Nieman Reports

March 1971

"After Keith Davey—What?"

By T. Joseph Scanlon

". . . Arguments by the Davey committee to support the case that group or monopoly-owned publications (in Canada) are automatically bad, are not so strong. . . "

The World Flow of News

By Erwin D. Canham

". . . American newspaper publishers and editors have not participated nearly as effectively as they might in helping make international organizations more significant. . . "

The Facts Are What Matter

By J. Russell Wiggins

". . . I like to have one clear unobstructed glimpse of the naked truth before it is dressed up in someone else's surmise and conjecture. Facts never were at a higher premium. . . "

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXV, No. 1 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | March 1971

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

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

Editors Fisher and Royster "Retire"

(Editor's Note: The New Year's most interesting coincidence in the world of journalism was the "retirement" to university life of the editors of two great newspapers. Roy M. Fisher, editor of the Chicago Daily News, became dean of the University of Missouri's School of Journalism. Vermont Royster left the editorship of The Wall Street Journal to become professor of journalism and public affairs at his alma mater, the University of North Carolina. Each of these distinguished journalists, whose papers' Pulitzer Prizes total twenty, wrote a farewell column we are pleased to present to readers of Nieman Reports.)

By Roy M. Fisher

Prof. Henry Kissinger, President Nixon's national security adviser, was asked at a recent Chicago press conference to compare his present life in Washington with his former life at Harvard.

Arching his eyebrows, Prof. Kissinger replied that he really found little difference in the kinds of things he does.

"In both places, the job is to make decisions . . . to solve problems," he said. "On campus, we do it with some confidence. If we don't find the answer in a day, we take two days—or two years.

(Continued on page 12)

By Vermont Royster

Old newspapermen may die but they rarely fade away. Just when you think they are retired to pasture they show up at the gathering, elbows bent and boring the young fellows with tales of how it used to be in the good old days.

Some of them keep right on scribbling. Turner Catledge, for instance, a former reporter on the Neshoba (Mississippi) Democrat who turned reverse-carpetbagger to manage the news for The New York Times, managed to retire in Southern splendor but he just couldn't handle that monotony. So he scribbled a book called "My Life and The

(Continued on page 13)

"After Keith Davey — What?"

By T. Joseph Scanlon

Mr. Scanlon is associate professor and director of the School of Journalism at Carleton University. He was previously Parliamentary and Washington correspondent for the Toronto Daily Star. He is a graduate of Carleton in Journalism and has an M.A. in Political Science from Queen's University.

It hasn't been announced publicly yet, but, sometime this spring, Canadian journalists hope to get together to do a little soul-searching. And while the formal title of that conference also hasn't been chosen, it seems certain it will be something like this: "After Keith Davey—what?"

For, even if the meeting doesn't come off, the very fact that it has even been planned should bring a sense of satisfaction to Davey, the 45-year-old Canadian Senator who single-handedly has forced Canadian mass media to take a serious look at themselves.

It is more than two years ago now—December 10, 1968—when Senator Davey gave notice of a motion calling for an inquiry to consider and report on the ownership and control of the major means of mass public communication in Canada.

The results of that study done by his Senate committee are available in three red-covered volumes for $13.50.

To anyone in the media in Canada they make interesting reading. To members of the concerned public they should be an absolute must. For if the basic findings of Senator Davey's committee are not a surprise to those in the media, they certainly must be to the public at large. What Senator Davey's committee found was that Canadian publishers, broadcasters and media managers generally, are on to a good thing, that they are in a highly profitable industry and that they are avoiding every way they can spending a buck on customer service.

The Davey report says the traditional monopoly rip-off occurs when corporations use their privileged position to charge their customers more than the traffic would otherwise bear. In the case of the media, says Davey, the situation is reversed: "It's not that the companies are charging too much—but they're spending too little."

Davey says the broadcasting industry does not produce Canadian programs because it can "make more money relying on canned American re-runs." It says Canadian newspapers don't develop their own editorial page columnists, cartoonists and commentators because "it's cheaper, far cheaper, to buy syndicated American columnists and reprint other papers' cartoons and to skimp on staff news coverage in the hope that one of the wire services will do the same job almost as well."

Davey concludes that one of the major reasons for the problem is the existence of media monopolies. He also concludes that as far as the electronic media, radio and television, go the Canadian Radio Television Commission (the F.C.C. is roughly its equivalent) is capable of dealing with the problem but when it comes to print something new is needed.

The committee calls for a government Press Ownership Review Board with the power to approve or disapprove

mergers between, or acquisitions of, newspapers, or periodicals. The committee concluded that such a board is a must because concentration of ownership in Canada has proceeded to the point where some form of intervention by the state is desirable and necessary.

The committee said that the board should have only one basic guideline that *"all* transactions that increase concentration of ownership in the mass media are undesirable and contrary to the public interest—unless shown to be otherwise."

The figures produced by the Davey committee to support its argument that Canada is in a monopoly situation are overwhelming. Two-thirds of Canada's 116 daily newspapers are group-owned. Close to one-half of Canada's television stations are group-owned and the same figures apply to radio.

In print, the facts *are* indisputable:

1. F. P. Publications Ltd. own eight major city dailies with 18.2 per cent of the total daily circulation and have another 551,000 weekly circulation with the major agricultural publication;

2. Southam Press Ltd. have 11 dailies and own a percentage of three others: their total circulation is 18.1 per cent of the total;

3. The Thomson interests have 30 dailies and are steadily increasing their holdings. Their total circulation, however, is less than half that of F. P. or Southams because they own no major city dailies (except, perhaps, one acquired last summer in St. John's, Newfoundland);

4. Paul Desmarais and those associated with him in Quebec own the largest French-language daily, La Presse, as well as papers in Sherbrooke, Trois Rivieres and Granby and also control five weekend newspapers including Dimanche Matin (287,000) plus 12 smaller weeklies;

5. K. C. Irving owns every English language newspaper in the province of New Brunswick and owns the TV outlet in Saint John and a satellite station in Moncton as well. He also has other substantial business interests in the province.

6. A single group own the newspapers and the dominant radio and television outlet in London, Ont. and another group are in much the same situation in Regina, Saskatchewan.

But despite these facts the arguments produced by the Davey committee to support the case that group or monopoly-owned publications are automatically bad, are not so strong.

Much to its embarrassment, the committee selected as the best Canadian papers, the Vancouver Sun, the Toronto Daily Star, the Toronto Telegram, the Toronto Globe & Mail, Le Devoir, the Montreal Star, the Windsor Star, La Presse and the Edmonton Journal. Only two of them are not monopoly or group owned. It got around this apparent conflict by concluding that the quality of a publication seems to depend on whether or not the owner has a genuine commitment to public service. "Personal good will or commitment to public service is simply not enough", the committee reported. "This country should no longer tolerate a situation where the public interest in so vital a field as information is dependent on the greed or good will of an extremely privileged group of business men."

In another area, the committee came up with a more expected conclusion and that is that Canada badly needs a press council.

In this case the committee did not feel that the federal government should be involved. In fact it said bluntly that government should have "nothing whatever to do with its format and/or operation."

The committee suggested such a council could help professionalism develop, could eliminate much of the criticism of the press and could increase confidence in the press and ensure that the growing number of monopolies would not, in fact, lead to control of the news. It attempted to rebut many of the arguments presented by publishers against such a press council by listing its answers to their objections.

The publishers objected a press council could threaten press freedom; Davey said *not* if the government is not involved.

The publishers objected that laws already exist; Davey said every dispute surely shouldn't have to go to court.

The publishers said editors are willing to listen to beefs; Davey pointed out that, as in England, his recommendation is that a press council will only listen to complaints where publishers have declined to listen or have rejected them.

The publishers claimed that press freedom would suffer; Davey said, "Well, why shouldn't the media have a watchdog just like government does?"

The publishers argued that the newspaper's readers are its court of appeal; Davey said that's only true if there is no monopoly.

In another area the committee reviewed one of Canada's continuing problems and that is what to do with the two non-Canadian publications which are Canada's most successful magazines—Time and Reader's Digest.

Despite the fact that these magazines probably look to most persons like U.S. magazines, and indeed, most of their content has United States orientations, under Canadian law they have special privileges.

Canadian firms may not deduct for tax purposes what

they spend advertising in foreign magazines, except (and the law is a little too complex to explain in detail here) in the case of Reader's Digest and Time. (Basically, this is because these magazines had established Canadian offices at the time that the tax requirements were laid down.)

An earlier Royal Commission headed by Senator M. Grattan O'Leary had recommended such tax privileges be withdrawn and that Time and Reader's Digest be treated like other American magazines. This was not done. Davey says that it still should be, even now; that it's not too late to go ahead.

In general the committee was unimpressed by what it learned about journalism as a potential profession. It found that newspapermen in Canada are largely trained on the job like factory hands and that salary scales in Toronto are far below those paid to bricklayers and in Peterborough are well below those paid to garbagemen. As the committee summed up: Media men "earn less than teachers, less than most skilled tradesmen, less than their counterparts in the advertising, circulation and promotion departments, less than they themselves could earn in other pursuits for which their education and training equip them. Is it any wonder that while they are still young enough, so many of them leave for jobs either in government or public relations or academia?" And the report stated quite bluntly that its detailed economic studies left little doubt that employers could do far more than they do now. It found, for example, that in the period 1958–1960, expenditures in wages and salaries in Canadian newspapers grew by 71.5 per cent but growth returns to capital increased by 95.2 per cent. "Salaries, in other words, lagged behind profits." In radio between 1962 and 1968, wages and salaries jumped 34 per cent while productivity advanced by 47 per cent. In television pay went up 39 per cent, productivity was up 90 per cent.

Finally, Davey mocked the usual explanation that small papers are least able to afford good salaries by commenting that its economic studies had shown that the largest newspapers—those with 100,000 circulation up—and the smallest newspapers—those under 10,00 circulation—are the most profitable of all.

Concerned by the lack of what it considers a professional education for journalists, the Davey committee found that there will be 7,000 new jobs in print journalism in the next two years and only 800 graduates, and called for four new university programs in journalism and television arts.

In looking at Canada's magazines the committee decided that something had to be done to help the smaller independent publications, and it recommended a publication development loan fund of $2 million to aid small independent periodicals. It suggested the fund should not give out money to new publications until the publication got started, established a readership list, raised some money and so on, and built a publishing record of perhaps six issues in the case of a monthly.

