Nieman Reports

Vol. XXXIV, No. 1 Spring 1980/$2.00

Holocaust and Healing

Robert Jay Lifton and Betty Jean Lifton

In the Name of Development

David Maybury-Lewis

Conversation with Ward Just

The New Reality

Anthony Lewis

Beyond the Bottom Line

Katherine Fanning

Nieman Selection Committee

Invitation for a Stroll

Regular readers of newspapers, a different breed from television viewers who have quick-cut minds, like to linger over their daily journals. The gentle exercise of turning pages at leisure becomes vital to the day's routine. The heft and crackle of newsprint is as important as the freedom to re-read paragraphs or tear out items worth saving.

Those who get their news from the tube miss out on such niceties, but they do learn about newsworthy events in the twinkle of an "on" button. Immediacy — television's strength — is also its weakness. Images flashing on the screen do not allow the brain to ponder.

In this issue of *NR* we offer opportunities to tarry and weigh in the mind some unusual aspects of familiar and cosmic subjects such as life and death, heritage and culture, media and communication.

Robert Jay Lifton and Betty Jean Lifton discuss the paths they have walked in their search for a sense of order out of the trauma of twentieth century holocausts and extermination — whether by overt violence or subtle and legal destruction of a person's selfhood.

From a different perspective, David Maybury-Lewis conducts a tidy warfare against society's methods of development, when exploitation masquerades as progress and destroys ethnic minorities.

Ward Just, journalist-turned-novelist, produces fiction by rearranging his world to suit himself, retaining the optimistic outlook typical of journalists: a belief in the logic of random chance.

With precise and affectionate care Anthony Lewis examines the conflict between the media and the law, the two professions he is closest to. He reminds us that the effects of this confrontation already have entered every newsroom.

Other authors in this issue include a newspaper publisher, a professor formerly a newsman, a senior journalist, and Nieman Fellows in this year's class.

An article recently torn out of a magazine informed this reader that geneticists have discovered regions of silence in each gene. In the mosaic of these spaces, light, air and tiny beings come and go, and by their kinetics, help to manufacture protein for the body's nourishment and abstract substances for the growth of human consciousness. We have no control over this physiological process, but we should recognize its existence.

In a parallel awareness, if we can carve out bits and pieces of time for ourselves, we will foster two of today's rarest commodities — silence and space.

—T.B.K.L.

Nieman Reports

Spring 1980
Vol. XXXIV, No. 1

EDITOR
Tenney Barbara K. Lehman

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS
Kettee J. Boling
Daphne B. Noyes

PRODUCTION
Janice Morgan

PUBLISHER
James C. Thomson Jr.

Nieman Reports (USPS #430-650) is published quarterly by the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Subscription $7.50 a year; add $6.00 for foreign mailing. Single copies $2.00.

Please address all subscription correspondence and change of address information to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

Second-class postage paid at Boston, Mass. and additional entries.

Postmaster: Send form 3579 to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

NIEMAN DIRECTORY

A complete directory of Nieman Fellows is available through the Nieman office. The first to be compiled since 1965, when Louis M. Lyons appended a list of alumni/ae to his book, *Reporting the News*, the booklet consists of an alphabetical listing of Nieman Fellows with their most recent address, and a chronological listing of each Nieman Class.

The cost of the Directory is $6.50; send orders to the Nieman Office, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138.

CONTENTS

2	**INVITATION FOR A STROLL**	Tenney B. K. Lehman
4	**HOLOCAUST AND HEALING**	Robert Jay Lifton and Betty Jean Lifton
16	**IN THE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT**	David Maybury-Lewis
21	**THE NEW REALITY**	Anthony Lewis
25	**CONVERSATION WITH WARD JUST**	
33	**BEYOND THE BOTTOM LINE**	Katherine Fanning
38	**GOOD NEWS ABOUT THE BAD NEWS**	Louis Banks
40	**AFGHANISTAN: CRAFTING OF A CRISIS**	Arnold Zietlin
41	**NIEMAN FOUNDATION RECEIVES FORD GRANT**	
42	**PHYSIQUE AND FREEDOM**	Deckle McLean
46	**YES, YOU CAN FOOL THE PEOPLE**	Max Awner
49	**BOOKS**	
	Financial and Economic Journalism: Analysis, Interpretation and Reporting *by Donald Kirsch*	Ann Crittenden
	A Survey of Black Newspapers in America *by Henry G. LaBrie III*	Acel Moore
	The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms and the CIA *by Thomas Powers*	Stanley Karnow
	Ding: The Life of J. Norwood Darling *by David L. Lendt*	Paul Szep
	A Turning Wheel: Three Decades of the Asian Revolution as Witnessed by a Correspondent for The New Yorker *by Robert Shaplen*	Robert Timberg
	The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court *by Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong*	James Boyd
	In the Public Interest: A Report by the National News Council	Ray White
57	**LETTERS**	
58	**NIEMAN SELECTION COMMITTEE, 1980-81**	
60	**JAMES MacGREGOR BYRNE, 1909-1979**	
61	**NIEMAN NOTES**	

Nieman Reports welcomes articles, letters, commentaries, photographs and artwork concerning journalists and journalism. Send with a stamped, self-addressed envelope to: The Editor, Nieman Reports, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. The deadline for the Summer 1980 issue (devoted to news photography) is April 1, 1980.

Holocaust and Healing

ROBERT JAY LIFTON
and
BETTY JEAN LIFTON

Robert Lifton: I hasten to introduce myself as someone concerned not just with holocaust — though very much concerned with that — but with holocaust or destruction on the one side and with transformation and life and change on the other. I'm actually against a psychology that is a thanatology — a psychology of death per se. My own work, especially my recent book, *The Broken Connection*, puts forward a psychology which is very concerned with death, but is a psychology of life. It's a simple idea with an important distinction.

Just to get things going, from my standpoint, there are a couple of things to illustrate that. For instance, my first study was of Chinese thought reform, so-called brainwashing. It was very much concerned with the destructive process going on in much of what I studied, but there was also an effort at transformation and change — all too coercively — but nonetheless an issue of change. I took occasion in that study to examine questions of change, for example, is there such a thing as open personal change as an alternative to the more or less coercive process that was being put forward by the Chinese under their program of thought reform?

Similarly in my study of survivors of Hiroshima in the sixties, I was concerned with what happened to people who were victims of the first use of atomic bombs on the human population. Much of the study was concerned with what they could re-create, what their survivor sense of themselves could produce, or how they could resume some sort of human existence, and what sort of survivor wisdom, as well as survivor pain, they might have derived.

In the study of Vietnam, I interviewed and worked in rap groups — a kind of modified group therapy really, we called them rap groups to avoid strictly clinical terms — mostly with antiwar veterans. There was a very dramatic experience of personal change in a lot of these young men. They went through hell. They were in the roles of victim and executioner both, the two roles that Camus warned us never to embrace. The veterans changed, and they grew, and in many cases, they were more profound people for what they had been through.

My recent work has been with Nazi doctors. We've been living abroad, me mostly in Germany, my wife mostly in Israel, and we've traveled over most of Europe, and a little bit of Western Europe, pursuing these interests over the last year or so. In the work with Nazi doctors, I've been concerned with first of all the strange process by which the Nazis medicalized killing — the doctors were the forefront of the killing process. The basic question is, how do you undergo this dreadful transition from healer to killer? It's a very absolute kind of question, and an important one to ask. What do these Nazi doctors help you understand about the Nazi genocidal process in general, but also about doctors? It's not only the Nazis, what about the Soviet use of psychiatry to incarcerate heretics; what about the American CIA and its manipulation, sometimes with the all too willing involvement of psychiatrists, psychologists, and other

---

Robert Jay Lifton is Foundations' Fund Research Professor of Psychiatry at Yale University. His most recent book, The Broken Connection: On Death and the Continuity of Life, *is published by Simon and Schuster.*

Betty Jean Lifton is an author who writes for and about children. She has spent many years in the Far East. Her book Lost and Found: The Adoption Experience (*Dial Press*) *will be published in paperback by Bantam in April 1980.*

doctors, in various thought-control programs or drug programs such as the LSD programs that we've heard a lot about recently? What is there about doctors — their mystique, their shamanistic legacy, their closeness to death? I don't know whether many of you remember who it was who mixed the poison in Guyana just a year ago. It was the group's doctor, the doctor. Anyhow, I'm much concerned about these issues, which spread more widely from the Nazis and have general relevance.

Just to close my brief introductory remarks, and perhaps become a little more personal — in all of this I've in a way had a double identity. I've tried very much to be a scholar, that is, to do things systematically, and with rigor. On the other hand, I've been something of an activist, much involved in a lot of political questions. When I was working with Vietnam veterans, I was very strongly opposed to the war. My wife and I both went to prison a couple of times for mild forms of civil disobedience, but we nonetheless felt strongly that we should involve ourselves in what we then called fat-cat civil disobedience — as opposed to the burden having been so much on the students and the younger people. I have struggled with this combination of scholarship and social involvement, and it hasn't always been easy, and not everybody has loved it or me in the process; but I don't think the two are antagonistic. I don't believe in neutrality about any kind of scholarship — there's no such thing — rather I believe in the model of a scholar or a professional who, on the one hand, is sufficiently detached to get at some general problems — and that means stepping back from issues, and taking a hard look at them in a careful way, using your technique that you're taught, and your discipline and your knowledge — and on the other hand, to have your advocacies, the things that you stand for, and to have them out front. I think that makes one more rather than less scientific, and we can talk more about that.

And then, finally, I have a role as an observer. One very astute younger colleague of mine at Yale, who was himself a psychiatrist and a Vietnam veteran, said something interesting. He said that in Vietnam the psychiatrists were something like the journalists. They were both observers among terrible things, and yet not free from involvement in these things. Of course, I struggle with this combination of participation and observation — never without difficulty and conflict, but knowing that they must both be there, and that lots of things happen to those who become involved in these dreadful things. I'm still not clear on what is happening to me from this last one with Nazi doctors, which is sort of the end of the road in terms of destructiveness, but if I can stay with it, and give it some form, some expression that has even a modest impact on others, some dialogue, some information and some ideas, and perhaps knowledge conveyed, then perhaps it's not all downhill. That very process of giving it form is, perhaps, what sustains it as much as anything else.

B.J., you were invited for equal time.

Betty Jean Lifton: I'll start by saying that I'm a writer, not an academic, and I think a writer finds the form a different way than scholars do. Sometimes you're not sure what the form will be. You go through the material, you feel, and express it in a way that the material moves you.

My husband and I were married more than twenty years ago. I followed him out to the Far East — I wanted to be a playwright at the time — and found myself in an Asian theater, with drama that was beyond anything that I could have imagined, since I had no background in the Far East. I decided to use my writing skills as a journalist. At that time, the Korean War was just ending, so I went to the Asahi Evening News in Tokyo and met a wonderful editor, Kempei Sheba, who said I could be accredited to his English-language newspaper.

