Nieman Reports

March 1968

To Speak One's Mind

John S. Knight

Society's Lonesome End

Wes Gallagher

The Isle is Full of Noises

Sir William Haley

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXII, NO. 1 MARCH 1968

Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

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

Izzy Stone is a Rare Bird

By Louis M. Lyons

In a Time of Torment

By I. F. Stone

Random House, N.Y. 463 pp. $7.95

With all our mass media and syndication, the day of personal journalism is not dead—not quite. Nor is its modern equivalent the syndicated columnist. In an earlier day of the columnist, when Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson began contributing individual viewpoints to editorial pages, often at variance with their policy, it was said that the columnist had revived the personal journalism of the old time editor who carried his policy in his hat and expressed the mood in which he got out of bed in the morning. But since Lippmann the column itself has become increasingly a stereotype. The reader can classify and label it—Buckley, right wing; Alsop, pro war; McGill, civil rights; Kempton, liberal; and so on.

There may be exceptions. But for the most part the nationally syndicated columnist is limited to certain few nationally accepted topics. He deals either with the policy and performance of the national administration, or at another level with the celebrity whose private life is public game.

One has to look elsewhere for the rare examples of personal journalism. *Cervi's Journal* in Denver is so personal in its views and so uninhibited that one assumes Gene Cervi writes it all himself. It is by no means restricted to the main lines of the daily news headlines but it has its solid following. The *Carolina Israelite* is of course the personal philosophy of Harry Golden, pronouncing provocative comment on such matters as he finds worth mulling over. Ronnie Dugger's *Texas Observer* is still another type of personal journal, almost a one-man production that provides form and focus for such liberal thought and program as that imperial State contains. It deals wholly with the concerns of Texas in terms of those who are concerned about them. Naturally its circulation is small. But its influence in bringing some cohesion to these concerns is not small.

A very special form of personal journalism is *I. F. Stone's Weekly*. Izzy Stone is a very rare bird, an utterly independent mind, with a radical outlook, a can-opener capacity to get to the bottom of things, who writes with the sharp-edged style of a barbed critic. He is absolutely informed on those vital national affairs that he delves into, and totally disrespectful to whatever powers or bureaucrats are covering up what he can dig out.

He had 20 years as a hard digging Washington correspondent behind him when he launched his Weekly in 1953. He owns it, runs it, is beholden to no one but his readers. He'll assign himself to go to Vietnam or Israel or the Dominican Republic to get the story straight, though most of his time is spent evaluating what is going on in Washington and what it adds up to.

In the raucous New Deal days when he was on the New Dealish *New York Post,* Izzy covered the State Department and it was nothing rare for Secretary Cordell Hull to open a press conference by pointing a wavering finger at Izzy and denouncing what Stone had written the day before. This had no perceptible effect on what he would write next day. Though he spent more time digging news than anyone else could cram into a day, he always had time for an argument, over coffee or beer, and his adversary was apt

(Continued on page 25)

To Speak One's Mind

By John S. Knight

Mr. Knight, editorial chairman of Knight Newspapers, Inc., delivered this speech in Phoenix in acceptance of the John Peter Zenger Award presented by the University of Arizona.

The roll of past recipients of the John Peter Zenger Award is a distinguished one, reflecting credit not only upon them but upon the University of Arizona.

I am proud indeed to be similarly honored this year.

May I give expression to the hope that the Award is in recognition not only of my labors during 1967 but of previous years as well.

For the struggle in behalf of a free and responsible press, as indicated by the name of the Award itself, is a never-ending battle. It is, as Andrew Hamilton said in his defense of John Peter Zenger, a cause to secure "the liberty both of exposing and opposing arbitrary power by speaking and writing the truth."

Many of us, including three distinguished Arizonians—Eugene C. Pulliam, William R. Mathews, and J. Edward Murray—have endeavored in our respective ways to uphold and defend the freedom of expression. And, even more importantly—to employ our Constitutionally guaranteed freedoms in behalf of the general welfare rather than merely talking about them at gatherings of the Fourth Estate.

Today's newspapermen—at least in this country—do not face the governmental dangers of John Peter Zenger. He was tried for sedition. But newspapermen since, and to this present day, are found guilty of contempt of court for refusal to divulge the name of a news source and, like Zenger, are subject to imprisonment upon conviction. Further, the difficulties of their assignments—of "exposing and opposing arbitrary power by speaking and writing the truth"—are infinitely greater today.

A 24-hour budget of news is overwhelming, more perhaps than the human mind can comprehend. The Washington correspondent, whose responsibility it is to examine the workings of the Great Society, must also produce a news report which makes this phantasmagoria capable of being understood by his readers.

According to the Associated Press, our government's public relations and informed programs cost taxpayers about $425 million a year. This is more than is spent annually by the Congress and the Judiciary. And more than double the combined outlay for newsgathering by the two major U.S. news services, the three major television networks and the 10 largest American newspapers.

So when the White House complains about adverse stories in our press—notably about Vietnam—let us remember that the press carries five times as much of the government's views as are presented by the administration's critics. The sheer bulk of this material—all news and which must be carried as such—is overwhelming.

State and local reporting is somewhat less complicated. Yet the proliferation of new agencies needed to cope and cooperate with their federal counterparts is testing the ingenuity and resourcefulness of every editor dedicated to informative and responsible news coverage.

Moreover, as James Reston pointed out to you four years ago, this nation is undergoing a set of social revolutions, each one as significant to the future as the Industrial Revolution itself.

We are still witnessing the revolution of automation, which so far has defied the soothsayers of doom and despair by creating more jobs than it has destroyed. A diminishing number of union leaders—notably those in the business of producing newspapers—and with their eyes fixed intently upon the past, are still resisting its inevitability.

This is only one of the revolutions we are undergoing, each one interwoven with each other—The revolution on the farm where 26 ears of corn grow on land where only one grew three decades ago, the revolution not of civil rights but of rising demands and expectations, and the demographic revolution which saw our population pass 200 million two months ago and which has created a new generation in danger of being left behind because we do not, as the Red Queen told Alice, run fast enough to stay even.

All of these revolutions are meeting in the cities, where the technologically unemployed farmer, the Negro demanding his fair place in the affluent society and the youngster are competing for jobs for which they are largely unprepared. And it is in the cities of course where the newspapers are.

Thus the role of the newspaper, despite the growth of electronic media, is not diminishing.

To the contrary, no other medium can treat these stories so exhaustively and effectively. Provided, of course, that editors accept the challenge and substitute "will" for "can."

Possibly because of this growing importance of news, we in this business find ourselves being subjected to detailed scrutiny. We have been weighed and found wanting by everyone from the Man in Charge, who finds us high in calories and low in conscience, as Arthur Krock put it a few years ago, to the man in the street, who wonders why there is such a credibility gap between the press and the President. And he wonders, when he is told hard and unpleasant facts about America's involvement with Vietnam, why he has not heard these facts before.

The blame, I suggest, lies both with the press and with the President. The press as well as the public is too inclined to forget, so long as all is going well, that, as Rep. John Moss said a few years ago, "Management of the news has always existed in government at all levels, just as it exists in every private business. Everybody wants to put out information in a way to show his actions in the best possible light." It is only when events are not going so well that we do sit up and take notice.

To the President and the loyal Sancho Panzas of his administration, they are living in a war; they think in terms of war, and mold their actions to a mood of war. And when the concern is legitimate, I cannot begrudge him. But we of the now aroused press must object when, in his efforts to put himself in the best possible light, the President forgets his responsibility to the people. They are the ones who hired him. He owes them an honest accounting of his stewardship.

It is one thing to hide vital facts which Hanoi, Peking or the Vietcong don't know, and another thing entirely to misinform the people when it serves no security purpose.

And it is totally inexcusable to lie to the people about matters which are of their utmost concern, and about which the enemy already knows the full truth. Yet the hard fact is that in trying to put itself in the best possible light, this administration has resorted to distortions of fact and half-truths of history.

Let me give a few examples, some culled from my recent visit to Vietnam and others from doing my homework which, I suspect, has kept me from suffering the same fate as George Romney—being brainwashed.

Secretary Rusk and other administration spokesmen justify our involvement in Southeast Asia on the ground that we have entered into sacred commitments which must be honored.

One of the "commitments" most frequently mentioned is the Eisenhower offer of aid to Premier Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954. Yet the American people are not told that it was conditioned on the expectation that "this aid will be met by performance on the part of the government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

More than 13 years later, as I saw, these reforms are still largely in the talking stage.

The President is fond of alluding to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, which included South Vietnam as a protocol state, as a "solemn commitment." Yet the treaty required the parties thereto to "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." The United States is in violation of that requirement.

Furthermore, in the event of subversion, we were obliged only to "consult immediately" with the other signatories on what procedures to follow. In case of aggression, members of SEATO were to "act to meet the danger in accordance with constitutional processes." This provision was ignored by the United States.

France, Great Britain and Pakistan refused to become involved and the remaining signatories have given only token support to the United States war effort. Yet our government would have us believe that we are in Vietnam

because "we always live up to our commitments." What commitments, indeed?

When you add to this distorted view of history the long list of optimistic and uninformed pronouncements on Vietnam from Gen. Paul Harkins, Henry Cabot Lodge, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Adm. Harry Felt and Defense Secretary McNamara, can there be any question but that the American people have been denied the truth?

Were they ever told, until Dean Rusk's speech of last October, that containment of Red China is our real objective? And when the Defense Secretary's press officer publicly proclaims that the government has the right to lie, how much confidence can we have in government?

We should be thankful that the best U.S. reporters in South Vietnam have never succumbed to the blandishments of either the Saigon government or our own State Department. No amount of attempted brainwashing has softened their determination to bring the truth to the American people or at least to such segments of our population as come within their newspapers' areas of circulation.

Specifically, I mention R. W. Apple of the New York Times, Malcolm W. Browne and David Halberstam who shared the 1964 Pulitzer Award for International Reporting, Neil Sheehan, then of the UPI, Peter Arnett of the Associated Press, Don Oberdorfer of the Knight Newspapers, Raymond Coffee of the Chicago Daily News and Mark Ethridge, Jr. of the Detroit Free Press as exemplars of truthful reporting from South Vietnam.

This list is certainly not all inclusive, but these and other able correspondents have put aside the feature and color stories, so popular in some quarters, to bring us coverage in depth and substance.

The uneasy accommodation between President Thieu and Vice President Ky, absence of press freedom and suspension of newspapers in Saigon despite pious reassurances from the government, the storm trooper tactics of Brig. Gen. Nguyen Ngoc Loan, chief of the National Police, graft and corruption among high officials, painfully slow progress in the pacification program, poor performance by the South Vietnamese army, the rising tide of anti-Americanism—these are a few of the headlines.