Its statistics on the magazine industry are startling enough:

- in the 1920's, 96 consumer magazines were launched or in existence—23 died;
- in the 1930's, 75 were started—65 died;
- in the 1940's, 92 started—70 died;
- in the 1950's, 29 started—50 died;
- in the 1960's, 250 started—137 died.

The committee also financed a massive study of Canadian attitudes about the media and found significant differences between the way Canadians view radio, television and print media. It found, for example, television the most believed and most important medium for international news and Canadian news of national importance. It found newspapers more believable and important for local news and radio not far behind in this area. It found local media more trusted than national media.

It got some conflicting views about Canadians' feelings of control of the media, depending on the way the question was put. According to one set of answers three-quarters of Canadians say that some form of censorship is desirable for television and half want the same kind of thing applied to radio and newspapers. But asked the same question in another way, eight out of ten said newspapers should be totally free from government control but still two-thirds wanted government supervision of television and radio.

And, of course, there was one of the more delightful findings of all and that is four in ten Canadians admitted they talked to their radio or television sets, partly from loneliness and partly from belated frustration at not being able to react to what is said or done on the screen. Senator Davey himself said, by the way, on television recently that he was among that four in ten.

The reaction to the report has been pretty predictable. Those who were praised, liked it; those who were criticized, didn't.

Perhaps the fairest comment has come from Content, a Montreal-based periodical concerned with the mass media which expressed just a little worry of the fact that so many of those involved in the report were Toronto-oriented. The committee chairman, Senator Davey; the chief consultant, Borden Spears; the research director, Nicola Kendall; and the writer Alexander Ross, are all Toronto-oriented. Content said, "small wonder that in some circles the Senate document was being labelled as the Honderich report after the Toronto Daily Star's (publisher) Beland Honderich."

It is certainly true that the report accepted much of what

the Star had said and the Star immediately praised the report and called for other Ontario publishers to join with it in an Ontario press council. But it is also fair to report that all Toronto publishers didn't like all of the report. The publisher of the Telegram, John Bassett, commenting on the press council recommendation said, "I expected that recommendation but I won't join it or pay much attention to it."

The Vancouver Sun whose publisher had praised Senator Davey for his fairness and whose paper was praised in the report as "entertaining, provocative and fair" headlined its coverage of the report, "Press Probe (Blush) Likes The Sun."

The Halifax Chronicle-Herald which was damned in the report for lazy, uncaring journalism, in contrast ran a front page editorial blasting the committee and charging that the report "is vicious, unsubstantiated, harsh and unfair."

Claude Ryan, editor of the prestigeous French-language Le Devoir whose paper was praised by the report, said that the report was "un travail d'honnête homme, accompli de manière très sérieuse."

St. Clair McCabe, the executive vice-president of Thomson Newspapers Limited whose chain was largely and roundly criticized, called the report "rather naive, dishonest and I would prefer to use the word 'stupid'."

La Presse which has so far been the one newspaper to run a lengthy series analyzing the report in some detail has made it very clear that in Quebec anyway the idea of a federal press council is not too acceptable. To put in the words of La Presse, "Un conseil de presse au Québec: d'accord. Un 'National Press Council': non." Canada, La Presse argued, is formed of many regions whose needs and problems are different insofar as they affect information.

There have been some signs of action resulting from the report.

As mentioned at the start of this article, there is the hope of a national conference of journalists. The sponsor is Content along with the Canadian journalism schools and some media associations.

Then the Toronto Star has come up with an editorial suggesting an Ontario press council though the Star has, in fact, called for the same thing in the past but never done anything specific about it.

A third sign of activity is that in some cases newspapermen are organizing internal commentaries on their own publications and some of these publications are even helping arrange for such staff criticism.

Finally, in Quebec itself, although this probably would have come about whether or not the Davey report had been written, a number of organizations of newsmen have got together and established a Quebec press council. The groups which include the Quebec Federation of Professional Journalists, the Quebec Daily Newspaper Association, the Canadian Weekly Newspaper Association and the Canadian Association of French-speaking Radio and Television Broadcasters, have agreed on a 19-member governing committee consisting of a president and three six-member groups representing news management, news reporters and the general public. The aim of the new council is to protect press freedom in Quebec and to guarantee the public's access to information.

Davey has stimulated a debate among those who work in the mass media but so far there has been no comment from anyone in government as to whether or not Canada will actually act on his report.

The World Flow of News

By Erwin D. Canham

Mr. Canham, Editor in Chief of The Christian Science Monitor, made the following remarks when honored by the 1971 John Peter Zenger Award at the University of Arizona.

Mention was graciously made, in the citation accompanying this much appreciated award, of my involvement two decades ago in the effort to negotiate treaties and intergovernmental agreements seeking to open up freer channels for the flow of news between nations and the unimpeded movement of correspondents.

Those efforts were mainly fruitless. Created by the euphoria of victorious alliance in World War II, they ran speedily into the hostile atmosphere of the cold war, the victory of Communism in China, and other unpropitious situations. It became apparent that no treaty we might have negotiated, however satisfactorily worded from our viewpoint, would necessarily be worth more than the paper on which it was written. All language can be interpreted by governments in different ways. Under our own constitutional system there would have had to be certain safeguards and exceptions, through which some other government could have driven a cartload of censorship.

So we gave up the inter-governmental effort to foster a freer flow of the news. I turned my own attention to professional rather than political contacts and organizations internationally: the International Federation of Newspaper Editors, FIEJ; the International Press Institute; and the Inter American Press Association. These are all rather fruitful and very pleasant ways for American newspapermen to participate in international activities and have some influence on a freer flow of the news.

All three organizations have had some value. From time to time each of them has helped some beleaguered editor or publisher striving desperately to stay afloat and out of jail in some part of the world which badly needs an independent press. All three organizations have also had their failures. And I want particularly to emphasize that only relatively few U.S. editors or publishers have taken active part in their work. If there is a single concrete thing I should like to say to you here today it is to urge you to consider the possibility of taking an active part in international newspaper organization. Some of you, I know, do so. I live in a glass house because I have not done nearly as much as I should, but in general American newspaper publishers and editors have not participated as effectively as they might have in helping to make the international organizations more significant and fruitful.

As perhaps might have been expected, the most vigorous U.S. participation has been in the Inter American Press Association. Here I should say that genuine American leadership has played a large role. And yet the burden has been carried by a relatively limited number of American editors and publishers.

Much larger delegations could have taken part in the fascinating annual sessions of the IAPA. Thus they would have lent moral support and practical business judgment and experience to the solution of the problems of our fellow newspapermen in this hemisphere. As it is, IAPA has helped

to protect and preserve journalists in trouble more than once against the pressures of governmental repression.

The International Federation of Newspaper Editors, called FIEJ for its French initials, is in fact composed of major publishers associations. The word Editeur in French means publisher.

The ANPA has carried the load of American participation after the first few years when it was also shared with ASNE at a time when the organization seemed likely to represent editors as well as publishers. Again only a handful of American editors have actually taken part in very pleasant and substantively interesting sessions.

The third organization, the International Press Institute, was founded in the U.S. and has always had larger American involvement including particularly needed financial support from some American foundations. It is the most throughly editor-related organization of the three. It has headquarters in Zurich, publishes a very interesting monthly bulletin, calls special conferences, an annual meeting, and undertakes important regional projects. The IPI has done a good deal to help journalism get on its feet in the newly developing countries of Africa and some parts of Asia.

In its early days it brought together French and German editors for very healthy discussion indeed. It may be said to have had a genuinely helpful political effect at that time. Its work in Africa and Asia, as I have said, was very badly needed, and has made a good beginning. There is of course a long way to go before newspapers are really effective, going concerns in certain parts of the world, notably in Black Africa. The IPI has helped very much in the dissemination of technical knowledge and moral support.

A few dedicated American editors have carried a large load in IPI as well as in the other organizations. A few other Americans have maintained their affiliation and gone to meetings more or less for the touristic values involved. These are very large and not to be sneezed at. The more American editors are able to wander about the world, the better they will fulfill their professional responsibilities. Nevertheless, tourism ain't all. Insofar as any of the organizations do not fulfill their potentialities, it is because many of their members do not take an active sturdy role in formulation of programs and discussions of specific ideas. Moreover IPI at least is barely viable financially. It needs the modest dues of more American members.

I shouldn't exhort you further on the subject of more active participation in international active professional organization. I do urge you to look into your personal schedules to see whether a way cannot be found for undertaking memberships that would not only be stimulating and enjoyable but a genuine contribution to newspapers on a broad scale.

Let me turn now to what is perhaps a more important question: how adequately does the news flow across the frontiers of the world? On the whole it seems to me surprisingly well in view of the extreme complexity of the world scene and the unexpected explosion of newsworthy developments from the Congo to Cambodia and Chile. One vast area of the world is not covered: Communist China. The few western correspondents who have been able to stay in Peking are severely limited in what they can observe. Their sources and opportunities to travel are very cramped indeed. From time to time a visiting journalist gets a guided tour of the hinterlands. Even with such severe impairment such a trip turns up interesting knowledge. If only correspondents could work in mainland China the way they can work potentially in other great areas in the world, the flow of history might be somewhat different.

It is a great tragedy that we know so little of the large fraction of the human race which lives under Communist rule in China. Some day we can hope that the situation will open up. Perhaps the U.S. has played its diplomatic cards badly in relations with mainland China. There was a time when exchange of correspondents seemed definitely possible. But the opportunity was missed.

Efforts to cover the China mainland from Hong Kong or Tokyo suffer the usual flaws of indirect reporting, but they are not as wild as the stories from Riga about the Soviet Union were in the 1920's. The China watchers in both capitals are relatively restrained, and unsensational. So the news flow is not too bad. But of course it is very inferior to direct reporting.

Americans frequently ask themselves how well or how fairly we have covered the Vietnam war. My own opinion is that we can be proud of how it has been covered while we recognize certain limitations and biases. Of course the fundamental national cleavage between hawks and doves has communicated itself somewhat to the correspondents in Vietnam.

Many of them, particularly the wire service reporters, have had to transmit communiques of the military establishment including body counts and other claims which even to them have seemed palpably absurd and which history has proved to be atrociously misstated. I would not expect many servicemen in Vietnam, high or low, to believe that the war they are fighting had been adequately reported. Few of us agree with the accounts of events in which we participated. This is a familiar phenomenon. It does not mean that the news accounts are wrong, but that we look at events with different eyes.