I went to Korea, where I saw, for the first time, what war does to people — especially children. Out of the Korean experience I started writing about children in war, but back in Japan I wrote fantasies *for* children, based on Japanese folklore.

I've written about twenty books for children on Far Eastern themes — some of them are original tales, some of them are oral tales, and many of them have been illustrated by Japanese artists.

We stayed in the Far East, and I went to Vietnam, where I followed the same pattern. I saw again what the war

was doing to children, and with an American journalist who was there, I wrote a book about the children in Vietnam. He was married to a Vietnamese woman, so he had the language and did a lot of the interviewing. Later on, when Bob and I were in Hiroshima, I wrote a book about the children of survivors there. Those children had formed a peace club, [the Orizurukai] the Folded Crane Club, and I did a film on their activities. I didn't know that I could make

a movie, I don't really consider myself a filmmaker, but I went around with the cameraman and said, I want some of this and some of that. The film has a distributor for schools now. It's about how children whose families have been affected by the nuclear bomb, who have seen death so intimately, restructure their lives. They feel very strongly and they ask, as children do, Why does the world have to go to war?

Now, I'm working on the European holocaust — the life of Janusz Korczak, a Polish children's writer. He's famous in Europe, although he's not well-known here. I've always been very interested in Anne Frank, naturally, because I thought it really interesting that a child should emerge as the symbol out of the Second World War.

They ask, as children do, Why does the world have to go to war?

Korczak was an educator, who, at the age of 64, went willingly to Treblinka with two hundred orphans that he was taking care of — he went of his own choice even though he could have escaped. In doing that, he became a symbol of many people in Europe, a symbol of how you do not give up your principles in times of evil. He was a man who had given his whole life to fighting for children's rights, and he was a Jew. When the decision had to be made, he made the decision as a Jew, to stay with his Jewish orphans.

I have also written my own memoir, which is about my own childhood as an adoptee — my own orphanhood — and I think that also relates to all the other orphanhoods and holocausts that I've written about previously.

Question: For college students today, the Nazi experience is history — it's far past. Hiroshima is before the lifetime of most students. When I went to school, we had tags around our necks, in case the atom bomb came we could be identified. How do you see that sort of external threat perceived in students today?

Robert Lifton: I think it's perceived very much, but indirectly. It's history, but it's with us. The fact that something is history doesn't mean it's not present — it's present in a different way.

I think there are certain devil's bargains in a culture — about what you're permitted to talk about, or what you're encouraged to talk about.

For a long time, nobody was supposed to talk about death in American society because Americans were young and lived forever. Death was something that happened to Europeans or Asians or somebody else. That went as far as it could go, and you have the opposite now — an enormous embrace of the subject of death by many groups. For a while you could talk about death and the devil's bargain was you wouldn't talk about holocaust — massive killing, massive death. There's now much more preoccupation with holocaust. The film *Holocaust*, a mediocre film, occasioned an incredible worldwide response — Israel, the United States, France, Italy — everywhere. I was in Germany and Austria just when that was happening, and it was phenomenal.

So now you talk about holocausts of the past, but the devil's bargain is you're not supposed to talk about the holocausts that threaten us in the future — or close to the present.

These two events: the dissemination of the *Holocaust* film, the unexpected response, and the Three Mile Island accident, and the enormous response from that — again, worldwide, not just in America — suggest that anxiety about holocaust is right there on the surface and has been all along. It wasn't created by these events, but was stimulated by them. We don't have too many channels to express this anxiety. Sometimes people consider it maladjusted if you think about it or talk about it.

I think that we all live with a double image. On the one hand, something has come into our world. You can trace it to World War II. It may have started long before, but the holocausts of World War II — the Nazi genocide and the atomic bombings — are an incredible turning point. We've developed the imagery of extermination; it's quite feasible that with our technology, we can eliminate ourselves as a species, or come damned close. That's new and that changes our sense of our relationship to the environment, to the future, to everything. On the other hand, we go about our lives as if nothing had changed. Both realities are there for us. We live on this double level, but the first one doesn't go away, it's suppressed, but stimulated by certain things.

My assistant, Michael Carey, interviewed people of his generation, now in their thirties, about those quaint nuclear air raid drills that took place in the schools throughout America in the fifties. Some of them said, Look, I don't think about those things. I never give a thought to it. But once he began to question them, dreams would come out, or they would remember other frightening situations.

We live with that double reality, it's in everybody's head to some degree, but we don't give it form. We don't give it the logic of its own requirement, which would to be to think harder than we do and take bolder steps toward avoiding this very real possibility of holocaust.

Question: Have the recent changes in China, especially the turning away from Mao Tse-tung's authority, forced

you to reassess your evaluation of the power of mind control?

Robert Lifton: Yes and no. I didn't expect this degree of turnabout, but Mao isn't finished yet, in my view.

I've written two studies of China. In my first study of thought reform, I did take a cautious position and say that thought reform isn't foolproof because there are certain openings the mind sees. The mind isn't susceptible to total control for various psychological reasons. In fact, I even raised the argument that maybe the Chinese over-reformed, even did themselves harm, because they had such an incredible wave of popularity during the early years of the revolution, or the years immediately following the takeover. One could argue that the thought reform program was as much to set the limits of behavior and expression as to have people re-create themselves for the new regime.

The second study I did was a later one, involved in the cultural revolution of the late 1960's, and there I said — and this is where I might have to reassess my views — there will be waves of intensity of thought reform programs, or intense waves of national emotion, like the cultural revolution (if not as great), as well as ebbs and flows, with time for pragmatic pauses. We're now in the latter stage to some degree, but I said then that in any case, Mao's name will be the linchpin, will be the image around which all this is achieved. Well, now they've gone further in raising critical questions about Mao, but my prediction would be that he will make a comeback in the sense of his still being a central human image of the revolution and of Chinese resurgence, as much national as revolutionary.

Question: How many Nazi doctors are there, and what do they have to say when you raise questions about their transition from being healers to being killers?

Robert Lifton: I was amazed at how many I found and got to talk with me. I interviewed twenty-eight of them, a whole spectrum: people who had been actual SS doctors in Auschwitz and other camps; people who had been involved in so-called euthanasia programs — the killing of mental patients; people who were medical administrators and theorists around racial concepts; high-ranking doctors who got involved in nasty things; and doctors who did more or less straight military medicine. I think that in a certain Germanic way, they felt that somebody who is prominent in this society, and a colleague, should be seen, and they also had a desire to explain themselves to me in certain ways. I was willing to see anybody who had been a prominent Nazi doctor, so that covers a lot of ground, because doctors were quite notorious in their embrace of the Nazi movement, more so than other professions perhaps.

I never quite said, How do you change from healer to killer — I was tempted to but that isn't quite a psychological approach. But I did ask some hard questions. They tried very hard not to see themselves as killers. At Auschwitz, as most of you know, the doctors did a thing called selection, in which they chose who would go directly to the gas chamber and who would stay alive and be permitted to work — at least for a period of time. In Auschwitz there were very large numbers of Poles, Jews, Gypsies, Russians and Slavs killed, but after a while it was only the Jews who were selected to die in that way.

The doctors saw themselves as surviving — coping with and adapting to a difficult situation. They were saving what lives they could — so they would claim. In the end, I think, as I pressed them, it was a kind of half belief.

A very few of them were extreme idealogues. One inmate-doctor — a non-Jewish Austrian who was a political prisoner and could speak up a little more than, say, a Jewish man — she and an SS doctor were looking out at the smoke of the crematorium. She asked him, How can you reconcile this with your Hippocratic oath? He said, Well, we see it as removing a gangrenous appendix from the body of the German people.

It was exceptional to be that extreme an idealogue, but other Nazi doctors did have bits and pieces of ideology. For moments, they might half believe something like that. It was on that kind of basis that Auschwitz was formed. Of course, this raises a lot of questions about partial beliefs, ideological fragments, and their relation to action.

Another issue I'm preoccupied with in my work is psychic numbing—how do you cease to feel? You do certain

Anxiety about holocaust is right there on the surface and has been all along.

things, but you don't feel the human consequences that are happening at the other end. That's enormously important and very central to this study.

There is also a very important question for all of us here in this room: the question of professionalism gone wild. Very often, the Nazi doctors conceived of themselves as an island of decency or sanity among really crude Nazis. They believed in the revitalization of Germany the Nazis were promising — and seeming to achieve for the first years — and they joined the party very enthusiastically.

They would say they were against the really barbarous side; that they wanted to come and help regulate the process and bring out what was really good in it and restrain the less gentlemanly side of things. So, as professionals, they saw themselves doing professional work — even though, in places like Auschwitz, they weren't acting as doctors — they were involved in the killing, they were even supervising the use of the cyclone-B gas.

If you can see yourselves as professionals, and put on total blinders, you can lend yourself to the most destructive, vicious forms of behavior — all in the name of professionalism.

Question: I have a couple of tangible questions about the Nazi doctors. Have any of them served time for war crimes? Are you using their names or what sort of agreement do you have with them? And with respect to psychic numbing, what is your own relationship with these subjects?

Robert Lifton: The agreement I made with them is interesting. It's a post-Nuremberg agreement. Before I could start my study, I had to clear it with the Yale Committee on Research with Human Subjects, which is strictly a post-Nuremberg body. The agreement is, that I have to be able to assure the people I see of two things. One is absolute confidentiality — I don't use their names at all. I may use the names of Nazi doctors who are dead, and there are certain written things which I can, of course, use; but the people I interview are promised confidentiality. That becomes very crucial, because some of them are under court procedures, some of them have served time, some of them are still at issue legally, and it's very important that I can assure them that absolutely nothing they tell me can be put into legal channels, or any other channels. I don't even have the right to tell anyone else that I've seen them.

If you can see yourselves as professionals, and put on total blinders, you can lend yourself to the most destructive, vicious forms of behavior — all in the name of professionalism.

The second requirement of my arrangement is that I do not harm them through my research. And that's of course a loose category, but it means that I don't have the right to press them to the point of psychological breakdown, even if I could. I must take that into account. There were certain dramatic moments where I could see that I was pressing almost to that point — especially in the case of older people — I felt they were under psychological and physical duress. I was worried about them, and I held back because that was the moral requirement under which I saw them.

The subjective issue of sitting down with them is fascinating. When a psychiatrist or any kind of therapist, as I'm trained to be, sits down with someone in some sort of inquiry or exploration of his or her life, there's a certain assumed sympathy. It's a friendly act. To sit down with these Nazis created all kinds of conflicts in me — especially as a Jew, because that adds another dimension. I'm committed to explore things with them to try to get as much as I can out of their experience, and to learn from it. It's very painful and makes me very uneasy just to sit down with them in this friendly way because I have such strong feelings about what some of them did.