Yes, we can be proud indeed that our newspapers and press associations are not failing in their rightful mission to South Vietnam, namely to bring us the truth. The unpopularity of our top correspondents with both governments in Saigon—the Thieu-Ky regime and the United States—is a tribute to their skills and dedication.

Upon entering this fateful year, the role of newspapers is vastly more important than ever before. As the politician uses his purchased air for his understandably one-sided argument, the importance of print grows. The voters of 1968 need the permanence of print for reference and reflection. They need to be able to reread the arguments as they always have done.

This is merely age-old "instant replay," recently discovered by television. But the second time around it drifts off into the air just like the first, while print remains. Our obligation is to provide the voters with fair, honest, all-sided, clear presentation of campaign news. They need the sharp illumination of your own editorials and the pungent, uninhibited viewpoints of your readers.

If it is possible to put labels on syndicated columnists, the readers would benefit if warned of their political or other persuasions. These journalists are now choosing up sides and the number of "house columnists" is—sad to relate—increasing in number.

How well will we do our job in 1968? Certainly, we have improved over the years. There is no longer a political press in the sense of slanted news, although we still catch hell from all sides. Some retired editors, professors of journalism and the Bagdikian types who write for money will peck away as always.

My own view is that our newspapers have shown vast improvement in the past several years, including specialization in science, economics, medicine, problems of the urban society, religion, politics, labor and business reporting.

Yet our editorial pages in the one-newspaper cities—with notable exceptions—strike me as being much too bland. In editorials written on top of the news, there is a tendency to accept governmental and other pronouncements as fact without subjecting them to hard examination and thoughtful analysis.

I do not underestimate the need for urgency on those occasions when the newspaper's voice must be heard either to avert or compose a crisis. But too often, I fear, the editorial writer overemphasizes the importance of timeliness. Thus we read editorials which are merely reflections of official policy statements and indicate approval of something that needs to be questioned.

As Mark Ethridge used to say, "I like an editor with fire in his guts."

For how else can the public interest be protected? Who will expose grafting public officials? Who will challenge the Reardon Report and resist the bar association's intent upon the supression of news?

Who can demand that public business be transacted in the open and not behind closed doors?

Who will fight extravagance and waste at all levels of government? Who can lay bare the land frauds?

Who will see that justice is done when citizens accused of wrongdoing are convicted on insufficient or rigged evidence?

Who, I say, but the newspaper editor with the courage to back his staff?

Too many of our smaller newspapers, unable to compete with metropolitan dailies in comprehensive news coverage,

have abdicated their responsibilities in the area of editorial opinion.

"Responsibilities" may be too strong a term since there is no public obligation to have any opinions whatsoever.

So let us refer to the opportunity that is being lost—to speak one's mind—the glorious right to be wrong. Even the smallest newspaper can have an editor or publisher with strong convictions. What he has to say will have high readership; either "the old man hit it right that time," or "that guy must think he's Walter Lippmann."

Either way, opinion gives personality and flavor to the newspaper. The late William Allen White of the Emporia Gazette was heard throughout the nation; two North Carolina weekly editors risked economic loss and even their lives by fighting the Ku Klux Klan. Both editors were honored with a Pulitzer Award.

And you have recognized with the John Peter Zenger Award our beloved J. N. Heiskell of Little Rock, who on the for side of 80 chanced everything he had built by standing by his principles.

All of us cannot aspire to be William Allen Whites or "Ned" Heiskells. But we do, I hope, have opinions and the ability to get them into print.

For, as political scientist and social philosopher Leo Rosten has said: "The purpose of life is not to be happy but to matter, to be productive, to be useful, to have it make some difference that you have lived at all."

It is not the fortunate lot of every politician to be able to speak the truth, for as Henrik Ibsen has written: "The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us is the compact majority."

We, as editors and publishers and newspapermen, are under no such inhibition. In this country, today's compact majorities have a way of becoming tomorrow's fragmented minorities.

If there are those among us who have never joined the crusade for truth nor tasted the blood of a bureaucrat, I counsel you to begin exposing and opposing the exercise of arbitrary power, now at its zenith in this nation.

You may even come to enjoy it.

We derive true inspiration from the life of John Peter Zenger. If not a happy man, at least he did matter. And it did make some difference that he lived at all.

The Trial of John Peter Zenger established truth as the historical defense against libel.

To be presented with an Award bearing his name is an honor which comes to few men.

Though I may be less than deserving, it lifts my spirits and strengthens my resolution to always defend and uphold the finest principles of our profession.

The Isle is Full of Noises

By Sir William Haley

Sir William Haley is editor in chief of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. These are excerpts from a speech at the University of Chicago.

I propose to discuss the question how opinion is formed and culture is influenced in Britain.

I think that the two things, opinion and culture, can be said to go together. Public opinion in some of its manifestations can be a form of culture. The condition of a nation's culture can influence its climate of opinion.

My credentials for dealing with this subject are that I have worked in Britain for thirty-five years as a journalist. Twenty-one of those years were spent in the north of England in charge of an evening newspaper in Manchester. The remaining fourteen years I was Editor of *The Times* (so often wrongly called *The London Times*). And for a spell of nine years between these two posts I was Director General of the British Broadcasting Corporation which, during the whole of that period, had a monopoly of radio and television in Britain.

During all those forty-four years I have been as active in trying to stimulate public interest in the arts as I have been in maintaining an open field for the expression of public opinion.

I hope it will be convenient to you if I take the subject under three headings. They are:

1. The main factors forming and influencing opinion and culture in Britain;
2. How far, under Britain's kind of democracy, opinion and culture can be free from restraints and inhibitions;
3. How public opinion and culture have developed in Britain in the last fifty years.

You will notice that into each of these headings I have brought the qualifying word "Britain." In doing so, I introduce my main theme.

One of the things that has fascinated me increasingly throughout my working life is the way in which physical factors influence what should be aesthetic judgments. I will give you two examples of what I mean.

Some years ago I delivered a lecture to the English Association in London in which I showed how in the course of a century and a half the size of *The Times,* as expressed in the amount of space the editorial staff had had to fill, had affected not only the treatment of news and editorials but also the language in which they were written. (When in early Victorian days the size of the paper leapt overnight from a regular eight pages to a regular twelve pages the effect on *The Times*'s style was at first deplorable.)

Similarly if, some generations hence, a musical historian should try to assess musical taste in Britain in the 1940s and the 1950s by the frequency with which the works of certain classical composers were then played, he could be hopelessly wrong. The choice in many cases had nothing to do with musical taste. It was simply that the works then

performed required the size of orchestras that could most conveniently be fitted into the concert halls available after a bombing war.

Now the greatest and most enduring of all physical factors is geography. The cardinal point always to be remembered about the British is that they are a nation of 54 million people living on a small island—an island that could comfortably be fitted into the state of Wyoming.

This has many consequences. One is that while the same economic pressures are forcing newspaper ownerships towards monopoly in both the United States and Britain, the kinds of monopoly growing up on the opposite sides of the Atlantic are very different.

In the United States—a vast continent—there are now said to be over 1450 cities whose inhabitants see only one paper. In Britain—a tightly packed little island—over 50 per cent of all morning and evening newspaper sales is now in three hands. But the British reader, no matter where he may be in the island, still has a choice of nine national newspapers each morning.

I would say that the British pattern is healthier for the democratic process than is the American. I must at the same time point out that the effect upon British newspapers of this state of affairs has been great. With over 15 million homes within reach of each national newspaper, the goal of a 10 million sale for one of them remains a kind of Shangri-la. It has subconsciously, in some cases even consciously, influenced the contents and levels of some newspapers. All nations, whatever the state of their educational and material development, are cultural pyramids with very broad and appallingly low bases. The larger the slice of the pyramid you want for your circulation the further down you have to go.

This analogy also holds good in the fields of entertainment, particularly in television. And however unwelcome the idea may be to intellectuals, popular entertainment has its effect on a nation's culture.

On the other side of the medal, I would now like to put to you the uniting effect that Britain's island geography has on information, politics, and the climate of opinion.

Sir Ivor Jennings, a great English constitutional authority, pointed out many years ago that the ultimate power in Britain is public opinion. That is true not only in theory but also in practice. Because Britain's 54 million people jostle together in so small a space, the whole country is a single Agora, and an Agora with one unchanging focal point. No matter what controversy may arise, whether it involves the rights of nations or the wrongs of an individual, whether it concerns politics, religion, industrial relations, health, morals, manners, the certainty is that it will end up as a dogfight in the House of Commons one afternoon. And by the next afternoon at the latest every pub and club in the country will have a shrewd idea of the merits of the argument and which side had the better of it.

Paradoxically, while this gives the impression abroad of the British as a hopelessly divided nation, it is at home a source of unity and strength. Seen from overseas the British seem to be a nation endlessly arguing and wrangling and grumbling and discussing—in agreement on almost no single issue. The isle is indeed full of noises. It has to be pointed out to foreign observers that this is merely British democracy in action—the Agora in permanent session.

The fact that almost all the newspapers throughout the country, together with radio and television, are simultaneously discussing the same issues, however trivial, does make for national unity. And when the whole British nation celebrates some solemn or ceremonial occasion, such as a Churchill funeral or a coronation, the foreigner cannot but marvel.

Among a people that can express its moods so strongly and so nationally, the final master is still public opinion. Governments are given license; they exceed it at their peril. And the climate of opinion is governed by the state of the nation as a whole.

I will now mention a factor, peculiar to Britain, which is divisive. This is not the class structure. It is true that in Britain, as in every other country, opinion and culture are conditioned by class structure. But it is ridiculous to make out that, even in the English speaking world, Britain is the only class-conscious country left. There are plenty of others with divisions just as marked.

What is peculiar to Britain is that there the divisions find expression in the way men and women speak. Not so much in the words they use—radio and television have given a wider vocabulary to all—but in their accents. (It would be an interesting sociological exercise to try to determine why Broadcasting has not affected these.)

It may seem far-fetched to place much weight on class accents. The spread of university education may in due course break down these phonetic divisions. There is little sign of this happening at present. In fact one of the most revealing discoveries is that young men and women who go to the universities from working class homes soon speak there in the same way as other undergraduates—and revert to their old accents the moment they return home on vacation, or permanently. They seem to be afraid of appearing "superior" if they do not, and of being isolated in their family and other circles.