The journalists' eyes are sometimes more detached and dispassionate. Anyway, I think coverage by an honorable list of great American correspondents has been informative,

penetrating, wise and brave. Certainly never before have so many newspaper people been exposed to so much danger, so many lost in action. It has been as tough a war for reporters and photographers as for soldiers. Praising the over-all coverage as I do, I must add that we take a very black mark for having failed to learn about the My Lai episode earlier, or for not digging into other similar episodes. The apalling side of the war has been covered with what seems to be very great restraint indeed. Perhaps we will regret it as we look back years hence.

As to the Soviet Union reporting, while often difficult it is a great deal better than in was in the 20's and 30's. Prior censorship has ceased to be a burden. Occasional expulsion and limitations on free movement around the country are the major obstacles. Yet shrewd correspondents can learn a great deal about the Soviet Union in a tour of duty there and can convey much vital knowledge to the American people. Of course they cannot get to Russian space launching sites or other quasi military secrets, but the sociological economic and political developments in the vast area can be pretty well reported.

I suppose the principal impairments to adequate informing of the American people about events throughout the world are the high cost of news-gathering and limited space. There is a good deal going on in the world which is of potential importance to America that is quite inadequately reported. There always has been. This is not only in the field of news events, but also more importantly, in the significance of events. Situation stories about how things are going in places like Nigeria, or East Germany, or Indonesia seem to be of secondary importance. And yet they may someday be of great concern to the people of the world.

As we all know, a good deal of the reporting of news events throughout the world has to come through the wire services. They have had to face greatly enlarging responsibilities with every passing year. I think on the whole they have done extremely well. With more money, which has to come from us, they could staff more posts with full-time seasoned correspondents. Such men and women could be encouraged not only to cover spot news, not only to be slaves of time and the bulletin, but also to write careful situation copy. Oftimes such copy would be well ahead of the news. It would certainly help to protect the American government from being surprised in various situations which diplomats frequently do not cover as well as good reporters could.

I am speaking in somewhat utopian terms because I suppose none of us is very eager to increase our payments to either the AP or the UPI in order to enlarge their services. Yet it would be a very good thing. And it would serve the national interest—of which newspapers are also a part!

It would be useful too if more individual newspapers could employ larger and better staffs of overseas correspondents. This sort of thing, as you know, is fearfully expensive. Today I believe it is true to say that fewer American newspapers have correspondents abroad than ever before. But the handful of papers maintaining this service may have more staff correspondents and better ones than they have had down through the years. The syndication of the file of these correspondents, notably those of The New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post, has done a great deal to increase the knowledge of Americans about events in a closely integrated world.

I can tell you bluntly that I do not believe most American newspapers publish enough of the material which is now available from these various sources. Presumably editors do not believe that its reader interest stacks up against sensational local and national developments. Or they are in an economic squeeze wherein more space does not seem to be available.

Again speaking in utopian terms I think we might reassess our priorities, with less attention to the breathlessness of mere spot news, and give our readers more information in depth about the long-range significance of what is happening in the world. Had we done this regarding Indochina early enough, it is quite possible we would not have fallen into the enormous calamity of the Vietnam war. There could be other calamities just around the corner concerning which information on the significance of developing situations would be immensely valuable to American citizens. For example, I do not think we have adequate and reasonably balanced information on events and their meaning in the Middle East. Coverage of events concerning Israel and ardent local interpretations of their meaning are abundant; it is much more difficult to understand the complexities of the Arab world and to see that they are accurately described in our papers.

I do not believe that even so obvious a situation as the flirtation which West Germany is conducting with the Kremlin has been adequately understood and conveyed to the people. And yet this situation may hold the key to future peace in Europe and the world and the tranquility of every American community. Who knows? It did a few decades ago.

The United States has had a special relationship with Japan since we occupied that country after World War II. There has been quite a lot of coverage, of course. And yet do Americans see clearly the meaning of Japan's emergence as already the world's third greatest power? What does this portend? Its significance can only be judged for American readers by newspapermen and women who understand enough about Japanese history, temperament and language

to evaluate it correctly. Here again the peace and order of every American home may conceivably be at stake.

Having said all this let me say again that I believe a fairly competent flow of news coverage does reach Americans from much of the world. It is better than it was in the 1930's. Except in obvious cases like China and Russia, the only obstacles to still more penetrating coverage are our own will and determination to set up and support news-gathering activity in the places which are of greatest importance to us. It is up to us how much we are willing to invest.

Plenty of able young Americans would be very eager to make their careers in this kind of foreign correspondence. They are pouring out of the universities, and we could give them the basic training they need in our own newsrooms. As an editor of a newspaper which maintains its own overseas staff, I have a certain ambivalence in recommending that more enter the field! And yet I think they should.

My emphasis on situation and background stories I think is particularly valid in the face of the electronic competition. Radio and television do a highly efficient job, with the aid of the wire services, in getting news of events to the public. The radio bulletin can of course beat the newspaper in speed any hour of the day. So can the TV bulletin if not the picture. What print has to provide is a more careful, more detailed, more accurate account. We can report the news in more significant depth. We can give it the emphasis and the explanation is requires. Our readers can absorb it at their own pace rather than being bewildered by hasty words or images which come and go. Our great advantage is the individualization to the reader of our product. Let us make the most of it by giving them the sort of thing which we can do extremely well, and which the electronic media can only do occasionally with documentaries and then in a different way—a mass audience presentation.

Despite what Professor McLuhan has to say, I do not believe the day of the printed word has gone.

There is a rich and permanent future for the written press, for the printed word. But it will be a steadily evolving role, making itself constantly more effective and useful.

It needs better thinking and better writing.

What do I mean by better thinking? Simply that human society in our time, and the printed word with it, is in danger of being drowned in a tide of sentiment and softness. We live in the greatest age humanity has ever known, and we are not worthy of it. All the human race has ever hoped for is in danger of being blown up, not necessarily by design but ingloriously by accident. That would be an inexcusable end for man. Men who use the sharp and hard tool of the printed word should be using it to awaken humanity to its danger. We need to snap out of our drift. This is a time for great and eloquent voices, not for the coward's whimper or the cynic's whine. Where are the great voices? Sometimes we catch an echo. They should be crying out daily from our newspapers.

The better thinking we must manifest in our columns if we are to survive applies not only to the issue of nuclear disaster. It applies to a better understanding of the vast stockpile of knowledge which we have built up. In the lifetime of the youngest person in this room, mankind has discovered more about its relationship to the physical universe than in all the years of human history that have gone before. Fortunately, too, the wisest men today know that there is still a great deal to learn.

Indeed, it is potentially a Homeric Age in which we live, as men—for the first time—lift their bodies as well as their minds towards the stars. The journalist's gaze should lift beyond the daily trivia or the daily danger, and fix itself upon the magnificent goals which today lie before the human race. Never in history have we had so much to gain as well as so much to lose. The editorial voice today should be eloquent with excitement, vibrant with awareness, rich with meaning. Where are such voices?

Free men should speak the language of their heritage, saying the things they have said in earlier, lesser crises of human history. Journalists have spoken before in great revolutionary days: in Britain, in France, in Germany, in Italy, in our own country. We are now living in great revolutionary days, and the revolution is the liberation of man from slavery to his material environment, the liberation which the free societies are proving in their way more effectively than the police state could ever do.

This liberation is still the fact, I am convinced, despite the crisis through which society is passing in this nation and elsewhere. The challenges of the so-called new culture, the youth culture in some instances, are real and urgent. The problem of making our peace with the environment is great and challenging. It is of the profound importance of these crises through which we are passing that the great voices of editorial leadership should speak.

In any case, I say to you that for the printed word, for the journal, to survive and save society with it, editors must think harder and deeper of the implications of these great days. Let us, for a change, take time to think. It will be the most valuable time we have ever spent.

My second appeal is for better writing. It goes hand in hand with the appeal for harder thinking. The word is being cheapened in our time. Everybody talks too much. It is an age of gab. Words are constantly misused, and in the U.S. at least professors write articles defending sloppy grammar. The first step toward better writing; of course, is

harder thinking. But that is not enough. Words are superb tools, priceless instruments. Let us use them well.

Now, newspaper writing in the United States has been somewhat improved in recent years. It has been simplified, and that is perhaps the beginning of wisdom. But except in the rarest cases, it has lost style. Style does not need to be affectation. It can be distinction. There is no style in a news story telephoned from a hot booth and written or rewritten for a hot deadline. Sometimes, of course, there is a flash of genius, but usually style has to be worked on with the care of the sculptor.

To the new simplicity, I believe we should add the new style. I suggest that the great newspapers of the past were often great because they had a number of talented writers on their staff chiseling away with words. The reporter must dig, and he must think, and he must write, and all three are important. The editor must do the same. Again it takes time. We have made too much of a fetish of deadlines on our newspapers. If we liberate our talent from the chain-gang of time, as the electronic media have done for us, we will see some stylists emerge. I think we should try. I believe one of our best competitive tools—facing the dramatic flash of the television screen—is really good writing, stylish, shining, ringing words.

I believe newspapers can help to save man—individual man—in an age when the monster mass, the mushroom cloud, the abuse of the material environment, and the confusion of knowledge threaten to destroy him. Newspapers have the ineffable privilege of fighting for their own soul—and for the soul of man. There is great need for the printed word and if we use it skilfully, bravely, and responsibly, it will survive.

FRANCOIS SULLY 1927-1971

(François Sully was a Nieman Fellow from Newsweek in 1962–63. Following is the United Press International's report of his death in South Vietnam on February 23, 1971.)

SAIGON—François Sully, a veteran Indochina war correspondent for Newsweek magazine, died of injuries from a helicopter crash that also killed South Vietnamese Lt. Gen. Do Cao Tri.

Officials said Sully, 43, was accompanying Tri on a visit to South Vietnamese troops stationed in Cambodia when their helicopter crashed after takeoff north of Tay Ninh city. He was taken to a US field hospital, where he died several hours later. None of the seven other persons aboard the helicopter survived the crash.

Sully was the 26th newsman to be killed in Vietnam since 1954. Four others are missing and believed dead in Laos and nine others were killed in Cambodia. Seventeen newsmen are missing.

