchers for the Atomic Energy Commission estimate if the solid wastes foreseen in the 35 years between 1965 and 2000 "were all compacted and disposed of by sanitary landfill, it would require burial to a depth greater than 10 feet in a land area the size of the State of Delaware." The major reason is that with about six percent of the world's population and about the same percent of the world's land, we in the United States are consuming about half of the world's resources.

There's a current irony in the statement made in the last century by the British historian Macaulay that "we have heard nothing but despair and seen nothing but progress." The question, of course, is what constitutes progress?

Materially, we were never as well off. But in matters of the spirit, there is great disenchantment and bitter division. And we can really take no comfort from Mayor Daley of Chicago who is quoted in a new book as saying, "Today, the real problem is the future," adding, "I don't see any more serious divisions in our country (now) than we had in the Civil War and at other times."

The ecological revolt reflects a new definition of progress —a definition which Raymond A. Bauer of the Harvard Business School says "will be couched more in human and environmental terms and less in terms of economics and technology and gross production of goods and services."

This ties in with a growing recognition that environmental problems are not a side effect, but an integral part of our technology, as it now operates.

That technology has not only produced enormous benefits, but monstrous liabilities. All too often, as Barry Commoner has said, our technology "is disastrously incompatible with the natural environmental systems that support not only human life but technology itself.

"Moreover," he adds, "these technologies are now so massively imbedded in our system of industrial and agricultural production that any effort to make them conform to the demands of the environment will involve serious dislocations.

"If, as I believe," concludes Commoner, "environmental pollution is a sign of major incompatibilities between the system of productivity and the environmental system that supports it, then, if we are to survive, we must successfully confront the economic obligations, however severe and challenging to our social concepts they may be."

Involved in what Commoner is saying are not only staggering sums of money, but some fundamental changes in values, attitudes and institutions.

Some people propose elimination of the profit system as a solution, overlooking the fact that environmental debasement is not a capitalist monopoly.

The Moscow River is polluted. So is Lake Baikal. So is the Caspian Sea. One Soviet scientist says, "the damage being done to the economy through improper use of natural resources and environmental pollution is immense." Another says, "Our woods, gardens and fields are becoming quieter and quieter."

Some view technological society as such, whatever the politics, as a "bad scene." They would kill technology, choke off all growth, and return to the Garden of Eden. But the Garden is closed and probably being subdivided. We simply have to look ahead and seek a desirable redirection of technology and consumption patterns, while working for population control.

UCLA Economist Neil H. Jacoby argues that the environment is degraded not by rising affluence per se, but by "the particular forms and methods of production and consumption to which our society has become accustomed."

The culprit, in his view, is not greater production and consumption per capita, but the failure "to control the processes of production and consumption so as to eliminate the pollution associated with them."

Since no company is likely to embark voluntarily on a tremendously expensive anti-pollution program that will give competitors a cost advantage, it's clear that government has to set and enforce the standards.

The result, as Jacoby says in an article in The Center Magazine, will be "corporate actions to modify products, prices and allocation of resources to conform to the public regulation."

Environmental improvement, he says "will call for annual public and private expenditures of tens of billions of dollars indefinitely into the future."

And "profound changes will be necessary in the structure of relative costs and prices of goods, and in patterns of production and consumption."

Jacoby sees changes in relative spending for, say, automobiles and houses; he sees new industries emerging "to supply the growing demand for pollution-controlling equipment and services." He sees both social well-being and the GNP rising, "provided that the increments of production improve the quality of life."

But American business has been slow to respond to changing social values and consumer desires.

Jacoby says "most corporate advertising is narrowly focused upon expanding public demand for existing products rather than for new products with superior environmental effects."

And he quotes Henry Ford's advice to corporate managers to "stop thinking about changing public expectations as new costs which may have to be accepted but certainly have to be minimized. Instead, we should start thinking about changes in public values as opportunities to profit by serving new needs."

I would judge that nationally most corporations at first regarded the ecological revolt as primarily a nuisance and then, as the expense factor emerged, as a menace. As the implications have become clearer, many seem to recognize that it is here to stay and therefore must be intelligently reckoned with and built into the cost of doing business. But some would seem to feel that if they can stall and gloss over their problems, the revolt will diminish in intensity, perhaps even go away. This latter group thinks it can clean things up with words rather than practices, dealing with images rather than realities.