That this is one of the factors preventing our political divisions from ceasing to be class divisions I am certain. The effect on our British literature, on drama, on mass entertainment is also important. The rise of kitchen sink drama and of comedy from the lower depths can be related to it.

In this connection I must mention a major development,

the eventual effect of which cannot be foreseen. This is the vastly increased spending power in the hands of young people. Along with it goes the fact that, for the first time in our history, young people in Britain demand that their entertainment shall be provided by performers in their own age group. The present effect on so-called culture is marked. And now that changes in the life cycle are being acknowledged, and that eighteen year olds will soon be able to vote and to marry without parental consent, the effect on the formation of public opinion may become marked also.

Other factors influencing opinion and culture in Britain I can deal with summarily.

First I must mention formal education. You may be surprised I have not dealt with it more prominently. I think it has been in too much of a state of political flux to have had any powerful coherent influence.

The churches now have little influence in England, more in Scotland and Wales.

The changing nature of Britain's population—notably the large influx from the Commonwealth—has as yet had little effect; nowhere near as much as the European influx in the nineteenth century, or the rush of refugees from Hitler's Europe had thirty to thirty-five years ago.

The weekly periodicals such as *The Economist, The New Statesman, New Society,* and *The Times Literary Supplement* still have an influence. As they are addressing the critical classes, that influence is healthily geared to the degree to which they manage to maintain their quality.

The influence of the Press in public affairs is much more important than that of television. The popular press, being less dominated by egomaniacs than it once was, has recovered influence. The political influence of the serious papers is being exerted in new ways and is still great. The influence of the press as a whole on culture is more widespread than ever it was.

The influence of the old "radical north" of England is no more. The north is now no more radical than the rest of Britain. And it has lost its distinctive voice.

One of the most interesting changes in influence affects the United States more than Britain. For nearly two generations, glossy Hollywood films, no matter how brilliantly directed, made what was taken to be the opulent American way of life distasteful to British eyes. Whatever anti-Americanism there was, this was the underlying cause of much of it. Today American domestic serials shown on British television screens are depicting a kindly, homely, friendly way of life that makes the picture of American society more congenial.

While I am dealing with my second heading—"How far, under Britain's form of democracy, opinion and culture can be free from restraints and inhibitions"—I would ask you to bear in mind that inevitably many of the factors I have already mentioned play their part here also.

For instance, the fact that the geography of Britain helps to maintain a healthy strength in public opinion can also make that strength unhealthy—if public opinion becomes harsh, restrictionist, or illiberal. Over a hundred years ago John Stuart Mill foresaw that the establishing of democracy would necessitate safeguards against the tyranny of the majority.

Fortunately Britain has one strong safeguard. I call it "the backwash." It, too, is effective because Britain is a small island.

To most new departures, whether they be in national affairs, religion, or culture, the first reactions are generally illiberal. The changes are disliked. Cries of danger are heard. Charges of corruption and bad taste are made. Denunciatory letters are written. Repression or censorship is demanded. To begin with, hardly a word is said from the other side.

Then when the campaign seems on the point of getting dangerously near succeeding, the progressives, freedom lovers, free speechers, liberals—call them what you will—suddenly take alarm. They become vocal. There is an even greater backwash. It generally overwhelms the illiberal or restrictionist tendencies. I must make it clear the backwash is not necessarily in support of the innovation; what it insists is that the matter be given a trial.

Another factor helping to keep the restrainers at bay is the generally healthy—but occasionally very unhealthy—British love of compromise. This has not only grown in the past half century but has also become more explicit. For this the credit should be given to the B.B.C.'s original discussion programmes. They brought a change in the manners of private and public controversy. They led the public to suspect the conclusion of any issue in which both sides had not been fully stated. And the way in which "dangerous works" of the not so distant past have now entered the accepted canon of print or performance has caused people to become chary of condemning new works that even to the liberally-minded may seem pernicious.

Artistically, culturally, morally, politically, the British have thrown off many old taboos. The Lord Chamberlain is soon to cease to be censor of stage plays—with his wholehearted approval. Whether or not one agrees with the conclusion that there was no harm to morals in publishing *Lady Chatterley's Lover* completely unexpurgated, the significant thing is that a jury of nine English men and three English women gave that verdict.

It seems more and more likely that future prosecutions against books will only be private ones.

Things are seen on television which would have scandalized the greater part of the nation even twenty years ago. At the moment most of them arouse only muted comment.

As I have said, many liberally minded people, fully in

favor of experiment and progress, feel all this has gone too far. More of the nation may come to the same conclusion. The climate of opinion may change. I cannot say. The point I want to make is that there is in Britain a real and continuing climate subject to change—and capable of making itself felt. At the moment restraints and inhibitions are few. The barriers are down. No one can be sure they will never be put up again.

In considering restraining influences and inhibitory factors one must not overlook the law. It may seem contradictory to do so after what I have said about the verdict in the case of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. But that was a decision made by laymen—the jurors—not the lawyers.

I do not know enough to generalize about lawyers whatever their nationality. I would say in passing, however, that while Britain may gain many advantages from not having a written constitution, she incurs one great disadvantage. That is that the Law Lords are hardly ever called upon, as the United States Supreme Court is, to redefine in the light of changing circumstances from generation to generation such abstractions as freedom, tolerance, individual rights, and so on.

Occasionally some Law Lords do attempt to use a particular case to state the thesis that the law must move with the times. And recently there has been a weakening of the old, nearly cast-iron rule that the Law Lords were bound by precedent. But whatever the changed conditions of society, the respect for legal precedent remains. And taken as a whole British judges and barristers and solicitors are restrictively minded.

That this should be more in evidence in matters of information and politics than in those of culture is natural. The law in its higher reaches is much more concerned with affairs than with art. It is, I think, not without significance that the agitation to deny British newspapers the right to report criminal proceedings in the magistrates' courts—that is, the lower courts—came largely from the legal profession. It is solicitors (and some barristers) who have tried recurringly—and, thank goodness, so far unsuccessfully—to have Parliament take away the newspapers' right to give details of personal estates and wills when people are dead. It is the increasingly harsh interpretation by the courts of the laws of libel—and the subconscious hankering of juries to regard libel damages as a means of capital redistribution—that has now brought the threat of libel to the point where it can act seriously against the public interest.

Recognition of this fact is growing. The response at a meeting which Lord Shawcross (a former Attorney General), Lord Tangley (a former President of the Law Society), Mr. St. John Stevas (a member of Parliament), and I addressed in London last year to start a movement for some modification of the law of libel was favorable. It is true that a debate soon after in the House of Lords showed Parliament to be still unsympathetic. But in Britain these things take time. The leaven is beginning to work. The day will come when public opinion will see the dangers and enforce a change.

This brings us to Parliament itself. It is the final arbiter. As has been pointed out more than once—and it can be a frightening thought—no British citizen is ultimately safe against a majority of one in the House of Commons. Historians have written with pride of the wonderful flexibility of the British Parliament, as shown by the fact that in one day at the beginning of September 1939 it was possible to deprive every British citizen of what had seemed inalienable rights, so as to ensure the full, vigorous, and successful waging of the war against Hitler. In those circumstances such an occasion can be well described as one of Parliament's finest hours. In other circumstances it could be its worst.

Taken as a whole British Parliaments of modern times have instinctively been on the side of freedom of expression. It is true that where comment on their own conduct has been concerned some members have been inclined to raise the cry of Privilege to a ridiculous extent. What matters is that the press and the public, and the corporate good sense of the House of Commons, have recognized that such claims of Privilege—which in effect would, if successful, have been a form of censorship—*were* ridiculous.

It should also be recorded that Parliament has been more forthright than the Press about the rights of newspaper editors to criticize judgments and judges. Uncertainty of the outcome, and the increasing penalties against newspapers found guilty of libel, have caused many Editors to have an unhealthy respect for the law of contempt of court. It has been pointed out in Parliament that, so long as a Judge's motives are not impugned, his decisions as a judge are open to fair comment. And a few months ago the Attorney General restated in the House of Commons the fact that comment on cases was permissible after a verdict and before an appeal.

These are examples of how the law can seem to become restrictionist without meaning to be. Parliament too can be a victim of the same unfairness. Things can go wrong inadvertently. An interesting example of this was the so-called "rule" banning broadcast discussion about matters before Parliament. It is instructive to see how it came about.

One evening in 1944 a Cabinet Minister was put on the air to broadcast in favor of a bill to be debated in the House of Commons the next day. Because it was war-time, the B.B.C. accepted the broadcast. They did so with misgiving. Reflection convinced the Governors the broadcast had been a departure from the B.B.C.'s strict rule of impartiality.

At the same time the Governors of the B.B.C. felt this was a weak case to fight. The Bill was a good one. It came from an all-Party Government. No immediate harm had been done. The danger lay only in the precedent. They attempted—as G. K. Chesterton's general did when he fought a battle to hide a corpse—to undertake a blanketing operation. They decreed that no controversial reference should be broadcast to any matter while it was before Parliament. This excluded everyone, the occasional Minister and the regular commentator.

For the rest of the war the matter lay dormant. Winston Churchill's national government was in office. There was no controversial political broadcasting. But as soon as the coalition broke up in 1945, the rule became embarrassing. It was soon realized that a bill could be "before Parliament"—that is from first introduction to Royal assent—for close on two years. Silence for so long was clearly impossible. After anxious reappraisal the Governors limited the ban to fourteen days before a debate.

Slowly the so-called "fourteen day rule" became a target for informed criticism. Later the criticism became general. Eventually the B.B.C.—and Parliament which, while it had not engendered the "rule," had found it convenient, and had become accustomed to it—were forced to abandon it. Now discussion has no time limits. And the instructive fact here is that it was unorganized opinion and no vested interest within the State that brought about the change.

A last restraint I must mention is the D notice system. This is the system whereby British editors are officially advised on what defense and other information should not be published because of the risk to national security. It has been prominently in the news this year. The wisdom of having such a system has been challenged both in Britain and by American journalists who have visited Britain.

The first thing to be said about D notices is that their nature is often misunderstood. They are advisory, not mandatory. Even during the war—from the first day to the last—there was no official censorship of the British Press. It is true there were censors. It is true newspaper stories were often submitted to them. It is true the censors expressed views about the stories. Every editor was free to disregard those views if he wished. There were occasions when editors did ignore them. Nothing happened. To disregard the censor's advice was no offense. All that mattered was whether the nation had been imperilled, and only the Courts could decide that.

After the war, the whole structure was demolished. But soon it was clear universal peace had not arrived. There were potential new enemies. And in peacetime what should and should not be kept secret was not so self-apparent.