Sully, a French citizen, came to Indochina in 1947 as a tea planter and became a correspondent for Newsweek. He covered the French Indochina war through its close and the beginning of American involvement in 1954. The dapper, affable Frenchman had the longest term of service of all the foreign correspondents in the Indochinese peninsula.

In New York, Kermit Lansner, editor of Newsweek, said Sully was "a unique correspondent, to whom Vietnam was not merely an assignment, but a calling and a career."

"There is probably no living Westerner—journalist, soldier or diplomat—who understands that tragic land as well as Sully did. The terrible risks he took, year after year, finally caught up with him. We mourn him as a gifted, dedicated professional and a loyal friend."

Fisher "Retires"

(Continued from page 2)

"Ah, but in Washington, I regret, answers will not wait—sometimes not even until we know what the problem is!"

The newsmen in his audience must have felt a close rapport with Prof. Kissinger at that moment. For deadlines, likewise, do not encourage the deliberate processes. We live by our quick draw.

This fact of life accounts for much of the imperfection in our communications media today. While perhaps no greater now than previously, these imperfections are more visible. Our madly dynamic society demands much more of its journalists.

The typically American answer to our present communications gap has been a massive infusion of talent, energy, and technology into our industry. More people are at work trying to communicate ideas today than ever before.

But the fastest growing segment of journalism is neither the newspaper nor the broadcasting media. It is the education and training of communicators for tomorrow.

Enrollment in college journalism courses, for example, has increased 20 per cent in the last two years; has nearly tripled since 1960. Today, 30,000 undergraduates and 4,000 graduate students study in our country's 57 accredited schools or departments of journalism.

These students stream off the campuses at the rate of 6,500 a year and find—to the astonishment of some of us who entered the business in an earlier time—an insatiable demand for their talent.

They move not only into newspapers, magazines and broadcasting, but into advertising agencies, book publishers, public relations firms, government—wherever there is a need to be heard in this noisy world.

This response to our communications gap is good. But as a newspaper editor, one who thereby has a special appreciation of the misunderstandings within our society, I suspect that this activity in our journalism schools is more a symptom of our problem, than its solution.

While a massive number of bodies may plug our communications gap, they could also serve merely to transform the gap into a barricade of bodies and bureaucracy.

The gap is not actually in communications, anyway, but in credibility, in understanding. We are overwhelmed daily with communications, often to the point that we cannot separate what to believe from what to disbelieve.

Communications, as both a social and a technical art, needs not only more and better trained people, but new technology and more highly perfected techniques.

This is the encouraging aspect of the surge onto the campus of young people who seek journalism as a career. It perhaps has influenced the decision of a number of highly dedicated editors to move to the campus, men such as Vermont Royster of The Wall Street Journal, Elie Abel of NBC, and Norman Isaacs of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

And it is one of the factors that explains the decision of this editor to become dean of the school of journalism at the University of Missouri, as reported recently.

Missouri, the nation's first school of journalism, operates its own newspaper and commercial television enterprises and maintains far-flung teaching and research programs at both national and international levels. It is well equipped to provide answers to some of the problems that beset our profession.

During the last five years, while The Chicago Daily News has been under my editorial direction, we have tried to recognize the imperfections in our medium and to compensate for them.

In an extended series of articles, in "Insight," in Panorama, and in numerous articles of background and analysis we have encouraged a more deliberate approach to the news.

When we shot from the hip, as often we must, we have been conscious of our need to give readers a basis for evaluation and interpretation. The traditional disciplines of objective reporting, therefore, remained the guidelines for the reporter under pressure.

Most importantly, we have sought to build a responsible, professional editorial staff competent to deal with the complex issues of today. Whether the subject was politics, race relations, science, education, music, or sports, we sought writers who knew their subject well and who could deal with it in a disinterested and objective manner.

And we have preferred to cover the news with our own reporters, rather than depend upon wire services or other newspapers to do our work for us. Of all the Chicago newspapers, for example, The Daily News alone has maintained its own correspondents in Vietnam throughout the war.

The intent of these "Letters from the Editor" has been to acquaint you with these men and women who report the news for you. By knowing something about them, I think, you are better able to evaluate the job they do.

I move to my new position with the deepest sense of gratitude and respect for my colleagues here at The Daily News. Under my highly competent successor, they will continue to do what one newspaper can do to establish the credibility that is the basis for a stable society.

And within more deliberate temporal dimensions, we will be working at the same thing.

Royster "Retires"

(Continued from page 2)

Times" (Harper and Row, $10), and is now so busy with lectures, interviews and radio raconteuring that he complains retirement is too strenuous for old folks.

Unless you're a New Yorker Mr. Catledge's book may tell you more about the Times than you care to know. But unless you're devoid of romance, curiosity about olden times and a delight in tall tales you'll find Mr. Catledge's salty memories as irresistible as peanuts. Anyway, both can spice the cocktail chatter.

What sparks this brooding about unretiring newsmen is the fact that the other day they changed the masthead on this newspaper, that little box that appears in the lower right-hand corner of this page and lists sundry people connected with the enterprise. In the rearrangement my own name disappeared. That was expected, of course, since my "retirement" was announced a month ago. All the same, it makes that little box look pretty naked.

* * *

It's also an occasion to stir memories. Not so long nor so rich as Turner Catledge's, for I am yet shy his three-score and ten. But long enough; they will do.

Early in his reminiscences Mr. Catledge remarks that things were different back in those olden days. Newspapering was more relaxed, more informal; less serious, less weighted down with responsibility for the state of the world. "We reporters," he recalls, "were a wild bunch. We drank a lot and had a lot of fun and didn't worry much."

He's sure right about that.

In the 1930s The Wall Street Journal was a minuscule newspaper (circulation 35,000) with salaries to match. But in those depression days having any news job put joy in the spirit. Exciting things were happening, and it was fun to be mixed up in them even if we didn't always understand them.

There was nothing unusual about seeing a whiskey bottle on desks in the New York newsroom or being caught up in a paper fight, with the wads of balled-up copypaper so thick in the air it looked like a blizzard. The managing editor would come grumbling out of his cubbyhole and wearily order a truce without dampening the animal spirits.

Every once in awhile something big would break, like a president of the New York Stock Exchange absconding with all the money, and everybody would run around ferreting out every tidbit of the scandal. The event might be a disaster, but the newsroom attitude was one of secret delight at having something exciting to write about.

The Washington bureau was equally informal, because Washington itself was. The tiny office had only four desks for twelve reporters, so a lot of them never showed up at all, preferring to work among the nude pictures of the Treasury pressroom or handy to the leather couches in the Capitol press gallery. If they did drift in during the late afternoon, they could always join the running card game on the copy desk until one of the typewriters was free.

There was no shortage of things to write about. Things were popping in those New Deal days and Administration officials were as carefree as newsmen about what they popped off about. Drop into any official's office and you'd walk out with a story, although whether it was true was another matter.

On one memorable morning The Wall Street Journal and The New York Times both carried stories about a proposed tax bill. The oddity was that they said exactly opposite things. No matter. Both were wrong. The reporters had talked to different people and accurately recorded the conversations, but the usually reliable sources turned out not to be. Embarrassing, but the Republic survived.

* * *

Congressmen were generally more trustworthy. Vice President Garner had a happy custom of holding open house, complete with refreshments, for his Congressional cronies and idle newsmen. The talk was wide-ranging, some of it unprintable, but you needed no elaborate rules about what was quotable or for background or for silence. Who needs rules among good drinking companions?

Why it all changed is hard to say. But today the Journal's New York newsroom is as sedate as a banking floor, and if you drop into our palatial Washington quarters you'll find no wastrels at their card games. In official circles popping off is frowned upon and the current Vice President is not given to camaraderie with newsmen, with or without refreshments.

Perhaps it's just the change in the times. In the thirties big things were happening, but hardly anybody was self-conscious about his rendezvous with destiny. The New Dealers, or most of them, were just having fun re-arranging things to suit their fancy, sometimes one way on Monday and another way on Tuesday, and those of us on the fringes were having equal fun recording it all.

Nowadays everybody is serious about everything, including themselves. Even college students need a "cause" to justify high jinks; they can't just eat goldfish. Officials think only a serious mien befits serious problems. Reporters feel they must be solemn because the stories are significant. It's a different life-style.

Well, maybe it's better. Certainly the times are grave

enough, as they always were. No doubt the young fellows in our newsroom, like those elsewhere, are more concerned about the social issues and more knowledgeable than were the old-timers. Whether they are having as much fun—that's a different question.

Yet what I remember now is the fun of it all, whether in a New York night court or at a Vienna confrontation of statesmen. You can "retire" from it, of course, just like it says on the masthead. What you can't cure is the addiction.

Which is why I, too, will now and then show up at the gathering, elbows bent for all who will listen. And keep right on scribbling.

A Multiple Choice Dispatch

A Report on Just About Any Day's Events in Cambodia

By David Hoffman

(Reprinted from the *Washington Post*)

PHNOM PENH, Jan.—Communist forces [encircled, continued to beseige, applied renewed pressure] against Cambodia's capital today as the Indochina War [neared a crucial juncture, escalated once again, started winding down, entered a new phase, further baffled experts].

Farther south, a combined Vietcong-North Vietnamese force [occupied positions along-side, withdrew from strategic passes, cut] Cambodia's one overland link to the sea. An estimated [three battalions, two divisions, one armored corps] of Communists reportedly were involved in the [retreat from, advance on] National Route 4 between Phnom Penh and the Gulf of Siam.

Military sources on-scene said that the over-all Communist goal was to [boost American casualties, starve Phnom Penh's civilian population, slow the pace of Vietnamization, capture the resort beaches of Kompong Som]. This assessment was confirmed by [a Khmer Rouge district chief, a high-ranking NVA defector, diplomatic sources in the capital].

Just outside Phnom Penh city limits last night, an earsplitting [crackle of small arms fire, roar from massed enemy cannon, silence] rose above the blackness.

Foreign diplomatic sources expressed fear that with the onslaught of the [dry, wet] season, the Communists would [concentrate on upgrading guerrillas, attempt to capture the capital, amputate strategic western provinces]. Informed conjecture has it that the enemy will first tip his hand by [massing, withdrawing] units near the strategic crossroads village of Pak Teoroi.

Pak Teoroi appears as Roipak Teo or Teopak Roi on some military maps.