These views are reflected, of course, in their environmental advertising. There have been perceptive commentaries about this in the news magazines, in Advertising Age and trade publications, in The Wall Street Journal and a number of other newspapers, and in The Environmental Handbook, among others.

There is also the biweekly newsletter of Environmental Action in Washington which in a regular column entitled "Debunking Madison Avenue" submits ads to detailed scrutiny. There is occasional mention of the subject in the syndicated newspaper column on the environment by Stewart Udall and Jeff Stansbury. And a Stanford graduate student, Peter M. Sandman, is completing his doctoral thesis on environmental advertising as a case study in advertising acceptance. He has generously allowed me to quote from it.

Sandman makes the point that since "the preservation of the environment is by now a clear question of survival . . . environmental advertising thus raises issues far more crucial than mere consumer protection. No other kind of advertising," he contends, "touches on such important questions of public policy."

Sandman studied the two San Francisco dailies, the Chronicle and the Examiner, and the West Coast edition of Business Week thoughout April of last year—a month which included observance of Earth Day. Environmental ads in the papers ran 2.1 percent of total lineage and in the magazine, 12.7 percent.

He found that while many of the ads provided accurate information, many others fell short. He comments on numerous ads from his sample and also on some from other publications.

Under inaccurate advertising, he cites a campaign built around the theme that "Santa Barbara is as enjoyable today as it was last year and all the years before." And he concludes that "this is a dubious assertion at best. Oil slick still spots the beaches of Santa Barbara at least half the time."

Under irrelevant copy, he mentions an ad for a product which takes suds out of detergents before they're dumped into rivers and streams—the emphasis being on removing the pollutant indicator (suds) rather than the pollutant (detergents), which continues to be present.

Sandman identifies five kinds of environmentally irrelevant ads: 1) Those that use environmental 'buzz words' but really have nothing to do with the environment; 2) Those that suggest technological solutions to problems that in the long run cannot be solved technologically; 3) Those that suggest cosmetic solutions to problems that go far deeper than appearance; 4) Those that boast of solving non-existent problems and ignore the real ones; 5) Those that urge the audience to flee the problems instead of solving them. Against this yardstick, Sandman concludes that 45 percent of the environmental ads in the San Francisco dailies and 91 percent of those in Business Week were environmentally irrelvant.

Under misleading advertising, he cites a utility ad which has also been criticized elsewhere. It features a healthy lobster over the caption, "He likes our nuclear plant." The ad neglects to mention that the lobster was borrowed for the photograph from the tanks of a local marine biologist, who says both he and his lobster take a dim view of nuclear power plants.

Sandman brands as misleading any environmental ad "that 1) Makes false claims for a product; 2) Uses sleazy . . . gimmicks to promote a product or a viewpoint; 3) Leaves out crucial facts relevant to the subject of an ad; 4) Stresses the small contributions of an otherwise environmentally irresponsible company; or 5) Encourages the audience to view a critical problem as uncritical or solved. "Roughly 20 to 40 percent of the ads in our sample," he says, "fall into one or another of these categories."

He then gets into a catchall labeled irresponsible advertising—the most common characteristic being "a failure to accept the fundamental premise of ecology: the interrelationship of all things."

He quotes a utility ad which says the firm provides "a balance of ecology and energy" and points out this is nonsense since ecology includes energy. His most general criticism, however, is that advertisers "persist in offering isolated solutions to single problems, with little attention to the environmental by-products of the solution."

I think Sandman's material reminds why in advertising, as in other areas of communication, we have the credibility gap.

In this age of cynicism, people tend to believe less than ever before of what they read or see or listen to. People can sense when a timid improvement is made to sound like a radical reform. Bad ads in the environmental field, as in any other, undermine the good.

A Wall Street Journal editorial had this to say:

"A recent survey by Harvard Business Review of 2,700 subscribers—most of them business executives—revealed that a majority were not only concerned about advertising's credibility, but also felt that the amount of advertising that is irritating or insulting to the intelligence had risen in the last decade. They aimed their greatest criticism at television and direct-mail advertising."

The executives relate this to attacks on business, and while 88 percent of those surveyed felt top management had to provide solutions, 81 percent blamed ad agencies for the problem.

Many are concerned about the need for upgrading and their role in establishing new organizations such as the National Advertising Review Board. Obviously if self-regulation fails, it invites the kind of legislation which Senator William Spong of Virginia is proposing, to require the Federal Trade Commission to impose criminal penalties on any corporation found to be advertising deceptively.