So the present D notice system was established. Its authority is not the Government as a whole, or the Ministry of Defence, or any individual Service. It is a committee on which the Press, the News Agencies, Television, and Radio have two-thirds of the membership. No D notice can be issued without this committee's agreement. And the notices they do authorise can be, and on occasion have been, disregarded by editors with impunity.

It seems to me the D notice system presents a choice of dangers. Admittedly the system might be misused. There have been occasions when people have wanted to misuse it. Against them there are two barriers—first, the D Notice committee without whose sanction no notice can be issued; second, the editors of all the newspapers, each one of whom is free to use his own judgment. And, as Lord Radcliffe said in the House of Lords last July, every Editor should have a healthy suspicion of Government.

The alternative danger is that secrets imperilling the safety of Britain may innocently be published. No responsible editor would want to do this. He is likely to publish more information rather than less if he is given guidance that he trusts. And such guidance openly given to all editors by a body containing a majority of their own representatives is surely preferable to private representations made by Cabinet ministers or the Services, which would be clandestine and not capable of being openly challenged.

I think this D notice system provides genuine freedom within a practical framework. Recent events have shown it can cause political explosions. But at any rate they are out in the open, with all the people free to make up their own minds about them.

What answers I can offer to the third and final question we are considering—how public opinion and culture have developed in Britain in the last fifty years—will, I hope, provide a natural summing-up.

First, it is necessary to draw a distinction between the development in the expression of opinion, and the development of the opinions themselves. Ever since, as a youth, I read John Stuart Mill's essay "On Liberty," I have devoted myself to fighting for freedom of expression and discussion. Many of the views now current, some of them held by the vast majority of my countrymen, I deplore. They worry me. I should be far more worried if either legal, political, or social taboos prevented men and women who honestly hold such views from declaring them, or from trying to convert me and others to their way of thinking. The search for truth is endless. I have been attacked for saying this because it implies no man has yet found truth. I do not believe that, in the largest sense of the word, any man ever has.

In this matter of searching for truth, whether it be in politics, in religion, in morals, or in social questions, Britain has made immense strides in the past fifty years. There is an outspokenness, an eagerness for debate, and a tolerance in debate, that were unthinkable in Edwardian days. Moreover, they are not confined to the politicians or the

intellectuals. The mood is spread through the whole nation.

One must admit at the same time that there is a paradox. British hatred of censorship in every form is now more vigorous and more widespread than at any time in our history. It would almost seem as if nothing is taboo. Let a suspicion of suppression raise its ugly head, then press and public will denounce it. Yet in spite of all this, public insistence on the right to know is not yet as strong in Britain as it is in America. It is growing, but it has a long way to grow. If dogs bark, people are ready to take notice. If dogs sleep, people prefer to let them go on doing so. British love of pragmatism endures. It makes for a quieter life to tackle no problem until it can no longer be avoided.

It is always dangerous to be dogmatic about national attitudes. There are occasions when nations surprise even themselves. I do not think, however, it is fanciful to see in Britain's post-war mood a continuing inconsistency.

This inconsistency is not surprising. Few nations can have gone through so great a change in so short a time with so little turmoil. I am not referring solely, or even primarily, to the social revolution. I am referring to Britain's status as a world power. I do not know whether, fifty years ago, Britain was still the greatest power in the world or not. These things are impossible to measure. I do know that when I was a boy the British navy was still on a two power standard, and the freedom of the seas was still in her keeping. Today she cannot command even one ocean.

This changed status has led to two moods—and they conflict. On the one hand there is a fear of too great involvement—on any nation's part—and from that comes a hankering after the status quo nationally and internationally, no matter what it may be. To many it seems the surest way to a quiet life. From such people, "Why bring *that* up?" is a constant reaction. Such opinion—so long as no clouds are on the horizon—tends to be complacent, unquestioning, conformist. If we have lost our power, let us at least enjoy the loss of its attendant responsibilities also.

On the other hand, there is the other part of the nation to whom Britain's changed status has brought no such assurance. The old foundations and bulwarks—of armed might, of society, of opinions, of belief—have gone. They must be replaced. Such people show an eagerness to experiment, a readiness to challenge any convention, a desire for the most thorough-going break with the past.

I remember how for a brief period after the 1939-45 war, many politicians believed Britain's future could be bound up with Africa's. The belief faded. Then for a time there was the cry that for her former military and industrial power Britain could substitute moral leadership. That died out also. Then research became a shibboleth, to be succeeded by that of technological development. Now we have Europe and the Common Market, on the altar of which we are going to lay the sacrifice of our coinage and our use of Greenwich time.

I mention these things as evidence only, not with favour or disfavour. The two points I would make about them are that they can be paralleled in every walk of British life. (The way in which some of them have been exported, even to the United States, shows that they are symptomatic of a wider uncertainty; in such cases what is British is their present extremism.)

The other point is that inherent national characteristics survive the headiest of ferments. There is reasonable hope that after all the excesses, the old virtues will emerge in new guise.

If my description of what has been happening is anywhere near true, then it follows that no clear dividing line can be drawn between the processes in opinion and those in culture. In literature, in drama, in music, in painting, in popular entertainment, there is the same suspension of the old canons, the same eagerness to try anything once, and the same broadening of the public interest in all these things from an elite of whatever class to the mass of the nation.

Where culture is concerned, broadcasting—I use that word to embrace both radio and television—can be seen as a creative agent much more than it can be in opinion, where it is largely a disseminating, and therefore a passive agent.

Much has been said about what the B.B.C. did to make the British a musically educated nation. There is no doubt that with the establishing of the Third Programme the British people were given access to the full repertoire of classical music on a scale no nation had ever approached before—or has done since. Nonetheless I believe there is a serious danger in overstating the gains. Is a nation of 54 million people musically educated if something like a million and a half of them comprise a large audience for the broadcast of a popular classical concert?

And this is an outsize figure from the heyday of unchallenged radio monopoly. (It can be argued that to enjoy a classical concert as presented on television is not to be musically educated at all).

It seems to me that what the B.B.C. did in drama was far more significant. For some years it broadcast a good middlebrow play every Saturday evening, till an audience of nine to eleven millions had been built up. Then, with careful calculation, it began to supplement these Saturday night middlebrow broadcasts with a rather less popular —or more difficult, call it what you will—play every Monday night. For this it gained an audience of about seven million people. Then after a further period of familiarisation, it broadcast every fourth Monday the greatest and most austere plays in the international repertoire. So successful were we that at one period we had an audience of 3,000,000 for "Hippolytus," 4,000,000 for "The Trojan

Women," and well over 5,000,000 for "John Gabriel Borkman."

I must confess that such audiences could not be gained in these days of competitive commercial television. (The reason I fought the introduction of commercial television was to keep broadcasting as an instrument of general education.) Nonetheless, the seeds were sown—the greatest plays and the greatest music were offered to the multitude, many of whom found they liked them.

And if the majority have since succumbed to what are now the inanities of all television, the remnant still provides a greater following in Britain than composers or playwrights have ever had before.

It does not seem to me fanciful to see in this massive bringing of plays of every description to the nation as a whole one of the origins of the present plethora of British playwrights. Playwrighting became an avocation in quarters where it had not hitherto been dreamed of. And British radio and television provided the newcomers with their first outlets.

I should add in passing that the Third Programme gave British radio an academic recognition it had previously lacked. Dons not only listened to it—they were among the most frequent broadcasters on it. This in turn influenced undergraduates. Unhappily the Third Programme is no longer the cultural force it once was. What its influence is now I do not know. The appearance of the younger generation of academics on television has, I think, led to an interesting cross-fertilization between them and Pop culture.

One of the very greatest educational influences on British thinking and culture during my lifetime has been Sir Allen Lane. By a careful progress similar to that of the B.B.C.'s, and an even greater maintenance of standards, he has gained for his Penguin and Pelican paperbacks a general public confidence. And the fact, for instance, that E. V. Rieu's translation of *The Odyssey,* which Sir Allen Lane published, has sold over 2,000,000 copies, and that Nevill Coghill's modernised edition of *The Canterbury Tales* may pass it, proves that Homer and Chaucer have, in Britain at any rate, now penetrated all classes. As for his Pelicans, no university can have put out such a body of knowledge on such a scale.

There are, of course, many developments in British culture and entertainment which do not seem so admirable. As Hooker said: "No change is made without inconvenience, even from worse to better." There is much we can —and should—condemn. Standards and values can go by default more easily than most other things. There is much we should be dubious about. Only time will show whether the older or the younger generation's opposing certainties will be justified. There are yet other manifestations we cannot understand. It is premature to say that, just because of this, they are all to be deplored.

What we can say is that fifty years of evolution—culminating in revolution—in the processes of forming public opinion and influencing culture in Britain find both at the moment more vigorous, more fecund, and less authoritarian than ever they have been before. There are many nations of which this cannot be said.

The swings of social change are long, slow, and uncertain. It would be foolish to be dogmatic about them. But I believe that in freedom of expression where opinion is concerned and in freedom of creation where culture is concerned the movement in Britain today is in the right direction. This is as much as we can reasonably ask. For the abiding lesson of History is surely that no society will ever be perfect.

The Newsman — Society's Lonesome End

By Wes Gallagher

Mr. Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press, delivered this speech at the Sigma Delta Chi National Convention in Minneapolis.

I would like to address my remarks to the younger journalists—those who will soon be leaving school. You will be the ones who will bear the responsibility for this profession in years to come.

I would like to touch on some of the broader aspects of our profession—namely, what can you expect when you leave school to become an editor or reporter.

Several years ago the Army football coach devised a new offense where one end stayed at an extreme side of the field and sometimes didn't even come to the huddle between plays. Sports writers dubbed him "the lonesome end." He was part of the team but remote from it. He was part of the action but divorced from it.

The first lonesome end was Cadet Bill Carpenter. He played his position perfectly and followed through in real life because he was decorated with the nation's second highest award for bravery. In Vietnam as a captain, he called down fire on his own position when it looked as though it would be overrun by the Viet Cong.

The image of the lonesome end in football was criticized —particularly in the middle of the week when the sports writers don't have anything else to write about. But Carpenter didn't worry about his image at West Point or in Vietnam.

I would like to draw some parallels between the lonesome end and the journalist.

Today, it is the newsman, the reporter, the editor who stands alone, separated from society but a vital part of it —divorced from the action but a recorder of it.