Questioned sharply by newsmen, U.S. advisers continued to deny the presence of American [CIA agents, infantry units, B-52 bombers, specially trained dog packs] in once-neutral Cambodia. Other sources, while declining to be identified, contradicted the advisers on this crucial point.

A South Vietnamese communique said that [tankers steaming up the Mekong, Lt. Gen. Do Cao Tri, B-52 bomb strikes, the dog packs] would bring an end to Phnom Penh's critical fuel shortage. That shortage, in turn, had been discovered and announced in Washington. The South Vietnamese communique was monitored beside the Hotel Royale pool, where nighttime swimming is popular.

Western correspondents have not been allowed out of Phnom Penh for [one month, two months, since President Nixon's incursion]. However, a [Burmese, Filipino] rice expert attached to a Cambodian company was quoted as saying "Communists everywhere outside. Coming big trouble."

In the [Parrot's Beak, Angel's Wing, Dog Face, Fishhook] area of Cambodia, which abuts South Vietnam, NVA regulars were reported [rebuilding, ignoring, restocking] their old jungle sanctuaries. This was believed preparatory to [a withdrawal northward, a strike east toward Saigon, a general refurbishing] during the [dry, wet] season.

Asked to interpret the current [lull, stepup] in Communist military activity, a U.S. Command spokesman would say only that "the enemy's military capability remains intact. Further information must come from Washington."

A Pentagon spokesman said it was the U.S. Command's responsibility to interpret enemy intentions. Further information he said, was available in [Saigon, Phnom Penh, Cincpac in Hawaii]. He added that the U.S. response was made in accord with President Nixon's important policy statement of [May 9, June 11, July 26, Oct. 14], "as is well known."

Meanwhile, to the North in Laos . . .

"The Facts Are What Matter"

By J. Russell Wiggins

I hope it will not surprise, dismay, depress or appall you if I say to you that, in this hour of our country's history, we newspapermen are not loved. Lou Harris has reported that 72 percent of educated Americans are distrustful of the press. George Gallup has recently said that "journalism (in his lifetime) never had been held in such low esteem." A well-known public official last year won national applause by criticizing the media.

No, we are not loved.

But, really, it is worse than that.

We never have been much loved.

There are few places where journalists have been more disliked or worse treated than in these very precincts. The General Court of Massachusetts in Oct. 1662 passed an act which said: "For the prevention of irregularities and abuse to the authority of this country by the printing presse, it is ordered that henceforth, no copie shall be printed but by the allowance, first had and obtained under the hands of Captain Daniel Gookin and Mr. Jonathan Mitchell, until this Court shall take further order therein."

On May 13, 1725, an Order In Council stated that the printers of the newspapers in Boston be ordered upon their peril not to insert in their prints "anything of the public affairs of this province relating to war without the order of the government."

After the formation of the Union, the press was long held in contempt by the leaders of the new government. President George Washington thoroughly detested many of the newspapers of his day. Near the end of his life, even Thomas Jefferson grew sour on the press. In 1816 he wrote James Monroe:

"From forty years' experience of the wretched guesswork of the newspapers of what is not done in open daylight and their falsehood, even as to that, I rarely think them worth reading, and almost never worth notice."

Alexis de Tocqueville, more than 100 years ago, in his *Democracy in America,* said of the American newspapers:

"The journalists of the United States are generally in a very humble position with a scanty education and a vulgar turn of mind . . . The characteristics of the American journalist consist in an open and coarse appeal to the passions of his readers; he abandons principles to assail the characters of individuals, to track them into private life and disclose their weaknesses and vice."

Few figures in our history loved the press less than did General William Tecumseh Sherman. When General Buell replaced Sherman as Commander of the Army of Tennessee, the Cincinnatti Enquirer rejoiced in the change and said of Sherman:

"His favorite, often proclaimed plan for the successful management of the war is the suppression of every newspaper in the country . . . He considers the press alone responsible for all the defeats of Federal arms, inclusive of Bull Run."

Long after the Civil War, in 1884, while writing of his refusal to become a presidential candidate, he said:

"If I ran for President, I'd wake up some morning and find all over the newspapers that I'd poisoned my grandmother. Now you know, I never saw my mother's mother, but the newspapers would say I killed her, and prove it."

I suppose no American public figure outdid Al Smith in the denunciation of an individual newspaperman. In his 1926 speech replying to the Hearst newspapers' accusations on the New York milk fund, Smith described William Randolph Hearst as a "lowbrow, sinister looking creature."

So, you see, we have been un-loved, even disliked, by many people, for quite a while.

This circumstance should not induce us to look with indifference upon public reproach and criticism. But it raises the nice question of whether or not newspapers reasonably can expect to be loved. If they do their work well they are bound to lose the love of a great many people. Perhaps it is not "love" they should covet, but respect, credibility and confidence—very different things.

There is no doubt that these are eroding in an age when controversy is rising and opinion is fragmenting. If the performance of the press exceeded that in any earlier period it probably would not now command the same general belief and credibility. It is serving an audience of much more diverse views than that served by the press of a generation ago.

This altered situation, in my own view, makes it more

important than ever for newspapers to be impartial, objective and fair. But I do not wish, on this occasion, to raise the controversy between the advocates of objective journalism and the proponents of the journalism of advocacy. I would like, rather, to summon the partisans of both doctrines to a respect for the facts, whether the purpose of the journalist is information or persuasion, objectivity or advocacy.

Facts never were at a higher premium in the marketplace of ideas than they are today. Facts were never more elusive, complicated and evasive. Facts were never more needed, never harder to come by.

The foremost political, economic and social controversies and our day cry aloud for facts. When a reader finds a single, solitary, undisputed, indubitable, inescapable and undebatable fact gleaming like a lost needle in a haystack of windy rhetoric, he is likely to be overcome.

Imagine the lonely life of a solitary fact wandering into the debate on Indo-China. For months, most Americans, relying on their newspapers, accepted as a "fact" the conclusion that the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front had scored a great victory in the TET offensive. But now there are many observers who agree with the British parliamentarian, Hugh Dykes, who recently said: "In retrospect the 1968 TET offensive was the Ardennes offensive of the Vietcong. It failed disastrously and the NLF has still not recovered from the shock of failing to persuade the people to rise up with it."

The conservationists and the people who oppose them are likewise engaged in a battle of words more filled with fury than with facts. Facts about environmental issues are very hard to get. There have been millions of words written on oil pollution, but it is hard to find out exactly what has happened to the seas of the world into which great tankers have been dumping three million tons of oil a year. You can get plenty of arguments over the effects of oil spills on coastal ecology, but few hard facts. For a long time, facts about pesticide pollution were almost unobtainable. It still is difficult to get facts on many pesticides and defoliants.

The facts about law and disorder are extremely elusive. They appear infrequently in the national debate over law enforcement. Philip M. Hauser recently pointed out in *The Smithsonian* that the frequent statement that crime is increasing faster than the population is really a "half-fact." During the sixties, the number of youngsters between 15 years and 19 years of age rose by 46 percent. So-called delinquency would have risen dramatically even if the rate of delinquency had remained the same.

Several years ago Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg brought out their analysis of the 1960 census, in their book *This USA*. They mobilized a whole catalogue of facts at war with popular assumptions about American life—facts about crime rates, population change, divorce, poverty, discrimination. They were led to conclude from the generally favorable facts about a somewhat discouraged society that "people tend to forget their social victories and concentrate instead on the problems that remain." They concluded that, in fact, American problems far from being insurmountable, are being surmounted—that "the fight is being waged and won" for a better America. But these facts did not have much of an impact in the decade in which they were made available. Their hopeful gleam did not penetrate far into the gloomy columns of a press intent upon examining the "malaise" in American society.

In part, journalists are handicapped as fact-seekers by the nature of news as the press generally has understood it. Bad news is good news and worse news is better. That rule of thumb underlies a great many news judgments. It is a rule that sometimes makes the press a provocateur.

Elements in society intent on public disorder, often are able to enlist the newspapers and radio and television as unwitting collaborators. The *Freedom Of Information Center,* in its October report, summarized some of the situations in which this happened.

WABC-TV had a phone-caller who asked if the station was willing to cover a demonstration at the Dominican U.N. Mission. When the caller was asked how many demonstrators were involved, she asked how many the station needed. When asked the time of the demonstration, the caller said it could be staged whenever convenient for the camera crews.

U. S. News and *World Report* in 1968 told of how a Television Crew brought picket signs to a college demonstration, just in case the demonstrators didn't have signs of their own.

Variety Magazine reported that two young hippies were asked by TV cameramen to block an entrance that President and Mrs. Johnson were going to use.

The National Observer reported that hunter Howard Knutson was asked by a film crew to fake the eating of raw wolf meat for a documentary.

Deliberate incitation, of course, is less common than the incidental incitation to violence by the very presence of cameras.

The self-fulfilling prophecy is another hazard of the press. A newspaper which is told that a riotous demonstration is going to take place can make the riot a certainty by giving it the advance notice that will attract participants and draw crowds of the curious who may become participants.

One metropolitan newspaper last year carried a well displayed story that campus violence was about to strike the

high schools of the community. The ink was hardly dry on the story before the high school riot vindicated prophecy —to the accompaniment of the cameras of the TV station of the newspaper.

Newspapers and TV stations are getting a little more mature about this and many are contenting themselves with reporting demonstrations after the fact instead of forecasting them.

The communications media has often been made the unwitting accomplice to violence by unfailing coverage of violence. If a hundred young men were to meet here and discuss the draft in an orderly way, their deliberations would get a paragraph in the back of the local paper. If they marched on selective service headquarters and threw a few rocks they would get headlines across the country. Our Pavlovian response to disorder has contributed to disorder.

For many years of my own career, I lived by the celebrated doctrine that "What God was willing to let happen, I was willing to let get into print." This doctrine has a lot to commend it. Editorial decisions in favor of withholding news generally are based upon an imperfect understanding of the situation.

Southern newspapers, for decades, dealt very gingerly (and mostly not at all) with racial violence, for fear of causing a race riot. When racial outbursts grew too large to ignore, the discontent and alienation they evidenced was news to many citizens who had no proper news preparation for these events. They did not happen, as they seemed to happen, like a clap of thunder but had been part of a storm gathering for years.