The following local reference is pertinent:

In Hawaii, environment is a hot subject and has been for several years—in part because we are islands, in part because tourism is a sensitive business, but also because this is a pretty sophisticated place which wants a high quality of living.

We have knowledgeable and dedicated environmentalists and if at times to some they may seem overly zealous, their constructive efforts are beginning to be reflected in action by government and business.

The president of a local corporation which is moving ahead to correct its own environmental problems of dust, waste water and noise told me recently:

"Industry must stop its pollution. The fact that there were many dirty plants in the 1960's gives us no right to expect that we can operate under similar circumstances today. The solution of this complex problem," he said, "requires intelligent leadership from government and cooperation from every level of society."

Allowing for differences over clean-up timetables, I believe he speaks for most of Hawaii's business leaders. And certainly the advertising agencies here share an enlightened view. I queried a number of agency executives on this subject and I would like to give you some typical replies.

One says that Hawaii's "practitioners of advertising, at least the larger agencies, are deeply aware of the increasingly heavy role they must play in rising—and helping their clients rise—to the challenges raised by the ecological revolt."

In citing several campaigns, he expresses his agency's approach to clients in this language:

"We counsel them constantly to tell their story now—whether through advertising or just public relations—before circumstances force them to tell it from a defensive position.

"Complete truth is essential. They can't just tell the good part and try to gloss over the possibly uncomfortable negatives or untackled problems. And they have to keep telling it over and over. Eventually the message will 'take.' Unfortunately, too many organizations tend to think they've told their side with a one-shot effort . . . which, of course, isn't even close to the actuality."

This agency executive calls advertising "the most powerful private communications force in the country. Yet," he observes, "the ecological revolt has happened and grown without the help or, to any significant extent, the techniques of advertising. It has been accomplished simply through gut communication on an emotionally involving subject. Perhaps advertising should learn a lesson from that fact for its own benefit as an industry.

"And," he muses, "wouldn't it be wild if the ecological revolt had at its disposal all of advertising's highly refined techniques of mass persuasion?"

The top executive in another agency points out that each corporate client is unique, "as are its management teams, corporate consciousness and the ecological problems and concerns faced."

He suggests that an environmentally clean company can advertise as it goes but that one "whose practices might be questioned, needs to inventory and quietly implement changes," keeping quiet until it has corrected its problems—unless it finds itself in a crisis situation.

Another agency leader agrees, "Actions speak louder than words and a company should implement remedial programs before it begins even to talk about them."

On getting clients to move, one executive says that "advertising and public relations efforts can suggest courses and seek to stimulate action, but there is absolutely no way they can be the prime movers. This responsibility falls to individuals, businesses, professions and government."

Another agency chief says his firm holds and expresses this philosophy to its clients: "If they are polluting the environment, the first step is to stop doing it. The second is to initiate reforms. And finally, we tell everyone in sight that our client has recognized he may be endangering the environment and is spending a lot of money to change his operations."

As Nobel laureate Paul Samuelson has put it: "Yes, Virginia, a large corporation these days not only may engage in social responsibility, it had damn well better try to do so."

To sum up: The ecological revolt is healthy and here to stay—and it should be encouraged. It will bring profound changes in our society, and those changes can enhance the well being of all. Advertising has an essential role in helping to bring this about, and I would fervently hope that this role is pursued with vision and creativity, with honesty and taste, and, above all, with full fidelity to the basic principle of ecology—which is that everything affects everything else.

Mr. Chaplin, editor of The Honolulu Advertiser, was a Nieman Fellow in 1941. He gave this speech to the American Advertising Federation in Honolulu.

Book Review

by Ray Jenkins

YOU CAN'T EAT MAGNOLIAS. Edited by H. Brandt Ayers and Thomas H. Naylor, with an introduction by Willie Morris. McGraw-Hill. 380 pages. $8.95.

Back in the early 1960's—the violent days of the civil rights movement when dogs were loosed on demonstrators, mobs were meeting the bus schedules, and the whole Southern countryside seemed alight with churches put to the torch—there remained a small but tenacious band of young politicians, writers, and scholars who clung steadfastly to the notion that all this conflict was only a catharsis necessary to get the madness out of our system once and for all.