The hardest moments came when the interviews were very long — and very productive — and took place in outlying areas. In Germany, most of these doctors have the decency to move out to the country because there's been something of a de-Nazification program. In Vienna, they're right at the heart of things; they are professors at the medical school and so on. There's been no de-Nazification since Austria's technically a victim country, but that's another story.

But when we're out in the country, and have a longer interview, and it becomes lunchtime, and there isn't an eating place within an hour or so — what happens? Usually, they invite me and my interpreter for lunch, and we sit down, and suddenly everything changes. We no longer have the protection of the two roles — interviewer-interviewee — and we're breaking bread together, with all the symbolism of that. I've never felt more uncomfortable moments. I try to keep notes and records of my own subjective reactions all the way through — they're a part of the story.

To answer the last part of your question, no relationship is continued with any of them after the interviews. Yet I have to keep a kind of friendly relationship, or at least avoid an antagonistic one, over the year or so that I've had some contact with them. I've seen a number of them many times. I've asked them questions by mail, I've asked for written documents, and I've sent a number of them my books — many of them read English, and some of the books are in German. But when they've asked me for more, I've always rejected it. One of them, for instance, was an old man who had actually been convicted at Nuremberg. Although it was unclear whether he really had been involved in experiments that he was convicted for, a German court thought otherwise, with some reason. At the very end, he said, Dr. Lifton, you must have some influence in America — he's a man in his eighties and is measurably

weakened from the time that I first saw him — he said, Perhaps you could do something to help reverse the Nuremberg verdict. Then he said, Also, could you invite me to give a lecture at Yale? He wanted to exonerate himself, symbolically or otherwise.

I immediately thought of three choices I had. Something in me wanted to say quickly, Look, whether you're guilty or not legally, you're very guilty as far as I'm concerned. Period. I didn't think that was quite keeping to my contract, though, and I didn't think that was right. The other extreme would have been to say, Sure, I'll try — but it might have been a little difficult to string him along and then of course not do it. And that seemed dishonest. So I took a third way, which I felt was right, and stressed my role. I said, Look, I can't do anything more with the people I interview. I make an arrangement with you to understand what happened. Everything is anonymous, and I have no other personal involvements with anyone, so it's impossible.

Anyhow, those are some of the thoughts. There's a lot more churning in me that I haven't said, and that I don't fully comprehend, because it's a painful process in many ways.

Question: Mrs. Lifton, how did you, in Israel, explain what your husband was doing in Germany?

B. J. Lifton: I didn't talk about what he was doing while I was in Israel because that would have been an invasion of privacy for a lot of people. I spent my time interviewing Polish survivors of Auschwitz and of the Warsaw ghetto who were in Israel. I was asking about the prewar period, and about Janusz Korczak. I was interested in why and how a martyr is made — why does the world need a martyr, and this particular martyr?

Question: Why did you escape from Munich?

B. J. Lifton: I didn't like living in Germany, for an Asian reason. The Japanese and Chinese talk in terms of a thousand years or ten thousand years for certain things to happen, and I felt it would take about ten thousand years, or at least one thousand years, before Germany is no longer polluted. That doesn't mean all of the German people, because we really met some very nice, concerned Germans. I made a point of reading the writers — Heinrich Böll and Gunther Grass — and going to their theater. The culture's very fascinating because they're dealing with the holocaust — this darkness, this madness, this irrationality and this violence of their fathers. Their art is very strong and in many ways, I was tempted to stay even though it was painful. But another side of me felt that the land was polluted and that it was immoral and indecent for me to be there. This was not a rational, logical decision, this was a gut reaction that I had, and I left.

Question: Dr. Lifton, in your work with Vietnam veterans, I'm sure you ran into some who had been addicted to heroin, or at least were taking heroin. What was your impression of how widespread that was, and are you aware of any follow-up studies on what effect heroin addiction had on Vietnam?

Robert Lifton: The drug thing with G.I.'s in Vietnam was in many ways situational, that is, a lot of people got hooked on drugs in Vietnam who wouldn't ordinarily get hooked on

The way veterans are treated is directly parallel to the popularity of the war they fought.

drugs, but because the drugs were so cheap and so strong, and because Vietnam was what it was, and people sought relief from being there, a lot of people got hooked. Because it was situational in considerable degree, a lot of people got off it fairly quickly, and often without elaborate treatment. For a long time the government minimized the drug problem, because it didn't look so good, and it revealed a lot about the nature of the war. Then they did certain things about it, mostly discharging people who were on drugs. I don't think there's been any systematic follow-up. The drug problem has considerably diminished. It still exists, but what's being found is that there is a very, very extensive set of psychological and generally human problems in Vietnam veterans. The study in New York that I had a slight connection with finds that from forty to fifty percent, almost half of Vietnam veterans, have significant human problems — severe emotional problems, drug problems, being out of work, elements of depression, problems of violence. That's an inordinate and an unprecedented kind of figure. And that, I would say, has to do with the nature of the war they fought, and the way they've been treated since coming back. The principle there being, that the way veterans are treated is directly parallel to the popularity of the war they fought.

Question: Dr. Lifton, you were saying earlier that you think Americans have taken a hundred and eighty degree turn in terms of death, and now a lot of Americans are studying it. It seems to me, though, that most Americans still try to

sublimate the topic to a large degree, more so than a number of other cultures. Do you think that's true, and if so, why is it true?

Robert Lifton: In America, we've reached an extreme of denial of death that isn't easily reversed. The incredible embrace of death, in a very American way, with complete enthusiasm — shouting it from the rooftops — is, I think a reflection of that denial. I reached a certain point where there had to be some kind of rebound reaction and there was a tremendously fertile soil for concerns about death.

Why it's so in America, it's hard to say. A couple of things come to mind. One is that America was the first and the most intense of the early industrializing countries to develop a large scale industrial base. Industrialization on a large scale tends to distance one from the death experience, by all sorts of technological barriers — in hospitals, cemeteries, in the technological assault on customs, you know, when you get into a modern or post-modern society, with high technology, it isn't only the literal technology, but it's the loss of customs around living and dying, including funeral customs, and belief in religious custom around funerals.

A second, related issue has to do with the fact that since America is such a strange and recently created country, it is unique among the major countries of the world in that it doesn't have any clear traditional base. We have many traditional forms, of course, related to various European cultures and various minority groups, but there isn't any firm traditional base in the culture from which America stems. We don't have a set of well-established, deeply enmeshed death customs — a traditional culture allows for touching death, confronting death, living in the face of death, and accepting death. These would include, for instance, a very careful set of rituals around a dying person — bedside scenes and the actual funeral ceremony can at their best permit one to face the death itself, the fact of loss. This is in opposition to what's been called the Forest Lawn Syndrome — you've all heard about Forest Lawn, brilliantly satirized by Evelyn Waugh, and written about by Jessica Mitford, two British writers incidentally — evoking this pattern of burying death under beauty, so that it doesn't look like a cemetery, it just looks like a lawn. After a talk I gave, a colleague came up to me and said, Don't knock Forest Lawn — they give money for death studies.

Question: This is addressed to Mrs. Lifton. In this country, it's typical that once we start doing something — like talking about death — then we're going to give courses in the schools and expose everybody to some aspect of death and dying. How do you feel about children being given a course in death? Do you work with children who have actually been through traumatic situations? How do they block? Is it good to let children just feel the fantasy and not try always to get into reality?

B. J. Lifton: For the children of Vietnam and Hiroshima, death is a reality of their life — it's a part of their history. The children of America are very different. When I went to Germany, I took my daughter, who's thirteen, and who had been reading Anne Frank, and who is Jewish. Even taking her to Germany was an assault on her sensibility, and she didn't want to read books about children who had been in camps, or anything else. Since we've been back, she has completely blocked it out.

I think you have to go, I suppose, by the age that the child is, and how the material is presented. How you present children with this kind of holocaust material is very difficult, but the main thing is that you have to be honest in dealing with any aspect of it — whether it's protesting nuclear weapons or Three Mile Island, or the death of a grandmother, I think you have to try not to lie, and not to be evasive, because the things that are unknown and the lies are the most threatening things. Children can accept truth, because then they can deal with their own emotions.

Question: In your studies, have you found common themes that help the survivors of Hiroshima and the Nazi holocaust to reconstruct their lives?

B. J. Lifton: Just thinking immediately of this project I'm doing on Korczak, there's a reason why people are resurrecting him, and making him a symbol, just as there's a reason why Anne Frank became a symbol. People need to hold on to something, some symbol, some person, that can give them courage for the future, or faith that there is some goodness in man.

Robert Lifton: In my own work, I try to focus on questions of meaning. A lot of psychological work in recent decades has missed out by simply not taking questions of meaning seriously, as a properly scientific subject. Meaning is very much a properly scientific subject. A survivor has not just had a physical shattering of his or her life, but has also experienced a shattering and a threat to the meaning of individual life, and to the meaning of human existence in general. Therefore, a lot of their struggle is around meaning. Sometimes it's on a great scale — the meaning of what can happen to one's people, for example, can the Jews be reborn as a people? Much of Israel was created around that struggle for meaning in a very immediate way. In other words, survivors are known to marry quickly, and then have children, because they want to reconstruct a symbolization

of life; they want to epitomize life right around them. Children, again, symbolize that.

Most survivors have to deal with the very painful emotions: loss, guilt, and shame. They have survived and others died, and they remember what they couldn't do to help others around them, or somehow to stop the process of killing and destruction. In massive killings, they're helpless before this destructive force.

They also have a difficult time, I've found, in overcoming the numbing I speak of — the numbing is not only in the perpetrators, but also in the survivors. They need it there while they're going through this terrible experience, otherwise they just couldn't survive psychologically, but it can overstep its bounds, its usefulness. It stays on longer that they want it, than they need it. We used to talk among Vietnam veterans — they are survivors too — of learning to feel. And that was a big thing which we talked about endlessly.

Question: How do you help them learn to feel?

Robert Lifton: There's no clear technique. I think mostly in the groups we were just catalysts. Where they were really doing it was in their lives, through love relationships, through having children, through friendships, and through their own collectivity. The Vietnam Veterans Against the War in its early phases, before it became highly politicized, was an incredible organization — as much a bond of brotherhood as a political organization. Survivors tend to seek each other out, to form groups, because they feel nobody else can understand what they've been through. They also sometimes try to avoid each other because each is a reminder of the ordeal.

There are certain prior emotions — strength, commitment, love — even when one has lost someone one loves, one has had the love relationship. I think it means a lot in reconstituting the experience of love.

Question: How can you possibly put loss of job or some kind of death equivalent in our comfortable, upper-middle-class condition, in the same league with Hiroshima or Auschwitz?

Robert Lifton: I don't — but I'm sometimes misrepresented as having done that.