So I am chary of counsels of suppression—even in good causes. During the Administration of President Truman, I was a member of an ASNE committee that called on the President to ask him to amend Executive Order 290, governing classification of documents. We had a long and earnest discussion, during which the President, in exasperation, turned to us and said: "I am only trying to protect the country, and you know, it's your country, too."

I think the President was mistaken on the immediate point, but his words have lingered in my mind. Whether we wish to acknowledge it or not, the news itself does have an effect on public order. The ties of custom, convention and tradition and law that incline a society to public order generally are tough and resistant and equal to the stresses imposed upon them by the mere burden of violent, reckless, or incendiary speech. But there are times in the life of a community when violence itself may threaten the fragile fabric that distinguishes social order from social anarchy. A newspaper that, at such a time, sensationalizes disorder, exaggerates it, condones it and capitalizes on it, is like a man who cries fire in a crowded theater.

There have been times in the last few years when I have thought of President Truman's exclamation. I have read columns, news accounts and editorials obviously written without any thought of President Truman's exasperated assertion: "You know, it's your country, too."

Then, of course, the focus of the press upon the noisy, superficial and trivial partakes a little of the phenomena described by Edmund Burke in the last century when he wrote:

"Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of great cattle, reposed beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field; that of course, they are many in number, or that after all, they are other than the little, shriveled, meagre, hopping though loud and troublesome insects of the hour." We do sometimes get pretty preoccupied with the "insects of the hour," to use Burke's phrase.

No reproach to the press should ever be uttered on the assumption that the facts are always easy to get. They are often very hard to find out.

Our brethren in the legal profession have put their chief reliance on adversary proceedings to determine the facts. The best that can be said of their system is that, in the courts, it is a better legal system then any known alternative method. But it is not a very scientific method of getting at truth.

And it is not a method that invariably works well for newspapers. A newspaper cannot really congratulate itself on having got at the facts impartially when it has quoted at length from two uninformed idiots on opposing sides of an issue. But that is the method we often use. We quote an official who says that there were 5,000 demonstrators and the agitator who says there were 20,000. Such facts are ascertainable and we ought to get them and use them as our own.

Sometimes I fear that we put a lower news value on published ascertainable and verifiable fact than we put upon unsupported assertion or allegation of fact that we have exclusively discovered by our own journalistic ingenuity. With us, a "fact" sometimes loses news value the instant it is known while rumor, report, and conjecture attain and acquire greater respect as "news" by their sheer novelty.

A disagreeable thing about facts is that they can be used selectively to prove an essential falsehood.

Pierre Goubert, in the 1971 Winter issue of *Daedalus,* says of local historians (which is what we are) that "a thesis or interpretation, however ingenious, needs to be supported by precise facts." He cites an author who used

facts about the rule of the Bourbons to prove that the French were miserable then. But he concludes that "one needs only to choose one's evidence carefully in the sea of published local history." It would, he acknowledges, "be quite possible to prove France was flourishing or that it was miserable during the reign of Louis XIII."

Richard Harwood, of The Washington Post, showed how this could happen in an article last November, in which he reviewed the press coverage of the Besson Report on what the Army had learned from the Vietnam War. The Army Times carried a long story under the headline: *LBJ & Co. Blamed For Botching War.* This was followed by stories in the general press under various headlines such as *LBJ Botched Viet War, Military Hits LBJ On Viet War, Defense Finds Johnson Used Faulty War Strategy, Pentagon Panel Faults Johnson.*

The General who wrote about the three-volume report sadly concluded: "I have not seen a responsible story on the report. What I have seen has been sensational journalism —picking out a statement here and there and sensationalizing it. The political and economic constraints did not result in any major logistical problems except some excesses at some times and some increased costs."

The stories written about this report were not written by irresponsible reporters or published by irresponsible editors. They were put into newspapers by journalists trying to cope with newspaper quandary. When you have a long report to get into a short story, you try to pick out one or two things. The result often is something like the description of the elephant by the committee of blind men. Each story is essentially correct but the whole story is not told.

Everyone inside the newspaper profession will find this kind of error understandable; and everyone outside the profession who is the victim of it will find it unforgivable. It is the result of a compound of mechanical limitations and our incurable itch for the negative, the adverse, and the controversial.

I know I will offend the proponent of advocacy journalism when I say that it makes a difference where you put the facts in a story. I have an old-fashioned preference for putting them first and deferring conjecture and interpretation. I was struck by the importance of this in the stories announcing the appointment of John B. Connally. The New York Times got to the fact at once, saying: "President Nixon announced today that he would nominate former Governor John B. Connally, Jr., of Texas, a Democrat, to replace David M. Kennedy as Secretary of the Treasury." The Washington Post said: "In another post-election cabinet shuffle, President Nixon, yesterday picked former Gov. John B. Connally of Texas, a Democrat, and ally of former President Johnson, to be Secretary of the Treasury." But I saw a story in a New England paper which said: "President Nixon sought yesterday to broaden support for his embattled economic policies by selecting Democratic stalwart John B. Connally, former Texas Governor, and close friend of Lyndon B. Johnson, to be his new Treasury Secretary." All the stories had conjecture as to why the President named Connally, and much of it was very interesting. But, as a reader, I like to have one clear unobstructed glimpse of the naked truth before it is dressed up in someone else's surmise and conjecture.

But I promised not to get into this debate, and I do not intend to do so. Whether the journalist is so old-fashioned and square as to desire to give information in an objective, fair and impartial way, or so modern and committed as to wish to practise the journalism of advocacy, he will help restore the respect for, belief in and credibility of the press by digging harder for the facts. He may write with wit and verve and dash and passion and concern and commitment, but if his stuff lacks the facts, it will not contribute either to the information of the public, the advancement of his cause or the credibility of the press.

This is not necessarily the path to popularity, affection or love. Many facts are unwelcome. Many facts are unpalatable. Many facts are almost indigestible. Many facts are painful. Nevertheless, the more confidently readers can turn to the press for the facts the more the press will be respected and believed.

When Rebecca West's great book *The Meaning Of Treason* came out 25 years ago, it was filled with wonderful insights about the men guilty of treason, but the paragraph for which I will always remember her and her book was this one:

"It is the presentation of the facts that matter, the facts that put together are the face of the age; the rise in the price of coal, the new ballet, the woman found dead in a kimono on the golf links, the latest sermon of the Archbishop of York, the marriage of a Prime Minister's daughter. For if people do not have the face of the age set clearly before them they begin to imagine it; and fantasy, if it is not disciplined by the intellect and kept in faith with reality by the instinct of art, dwells among the wishes and fears of childhood, and so sees life either as simply answering any prayer or as endlessly emitting nightmare monsters from a womb-like cave."

The above remarks by Mr. Wiggins, Editor and Publisher of the Ellsworth American, were made at the Annual Awards Dinner of the New England Press Association in Boston.

Let Us Pray for Deliverance

By John C. Quinn

Those of us who cater to the whims of the intellectual establishment carry Pogo on our comic pages. Two days ago the Pogo strip related a conversation between a cunning chap who could be a very important public official and a foxy fellow who may be a syndicated columnist.

The conversation went like this:

Columnist-type: "When you speak of throwing the rascals out, what rascals do you mean?"

VIP-type: "Well, indubitably naturally and of course . . . those who oppose, those who traitorously place the true policy in jeopardy and worse."

Columnist-type: "How about the other rascals?"

VIP-type: "You mean those who are compatibly in agreement with the eminently correct course? Well, sir, they're all right. . . . They're OUR rascals."

With apologies to Walt Kelly, let me say that a rascal is a rascal is a rascal. Rascals survive on mischief-making. They are challenging, abrasive, aggressive, totally irresponsible and usually unsuccessful.

And these days, we seem surrounded by rascals. We have rascals on the left; we have rascals on the right; we have rascals popping up all over the middle—those silent rascals with very big mouths. We have rascals without and rascals within. We have rascals, good, bad and indifferent.

And, if we are not very, very careful, these rascals may succeed in their mischief-making. Take warning: success will spoil any rascal, good or bad.

Some years ago, a colleague, discussing excellence in journalism, conceded there are all kinds of newspapers—excellent, good, mediocre and downright bad. But he went on:

> "The United States is served far better by its press than any other country in the world, and better than most of its citizens realize. The press has developed in a particular way to serve a particular society—ours and no one else's—and it is a key block in our society's foundation. I would not care to risk a fundamental change for fear of bringing that society crashing down."

And crashing down upon us that society will come if we allow the mischief-makers to succeed. All those mischief-makers . . . all those rascals—right, left, middle . . . good, bad . . . yours, ours, theirs.

They cannot succeed, *but* they must continue to exist. We cannot eliminate them. And we should not eliminate them if we could.

For mischief-making also is a key block in our society's foundation, another particular factor in our society. Its history reaches back to our earliest days, and its finest examples can be found in this very city. Yet our society did not collapse. It thrived on it because it needed that mischief to succeed.

If we are truly objective, we shall see that we need the mischief-makers today.

We need that mischief-making, but we must deny the mischief-makers any success. Indeed mischief must always be a threat, never a reality. When it becomes a reality, it becomes a disaster. And we have seen the tragedy that brings—all too often of late.

So in the delicate design of our society, the rascals must be around to raise the issues, to sound the cry. But we, too, must play our part in that delicate design. We must respond to the mischief, to the challenge, to the cry. We must respond with leadership, with responsibility, with competence.

Leadership . . . responsibility . . . competence . . . and a million more clichés all of us have heard too many times.

While the rascals scream their mischief we can smother

like a pitiful, helpless giant in a bottomless pit of clichés about the vital role of a free press in a free society. All true enough, of course; all seeped in the security of self-righteousness. But rather weary replies to the rascals of our days and very empty replies to the mischief some of them are making.

What else, then?

Let us, for a few moments, pray.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who bully us for speaking sharply;

. . . from those who ridicule us for speaking with conviction;

. . . from those who berate us for speaking honestly.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who want us to look but not see and see without looking;

. . . from those who want us to listen but not hear and hear without listening to all;

. . . from those who want us to know but not understand and understand without knowing the facts.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from the propagandists who would use us;

. . . from the demagogues who would misuse us;

. . . from the rascals who would abuse us.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who want us to report all that titillates them;

. . . from those who want us to avoid all that annoys them;

. . . from those who want us to hide all that aggravates them.

Let us pray for deliverance, too, from those within our ranks . . .