"The South will some day show the nation the way out of this mess," they would say, reasoning that after all, white and black people had lived in close proximity for generations in the South and there was never the physical fear of the opposite race that one found in inexperienced regions. In due course, we would put the obsession of race prejudice behind us, and we would, in the words of the civil rights theme song, march "black and white together" into that glorious destiny so long denied the South by devotion to its complex mythology.

This cult of optimism was exemplified by Willie Morris, the Southern literary expatriate, and reached its highest expression in Willie's delightful little book, *Yazoo.* In the book, Willie chronicled the success story of integration of his hometown in the Mississippi Delta. Its theme was that integration would work if only the young people could be left to their own uncorrupted devices.

Most of us now concede that such uncritical optimism was mere wishful thinking—perhaps a new Southern myth. Integration came—and it was by no means as easy or as successful as Willie might lead us to believe in *Yazoo.* But far from being the end of our problems, the tenuous racial detente represented only a beginning.

When the second reconstruction of the 1960's was over, the South was still confronted with the legacy of its enduring regional problems of poor education, poor health, violence and intolerance, forced migration, rural isolation, agricultural subsistence, bad industry, the domination of political conservatives, and a general pessimism about human nature.

You Can't Eat Magnolias is a penetratingly realistic and honest assessment of those problems and what can be done about them in the South of the future.

The book is a compendium of 22 essays on Southern politics, economics, education, culture and history. It is written for the most part by young Southerners—politicans, writers, scholars, and economists.

Maynard Jackson, for instance, writes from the unique perspective of the black man who made it as vice-mayor of Atlanta. Terry Sanford, the first of the new breed of progressives or neo-populists who have come to the forefront of Southern politics, writes about the Southern future. Reynolds Price, the novelist, discusses the prospects for lit-

erature in a region which has produced some of the nation's finest writers. Luther Munford, a gifted Mississippian, gives us a poignant glimpse of the conflict raging within himself on whether to come home or to become a Southern exile.

Two of the essays are written by former Nieman Fellows. Brandy Ayers, an Alabama editor, writes perceptively on the prospect of a humane urban South of the future. And Jack Bass relates a moving story of how one courageous doctor created a national outcry by revealing that hunger and pestilence still exist on a massive scale in many parts of the South.

The authors are for the most part members of the L. Q. C. Lamar Society, a relatively young organization of intrepid Southern moderates who took their name from the 19th Century Mississippi statesman who, although once an ardent secessionist, devoted his later life to working for racial and regional reconciliation.

Inevitably the book invites comparison to another volume of essays which appeared in 1930 entitled *I'll Take My Stand,* a pastoral idyll which extolled the virtues of Southern agrarianism and sounded the call to resist the evils of industrialization and urbanization which had corrupted the human spirit in the North. While penetrating in its perception, the book nevertheless revealed an astonishing blindness to the reality that, for better or worse, the South of the future would be an urban society.

By contrast, *You Can't Eat Magnolias* is ruthlessly honest about the Southern past and the future as well. Its purpose is to chart the course for a South that will eliminate and rectify sins that have been visited upon far too many generations, and at the same time to preserve those traditions that have been exemplary—in the words of Brandy Ayers, "a manner of life which stresses courtesy, neighborliness, and community over the ruthless competition of the lonely crowd."

The South has a long tradition of producing prophets who mirror Southern society with brutal reality—men like W. J. Cash, William Faulkner, and Robert Penn Warren.

These prophecies, for the most part, have been pessimistic. Typically, Cash wrote in 1941: "So far from being modernized, in many ways it (the South) has actually always marched away, as to this day it continues to do, from the present toward the past." (Cash, a towering figure in Southern history, killed himself not long after writing his incomparable *Mind Of The South.*)

You Can't Eat Magnolias, fits well into the tradition of Southern prophecy, but what makes this volume unique is its guarded and realistic optimism—as opposed to the uncritical optimism of the 1960's—and a firm conviction that with proper leadership, the South can be carried into a humane new era in which we avoid the mistakes of the North, put aside the myths and vices which have shackled us, and yet preserve and nurture the old virtues which have given the region its unique identity.

Mr. Jenkins, a Nieman Fellow in the class of 1965, is Editor of the Editorial Page of the Alabama Journal.

The press is a sort of wild animal in our midst—restless, gigantic, always seeking new ways to use its strength. . . . The sovereign press for the most part acknowledges accountability to no one except its owners and publishers.

—Zechariah Chafee, Jr.
The Press Under Pressure
[Nieman Reports, April 1948]

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

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

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

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