If the reporter writes about drug addiction he is charged with making it attractive to non-users. If he doesn't he is suppressing the news; if he writes about Negro Nationalists he is accused of writing about a tiny minority; if he doesn't he is told he is not reporting the true militancy of the Negro; if he writes of a military victory in Vietnam he is attacked by the doves; if he writes of the failure of the Vietnamese to clear their house of corruption he is attacked by the hawks; if he reports that the rapist was a six-feet four-inch Negro he is charged with stirring racial hatred; if he doesn't he is accused of misrepresenting the crime; if he reports that the Mets are strictly a dismal bunch of stumblebums he is against the new team in town; if he doesn't he is a publicity agent. And so it goes.

The newsman is the lonely end of society. From his position he looks at a strife-torn, controversial world which seems bent on its own destruction. He is in constant danger of losing his reportorial cool.

But the world has frequently seemed like this. For example, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair." Our times? Possibly, but this was written by Charles Dickens about the French Revolution.

And what about this? "We are unsettled to the fiery roots of our being. There isn't a human relation, whether of parent or child, husband and wife, worker and employer, that doesn't move in a strange situation. We are not used to this complicated civilization and don't know how to behave when personal contact and eternal authority have disappeared. There are no precedents to guide us, no wis-

dom that wasn't meant for a simpler age. We have changed our environment more quickly than we knew how to change ourselves." Who said it? Our good friend, Walter Lippmann. When? In 1914.

It is little wonder after writing this Cassandra-like prediction of the future 33 years ago that Walter today is hard pressed for adjectives to describe our present situation.

And what about youth—that much maligned group? "We live in a decadent age. Young people no longer respect their parents. They are rude and impatient. They inhabit taverns and have no self control." When did this evaluation take place? Six thousand years ago. It is the inscription on an Egyptian tomb.

Incidentally, those youth who think today's hippie philosophy of love and disdain for materialistic society is new might ponder this. "It is not love but booty this Iron Age applauds." Cicero in 56 B.C.

Now I am indebted to Bill Moyers for one more quotation. This is a report of a cabinet meeting. "The President was much inflamed and got into one of those passions when he cannot command himself, ran on much on the personal abuse which has been bestowed on him, defied any man on earth to produce one single act of his since he has been in government which was not done on the purest motives, that by God he had rather be on his farm than to be made emperor of the world—and yet they were charging him with wanting to be king. That rascal, the newspaper editor, had even sent him three of his papers every day as if he thought he could become the distributer of his papers. He could see in this nothing but an impudent design to insult him."

Now this was not Bill Moyers quoting President Lyndon Johnson, but Thomas Jefferson quoting what George Washington had said. Bill in a recent speech when he quoted this added that he believed the government and the press worried too much about their relationship to each other. To that I can only say, "Amen." He also said news is made by the press against government just as fire is made by flint striking against rocks, which is as good a description as any.

We are beset today with the problem of rioting in our cities, multiple crisis growing out of segregation and integration, or Black Nationalism, or the never-ending war in Vietnam, or the lightning war in the Middle East. But it is well for the journalist to remember that civilizations of the past faced similar problems which they felt were fully as important. It is also well to remember some of these ancient problems were never settled in any black and white way but simply lapsed into a state of tolerability.

Many of our problems today will never be solved but simply will be accepted by generations in the future as undesirable but tolerable.

The difference between this age and others is that instant communications have spread the effect of problems over vast multitudes of people. And these people differ in color, history, and civilizations. These differences in turn multiply the effect of common problems making their solution difficult and sometimes impossible.

It is the journalist—the newsman—who is the master of these new communications. It is his responsibility to see these scientific miracles serve mankind to bridge gaps, not create them. This is a tremendous responsibility.

The concept of objectivity in the news and the reporter being a noncombatant and an observer rather than a partisan is relatively new in journalism. It is this striving for objectivity that places the journalist apart from society today. It is this struggle for objectivity that keeps him awake at night as he wrestles with the facts. It is this concept of non-partisanship that makes him fair game for the partisans.

There is a simple solution for some journalists. It is a guaranteed tranquilizer. If he wants to, he can become a partisan spokesman in one of the controversies of the day —for or against the war in Vietnam, for or against integration, for or against Israel or the Arabs. In one of these secure positions he will at least have some friends, and he can flail away at his enemies with gusto. He can fit the facts to his prejudices. He can be a professional liberal or a professional conservative.

But . . . to the true newsman partisanship is the original sin, the apple in the journalistic Eden.

It is easy to eat but hard to digest, because a journalist deals in facts in his work and they continually come back to haunt him because facts are often contradictory. And the journalist, knowing this, cannot seize the easy partisan solution without a crisis of conscience.

Therefore, a true newsman of today must be aloof to controversy, a part of society but not an acting participant in its disputes.

This lonely end position makes the journalist fair game for critics, but we should not worry about this. The louder the critic, the less founded his criticism is likely to be.

We have recently been deluged in controversy over free press and fair trial. The subject is likely to be talked to death—perhaps this wouldn't be a bad solution either. The Bar Association has shed rivers of tears about sensational crime coverage, but there are more sensation-seeking lawyers than sensation-seeking reporters. It wasn't a newspaper reporter who tossed an artificial limb into a jury box in an accident case. It was lawyer Melvin Belli. If the Bar wants less sensationalism, let it *first* clean its own house. Let it act against the lawyers who turn courtrooms into theaters.

Until it does the Bar Association does not come before the court of public opinion with clean hands.

Critics seldom let logic confuse their thinking.

And the critics will have much to say in the coming year

for 1968 is likely to be the most controversial year since the Civil War. All of us will need to keep a firm grip on our reportorial calm and not allow events to make us a profession of Cassandras. The political cancers that have eaten into the roots of American society—Vietnam, segregation-integration, rioting in the cities—will be present in their most malignant form in 1968. They will feed on the fiery oratory and illogic of a presidential year.

As the candidates crisscross the country it is hard to envision a city which will not be wracked with dissension, protests, and possibly rioting. The supporters of the liberals, the conservatives, the blacks, whites, the war, the anti-war, will be highly vocal. They'll be long on expression but short on listening. There will be much talk but no communication. It will be the task of the journalist to bring some sense to this.

To cope with this emotional news of our age there has been much talk of codes for the journalist. In fact, the talk of codes reached the peak of something or another when a few days ago Representative William L. Hungate of Missouri reported that he had conducted a private poll of Congress, and the majority of senators and representatives answering said they favored a code for newsmen covering the House and Senate. The idea of Congress which has been loath to adopt a code of ethics for itself, writing a code for reporters has a somewhat curious ring to it.

But the public will not be served nor problems solved by the adoption of unenforceable press codes, news blackouts, news time lapses nor similar restrictions. The public has serious doubts on many facets of the news now without having its confidence further undermined by the adoption of vague generalities which infer there is something in the news too distasteful for them to know, or even more insulting too difficult for them to understand.

Restrictions foster rumors which are far worse than the truth. The Detroit News and Free Press have spent weeks and literally thousands of hours of reporters' time running down every possible rumor as to what took place during the rioting there. They printed the truth as they found it, but they would be the first to admit that many readers in Detroit undoubtedly still feel something is being hidden.

Of course, the same feeling exists in the public about Vietnam. Despite the millions of words printed and spoken. There is a credibility problem not only on the part of government. The newsman must establish his credibility. He must convince the public he is truly detached from the causes of the day. He must convince them by his skills as a reporter that he has no cause to serve except to get the truth. He must convince them by his honesty he is truly the public's eyes and ears, their trusted representative at complex or distant events.

He must convince them he will not succumb to the red dogs of the lobbyists.

He must convince them that he is motivated alone by pride in his profession.

And he must convince the public he is willing to call down the fire of the partisans on his own head, as Captain Carpenter did, if it becomes necessary—and it will become necessary.

If he does these things he will be believed, not loved but respected, which is all he can ask. His constant difficult task will be to put the news in perspective.

In perspective—when he writes about the draft protests to point out that this phenomena is not new. In fact, during the Civil War draft riots in New York City between four and five hundred rioters were killed. In addition, the rioters killed 98 federal registrars in the North. These figures make the rioting even in Detroit look small.

In perspective—when writing about Vietnam to constantly put before the reader that no one, hawk or dove, has proposed a viable solution.

In perspective—to point out the black community is divided among the Black Nationalists who want to establish their own black society and those who want an integrated society with the whites. That the white society is also divided between those who favor integration as the solution and those who would keep an all-black society separate. Despite this there is no common ground even for a sensible dialogue.

Perspective is the indispensable key in this age for the reporter as I have tried to point out earlier by citing quotations to show our problems are neither new nor unique.

I emphasize again the difference between this age and others is that instant communications have given the journalist an immense audience which in turn means his work can have a tremendous impact on our civilization.

The work of the journalist is just as necessary to our society as that of the scientist, doctor, or the highest public official. In these times it may be even more important.

Journalism offers young men and women today—in this age—the greatest of challenges to make a worthwhile contribution to mankind. And for a job well done it will offer the greatest of personal satisfactions, even though you will constantly find yourself to be society's "lonesome end."

Seminars: Prescription for a Healthy Press

By J. Montgomery Curtis

This address by **Mr. Curtis,** vice president-development for Knight Newspapers, was made at the General Assembly of the Inter American Press Association in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

What is the future of the printed word and picture in news and in advertising (which is also news)?

How can newspapers succeed today, tomorrow, next week and beyond?

What can make newspapers fail?

What is the relationship between quality and financial success in newspaper operation?

Before turning to our own internal affairs, let us consider the external trends which are helping us.

More people are reading more of everything in every country. Sales of newspapers, magazines and books increase yearly. More people are absorbing more advanced educations, not only through schools, but through self-education, and many are continuing their education far into adulthood. The result is that more people are interested in more subjects and want to read about them. There are so many, many basic fields of interest and action in the news today.

Consider:

Science—men are shooting for the moon.

Sociology—men and women are striving (yes, and rioting) for the materially good things of life.

Education—traditionally accepted methods of teaching are challenged, and different methods are being tested.

Religion—here is an evolution, almost a revolution, as we report on subjects not discussed a few years ago: the celibacy of priests; mass in the native language; the control of population growth; the merger of faiths.

Economics—the problem of jobs and human dignity as we develop machines to do the dull work of the world.

And, there are more problems, especially unsolvable problems, tormenting mankind. What a day for the editorial writer! Never did he have so much to write about. Never were there so few solutions, and never were there so many subjects calling for deep and accurate knowledge.

Finally, in many countries there is so much more leisure —the shorter work day, the shorter work week, and the longer, more frequent vacations. There are some newspapermen of my generation frightened by increased leisure. They see it as a threat to reading. For them they are right because they know not how to meet the challenge. But they are wrong for those newspapers which are mastering all the new techniques of appealing to more readers by reporting the news of this exciting world, and illuminating it with brilliant comment, and delivering a better product to the reader more quickly.