. . . from those whose opinions get in the way of their facts;

. . . from those whose concerns get in the way of their competence;

. . . from those whose conclusions get in the way of their curiosity.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who believe news is what is important to them;

. . . from those who believe trivia is what is unimportant to them;

. . . from those who believe importance is for them alone to decide.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who argue that facts cannot speak for themselves;

. . . from those who argue that analysis must speak for them alone;

. . . from those who argue that opinion must be spoken at all times.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from editors who would abdicate to panels of amateurs;

. . . from editors who would hide behind committees of advisors;

. . . from editors who would forfeit their own rights and responsibilities along with the rights of and responsibilities to the public.

Let us pray for deliverance . . .

. . . from those who prefer power to responsibility;

. . . from those who prefer accolades to accomplishment;

. . . from those who prefer comfort to courage;

. . . from those who prefer Mother Goose to good journalism.

But if we pray for deliverance from all these rascals and if our prayers are answered, who then in this world is going to challenge those rascals?

Who is going to keep those rascals as a healthy threat and not a tragic reality?

Who indeed?

No one is going to do that job except us.

So how can we be delivered? And why should we be delivered?

Let us instead pray for strength to do our job well . . . to serve our community and everyone in it competently, conscientiously, consistently, confidently.

Not to produce the finest journalism in the world—though it could; not to produce the finest journalism in the nation—though it could; not to produce the finest journalism in the state—though it could; but to produce the finest, most responsible journalism for our community.

The very goal of this society and this academy we salute!

And when we have the best journalism in the community, we shall know it; our community will know it and will be served by it.

In that knowledge, we shall find the strength and courage and ability to deliver ourselves and our community out of the reach of those nasty rascals, not by denying them their useful part in our free society but by truly meeting our responsibility to keep that society free for all men.

Mr. Quinn is Executive Editor of the Gannett Newspapers in Rochester, New York. The above remarks were made at the Yankee Quill Awards Dinner sponsored by the New England Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi.

A Newsman on Sabbatical

By Ian Menzies

Mr. Menzies, Associate Editor of The Boston Globe, and former Managing Editor, was a Nieman Fellow in 1961–62. He took his sabbatical year from February 1970 to February 1971.

"You say you're on a sabbatical?" . . . (pause) . . . and you're a newspaperman?" Look of disbelief.

"Yes."

"Are they paying you?" This is asked with almost compulsive embarrassment in the hope that a negative might resolve the questioner's dilemma.

"Yes."

"Hhurrmm." No conglomerate of letters can quite describe the variations of that sound and the multitudinous thoughts behind it.

Obviously the questioner considered the phrase "newspaper sabbatical" a euphemism for being fired or at least being put out to pasture, as did 98 per cent of the staff on The Boston Globe and not a few acquaintances.

Sabbaticals and newspapers are a seeming contradiction in terms in the minds of most men including those who normally rub shoulders with newsmen. Even academics, for whom sabbaticals have long been a way of life, seemed considerably startled, even defensive as though their position was being infiltrated.

But you can't blame anyone for being surprised. Until my own, I had never heard of a newspaperman on a sabbatical and this flips some 30 years in the business, less a world war.

Why is this? Why has it taken so long for the word sabbatical to enter the newspaper lexicon?

True there are all types of academic fellowships available —at Harvard, at Stanford, at Columbia. There are also traveling fellowships, foundation scholarships and internships. But they are all for the young.

What about middle-aged editors, chronologically described as over 40 but under 60; often more colorfully described by younger associates. No matter their venerability these are still the men who set policy, determine emphasis, enrage reporters, hire and fire and influence coverage. Where do they go?

And in that sweeping word "editors" include everyone from The Editor through managing editor, news editor, national editor, city editor (if he be over 40) to senior desk editor.

Some editors when they first enter the management stage attend API's at Columbia. A few attend more than once. The cinder track record is said to be four which adds up over innumerable years to a munificent eight weeks of talking quite profitably to other editors and avoiding "the dangers of Harlem" where the people are.

In addition there are the professional meetings, the one week annual get-togethers of ASNE, APME, NCEW, etc. At each and every one of these meetings the group is invariably lectured, often by outsiders, on how the young are thinking, how the blacks are thinking, how women's lib is thinking and for a change of pace how the hardhats are thinking.

Evidently the editors haven't a clue themselves or you'd think they'd get a new program chairman.

Some times a Norm Isaacs or a Ben Bagdikian is trotted out to stir up a little action but as both men probably well know, although given an attentive hearing, they are regarded by the mass membership as "house radicals" whose performance once given can be absorbed within comfortable establishmentarianism.

None of these activities comes close to subbing for a

sabbatical, or even rating as a form of continuing education.

For a change of pace, though not a solution, it might help to hold the next APME or ASNE meeting in some city ghetto and billet every editor with a different family. Meetings could be held in the welfare office with a final party for the host families at the Waldorf.

This approach certainly would do more to change the face of the American newspaper, the ghetto and its poor than 50 years of Congressional debate.

Move editors out of the paper and you'll move the news they look at in.

Older editors must be given a chance to get clear of their desks and what may be worse—other editors. They have to go look, listen, smell, taste, question and analyze, especially in these days of advocacy journalism where the first move of a bright young reporter is to try and advocate the defenceless editor out of the seat of his pants and to the writer's viewpoint.

Do publishers really feel their key editors are so attuned to every changing nuance within and without the country that they can spend 10 years "on the job" enriched only with an API, an annual one-week professional meeting and three-week vacations in Jamaica?

Do editors themselves believe that an intellectual diet of suburbia to office and back again, a glance at "scores" of magazines, a look at a "few" books, some "stimulating" luncheons, a brush or two with a "bright" academic and a "top" briefing now and again is enough to allow them to direct today's sophisticated news staffs who reflect this complex, changing world, capable, for the first time, of instant self-destruction?

Any senior editor who boasts today of "being on the same job without a break for 10 or 15 years," and there are many who do, is either ready for analysis or is unaware that the paper is being produced around him or despite him.

Is it possible that editors themselves are to blame for the dearth of sabbaticals?

Are they frightened to relinquish their chairs in case they may be occupied when they return or does a return to traveling around in the big outside world scare them silly?

It does seem true that corporate structure is creeping into the newsrooms, that management within the expanding big city dailies is becoming more patterned on the organization man than the news executive.

Many papers don't seem to feel in style today unless on a small scale they can boast the editorial management intrigue of The New York Times, plus warring factions of advocacy reporters.

This militates against sabbaticals, as well as strong newsroom morale which should more parallel academe than insurance conglomerates.

Sabbaticals as a newspaper way of life also require enlightened publishers; must have them. I have been favored with such a publishing family, with a publisher who on reading of the Selma March back in 1965, and who had trouble believing this could happen to the America he knew, took off quietly for Alabama to learn the facts for himself.

And publishers should be interested in sabbaticals for other reasons, little discussed as yet.

Being an editor can be bloody boring, speaking from personal experience, and publishers and their papers stand to loose some good editors if they can't make life more interesting.

There is also, as "Newby" Noyes, editor of the Washington Star, perceptively remarked at a rump session of editors on Cape Cod two falls ago, the major problem of how to move senior editors gracefully to one side.

The two points are not unrelated.

Sabbaticals introduce a pattern of fluidity into static situations.

A sabbatical allows a top editor who is bored or frustrated to make a readjustment without leaving the newspaper business. It also allows a publisher who may be bored with a top editor to readjust the editor.

If the editor is in the early 40's he may return to the job he was doing or he may change direction. If he is in his late 50's he may step from line to staff function, utilizing the benefit of his sabbatical year to make a new contribution to his paper in a different capacity, even in a different department.

The institution of sabbaticals within a paper makes such movement graceful and natural.

As big newspapers grow bigger the number of middle-management editorial jobs increases but room at the top remains unchanged. If newspapers wish to retain their bright but fortyish editors they should do everything possible to increase fluidity.

Vermont Royster who is opting out of the main stream of The Wall Street Journal was quoted recently as saying he wanted to follow his own thesis that men ought to change jobs every 25 or 30 years.

There is a strong argument to go even further, to introduce rotation to newspapers; to have editors change jobs within a particular paper every five or so years without feeling, as Royster remarked, the need for an ego adjustment.

Newspaper publishers have brought static senior editorial management upon themselves by accepting its existence without seeking a remedy.

Sabbaticals could introduce the fluidity so urgently needed.

Finally and not unimportantly what are the editorial benefits of a sabbatical to an editor who has been under house arrest for five or 10 years, and his paper?

First off, sabbaticals should not be confused with leaves of absence to write a book or perform some specific civic or political function nor with fellowships which are seldom available to those over 40 anyway.

The initial benefit of a sabbatical is that it makes an editor think. It shakes him up. He's going to have to go out on his own again. He's not going to fall into some neatly arranged fellowship program; he has to carve out his own ticket, his own program, alone.

Although many editors know exactly what they would do if given a sabbatical, it can be frightening to others which is a strong reason for making such programs official so that the timid can be pushed outward.

Some editors may need help from their publishers and associates in planning a sabbatical and such help should be given, but only on a general basis. The benefit of a newspaper sabbatical, as opposed to an academic sabbatical, should be in the looseness of its structure.

Two ingredients are essential: writing and travel. The writing need not necessarily be for the news or editorial columns but might well consist of reports on anything from future computerization to satellite publishing plants to adoption of a new type face.

My own program was determined by self-evaluation. I needed retreading after seven years at a desk, two as financial editor and five as managing editor, fighting for every thinking moment.

The wonderful learning years as a general assignment reporter and a specialist in education, medicine and science seemed to be fading into oblivion. A decade-old Nieman Fellowship seemed an eternity away.

The years between 1965 and 1970, perhaps, the most traumatic of the American 20th century, could have burned out an insensitive computer far less a mere managing editor of what is loosely described as a "liberal paper" which opposed the war when it was not fashionable to do so and in the face of Louise Day Hicks, now a Congresswoman, talked and hired blacks as far back as 1965, something still not too fashionable in some newspaper quarters today.

Those five years when it was impossible to be right needed rethinking; they still do.

I chose to look at the crisis in the cities, as it seemed a microcosm of everything wrong in America, and was offered a base operation by Robert C. Wood at the Joint Center for Urban Studies, M.I.T.–Harvard, which he then headed. Wood, former director of HUD, is now president of the University of Massachusetts.