Question: What do you mean by the phrase "death equivalent"?

Robert Lifton: The phrase, death equivalent, means something very specific in my work. Somewhere around the age of two, a child begins to think about death, begins to try to understand what is this thing — death. Certainly it takes until the age of four or five — even six or seven — to begin to recognize and accept the finality of death. Before that, the child has certain experiences that prepare it for later knowledge of death. I call those death equivalents. Those include a fear of *annhilation* or *disintegration*, such as when a child bleeds, it feels its body falling apart; second, the

Meaning is very much a proper scientific subject.

experience of *separation* from the nurturing figures — the mother, the father, whoever is taking care of the child; third, that of *stasis*. You notice any infant will fight if you try to hold it very still. So those are the early experiences through which one learns; those experiences later become associated psychologically with actual death. Because you need something to build on before death, which is a more abstract concept, enters into your meaning system. Then all through life when we have losses and we have separations, when we lose somebody we love, or become scattered in our lives, or we feel something disintegrate, whenever we have these experiences, they go back and forth with the experience of death. We feel inundated by death when we lose somebody. When we experience a death, we feel the separation, so that it is a back and forth association of death and death equivalents.

Of course, I don't mean to say that everybody is a survivor on the same level. What I said very carefully, beginning at the end of my Hiroshima book, and repeated in my new book, was that survivor imagery is abroad, in all of us, in some degree. It doesn't mean that we're the same as somebody who's been through Hiroshima or a Nazi death camp, but certain survivor imagery is in all of us because of the many holocausts that we are indirectly associated with, or that in some way enter our psyches. All survivor imagery is dialectical. It can be mobilizing. It can be a source of energy or insight.

To place someone in the role of the expert, who will teach you how to die, is very unfortunate and has a lot to be said against it. It's trivializing a very fundamental human experience, one that nobody can avoid. Now, of course, it's not healthy to be immobilized by preoccupations with death, but Americans, and perhaps people everywhere, have suffered more from the opposite tendency — that is to try to block out any awareness of death and to live on a level of denial, or numbing, toward death. That has its consequences, because it spreads into other areas of your life. If you're protecting yourself against death, you may

become exaggeratedly cautious or withdrawn about the way that you live or the numbing may extend into other human relationships. It could impair your capacity to live or to love or to be close to people. I think that the capacity to confront the idea of death, and various facets of death, has always been sought by creative people, by artists. The capacity to in some way take hold of death, and some of the imagery of death — since it is a destiny of all of us — is associated with creativity, and with moving forward in human culture in general. Now, death can be trivialized and overdone and put into too many courses, and too many how-to arrangements, but that doesn't remove the fundamental wisdom of confronting it. The best phrase I know to illustrate that — these things are always better said by artists — is from Heinrich Böll. He said, The artist carries death within him like the good priest his breviary.

Question: There was an article the other day about the Israelis giving part of the Sinai over to Egypt, and the interviewer asked a Bedouin what he found most impressive about the Israelis. The answer was, that when anyone gets sick, they send helicopters and provide medicine — that they care so much about one person. I guess he couldn't believe the tremendous value the Israelis place on human life. You were talking about being a survivor as possibly being an energizing force. Do you feel the Israeli regard for human life comes out of that sense of survival, and do you feel that it's beginning to get into our political system — however tentatively? For example, at least in Cambodia, we're attempting to overcome the barrier of politics. Do we dare hope that having to live with the threat of annihilation and having to live with the memories of what has happened will somehow lead us to an equilibrium that is more human?

Robert Lifton: I believe that there are elements in Jewish tradition in general that place great value on human life, nonetheless, I think that Jewish survival and experience of the holocaust is an enormous factor in what you described. Perhaps some of America's experience in Vietnam and recent greater consciousness about the holocaust could be contributing to our concern about what's happening in Vietnam and Cambodia now. Having said that, I would be very cautionary. For one thing, we're not doing enough about Cambodia — because it is another holocaust situation. Second, the experience of survival tends to infuse everything we do, but doesn't give you a politics or an ethics out of hand. It can contribute an intensified effort, but for the ethics and the politics, you need other ideas; and the other ideas can sometimes be bad ones.

One way of looking at some of the conflict in the Middle East, say, between Arabs and Jews, would be that both have survivor imagery of very intense kinds, the Jews in the ways we've talked about. But also, many of the Arabs and Palestinians have this sense of being dislodged from their homes, and of having survived this dislocation. Other Arab groups have survived Western domination with certain contributions and manipulations by outside powers — including Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Neither experience is the same as the holocaust in Europe, but for them it is a profound experience of survival. Survivor energy can intensify conflict, rather than relieve it. So you can't count on survivor experience as humanizing what we do, but we should call upon survivor knowledge, along with humanizing ideas, and then survivor intensity can be brought to these ideas. That's the ideal model.

Question: I gather in your new book you write about importance of groups of being rooted in terms of religion or family or nationalism. Maybe I'm just recycling a cliché, but my impression is that American culture is systematically broken down in most of these groups. Where does that leave us, or are we now groping towards some new meaning that's larger than the individuals?

Robert Lifton: The struggles of the late sixties and early seventies can be understood in terms of many things happening, including a lot of protests; but another dimension that has been overlooked is the search for larger principles. A lot of the groups of young people in the sixties were quite conservative in their aspirations. When they went out into rural areas and formed communes, and some are still doing it, they wanted a way of living, and a larger set of beliefs. They wanted to reassert what I call a symbolic sense of immortality, of living on endlessly in some human stream — past and future. And we feel the absence of that, I think, very keenly in American life, all the more so in crisis. There's a certain amount of profound questioning of the dishonor that's been going on in American life over the last couple of decades — Vietnam and Watergate, for example. So, yes, I think we are groping. And I think some of the problems of the presidency, for instance, are not just whether Carter is an able leader or not an able leader. These are issues, but they go so much deeper — How does one lead at a time like this? How does one find new visions, of not just leadership, but of a belief system?

Question: Do you think the popularity of books like *The World According to Garp* is an influence on the psychic numbing you talk about?

B. J. Lifton: I didn't finish it — I read half of it and realized it just wasn't talking to me.

Robert Lifton: I have just read it, as a matter of fact. I have a certain complicated idea about violence in literature and the media. You just turn on the television any night, and there is much more violence than in *Garp*. Prime time seems to be all violence of one sort or another. *Garp* was part violence and part hype. I've never seen a book so actively promoted.

American life itself — and in the world — we fear violence, we feel the threat of violence around us and in us, so that we're bound to have a lot of violence in our entertainment. Of course, given the structure of our society, it is then exploited for commercial reasons. But this doesn't mean that one could legislate the media — including print media like *Garp* — to limit their violence and solve the problem. For me, judgments on violence are around the quality of the art. If *Garp* were better art, I would justify the violence because it would be in the name of a principle, of looking critically at violence. It's the threat of violence around us so strongly and extensively that contributes to novels like *Garp*, and the television programs much worse than *Garp*, and the preoccupation with violence.

B. J. Lifton: But doesn't *Garp* try to talk about the meaninglessness, rather than the violence, of life? What I read gave me the feeling that the writer had something he was trying to do with that violence. He was satiric; he used black humor.

Robert Lifton: Yes. The black humor part is very important to me. I think that black humor, gallows humor, has always had a very necessary role. Even in the Nazi death camps, there was a kind of gallows humor. The black humor is the better side of *Garp* because it is relevant to the threat and is a constructive and creative way of looking at violence and seeing its absurdity. The quality of humor in all this is very crucial.

Question: Do you think it is important that access to birth records be made available to everyone?

B. J. Lifton: That's what my adoption books are all about. The last book I did, *Lost and Found*, was about the psychological effects of adoption on people who didn't know who they were. I strongly believe that the records have to be opened, because otherwise you're asking a whole group of people to live in a kind of floating existence, not knowing who they were born to, or where they came from. This creates a whole psychological syndrome, very close to the survivor syndrome, which is what's interesting about it. Adoptees have survived something, but they don't know what. They don't know who their parents are; they're separated from their clan. At least other survivors know what their holocaust was. The person who is adopted doesn't know anything, and it leaves one with a kind of negative identity, very bad fantasies, and an inability to love.

I was interested to find out that the Hillside strangler, as well as Son of Sam, were adopted. I think this is very significant.

Question: How does this opening of the records — making adoption records available — affect those who have had children at a very young age, given them up, and built lives that might collapse if that child reappeared?

B. J. Lifton: Their lives are based on this psychic numbing, and therefore a lot of them are leading very repressed lives. We've found that when they are willing to face what has happened, and to let all of it out, they are much more happy on all levels.

Robert Lifton: This relates to what I was talking about before, about symbolic immortality, a sense of connectedness we seek beyond the self, beyond our individual life. That's why we're so concerned with heritage of the past, and with future continuity of our family, or other human groups. The adoptee has a confused sense of where his or her heritage lies. How you connect to the larger human flow, in my view, isn't so much a direct biological question — as the absence of that knowledge of your roots and parents, of where you come from.

Where do I come from? Anybody who has a child has heard that question again and again. How was I born? The question has been too quickly sexualized in the Freudian tradition to mean, By what sex act was I born? It can mean that, but it can also mean, What are my origins? Where am I from? What source?

Question: Dr. Lifton, you referred to the search for a form and sustaining it. Were you referring to that in the sense of a search for an explanation to act as a buffer against meaninglessness?

Robert Lifton: I think every writer and every artist — for that matter, everybody who tries to say something that's of some significance about anything — goes through that struggle.

In doing very painful work, what I'm sustained by is the confidence beneath those doubts that I can bring a form to it — a further insight and psychological interpretation of what is involved. By giving it a form, I give meaning to my enterprise, which in turn gives meaning to my life. This helps what seems to be very gory, very grotesque, to feel

less so. I'm taking in these grotesque things, but I'm also struggling with the effort to give it form — even when I'm in a very preliminary stage.

I wouldn't feel meaning in my life if I couldn't give these things some kind of form. That's my justification for having studied these very difficult and destructive events. I would say that we seek pleasure and vitality all the more intensely as a result of this struggle.

But I would also like to emphasize that I don't live totally in this. My whole life isn't a holocaust. I'm a demon tennis player, for instance.

Question: The system of slavery that was developed in this country was probably unique in one aspect, in that families were separated, babies were taken from the mothers. I'm interested in your definition of the psychological effects of not knowing your roots, not knowing your parents.

B.J. Lifton: Yes, the African people were brought over here, they were cut off from knowledge of their family, their name, everything. It was a completely dehumanizing situation and the rage that is in black people today can be traced to this very early beginning, as well as to what happened after they arrived.

It's interesting that adoptees often call themselves slaves. When they go to court, they argue that they have been treated as a slave group because they're not allowed to know their families. The argument is always thrown out of court.