Now some of you are thinking: "But what about television?" Let us welcome the subject.

The best quality newspapers in the U.S. have made their greatest progress in reader service and circulation during the age of television which began in earnest fifteen years ago—1952.

Not long ago a television-radio man now with a journalism school said that newspapers were an outmoded form of reporting the news. And how did I learn that? I read it in the newspapers, which give me all my news of television.

When television or radio broadcasts an important message, the program may end with the announcer saying: "For a complete copy of this broadcast, write to Station So and So and we will send you a printed pamphlet."

Again they show faith in print by purchasing publishing companies—Columbia Broadcasting offered millions for a book publishing house; RCA (Radio Corporation of America) bought Random House, a publishing firm; Raytheon bought another publishing house, Heath and Company.

Why this faith in the printed word?

Let us propose some answers.

Print is referable. You reread. How many of you will reread a paragraph to smile again, to savor a bit of wisdom, to be reimpressed by a fact or an opinion? When you do so you are engaging in something which television recently discovered. They call it "Instant replay." We have been doing it since the very first printing in 770 A.D.—one thousand one hundred and ninety-seven years ago; since the first printing in Mexico in 1530; since the first printing press in Lima in 1584; and since the first printing press in North America in 1638.

Print is preservable. Can you clip from the screen or from the radio speaker, (and will you replay by future video) the advertisement giving descriptions and prices; the local news stories, some close to your hearts, which you want to save; an article to help your children in their school work?

Print is portable. You can so easily move the newspaper, the magazine or the book from room to room, from place to place, and it can be used by many people at times of their choosing.

Print is reliable. In the hands of writers and editors schooled in balanced judgment, restraint, and the virtue of pausing for verification.

Print has the great virtue of *presenting news judged in proportion* to the importance of the event itself, and in relation to the other news of the day.

Finally, the *reader* is in control when he is reading. He can skip. The item will be there if he wishes to return. He can absorb. He can turn the page. He can go to another section. He can nod in agreement with an editorial. Or he can sneer silently at the editor. He can do exactly as he wishes as he engages in that most intimate form of communication, the silent reading of what a competent journalist has written or photographed.

To what extent will your newspaper share in the future of print with its new methods and processes? Will it succeed? Or will it fail?

This is neither the time nor the place to inquire into the many methods now employed by successful quality newspapers to insure their futures, to keep pace with their readers, and to advance in new fields. To treat only one subject usefully requires six weeks of preparation and two weeks of intensive ten-hour days, as those of you know who have attended Seminars of your own splendid Technical Center, or of the American Press Institute.

However, I can submit for your judgment one guide to success. It concerns your use of Seminars.

You need not take my word. I wrote to newspaper friends of Latin America and asked them to tell us how their newspapers succeeded or failed in using Seminar material. Their answers are here. When I first read them many answers seemed familiar. They gave the same reasons for success and failure that were encountered in the early days of API twenty years ago.

First, there is the basic rule: Send the right man to the Seminar—one who is ambitious, who will work hard, and who has the authority to command respect when he returns home. Listen now to Nicolas Velasco of Las Ultimas Noticias, Santiago:

"If there were failures it is mainly because participants in those cases were badly chosen. Those papers which improved their quality and profits after seminars were those whose representatives were well chosen.

"My newspaper, for example, has increased its circulation since my seminar in 1963 by almost 40 per cent during weekdays and more than 30 per cent on Saturday.

"We had good results because of things I got from the seminar on promotion, marketing, make-up, reader's psychology, staff training, etc.

"Most of the ideas from the seminar at Columbia are being used. An example is a plan recently developed concerning promotion among high schools which has been a complete success.

"I am quite certain that in many cases some journalists attend seminars because they want only to travel. They fill a position which should have been used by a real professional."

M.F. Do Nascimento Brito, executive director of Jornal Do Brasil in Rio de Janeiro, writes:

"Seminar participants are blocked many times by the very executives of their own newspapers. Some fear the innovations and proposed benefits for economic reasons. They are afraid there might be problems to the economy of their own enterprises. Others fail to adopt changes because they are satisfied with what they have. They have stagnated.

"For them, the seminar is seen more as a prize or a vacation period which they decide to enjoy themselves or transfer to one of their staffers.

"If enterprising Directors themselves took the seminars more seriously, results would be profitable for them. In our case, we have benefited much. Seminars are excellent opportunities to become acquainted with the new techniques.

"We go to seminars to work. And upon returning to our offices, we try to put into practice and transmit to our colleagues everything we learned.

"Normally, Jornal do Brasil representatives continue their seminars when they are back home by making reports, holding meetings and conferences.

"The Directors of Jornal do Brasil include seminars in their program of needed investments. That is why, when seminar participants return, we give them all support in improving our newspaper."

And there is our second theme, sounded time and again in these letters: When the seminarian returns, listen to him, have him share his experience with the staff, and consider thoroughly every suggestion for improvement.

There comes now a third theme: Go to a seminar yourself, put the material to work with enthusiasm, and then send your chief executives. Listen now to Diana Julio de Massot, Editor, Publisher and Chief Generalissimo of La Nueve Provincia, Bahia Blanca, Argentina:

"My own experience with seminars suggests tremendously positive results.

"If the newspaper representative is its general editor or its owner-publisher, results should prove doubly positive because there shall not be needed then any selling of the ideas, and consequently the modern methods will be put to work efficiently.

"When department heads are sent to seminars (provided they thoroughly know their trade) it should be expected that after brief explanations to their bosses, the good things they have learned will be put to work. This will be especially true when the person was chosen on the basis of capability and trust.

"We feel satisfied about real improvements derived from applying the know-how about practical matters imparted through seminars. This is a real success with us. There is a very receptive attitude of staff members and a prompt response from them as to the adoption of up-to-date techniques and the discarding of old practices.

"Please believe that, as we say here, La Nueva Provincia es su casa para lo que necesite."

There is the key to the success of every good newspaper: It is necessary. It is needed. It is wanted.

But how do you overcome resistance to change? We are told by Guillermo Klappenbach, Technical Director, La Nacion, Buenos Aires. He writes:

"You wish to know the reasons for success or failure of seminar members. Success is easy at the beginning when minor changes do not affect people. But when major changes are proposed, resistance appears from all sides. People suddenly become illogical.

"In this situation nothing works. Nobody dares start anything new. Tensions become stronger and stronger. At the end, a crisis bursts out. The tempo has to be slowed down. Everything has to be started again with new approaches. The reason? People dislike changes that affect them personally. Change means a special effort, the facing of the unknown, and going against past convictions.

"What can be done about it? Care should be taken from the beginning to involve everybody. Never impose a change and make it appear irrevocable. People need to believe they have some control. They don't like to be pushed into the unknown without having a return ticket in their hands.

"Everybody should participate in planning the change. When the implementation takes place, everyone should have an opportunity to ventilate personal problems.

"The change should not appear as a criticism of what was established before. The basic solution is to make the organization flexible to change. This takes longer but makes everything easier later.

"To make the organization flexible, we must improve communications. The easier and more numerous the interpersonal contacts, the easier it will be to assure an understanding, the less will be the underlying feelings and the easier it will be to bring feelings into the open where they can be better handled."

And he ends with this bit of wisdom:

"Involve your people. They will support what they help create."

There we have our final theme: Look upon intelligent, helpful change not as a threat, but as a challenge and an opportunity.

There have been more new ideas, techniques and methods of value to newspapers in the last fifteen years than there were in the preceding 83 years. These tested changes improve quality and increase profit. They involve every department, and they are the province of experts who follow on this program. I gladly turn the field over to them. There is absolutely no substitute for knowing what you are talking about, and our experts most surely know. They are the best qualified in the world.

But why, many of us ask as we work through the years, why do we work so hard to make a success of a newspaper?

Sometimes the answer, so well known to all of you, can be obscured by the frustrations and the fatigue of the job. Let us remind ourselves of the answer. It is well expressed in one of my favorite editorials, printed a good many years ago in the San Diego Evening Tribune. It reads:

"The biggest story that ever could happen in the Americas will not be printed in the newspapers.

"That story would be the death of freedom.

"It would not be printed because there would not be any free press left to record the passing.

"The newspapers, the truthful and trusted ones, would long since have been killed as a prelude to the death of freedom.

"Whatever printed word remained would not be a "news" paper. It would be a controlled propaganda organ.

"And it would not mention freedom's death. In fact, it might headline a monster public "freedom" rally. You would attend, of course.

"That story will not happen if the free press keeps faith with its readers, and informed readers keep faith in the Americas."

Newspaper Advertising: Moving Toward The Year 2000

By Dr. Leo Bogart

Dr. Leo Bogart is executive vice president and general manager of the Bureau of Advertising, American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Just before coming to New Orleans, I took a couple of vacation days on an island off the coast of Mexico. One evening, I wandered along the streets of the local village, where through the open doors and windows I could see people sitting in their living rooms, talking, playing with their children, occasionally reading or listening to the radio. It struck me that I was back in a pre-television civilization, which exists at the same time as the age of television in cities a few hundred miles away.

I begin with this observation because when we talk about the year 2000 we must recognize that in our complex, varied world, the arrival of new media has never yet driven the old ones out of existence. Radio and the movies are flourishing today, but both are quite different in content and character from what they were a third-century ago. Network entertainment TV as we now know it also represents a fleeting phenomenon in the history of mass media. It is already technologically obsolescent, because all the canned entertainment for a month can be compacted and transmitted in a few seconds for storage within a home recording unit, to be played back when the viewer wants it.

In all the mass media, change is taking place today at an accelerating rate. Change always creates wider and wider disparities between those who are with it, who stay at the crest of the advancing tide, and those who are left out at sea. There is bound to be a growing gap in success and profitability between those who have the know-how to manage change and those who merely let change happen to them.

To manage change requires venturesomeness and experimentation, and this in turn involves risks and costs money. Venturesomeness demands marketing to the needs that will require fulfillment tomorrow rather than selling what we happen to have available today. The kind of venturesomeness I mean is typified by the Louisville *Courier-Journal*'s change in format and their simultaneous switch to a single-rate structure, which has paid off for them remarkably fast.

Venturesomeness is demanded now in color, which is bound to become a more important feature of newspaper editorial as well as advertising. Color, whether ROP or preprinted, brings headaches and complications in production. In fact an advertiser still can't buy Spectacolor in some of the biggest markets of the U.S. The investments required to solve the problems of running color cannot be justified by the short run payout for the newspaper, but these investments are vital if we are going to retain our position as the primary advertising medium.