I looked and wrote of regional-metropolitan government here and abroad, of new towns; looked for answers to mass transportation and alternatives to the automobile within the city, at ways to rebuild cities without displacing people, how to mass build houses, how to raise money, how to administer cities.

One quickly learned that the great weakness of American newspapers today, including our own, is that they write of the froth and gossip of politics and little of the substance of government, an understanding and nurturing of which is the real road to progress.

I enjoyed a flashback to my old medical reporting days and produced a six-part series on the great and continuing health debate spiced with Q and A's which introduced me to the fine new reporting tool—the tape.

I can only say that things haven't changed in medicine in 15 years out. The nation is still unable to deliver health care adequately. People are still going broke paying for health care. Doctors and insurance companies are still running the system and the nation still needs a national health insurance program and will have one before the 70's pass into history.

I put together a cold, appraising look at the paper, its strengths and its weaknesses, at least in the mind of one man, and took a stab at the great issues we should expect throughout the 70's.

In addition to men who know more and write better on government, we need a new evaluative approach to labor reporting, to analyzing civil service; we need specialists who understand budgets and taxation and revenue sharing as a unified whole. In Washington we need reporters who do nothing but cover DOD, the lost key to future U.S. tranquility, and HEW and Transportation. We need suburban specialists who understand the socio-economic relationship of city and suburb and see and understand the need for some form of regionalization. We need political reporters who see the need for enormous change within our political system both at the local, state and federal level, and we need to understand that there can be both centralization and decentralization at one and the same time—the two-tier form of government which operates successfully in Europe.

This hard look at where we might be going led naturally to a discursive report on scrapping the city room. In its place could be substituted five- or six-man teams, each with a leader. This might eliminate problems of communication and duplication in the gathering of news.

While in Europe is was possible to fulfill a longtime plan, do a detailed report and cost analysis of how a paper the size of the Globe could set up a very basic three-man team of foreign correspondents—one in Europe, one in Mid-East/Africa and one in Asia—on a new, non-bureau,

live out-of-the-attic approach, more attuned to today's reporters.

Costs are no more than supporting a staff reporter in this country whose assignments take him out of town. Advantages to the paper include an appreciation and play of foreign news which doesn't come with any wire or syndicated service.

It is also invaluable as an educational tool within the paper to produce better reporters and tomorrow's top reporter will not stay with papers which cannot provide the overseas experience.

These men would not handle spot news but seek out, develop and background the big story as well as report on new ideas and what makes other nations and other people tick. They would keep the office tuned to the developing overseas story and how it should be played.

The nation sadly needs multiple views of what's going on abroad as the history of Vietnam, from a few U.S. observers to the longest war in American history, now shows.

Finally there was a report on the benefits of sabbaticals with a concluding line that "it was a helluva good year."

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

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

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

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

Nieman Notes

1940

Volta Torrey is one of three authors of the book, *This Island Earth*. Readers are presented the earth as it looks from the vantage points of the Apollo astronauts in space. The book was printed by the United States Government Printing Office.

1942

Edward M. Miller, managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, retired on December 31st. His successor is the assistant managing editor, J. Richard Nokes.

1943

G. P. Putnam's Sons has recently published *Your Laws* by **Frank Kelly.** It is a companion volume to another book by Kelly, *Your Freedoms, The Bill of Rights.*

1946

James Batal, for the past 10 years resident lecturer in southeastern United States for the Arab Information Center, has retired after 27 years of work with developments in the Mideast. He first visited that region in 1943 for the Office of War Information. Later he served as lecturer in journalism at the American University in Beirut.

1948

Charles W. Gilmore, editor of the Toledo Times since 1959, has been named Associate Editor of the Monterey (California) Peninsula Herald.

1949

Delbert Willis has been appointed editor of the Fort Worth Press. He succeeds the late C. A. Sellers. Willis started his career at the Press as a copy boy 38 years ago, and was named the managing editor in 1969.

1951

Roy M. Fisher, editor of the Chicago Daily News, has been named Dean of the Missouri School of Journalism. (See page 2.)

Hoke Norris has joined the executive staff of the Chicago Public Library as Director of Public Information. He has been an editorial writer for the Chicago Daily News, and prior to that, for the Chicago Sun-Times.

1952

Shane MacKay, formerly Director of Public Affairs, has been appointed Assistant Vice-President of the International Nickel Company of Canada, Limited.

John M. Harrison, professor of journalism at Penn State University, is chairman of the Journalism Education Committee of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

1953

The first Richard L. Neuberger award has been presented to **Robert Frazier,** editorial page editor of the Eugene (Oregon) Register-Guard. The award was sponsored by the Oregon Environmental Council.

Robert E. Farrell, Paris bureau chief and Senior European correspondent for McGraw-Hill World News, returned to Washington in February to take up a new post as bureau chief of the McGraw-Hill bureau. Farrell has been in western Europe since 1954, reporting for Business Week and other McGraw-Hill magazines.

1955

Mort Stern has been appointed editor of the editorial page of the Denver Post. Stern has been assistant to the editor and publisher, Palmer Hoyt, who retired at the end of last year.

1956

Donald J. Sterling, Jr. became executive editor of the Oregon Journal on March 1st. He has been with that newspaper for 18 years, and was editor of the editorial page prior to 1967.

1959

Norman A. Cherniss, associate editor of the Riverside (California) Press-Enterprise, will be a visiting lecturer at the University of Southern California School of Journalism during the 1971 spring semester. Cherniss, who was a visiting lecturer at the University of Southern California in 1968–69, will teach a course entitled "The Press and Society."

Howard Simons has been named deputy managing editor of the Washington Post. Previously he was an assistant managing editor.

1961

Robert P. Clark has been named executive editor of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times. Formerly managing editor, he succeeds Norman Isaacs, who is teaching at Columbia University.

1963

Bernard Nossiter is the author of a book, *Soft State: A Newspaperman's Chronicle of India,* published by Harper & Row. Nossiter was the Washington Post's correspondent in India in 1967 and 1968.

François Sully died in Saigon on February 23rd. (See page 11).

1964

James McCartney was the Peter Edes lecturer at the University of Maine in Orono. McCartney, foreign affairs and national defense writer for the Knight Newspapers in Washington, delivered five lectures on national security and newswriting.

1967

Dana Bullen, on leave from the Washington Star, is spending the spring as a Research Fellow at the East Asian Research Center at Harvard University in preparation for a trip to Asia.

W. William Meek, assistant city editor of the Arizona Republic, has been appointed to the newly-created post of public affairs editor.

James R. Whelan has joined the staff of Scripps-Howard Newspapers in Washington. He will concentrate on the coverage of Latin America. Whelan was the Latin American correspondent for UPI when he was a Nieman Fellow. He later became general manager for the Caribbean region of International Telephone and Telegraph, Inc.

1969

Robert Levey, columnist of The Boston Globe, has been made editor of the Globe Sunday Magazine.

Larry Allison, city editor of the Long Beach Press-Telegram, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Associated Press Managing Editor's Association.

1970

J. Barlow Herget, the former managing editor of the Paragould (Arkansas) Daily Press, has become assistant city editor for the Arkansas Gazette in Little Rock.

A Gentleman Journalist Finds his Haven

By Charles King

(Reprinted from Canada's *Ottawa Citizen*)

One of the best friends this country has had in the world of journalism in the United States is preparing to turn in his seven-league Arctic mukluks to step into a publisher's shoes.

For Robert H. Estabrook, the dean of foreign correspondents of the Washington Post and a regular visitor to Ottawa for the past few years, it will be the realization of a dream.

He'll be trading an audience of some 486,422 daily readers for a select group of 4400 once each week on Thursdays.

But he considers it, as any working newsman would, a step forward. For on May 1, 1971, he will become, with his wife, sole proprietor and publisher of the Lakeville Journal in northwestern Connecticut, a 73 year-old publication with a distinct social conscience and the guts and independence to speak its mind.

Under the guiding hand of its new proprietor, it will lose none of its crusading zeal. But it will gain the benefit of an experience almost unique in the field of journalism, a man who has been everywhere that matters and can count many of the world's current leaders as personal acquaintances.

When Bob Estabrook and I occupied adjoining offices in Fleet Street in London, I used to marvel at the authority and depth of his knowledge of European, African and Asian affairs.

He could talk the language of experts on any subject ranging from politics to economics to salt water cruising. He knew where most of the skeletons were buried in government offices on every continent, and was always available as an adviser on the best hotels, air routings and most useful contacts in every capital.

For five years my wanderings paralleled his through Europe and Africa, and wherever I went I found a mention of his name would open doors to presidents and prime ministers who may not have liked his country much, but considered it important to have their comments reported in the paper President Kennedy, and later Lyndon Johnson, read at their breakfast table.

More recently, after the Post returned him to the United States to head its staff of foreign correspondents, he moved to New York and an assignment at the United Nations.

He found it both absorbing and frustrating. And whenever the opportunity arose, he came to Canada to escape the hot-house atmosphere of the global cockpit and to get to know us better.

During the past four years he has reported to his readers from the length and breadth of Canada, touching points so remote that few Canadians themselves have been within a thousand miles of them.

Many of those pieces have been carried in The Citizen through our link with the Times-Post News Service.

But Bob Estabrook's interest in Canada has gone far beyond the broad limits of his profession.

As a keen yachtsman, he has returned here several times on holiday visits. Three years ago he navigated the inland route from New York City to spend some time at Expo, and last summer he made a month-long voyage in his power cruiser via Lake Ontario and the Rideau system, with his wife Mary Lou and three of his children as crew.

He was back in Ottawa recently, warmly insulated from the freezing temperatures in a fur helmet acquired in Tuktoyaktuk last spring, to pay a farewell visit to senior government officials here before setting out on his new career.

A replacement is promised in due course, and the publisher-to-be will be back to introduce him.

His Canadian experience will not be forgotten, however, when he moves to Lakeville from New York to supervise his new pocket-size business empire.

He hopes to persuade some of his fellow correspondents at the UN and elsewhere to contribute to the weekly from time to time. And he assures that there will be space reserved for periodic tidings from Canada as well.

Bob Estabrook has done much for this country as a reporter in the past. It will be our pleasure to help him in any way to keep Canada on the map in Lakeville in the future.

The Truth Will Emerge

"The theory of a free press is that the truth will emerge from free reporting and free discussion, not that it will be presented perfectly and instantly in any one account."

—Walter Lippmann