Robert Lifton: I agree with the scholars who have established that American slavery was different from, say, Spanish slavery, in that it broke up families more consistently, partly because there weren't any intervening institutions. I think a lot of black protest of the sixties and seventies — what was then called the black power movement — was speaking to this question of origin in seeking roots and sources in African culture. It had a very real political and social edge, as well as a psychological edge.

Many blacks are ambivalent about being a part of America, and many felt that they couldn't become a real part of a larger social group until they had reasserted where they were from and who they were.

Another aspect of this that has come out recently in groups of adoptees is a kind of emptiness that they often experience — the sense that they don't have a full identity until they touch their natural parents, discover their roots.

There's a lesson here in the capacity of groups to take a very painful experience and reassert something around it. This has consequences that haven't been adequately looked at.

Question: In your work on dying and death, have you come to any conclusions about the role of religion in our culture, in helping or hindering?

Robert Lifton: Although I haven't done any systematic studies of death and dying in this culture, my sense is there's a lot of religion in America, very routinely practiced, almost automatic. You go to church or temple on Sunday or Saturday and it's a social belonging which certainly can help you when somebody close to you dies, but it doesn't necessarily alter your basic psychological relationship to death or to that very difficult combination of denial and some degree of openness and confrontation.

In my own life — my wife will have to speak for herself — I've never practiced any religion, but I am part of a long-standing and difficult, but interesting, struggle around how to be a secular Jew in the modern world, to put it simply. It's a vast identity struggle that Jewish authors write about. Once you have the emancipation from the ghettos around the turn of the century, with at times a radical rejection of religion, and often a secularism transmuted into politics or social reform, this identity problem emerges.

In terms of my facing death, I have the same struggles with numbing and denial that everyone else has. I wouldn't claim any great knowledge or wisdom because I study these things. But I do think about them, and I feel that the more I achieve in my life — the more I say, the more I do — the more I am able to contemplate my own death. Of course, we never think that death is timely — it's always untimely — so we're never fully ready for it, but there are degrees.

The same process that religion attended to is now secularized — I call it symbolic immortality — which I think makes it harder for us to face death, because the belief system is less firm than in the more established moments of religious experience. We transfer that struggle onto secular ground.

B.J. Lifton: If the holocaust hadn't happened, a lot of people like myself — assimilated Jews who don't think about being Jews — would have continued with assimilation. Although I wish people didn't have to be divided by religion and nationality and so forth, going to Europe, to Germany and Poland, sensitized me to my Jewish heritage and I've started reading — for the first time — books on Hassidic tales and Talmudic wisdom. I've started learning about my cultural past and trying to get the richness of it.

Question: Christianity allegedly believes in an afterlife. Judaism leaves that a question mark. Do you find that those who have a firm conviction about an afterlife die happily?

Robert Lifton: There's the example of the ancient Chinese mandarin sage, who has reached a ripe old age and is getting weaker and ready for his death. He has three or four generations of his family under his roof, all practicing the proper Confucian forms, the family is harmonious, the country is harmonious — no such stage ever existed, we all know, but it's an image of how one is ready to die under the most idealized circumstances, where one sees everything one has stood for continuing after one's death.

We're more ready to die when we're convinced that our life has contributed to a larger human process, to our immediate family, or something beyond it.

I once discussed this with Paul Tillich, who said that the literal idea of the afterlife was something that theologians would hand out to the common people, but that the basic feeling of the afterlife is imagery or symbolization of some unending spirituality in human experience.

So I can't help but think that in much Christian imagery there is also the symbolization of being part of something that continues indefinitely into the future.

Question: In a totalitarian country, a person who reads the newspaper doesn't believe it from the very beginning, because everybody knows this is official government stuff. They try to read between the lines. Do you feel that the traditional totalitarian way of brainwashing has been less successful than the so-called free democratic way practiced by the government and the media in America?

Robert Lifton: The word brainwashing as you're using it now tends to mean a devious way of influencing people — devious and indirect in a way that one disapproves of.

There is some truth in what you say. That is, if a population of a totalitarian country is really alienated, if they all feel that the means of media are controlled, then they start out on their guard.

In the United States, as Chomsky and others have said, it's not a plot. For a long time the media said very little critical about the war in Vietnam, and there was an unquestioned acceptance of the assumptions that were made by American political leadership. That's why people say that the media made the Vietnam war into another John Wayne film. You could watch the South Vietnamese chief of police putting a gun to the head of a so-called Viet Cong suspect and shooting the damned thing, killing him right there on the screen. Horrible. You become numb if you watch that every night.

My own experience of being against the war began back in the fifties. We had both been in Vietnam and saw things happening. We saw the transition of the French leaving and the Americans arriving. It was so clear to anyone who opened their eyes that this was a tragic and evil situation for America to become involved in — a kind of neo-colonialism.

We were totally against it and we did some fairly strong things. I was involved in the dissemination of information about American war crimes — it wasn't quite acceptable or popular to do this, and the media didn't have too much space for it, but we could find some journal somewhere, some audience.

Once the media had turned, you knew that America had turned. but the media really were an opportunity for some sort of powerful critique of the war, and agitation against it, as well as contributors to the numbing process.

America is a strange country and I feel a duality in my relationship to it in the sense that we're capable of enormous destructiveness very quickly, as in Vietnam. We leveled so much of South Asia. We've done a lot of nasty things on an immense level. The whole issue of blacks, mentioned earlier, is another example.

On the other hand, there's still something open about what America permitted while it was at war in Vietnam — even people who were much more militant than I. I feel that speaks well for some kind of democratic process which still exists.

Question: What effect does the media — especially television — have on children's concept of death?

Robert Lifton: Let me start by saying that the idea that when you die, you're not really dead, you'll be reborn, is a fantasy of every child. This is a univeral fantasy. What television programs do is reactivate these fantasies that occur very early on — age three, four, five — when they first become conscious of this very terrible thing. We never do entirely achieve a conviction about the finality of death.

It's a very fearful and painful idea to discover what death is. It is pretty common for kids to think if they go to sleep they might not wake up. Sleep has this association with death — a lot of images of death resemble sleep — the stillness. But once they've had that anxious night, and they wake up, perhaps there's a certain knowledge gained, as compared to those who numb fear, who make believe it doesn't exist.

It's useful to face death, but you can't force it on a child; you can't say, Now we sit down and study death as parent and child. Nor can you protect kids from the media — they get the kids younger and younger. But if there is some sort of exchange back and forth, and a willingness to be open about death, that's as good a way as any. If you can open these issues up, they don't become areas of enormous numbing right in the family circle. □

In the Name of Development

DAVID MAYBURY-LEWIS

I welcome the opportunity to address this group about Cultural Survival and what we try to do. In Cultural Survival, we are conscious of the fact that in order to accomplish our task we have to get a certain message across to the public at large, and by that I mean the worldwide public. Therefore it is tremendously important for us to have the opportunity to talk with journalists, who are in another sense in the same business, and for us to have your reactions and comments on the thesis which we present.

It seems to us in Cultural Survival that a number of things are done in the world today which in our quieter, more reflective moments, we would not be too happy with, and they are done in the name of development, which supposedly makes them all right. And indeed, at a time when the various ayatollahs and popes are all having at each other, the closest thing we appear to have to a world religion today is, in fact, the notion of development. Presumably everybody is willing, if I can quote, to "pay any price, bear any burden," to achieve development, however it is defined or whatever it may be. To be found "standing in the way of development," is very often thought of by the Western industrial world as something between a sin and a crime. It is a sin which we find almost unpardonable and a crime which the industrial world punishes very severely.

What I want to ask you to think about today are the tribal societies and ethnic minorities who, until quite recently, were minding their own business in the backwaters of the world economy, who all of a sudden find themselves accused of "standing in the way of development," and then find themselves visited with rather dire consequences as a result of this accusation. It is an accusation of course for which we, in the developed world, are prosecutors, judge and jury — and very often executioners as well.

We hear about this when a small group of people, like the Tasaday in the Philippines, are found in the jungles and come blinking out into the sunlight; it's marvelous copy and people rush to them and wonder if they really had a word for sun at all, or had they been living in the canopied jungle and never seen it and so forth. But what I want to emphasize today is that whereas these incidents are dramatic and therefore obviously newsworthy, really they're only certain little points in a process that's been going on for a very long time.

Let me give you an example. A couple of years ago when I was in England on sabbatical leave, I watched a television program in which the premier of Tasmania was shown making a public and posthumous apology to the person who was thought to be the last Tasmanian, a lady called Truganinni, who lived a rather tragic life. She was terrified of having her bones put in some museum or other. In fact, she'd been treated rather like some museum piece even in the later years of her life. In spite of her pleas that her remains should be treated with dignity, the physical boys couldn't wait to carve her up the moment she died. After she was dead, her bones were promptly carted off to various labs for examination. The Tasmanians now feel really badly about this. As I say, the premier recommitted the remains of Truganinni in a rather moving ceremony and made a public gesture of atonement.

If you're feeling terribly cynical, you may say that public gestures like that don't do anybody any good and they certainly don't bring the dead to life. But at least they can make us stop and think. What it made me do was stop and think why it was seen to be necessary to eliminate the Tasmanians in the first place. The original inhabitants of Tasmania were aborigines like the Australians. Now, just asking the question of why it was necessary to eliminate them might strike you as a bit odd because we have come to accept as almost axiomatic that if there is a small aboriginal population in places like Tasmania, they will be wiped out

---

David Maybury-Lewis is Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, and is chairman of that University's Anthropology Department. He is president of Cultural Survival, Inc. His book Dialectical Societies *was published by Harvard University Press in 1979.*

when civilization moves in. It is quite clear that in Tasmania the people who moved in — the whalers and convicts and later on the farmers and administrators — felt they were civilizing Tasmania and that in this civilization the actual inhabitants of Tasmania had no part. Furthermore, that they were beneath consideration as people who were not "civilized," or, to use our modern jargon, they stood in the way of civilization and therefore they were dealt with in the way that was quite common, they were annihilated.

This of course has been the classic colonial justification for the annihilation or genocide practiced against tribal peoples. Herman Merrivale, in his *Lectures on Colonialism* which was published in London in 1861, pointed out — and Merrivale was quite a staunch supporter of the colonial system — that the colonialists talked a great deal about civilization but in fact the whole process of colonialism was accompanied by an enormous amount of violence, both personal and institutional. Native peoples were annihilated and what we are pleased to call civilization came slowly and lamely in the wake of this crime.

It's true that we no longer live in the era of colonial expansion. One might say that is an unhappy nineteenth century chapter which is over and done with, but it is also true that violence and greed have not been banished from the world, and that remnants of the same process are still going on today. On occasion, settlers are still dispossessing or killing Indians in various parts of Latin America; ethnic groups are being dispossessed or harried to death — not necessarily by colonialists this time — in parts of Africa and Asia; and the latest and most striking examples of what can happen to ethnic groups who get on the wrong side of the majority are to be seen in Southeast Asia — features which have shocked the whole world and, quite rightly.