Some bright publishing team may some day soon be venturesome enough to produce a newspaper in which display advertising is run as far as possible on a classified basis, with ads for competing products and stores placed next to each other as they are in the real market place, rather than separated to avoid the conflict which most advertisers today assume (without evidence) to be bad.

By the year 2000, the sharp distinctions among media will become blurred. Even the line between electronics and print will be hard to draw as we move into an era of condensed

transmission of information, electrostatic printing and the all-purpose home communications console. These developments imply a greater need for newspapers to present a solid front to the national advertiser and to stay in the vanguard of marketing ideas.

Other media will become more flexible. With the spread of population into sprawling interurban belts, regional magazines will find more and more advertisers listening to the argument that the traditional newspaper markets, based on communities in geographic space, ought to be replaced by the idea of vertical markets, arranged by income, occupation or special interests.

By the year 2000, I should imagine that there will be a number of national daily newspapers following the lead of the *Wall Street Journal* in such categories as general news, sports and cultural affairs, or else we may see weekly special interest magazines like *Newsweek, Sports Illustrated* or the *Saturday Review* stepping up their frequency of publication. As TV viewing becomes an individual affair, television and radio stations will compete more intensively for the loyalties of small, sharply defined sectors of the audience, with greater emphasis on live, documentary-type programming.

Certainly one major trend in the next third of a century will be a sharp step-up in the flow of communication through all the media, new and old. This implies that consumers will be more inattentive to unwanted messages and more selective in actively looking for information to help them make their choices. The change in retailing and merchandising practices puts greater emphasis on pre-selling before the consumer confronts his purchase decision. This carries implications for advertising: less of it may be devoted to persuading or reminding people who could not care less. Television commercials have already started to go the route of the radio jingle—taking themselves and the product lightly—abandoning hard sell for a deft touch, which is often more entertaining than the surrounding programs. More advertising ought to be informative, serving people who want to know about the subject. Newspapers, as the primary information medium, are in an excellent position to benefit from this trend.

However, with each year that passes, department stores are putting a smaller percentage of their sales into advertising budgets. Moreover, a growing proportion of retail advertising is accounted for by chain stores or by department stores affiliated with national buying organizations which carry on unified merchandising and promotion campaigns. The rising young generation of retail management is at home with the vocabulary and marketing concepts employed in the big advertising agencies, and it is bound to re-examine coldly the existing patterns of dependence on newspaper advertising.

In the future, the newspaper salesman will be able to rely less and less on his personal friendship with his customers as a guarantee of getting the business. In a new era of impersonal selling and hard-headed evaluation of advertising effects, there will be from the retail side, as there is from national advertisers, an increasing demand for hard data on audiences and readership. This demand cannot be satisfied in amateur fashion.

The newspaper advertising salesman of the future will have to be someone who can show advertisers how to use our medium to sell successfully, someone to whom they can look up as an authority. An estimated $1,250,000,000 of manufacturing money now goes into newspaper co-op, but a sum about half as large, which manufacturers allocate as co-op funds, is never invested because local retailers don't take advantage of what is available. Only the aggressive newspaper salesman can get them to do it. But the traditional arts of salesmanship have to be supplemented by a solid grounding in the marketing principles with which more and more buyers of advertising are familiar.

The professionalization of newspaper advertising salesmen will, I think, tend to wear down some of the traditional separation of the business and editorial sides of newspapers. Both the salesman and the reporter, the ad director and the editor, will share some strong concerns.

The decay of central business districts provides the raw material out of which the news and feature stories of the day are shaped and written. But these developments are also profoundly changing the retail business. The first goals of the rioters in Watts, Newark and Detroit were the supermarket and the appliance store, the heavily advertised symbols of the good life. By the year 2000 a majority of the population in most of our big central cities will be colored. At last week's meeting of the National Retail Merchants Association, the dominant theme of discussion was the urban crisis. If this is the number one concern of our number one customers, is it something that we as intelligent advertising people can afford not to confront when we talk about the future?

The strength of the newspaper has always been in its ability to embody a community's sense of its own identity. The deterioration of our cities has changed the advertising requirements of stores whose customers are changing or who are themselves forced to move to suburban shopping centers, where customers are drawn from a more limited area than the metropolitan newspapers' traditional circulation zone. How can we as newspaper advertising men assume that urban problems are just for the editorial side to worry about? And how can the newspaper editor fail to recognize that some of the most expert wisdom on what is really going on in the economic and social life of his community can be found right on his own advertising staff?

In the years to come it will be a matter of vital concern to advertising men as to whether or not their editorial product can retain interest for populations that are changing

radically in racial character, in age distribution, in education, and in political outlook. At the same time, editors will have to take a fresh look at the advertising side. It is high time to break down the traditional disinterest and even disdain for the business office which pervades the classical training of young reporters.

In most journalism schools a young newspaper man can pursue his entire training without taking a class on the basic economics of the newspaper business. Joseph Pulitzer, when he left his original bequest to endow the School of Journalism at Columbia, specified that no course be taught about the business aspect of newspapers, because he wanted to keep the editorial side pure and uncontaminated.

Advertising can never be separated from matters of editorial content, circulation or production. Today, advertisers aim their efforts at the best customers. Newspaper zoned editions and satellite printing plants will make it easier for each marketer to reach his own targets. But the health of newspaper advertising depends not only on continuing improvement in production capabilities.

It depends on successful efforts to broaden our editorial appeal to young people and to minority groups in the big cities. The draft, the Pill, drugs and the political slogans of the New Left have transformed the basic values of the brightest youngsters in the generation which is coming of age today. If advertisers question their loyalty to newspapers it is not so much because the children of the electronic era have forgotten how to read as because they are in many cases alienated from the traditional motivations which underlie our whole business system. Is this of no concern to us as advertising men looking ahead through the rest of this century?

The growth of our economy depends on consumer acceptance of new products, new ideas, and new brands. Newspapers, through their editorial as well as their advertising columns, make people receptive to innovation. But when we train the public to accept innovation, we cannot limit this to tolerance of improvements in products and to new brand names. Advertising also makes people more receptive to change in society, it teaches them to tolerate and even thirst for what is new and different. On this change depends the growth and stability of our own business.

I don't know what newspapers will be like in the year 2000, but our own internal planning at the Bureau is predicated on the estimate that newspaper advertising in 1975, just seven years from now, will be in the $8 billion range. We have every confidence in the continuing health of our business for many years to come, because we have confidence in newspapers' ability to adapt to the revolutionary changes which are under way today in the technology of communication, in the science of distribution and marketing, and in the very structure of our society.

The future of newspaper advertising is not without its uncertainties, but it is bright. The future of any great institution is never fated; and we are not its passive subjects, but the people who can make of it what we want it to be.

Mistrial Excuse

This editorial appeared in the November 18, 1967, issue of Editor and Publisher.

A New York judge declared a mistrial in the case of four defendants charged with murder because several jurors acknowledged having read a newspaper article mentioning previous convictions of three of the men. It was said there were five newspapers in the jury room despite the judge's admonition against reading anything about the case.

The judge stated: "It is beyond dispute that a number of jurors read a newspaper account primarily recording events of the trial but incidentally containing information about the defendants' previous convictions.

"Although jurors said they could put the matter out of their minds, the court is not persuaded of their ability to do so."

This reasoning is as old as the courts themselves but is an anachronism in present-day society. It flies in the face of modern communications techniques and the education level and sophistication of a better-informed electorate. Supposing these jurors had received the same information via radio or television? Would defense counsel and the judge have known about it or reacted the same way?

Three of the defendants here had been convicted and sentenced earlier this year for a series of bank robberies. When first tried on this charge in January a mistrial was declared because defense alleged prejudicial accounts had been published in newspapers. One of the defendants had previously been listed by the FBI as a ranking member of the Mafia underworld syndicate which had been duly reported not only in newspapers but in national magazine articles.

How can the courts and the American Bar Association expect that newspapers not report such things? And, once reported as a matter of public record, should newspapers be called upon to wipe the slate clean, forget the past, ignore history? It is as unthinkable as expecting to find a juror who has never heard of the defendant or, if he has, to ask the juror to erase the past from his memory.

Isn't it enough to expect today to find jurors with the intelligence to decide a case on its merits and on the facts without trying to brainwash the past from their memories and at the same time hoodwink the general populace by reporting only part of the story? We think it is.

"Fair trial" should mean a fair trial on the charges as presented. It should not include erasure of the past *and the public record* for the entire populace.

Legal Notice

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Date of Filing:
   October 1, 1967
2. Title of Publication:
   Nieman Reports
3. Frequency of Issue: Quarterly
4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138
5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers, Same
6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor and Managing Editor:
   Publisher: Nieman Alumni Council
   Editor: Dwight E. Sargent, 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts
   Managing Editor: None
   77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts
7. Owner: Society of Nieman Fellows, 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts
8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities:
   None

10.

A. Total No. Copies Printed:
   Average No. Copies each issue during preceding 12 months 1800
   Single issue nearest filing date 1500

B. Paid Circulation:
   1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales
      average none
      single issue nearest filing date none
   2. mail subscriptions
      average 1325
      single issue nearest filing date 1175

C. Total Paid Circulation
   average 1325
   single issue nearest filing date 1175

D. Free Distribution By Mail, Carrier or Other Means
   average 10
   single issue nearest filing date 195

E. Total Distribution
   average 1335
   single issue nearest filing date 1370

F. Office Use, Left-over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing
   average 125
   single issue nearest filing date 130

G. Total
   average 1450
   single issue nearest filing date 1500

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

(signed) Dwight E. Sargent

A Meaning Look

By William M. Pinkerton

Mr. Pinkerton, news officer of Harvard University, was a Nieman Fellow in 1940-41.

The word-ferrets of the great Oxford English Dictionary (1933) flushed *meaningful* from some dated novels, and duly mounted the specimens: "All the meaningful little gifts" (1852), "a . . . meaningful smile" (1879), "Orthodocia glanced at me . . . meaningfully" (1890). It meant the opposite of *meaningless,* they ruled: "Full of meaning or expression; significant." Other big-dictionary men went along with that—except Webster's 2nd, who didn't find a place for *meaningful.*

Before the word gained its present wild popularity with high and low from coast to coast and on the transocean jets, it popped up quietly here and there among the literate —in a C. P. Snow novel, for example. Prof. Leslie Marchand in 1950 assessed Byron's life as "one of the most meaningful." Prof. Archibald MacLeish in 1961 found the Yankees of the American Revolution writing "meaningful English." Prof. Robert Engler in 1961 noted that Mossadegh "could not market his oil in meaningful quantities." M. Lincoln Shuster in 1965 valued Stanley Walker's assessment of Herbert Bayard Swope as "particularly meaningful" because they both had been city editors.