What I would like to argue today is that there is no necessity in all this. Because we tend to shrug our shoulders and say, Well, it's an irreversible historical process — the hidden hand of history is really against these peoples, they are in some neo-Darwinian sense unadaptable and therefore they just have to pass away. The whole point of my remarks is that this is not really true. I think these people are condemned not by necessity, not by any abstract process, but rather by an attitude.

It's an attitude which was put much more bluntly than most of us would find comfortable by a reviewer for the *London Sunday Times*. This man was reviewing a very interesting book called *Red Gold, The Conquest of the Brazilian Indians* by John Hemming. The reviewer said, in effect, how unfortunate that the conquest of Brazil involved such atrocities against the Indians — unfortunate, sad, but nevertheless, you know, European civilization at the time had operas and universities and so on and the Indians in Brazil lived essentially whimsical and uninteresting lives.

So while the reviewer didn't condone the atrocities, he felt that somehow European civilization in the last analysis stood justified.

Now it strikes me that since the reviewer is a literary man and not a social scientist, he put rather bluntly what many other people would be too embarrassed to say. Nowadays we normally don't claim to be more civilized than our neighbors because the whole notion of civilization has been so thoroughly relativized in our own thinking. We find that claim rather arrogant, in fact, unegalitarian, in this particular society we live in. And yet it seems to me that we have no such embarrassment about thinking of ourselves as more *developed* than our neighbors, and this is a nice displacement. In the old days we were the civilized ones and other people could be done away with in the name of civilization. Now we are the developed ones, and in the name of development almost anything is condoned — even genocide. I find it rather sad that it is only when a tribal group or ethnic minority is on the verge of extinction or has actually been extinguished that they make the news. I think genocide is horrifying, but I think the exclusive focus on genocide is also rather unfortunate. Obviously it is a terrible thing to see an entire people wiped out, but what I want to emphasize is that this is the last stage of a process. I wish that we could get people to attend to what is going on before these peoples are actually annihilated, because any effort to do something about the process depends on an understanding of that process while it is still going on, and not when it has reached a genocidal extreme.

Finally, while I'm going through this little catalogue of misconceptions which cause such untold suffering to other peoples, let me take issue with those realists who may be

David Maybury-Lewis/Anthro-Photo

amongst us who argue that modernization and development is a process which is fraught with risk and pain, and that therefore only sentimentalists would try to avoid the risks and eliminate the pain altogether. You know, "You can't make an omelet with breaking eggs" — you've heard that, I'm sure. The phrase really conceals the fact that it is we in the industrial world who make the omelet, and it is the tribal peoples and ethnic minorities who are the eggs. That raises a severe moral issue. Are we really justified in cannibalizing them in this sense? In making them the eggs in our own developmental omelet? The moral implications of that ought at least to give us pause. I find them rather disturbing, but some people feel that it is not really that bad — what we are doing is bringing them civilization and development. We're doing them a favor. If it is then pointed out, as I have just done, that the favor can be a highly destructive one, then very often our hard-nosed realists take refuge in the neo-Darwinian theory, claiming that there is an inevitable process going on here which we cannot interfere with. That's really the argument that I want to take issue with. Is this process really inevitable, or is it simply convenient? Is it that we are stronger and therefore able to serve our economic and political interests without any restraint in the areas where these other people live?

One final argument that is often brought up is that the industrial world desperately needs the resources of the planet. Tribal peoples and ethnic minorities, we're told, block access to these resources, and therefore it's really serving a higher moral good to move in and get those resources. It is serving the greatest good of the greatest number, the old Benthamite notion.

There are two objections to this argument. One is that is not always true. Take Brazil, for example, the country which I know best, a country whose development has been accompanied by enormous maldistribution of resources and income. This is a well-known economic fact. I am not talking only about the Indians, I am talking about the people within the Brazilian society for whom, presumably, the whole society is being developed. It is very difficult to believe the argument that the Brazilians have to dispossess Indian tribes in the Amazon in order to get at the resources which those tribes may or may not be sitting on, in order to get better distribution of those resources in the society as a whole, because it is precisely that distributional mechanism which is not functioning very well in Brazilian society. So, one needs to treat such arguments with caution, as rhetorical devices for concealing a fairly barefaced exploitation.

But suppose you had a benevolent government in a relatively resource-starved society that really was interested in getting at resources and making them available for the people. It is still not true — and I can't emphasize this enough — it is still not true that ethnic peoples and minority peoples are obstacles to development. These peoples can in fact take part in modernization if they are given half a chance.

Twenty years ago, my wife and I were with a group of Indians in central Brazil, the Shavante Indians, who were in those days monolingual. They didn't speak any Portuguese; they were seminomadic; they were technologically extremely backward. We were flown out to someplace where we could get in contact with them and then we walked across the savannah with them. Now one might have thought that the Shavante were every developmentalist's idea of people who could not conceivably adapt to civilization and the outside world. The only reason why they were allowed to exist in this way for so long is because they occupied relatively inaccessible lands in the middle of Brazil, where there were no obvious strikes of oil or gold or minerals, so they had been left in a backwater. Brazilian society caught up with them just after the founding of the new capital of Brasilia. After the opening up of roads, they discovered that Shavante country is very good for cattle raising, so there are now lots of cattle farms moving in on the Shavante. The Shavante are a proud and warrior people, in many ways rather like the Masai in East Africa, but there are far too many incoming cattle ranches for them to fight off. The interesting thing is that the Shavante don't particularly want to fight them off. They are not terribly interested in being allowed to wander over their territories hunting and gathering for all time; they are quite prepared to settle down to agriculture. The Shavante are very good at driving tractors and engaging in intensive agriculture —

and this, without losing their own culture, incidentally. They still speak their own language, practice their own customs and still call their soul their own.

What they really need is a guarantee of land and title to that land. This is the crux of the whole issue in dealing with tribal peoples and ethnic minorities. These people occupy land *de facto* and then settler society comes in and says, "Oh, yes, but you've got to have a bit of paper." Settler society issues the paper, and of course doesn't issue it to the people who are occupying the land. So the Shavante are not asking that the settlers clear out. They're not asking for an end to cattle ranching in the area. They're not asking to put an end to development in this particular region. They would in fact quite like to participate in the development of the region. They wouldn't mind owning cattle themselves. All they want is a just settlement of the land question, so that they're not simply moved off it like dust in front of a broom, which is what all too often happens to both the tribal peoples and ethnic minorities, and indeed to the other smallholders at the bottom of the heap. It is a continuum of dispossession.

I would like to insist that the Shavante are a sterling example of what is possible everywhere. Developmental specialists often say, "Well, nomads can't settle down. They are the prototypical people who cannot participate in development." In certain areas of the world it has been shown that nomads can make a magnificent contribution to development. In northern Afghanistan once the nomads were given a stake in the development of the Qataghan area, it turned out that they made a vital contribution to it, because they established a symbiotic relationship with other cultures in the region. But that was done deliberately. People thought of them and decided to include them in the development of the land, instead of considering them a stone in the way to be kicked aside.

What about areas where timber is the major resource? If you get great timber companies in, they are going to cut the forests. What does this do to the people who live in the forests? Not much, necessarily. Unless the timber companies are going to deforest the area entirely — which would be a bad idea ecologically, anyway — it is quite possible to have a middle term between outright developmentalism on the one hand, and the needs of the local population on the other. All this requires is selective cutting and paying some attention to the needs of the local people; then they can be brought into the whole process.

You might ask about other situations, such as when mining is the issue. Surely this is absolutely intractable. I mean, if you're going to bring in big mine interests to take out cassiterite or tin or whatever it is, surely this is going to utterly and irrevocably disrupt the life of the native peoples of the area. Well, yes, it is going to change it. But the point

David Maybury-Lewis/Anthro-Photo

is that the native people's lives are changing anyway. They don't mind change; they can absorb change, provided they're given a reasonable chance of coping with the change. A reasonable chance means some guarantees of land and some guarantees of income.

If you bring in the mine and just tell these people to take their chances, you're likely to destroy the entire population of the area through disease and dispossession. However, if you accept the principle that the peoples of the region are entitled to at least a fraction of the share in the profit, that share could be put into a development program, which would make it perfectly possible for those people to participate in the development of the region, instead of being alienated by the development. And all of this requires only imagination, careful planning and finally, and of course most importantly, some tempering of the greed of the developers.

To start my conclusion, cultural survival as a concept — and our organization which bears its name — is neither impractical nor romantic. We are not an organization devoted to keeping things the way they are. We think of cultural survival as a very dynamic matter. We think of it as encouraging the relative autonomy of ethnic groups and tribal societies; giving them some space in which to absorb the changes from the outside world that are inevitably going to affect them; giving them some space in which to make their own adjustment to the outside world; giving them some say in the crucial decisions which affect their lives — something which all of us would like to have in our own societies, never mind whether we're dealing with ethnic minorities or not.

The final consideration I'm sometimes asked about is,

Why bother? Why should this really affect us? Supposing we are all sitting in our metropolitan centers wherever we are, why should we really worry about what happens to small tribal societies and ethnic minorities at the edges of the world? Why should the industrial world exercise restraint if it has the power to impose its will? Very often there are all sorts of good reasons advanced as to why this should be done. For example, we can learn a great deal from the societies which we all too often brush aside so carelessly. People are now beginning to say that if we'd really paid a bit more attention to the ecological wisdom of some of the people in the Amazon, we would all be better off. I think those reasons are good but not overriding. There is one fatal flaw in this reasoning. That is, if we feel that we ought to give these societies a fair shake because we can learn from them — and I believe that we can learn from them — the corollary of that argument is that the moment we feel we have nothing else to learn from them, then we don't have to give them a fair shake. Or if at any moment we feel we don't have anything to learn from them, then they are fair game, and I don't think that's true at all.

The nub of the argument is really the moral argument, that the strong should not trample on the weak... the weak everywhere affect the security of the strong.

The nub of the argument is really the moral argument, that the strong should not trample on the weak and, incidentally, we have a lot to learn from the weak, too, so it's stupid to trample on them. But you may say that's all very well, but life is not lived in the real world according to moral injunctions. We should love our neighbor, but the world is not really run on those principles. Yet I would like to argue that this is not only a moral injunction, but it is also an extremely practical one. It's practical in two senses. It's practical in the sense that it can be done. I can quote you an endless litany of instances where in the name of development, horrors were perpetrated which were not even terribly efficient. Again, in the name of development, the thing can be done right and it can work out efficiently — there are very few such cases, I'm afraid.

It is also in our own self-interest. Freedom is indivisible and it ill behooves us to say we've got freedom in our own society, but we don't really care what happens elsewhere. We realize that policy is dangerous because if we close our eyes to what happens elsewhere, eventually we are threatened ourselves. The rights of the weak everywhere affect the security of the strong. It is not just these tiny societies at the edges of the world who are affected. What I have called developmentalism not only affects these little tribal people who face annihilation, it also affects those ethnic minorities all around the world who are going to be sacrificed to some national plan. Indeed, it also affects the peoples at the bottom of the heap whose interests and most cherished values are often sacrificed to the higher interests — or the higher interest payments — of the developers. It is this arrogance of power vested in the hands of the developers against which I'm arguing. It doesn't simply result in a small outcry over the genocide inflicted on three or four hundred people in the Amazon jungles, it produces explosive situations. It can produce exactly the sort of upheaval which we are now witnessing in Iran, which is an immediate consequence of the arrogance and foolish developmentalism of the shah's regime.

What is the use of all our civilization and of all our science (in the name of which these policies are put into effect), if we cannot learn from the past? The past teaches us that superior technology, plus greed and violence, wrought unbelievable havoc on the peoples who were contacted by the supposedly superior civilizations. The present, all over the world, shows us that in country after country, and in region after region, peoples of different cultural traditions are increasingly living together, or trying to, in multi-ethnic societies.

It seems to me that our task for the future is to figure out ways of making multi-ethnic societies work as harmoniously as possible. That is really the nub of the issue when we talk about cultural survival. This requires an entirely new view of development. It is true socioeconomic development which I've been arguing for, and arrogant developmentalism, which I've been arguing against. □

The New Reality

ANTHONY LEWIS

Anthony Lewis, Nieman Fellow '57, columnist for *The New York Times* and Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School, gave the following address at the annual Christmas dinner of the Signet Society in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Martin Chuzzlewit, the hero of Dicken's novel of that name, sails to the United States on a packet boat. As the boat reaches New York harbor, it is boarded by a gang of newsboys who shout out the latest in their papers — the New York Stabber, the Plunderer, the Peeper, the Family Spy and so on. "Here's the Sewer!" cries one of them, "The New York Sewer.... A full account of the Ball at Mrs. White's last night....with the Sewer's own particulars of the private lives of all the ladies that was there!...Here's the Sewer's exposure of the Wall Street Gang, and the Sewer's exposure of the Washington gang, and the Sewer's exclusive account of a flagrant act of dishonesty committed by the Secretary of State when he was eight years old; now communicated, at a great expense, by his own nurse."

Illustration of Martin Chuzzlewit by Phiz
The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1868

Well, Dickens could be extravagant, and in *Martin Chuzzlewit* he vented some extremely unhappy feelings about the United States. But just a few years earlier, in 1835, a most judicious foreign observer who deeply admired this country indicated similar doubts about the uninhibited character of the American press. In *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville quoted a rancid newspaper attack on President Jackson as, among other things, corrupt, ambitious, intriguing and shameless. De Tocqueville said:

"I admit that I do not feel toward freedom of the press the complete and instantaneous love which one affords to things by their nature supremely good. I love it more from considering the evils it prevents than on account of the good it does."

Nowadays the American press feels unloved, especially by judges. Cases decided in the last few years have left many editors and reporters with an acute sense of living under threat from the law. One of those cases involved Myron Farber, a *New York Times* reporter who was jailed for contempt when he refused to produce his notes for possible use by the defendant in a murder trial. After that, a *Wall Street Journal* reporter wrote:

"The judiciary — certainly not all of it, but enough of it to lay down the law — has for all practical purposes declared war against the press."

Another case involved the Stanford *Daily*, Palo Alto, California. The undergraduate paper covered a violent demonstration at Stanford University in which a number of people were badly hurt. The police, with no other clues to the identity of the assailants, got a warrant and searched the paper's offices for photographs of the event — and the Supreme Court upheld that search. Carl T. Rowan, the newspaper columnist, called it "an atrociously un-American ruling" and said:

"History will probably judge this to be one of the worst Supreme Courts in our history."

Just the other day Jack Anderson, the investigative columnist, commented:

"Crazy as it may seem, the current Supreme Court is systematically working to repeal the United States Constitution."

Strong words. Can they be true? Have our courts forgotten the First Amendment? Or why is there this feeling of embattlement, of hostility between the law and the press?

American courts cannot fairly be charged with any general insensitivity to freedom of expression. Over the last two decades judges, especially those on the Supreme Court of the United States, have interpreted the First Amendment generously, even imaginatively, to protect freedom of speech and press. They have given editors what I think is beyond doubt the widest measure of legally enforceable independence that exists, perhaps that ever has existed, in any country.

Consider libel as an example. Before 1964 there were no constitutional limits of any kind on libel actions. That is, no award of damages for a defamatory publication — however large, however outlandish — was then thought to infringe on the freedom to publish under the First Amendment. Since then the Supreme Court has read the Constitution to put sophisticated limits on a libel action. It has transformed the American law of libel. There are still serious burdens in its application, notably the cost of defending lawsuits. But compared with, say, Britain, the threat of libel actions to freedom of expression is minimal.

In recent years, the press has acquired significant new legal protections in other areas, too. The Supreme Court decided, in the Pentagon Papers case, that a newspaper could not under existing law be restrained from publishing top-secret documents that the government insisted might compromise the national security. The Court has similarly said no to what the press calls gag orders — injunctions prohibiting publication of a defendant's confession and other such material before or during the trial of a criminal case.

Those are among many recent legal victories for the press. Why, then, the feeling of anxiety, almost of persecution by judges? It stems primarily, I believe, from concern over the protection of confidential sources. The fear that the names of sources may be discovered in unannounced police searches of newspaper offices explains the very critical reaction to the Supreme Court's decision in the Stanford *Daily* case. And the need to protect the identity of sources was the main legal argument made by Myron Farber and his employer in resisting the demand for his notes.

The argument is straightforward. Information about wrongdoing in our society can often come only from people who fear retaliation if their names become known. So reporters may have to promise confidentiality if they are to get the story — and their effectiveness in the future depends on keeping their promises. The Constitution must protect this essential aspect of journalism.

In newspaper terms, that is a strong argument. There is no alternative to some use of confidential sources — Watergate shows that. But it does not follow that the Constitution protects journalists in this professional mechanism. Even less, in my opinion, does it follow that the interest of the journalist is the only one involved.

Another interest, for example, is law enforcement. In 1972 the interest of the press and of law enforcement clashed. In several cases grand juries were investigating crimes or possible crimes that reporters had witnessed. The reporters were called to testify. When they refused, they were held in contempt — and by a vote of five to four the Supreme Court upheld the contempt findings. The opinion, by Justice White, emphasized the ancient right of the grand jury to "every man's evidence."

A curious sidelight to that case was decided on June 29, 1972, just twelve days after an event at the Watergate in Washington, little noticed at the time. I think Justice White has to be credited with prescience for putting into his opinion a footnote about the importance of every man's evidence:

"Chief Justice Marshall," he noted, "opined that in proper circumstances a subpoena could be issued to the President of the United States."

Not too long afterwards a subpoena *was* issued to the President of the United States. He resisted, saying that he had a privilege to keep the intimate conversations in his office private. The Supreme Court agreed that there was such a Presidential privilege, but said that it could be overridden in the interest of law enforcement.

Are we to say, then, that law enforcement is so important that the constitutional privileges of presidents must bow to it — but that the interest of the press always comes first? I would not say that.

Or consider the Farber case. This time it was not the

prosecution that wanted the reporter's evidence but the defendant — a doctor who had been implicated in some hospital deaths by Farber's stories and who had then been indicted for five murders. Myron Farber says that his notes were irrelevant to the doctor's defense, and I believe him; he is a fine reporter who respects the demands of the law. But the press is not always the good guy. In McCarthy days the press sometimes treated individuals cruelly. Shouldn't someone named as a Communist in a redbaiting paper be able to find out the paper's evidence?

A defendant has some specific constitutional rights. One of them, secured by the Sixth Amendment, is the right "to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor." If anyone doubts the importance of that right, or its part in a civilized system of criminal justice, think of the dissenters who at their trials in the Soviet Union are often prevented from calling witnesses in their favor.

When the press talks as if no rights other than its own were involved in these cases, its premise must be that the Constitution gives the press a unique status: an immunity from rules that bind others in our society. That view was given considerable standing when it was expressed five years ago, in a speech at Yale, by Mr. Justice Stewart of the Supreme Court.

His speech dealt with the press clause of the First Amendment, the last four words in the famous command: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." Justice Stewart said the authors of those words intended to give special protection to "the organized press" — newspapers, magazines, broadcasting — because it provided "organized, expert scrutiny of government."

As a matter of history, I do not think Justice Stewart's view is very convincing. He said the framers were conscious of Tudor and Stuart repression in England, where the press was "licensed, censored and bedeviled by prosecutions for seditious libel." True enough. But that repression was not aimed solely, or especially, at newspapers. The censors were just as severe toward books and pamphlets — "ofttimes huge volumes," as John Milton said in protest of the censorship.

There are also practical problems with Justice Stewart's thesis. One is definitional: Who would be included in "the organized press" and get special treatment? Would the concept be limited to established publications and broadcast stations, or would it include underground newspapers, journals of sexual exploitation, Wall Street tip sheets? In these days of the Xerox, what about the person suddenly inspired to circulate among the neighbors an angry attack on real estate speculators? Such questions would force the courts to go into the business of defining "the press," a form of judicial licensing that I think would not really please the press.

In today's world some people who are not editors or reporters may play important roles as communicators. There is the former CIA man who published a book on the final days in Vietnam without having it cleared first; when the Government tries to punish him by lawsuit, should his rights — or the interest of the First Amendment — be any less than in the case of a reporter? Or consider the Harvard professor who was subpoenaed by a Federal grand jury looking into the Pentagon Papers case and asked to reveal his sources for a scholarly study he had made of Vietnam; should he have to reply while Mr. Farber is exempt? When I put such cases to students, I find that they always want to define the professor and the CIA man as "the press," too; the cases are simply too compelling to be treated less sympathetically. But when you make the definition that broad, Justice Stewart's concept of press exceptionalism loses its meaning.

In dissent from the Stanford *Daily* decision, Justice Stewart expounded his view in these words:

"Perhaps as a matter of abstract policy a newspaper office should receive no more protection from unannounced police searches than, say, the office of a doctor or the office of a bank. But we are here to uphold a Constitution. And our Constitution does not explicitly protect the practice of medicine or the business of banking from all abridgment by government. It does explicitly protect the freedom of the press."