Notice how *meaningful* becomes comparative: some—much—most? Not only "full of meaning" but "with some meaning" seems to fit. The people at Webster's 3rd (1961) noticed that, too. They shaped a new broad definition for *meaningful:* "having meaning or purpose: capable of being understood or interpreted: requiring or done with understanding or intent." And don't think we readers didn't appreciate it—with "more meaningful" flowing this winter from the honored pens of Prof. Herbert J. Muller (on Shakespeare in the schools), Reviewer Thomas Lask (on Harlem), Editor Selig S. Harrison (on population projections) and the Wisconsin School of Journalism (on election reporting), among others; with Joseph Alsop writing about something being "indicative or meaningful"; and with William Birmingham telling Newsweek about a "completely meaningful form of Christian worship" while Architect Kevan Roche tells them about "making meaningful space."

Comparative or not, *meaningful* has been this winter's great sentence-filler for those people from Washington and Hollywood on TV panels, for scholars and executives, and for hard-pressed news writers. Vice President Humphrey (Dec. 2) wants somebody to enter the low-cost housing field "in a meaningful way." The UN (Dec. 12) wants "a lasting and meaningful peace." The National Business League (Dec. 5) wants minority citizens to become "meaningful participants" in economic life. Professor Muller, in his fine report, "The Uses of English" (1967), wants teachers to choose reading that is "meaningful, interesting and enjoyable," or at least "meaningful and enjoyable," and worries about writing that is "not actually very practical because not meaningful."

Newsweek's opinion piece on "The Negro in America" (Nov. 20) calls for "meaningful improvements in slum environments," "meaningful business involvement," and a fight against poverty "on a meaningful scale." Time (Nov. 24) tells us about what makes a strike "such a meaningful victory." Time's Essayist (Dec. 16) wants parents and children "doing meaningful things together." Newsweek (Dec. 25) finds young nuns "looking for meaningful commitment." The New York Times (Dec. 7) relates that a young Yale teacher "shook his head meaningfully at his students." And an Atlantic reader (January) complains of "a consistent lack of meaningful insight."

Tired? For a change, try Dickens:

"Had done business with him," said Mr.
Barney with a meaning look.

Izzy Stone is a Rare Bird

(Continued from page 2)

to go away licking his wounds but with a grin from Izzy that invited him to come back for more.

He has a passion for polemics, an instinct for the jugular. He is an authentic voice of opposition. But what he writes is neither propaganda nor editorializing. He deals with what is, as he finds it and sees it.

How he covers the waterfront all by himself is one of the more arcane mysteries. He has of course a selective sense of what really matters, and he has an historic sense of how it relates to what happened or failed to happen last time around.

So far as I can make out, Izzy Stone's primary method of arming himself indubitably with the facts is to read just about everything, including and especially between the lines, and make his own informed assessment of it. As an analyst he often enough makes rational sense out of confusion and ballyhoo. When the State Department in 1965 issued its White Paper on Vietnam, Stone just took it apart by digging out of its own documentation, and what was on tap at the Pentagon, the facts to refute it. This is one of his best games.

He began his weekly by exposing McCarthyism at its flagrant peak. He moved on into the Civil Rights issue, the controversial course of the Supreme Court, Vietnam, LBJ, the Negro Revolt, the Middle East war, the bomb, and the space racket. And he has readers. As a news broadcaster I hear from them, saying, in effect, "Why don't you read Stone's Weekly and know what you are talking about?"

As a reporter, Stone is in the same small class as the late Tom Stokes, and though his style is more acidulous, he pursues the same relentless scent for the story that is not being told or the other side of the one that is.

This book offers some of Izzy Stone's most effective pieces from his Weekly over the last five years. They are grouped under major topical heads and show the development of these issues and his handling of them in this period. They are cogent, relevant, provocative, a look at the other side of the coin. In all of them Stone is saying "Is that so?", "Now wait a minute." "So what?" He brings you up short and it's an experience. Stone calls himself, "an anachronism in this age of the corporation men." Murray Kempton, in another able journalist's appreciative introduction, calls Stone "the essential journalist." His book is a live package.

Harry Golden announced on February 22nd that his Carolina Israelite was going to press for the last time.

Hulteng Holds Newsmen's Respect

The following editorial appeared in the Oregon Journal on Monday, February 5, 1968. Mr. John L. Hulteng was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

When John L. Hulteng, dean of the School of Journalism of the University of Oregon for the last six years, made known recently his decision to relinquish his administrative responsibilities in favor of teaching and writing, he left an unenviable task to the University administration—that of finding a successor of nearly comparable background, attainment and skills.

Hulteng came to Oregon as a professor in 1955. He came with a well-grounded career as a practicing newspaperman which culminated in a number of years as chief editorial writer for the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. His ability was immediately recognized on the campus by both students and fellow faculty members, and his selection as head of the school was a popular one.

Merit of the appointment has been amply proved over the intervening years. He has won numerous honors, among these (while still a professor) the $1,000 Ersted award for distinguished teaching, the University's highest tribute to a faculty member. He has served and is serving on important national committees whose work is aimed toward betterment of various facets of the profession. In addition to his demanding administrative duties, he has found time, also, for writing for professional publications such as the Columbia Journalism Review.

UO Pres. Arthur S. Flemming, regretfully accepting Hulteng's decision, wrote him: "The progress of the school has exceeded my expectations as the result of your exceptional leadership. You are recognized today as one of our nation's top leaders in the field of journalism. It is a well-deserved recognition."

The many able reporters and editors who were fortunate enough to have received their training at Oregon since Hulteng joined the teaching staff like him, respect him and greatly appreciate his contributions to their profession. So do those working newsmen in the state who know him—as few do not. They wish him well in his return to his first loves, teaching and writing.

Nieman Notes

1940

Hodding Carter, publisher of the Delta Democrat Times in Greenville, Mississippi, resigned as advisor to the Tulane University student newspaper, Hullabaloo, after it printed material he considered to be obscene. Carter referred to those responsible for using the material as "dishonest little jerks," and said their conduct reflected on the university and on his position as advisor.

William B. Dickinson, managing editor of the Philadelphia Bulletin, is one of the 1968 Pulitzer Prize journalism jurors. **Robert P. Clark** (1961), managing editor of the Louisville Times, and **William McIlwain** (1958), editor of Newsday, are also jurors.

1946

Arthur W. Hepner leaves John Wiley & Sons on April first to become senior manuscript editor in the Houghton Mifflin college department in Boston.

1949

Peter Lisagor, Washington Bureau Chief of the Chicago Daily News, and **John Seigenthaler** (1959), editor of the Nashville Tennessean, were among nine American newsmen who made extensive tours of India during November and December as guests of the Indian government, which is trying to improve its image abroad. Seigenthaler had a close call with a mob of rioting university students.

1950

John L. Hulteng has resigned as dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon in order to devote full time to teaching and writing. After serving as the School's administrative head for six years, Hulteng will leave his post July first.

David J. Kraslow has been elected to membership in the Gridiron Club.

1951

Bob Eddy, editor and assistant to the publisher of the Hartford Courant, has been elected vice president of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors.

1955

Carlton M. Johnson, editor of the Columbus, Georgia, Ledger and Sunday Ledger-Enquirer, has been promoted to executive editor. He succeeds Edge R. Reid, who is stepped up from executive editor to associate publisher of the Ledger and Enquirer.

1956

Julius Duscha, associate director of the Stanford University Professional Journalism Program and former reporter for the Washington Post, has been named the director of the Washington Journalism Center. Duscha is succeeded as associate director by Nieman classmate **Harry Press,** who was formerly in the Stanford News and Publications Bureau.

1957

Harold V. Liston, assistant to the editor of the Bloomington Daily Pantagraph, has succeeded H. Clay Tate as editor as of Mr. Tate's retirement on December 31, 1967.

1958

William McIlwain (See 1940)

1959

John Seigenthaler (See 1949)

1960

Peter Braestrup has left his post as correspondent for The New York Times in Bangkok to become Saigon Bureau Chief of the Washington Post.

1961

Donald G. Brazier, assistant city editor of the Seattle Times, has been promoted to assistant managing editor. In his new position he will be responsible for feature and section news, the rotogravure and magazine supplements, as well as women's news, real estate, drama, radio, TV, and entertainment.

Robert P. Clark (See 1940)

In a realignment of top managment at The New York Times, **John Pomfret** has succeeded John Mortimer as Director of Industrial Relations. Pomfret was a Nieman Fellow from the Milwaukee Journal and served in Washington as The New York Times labor reporter before going to New York.

1962

John Hughes of the Christian Science Monitor has a bylined article on Indonesia in the December Atlantic Monthly.

Murray A. Seeger left the Washington Bureau of Newsweek on January first to join the staff of the Washington Bureau of the Los Angeles Times. As he did for Newsweek, he will cover a combination of economics and labor.

1965

James S. Doyle of the Boston Globe spent the month of February covering the Viet Nam war.

Price Waterhouse Foundation To Sponsor Another Nieman Fellow

The Price Waterhouse Foundation has announced that it will sponsor a Nieman Fellowship for a business and financial writer for the academic year 1968-69. Newspapermen seeking this award must file the regular application provided by the Nieman office at 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, and be chosen by the Nieman Selection Committee appointed annually by Harvard University. This year the Nieman Fellow sponsored by Price Waterhouse is Allen T. Demaree of McGraw-Hill Publications (Business Week Magazine).

April First is Deadline for Nieman Fellowship Applications

Applications for Nieman Fellowships for 1968-69 must be in the Nieman office by April first. The Nieman Selection Committee will award about twelve Fellowships for the academic year opening in September.

The Fellowships provide for one year of residence and background study for newsmen on leave from their jobs. Applicants must have at least three years of news experience, be under forty, and agree to return to their jobs.

This will be the thirty-second annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard. The Fellowships were established in 1938 under a bequest by Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee Journal. Members of the 1968-69 Nieman Selection Committee are the following:

Frank Batten, publisher of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot and the Ledger-Star;
William F. McIlwain, Jr., editor of Newsday;
Newbold Noyes, editor of the Washington Star;
Fred L. Glimp, dean of Harvard College;
William M. Pinkerton, news officer of Harvard University;
Dwight E. Sargent, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.