So in Justice Stewart's view the Constitution did not allow the police to get a warrant to search the offices of an undergraduate daily for photographs of a felony, a vicious mass assault. But the Constitution would allow an unannounced search through a lawyer's files, or the files of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, Dr. Fielding. To state the proposition is to refute it, I think. Such a mechanical concept of the Constitution would be utterly unacceptable to most Americans. The Constitution protects values, not particular classes of people. And there are values other than "the right to know." One is the right of an accused to defend himself effectively. Another is reputation, which Justice Stewart has convincingly said reflects "our basic concept of the essential dignity and worth of every human being." That is why the Supreme Court has not held all libel actions unconstitutional and why I think it will continue to allow some means, whether by damage suits or some other corrective process, for those who are defamed to vindicate their good names.

Finally, Justice Stewart has disappointed the press in one important respect. He said the press should have special protection for its sources because the Constitution protected "news-gathering." But he then vigorously rejected claims by the press that it had a right of access to

institutions closed by government action. When reporters wanted to see prisons which had been closed to them, Justice Stewart said they had no constitutional right to do so. And in July 1979, in perhaps the most important of all these cases, he wrote for a five to four majority of the Court in allowing New York State to hold an important pretrial hearing in a criminal case in a closed courtroom. That decision, in the Gannett case, aroused some more angry words from the editorial writers and columnists: this time, I think, with more justification.

Is there any way out of the conflict — a way to protect the vital *public* interest in a free press without a distorting constitutional favoritism for one institution? I think there may be.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. made an important contribution in a recent speech at Rutgers University. He chided the press for making exaggerated attacks on the Supreme Court, for overdoing the gloom and doom. He had dissented from the decisions that so outraged editors, he noted, but he did not think they were the end of the world — or of our amazingly free press. Then he made an interesting suggestion. He said the press was confusing two different aspects of the First Amendment in its blanket criticism of the press decisions.

One thing the First Amendment protects, Justice Brennan said, is speech as such: "the right of self-expression," "the right to speak out." That is the right that was involved in some of the classic free-speech opinions by Justices Holmes and Brandeis: the right of the streetcorner orator, the pacifist, the socialist newspaper — "freedom for the thought that we hate," as Holmes said.

But the First Amendment does more than that, Justice Brennan said. It "forbids the government from interfering with the communicative processes through which we citizens exercise our rights of self-government. . . . Another way of saying this is that the First Amendment protects the structure of communications necessary for the existence of our democracy."

That same thought about the two functions of the First Amendment was expressed twenty-five years ago in more moving words by Professor Zechariah Chafee of Harvard. "There is an individual interest," he said, "the need of many men to express their opinions on matters vital to them if life is to be worth living, and a social interest in the attainment of truth, so that the country may not only adopt the wisest course of action but carry it out in the wisest way."

What is at stake in that second category is, in short, the ability of the American public to scrutinize its government — to scrutinize and criticize. Justice Brennan takes a broad view of what is necessarily involved in that public ability: wisely so, I think, in light of the way society has developed.

In the eighteenth century, newspapers did not usually provide the "organized, expert scrutiny of government" that Justice Stewart kindly attributed to them; they were political sheets, amazingly propagandistic in tone to our eyes. Democracy was simpler in that small country. But today the issues have become so complex and the public so remote from the political actors that it depends for its democratic role on what it gets from the political communications system. And that system has itself become much more complex. The soapbox orator is no longer the paradigm. We are in an age of giant media corporations: Time Inc., *The Washington Post*, the networks — and of large lobbying organizations, from the oil companies to the NAACP.

Justice Brennan's formulation takes account of the new reality. It recognizes that communication about government today is a complex process, and that the process must be protected in all its aspects if the central meaning of the First Amendment — the public's ability to hold the government accountable — is to work. It is a formulation that avoids any narrow definition of "the press" and protects whatever plays a part in the informational process. I think Justice Brennan's view would assure the public and its representative, the press, some access to official business — the right denied in the closed courtroom case — because there can be no accountability in secret.

But the price of that broad view is that it cannot give anyone absolute protection. The interests of the press, Justice Brennan said, have always to be weighed heavily — but weighed against other public interests: reputation, privacy, law enforcement and the like. For example, the rule would be that courtrooms are presumptively open — but the presumption could be overturned if a pretrial hearing involved material gravely prejudicial to a fair trial.

Justice Brennan told the press that it would be more effective in its criticism of the court "if bitterness does not cloud its vision, nor self-righteousness its judgment." He suggested that we reporters and editors might have to accept "a certain loss of innocence, a certain recognition that the press, like other institutions, must accommodate a variety of important social interests."

That seems to me to be good advice. I hope the press listens to the message, and I hope Justice Brennan's colleagues take up his suggestion that the First Amendment assures the accountability of government by protecting the informing function in its whole contemporary complexity.

I happen to have a deep affection for both the press and the courts. I think both institutions are vital to American freedom, and I worry when they are at war — even a war of words. I think the two of them owe it to the country, and to themselves, to begin learning more about each other. □

Continuing our series (*NR* Winter 1978; Spring 1979) on fiction writers and poets who began their careers as journalists, we are pleased to present excerpts from the Nieman Fellows' recent

CONVERSATION WITH WARD JUST

James Thomson (Curator, Nieman Foundation): Our friendly visitor is Ward Swift Just, who has been a friend of mine since the first golden days of Camelot. In those days, Ward had been assigned to Washington, from the Chicago bureau of *Newsweek*. Ward comes from Waukegan, Illinois, one of the most attractive lakeshore towns. It has a great newspaper, of which Ward has been the publisher —

Ward Just: — I'm no longer publisher.

Thomson: But it was a family trust, of sorts?

Just: It was a family trust of sorts —

Thomson: — which is the title of a novel he wrote recently. Ward has done almost everything you can imagine in your craft, and outside of it. He has been a reporter for *Newsweek* and *The Washington Post*. He has covered the local American Washington political scene as well as Chicago and points elsewhere. He had what I call a Hemingway problem, which means that he had to get where the action was, so whenever there was a horrendous *crise*, Ward went where the battle was. That involved him in the sequence with the Dominican Republic, with Cyprus, with Vietnam — where he was wounded quite badly. He has been a publisher, a reporter, a war correspondent, a political analyst, and he did the thing that so many of us — or you — want to do: he finally broke loose and became a free-lance writer of short stories, which were published initially mainly in *The Atlantic*, and have come out in book form, and he has written novels. For a while he was a recluse in Vermont, but now he's a recluse in Boston. I thought it would be very interesting to find out what it has felt like to do these various things and which you would do again, and which you wouldn't do again, and in what sequence.

Just: Jim is right in one sense. I really have kind of gone around the block, as an editorial writer once — for a while — with the *Post*; I've worked for a magazine that failed, *Reporter Magazine*, back in the early sixties. I covered politics, covered foreign stuff, and now am quite happily writing novels and stories.

Question: Do you find fiction writing — short stories and novels — more interesting or fulfilling, perhaps, than journalism and if so, why?

Just: Yes. The happiness is on an entirely different level. The happiness, I think, that comes from reporting is discovery of whatever it is you're trying to discover, whether it's the action during the war or political campaigns, and then publishing it; and if you're working for a largish paper, or frankly even a small one, the people that you come in contact with, have actually read your work and if it's done well enough and is powerful enough, it can have a real effect which you can observe. Particularly in

---

Ward Just's latest book is Honor, Power, Riches, Fame, and the Love of Women, *published by Dutton. His "Newspaper Days" column appears in* The Atlantic.

Vietnam, I could see that what I was doing was having an effect, however small, on the bureaucracy.

Fiction is an entirely different arrangement. Not very many people read it — or read me, anyway. When they do read it, their reaction is really quite private. My own view is that if you write fiction, anybody who reads it has a right to take away from it anything they want to take away from it. I'm in no way offended that sometimes they take away the opposite of what I intended. That's perfectly okay. But it's a very private act and the pleasures are correspondingly private, more private, and they're in the act of composition itself. What happens once it's published is an entirely different thing, on a much smaller scale. Fiction, or at least my fiction, simply doesn't have anywhere near the impact that I fancied I used to have writing for *The Washington Post* or —

Question: Do you think your new craft is as important then?

Just: It sure is as important to me. I think that the level of subtlety that you can reach, and the depths that you can go by rearranging reality to suit yourself, are much greater than anything that you can do when you're playing in a field that's bounded, after all, by certain facts, and you can't bust those — you must stay within that realm. Often you can do some invention within that, but it's mostly linguistic invention; you can't toy with the facts themselves. When you're doing fiction, you can really rearrange the world to suit yourself. Take characters — you can wind them up, and send them on their way, and they can do any damn thing they want to. You can get a narrative drive going, and put them all on the road, and if it's successful enough, people will follow them all the way down that road. It has nothing to do with what you see outside with your eyes. Yes, I find it much more satisfying, but I was never hooked on impact anyway — here today, gone tomorrow.

Question: When did you leave *The Post*?

Just: I left in 1970.

Question: Had you at that point published short stories? What I'm interested in is how you made the decision to stop.

Just: I was covering Nixon and McCarthy in 1968 — mostly Nixon — and there was a lot of turbulence in my household at the time because I was away so much covering these campaigns. Frankly, six months of Nixon was the world's most boring enterprise. I reprised all that in a piece for *The Atlantic* — that campaign and how we tried to cover it. Anyway, bored out of my socks by summertime, Phil Geyelin came to me and said, Why don't you try writing editorials. I'd never done that and it sounded like fun, just for something to do. So I went over and did that. At that time we were engaged in turning the *Queen Mary* — meaning *The Washington Post* — around for a more reasonable Vietnam policy. It really was like turning the *Queen Mary* — just going around by inches, and having a role in that appealed to me. The paper's editorial policy on Vietnam under Russ Wiggins — a great man in other ways — was just disastrous. I went over to the editorial page in September or October of 1968. In the summer of 1969, I managed to get them to give me leave for two months to go out to New Hampshire to write a novel — which I did. I had so much fun doing that, it was such a break; it was the first time I'd written any fiction since the early sixties, when I took off six months and made the horrible mistake of going to Spain where I fell under the influence of Hemingway and too much wine and a lot of bullfights — it was just a horror show. I still have about eight or nine unpublished short stories from that bleak period.

So in 1969, I went to New Hampshire, wrote a novel and was pleased with it, and was even more pleased when Knopf bought it right away — for not very much money, but Knopf is such a good house that I was very exhilarated by it. When I came back to the paper, I just couldn't get it up for the editorial page. It was a weird thing. I really loved, and love, the practice of journalism. I love running around in airplanes and all of that nonsense, but it became very boring with Nixon. On the other hand, editorial writing was not much more fun because you sat in a little cell and went like that [*sucks his thumb*], and frankly, my long suit as a journalist was never analysis. I was much better as a describer of things, you know: look at it, describe it — that was the stuff that I could do best. So after four or five months of that, I went to Geyelin and said, This just isn't working. Coincidentally, Bob Manning of *The Atlantic* came up with a beautiful idea to do a long magazine piece on the state of the United States Army, and I was still fascinated with the army in Vietnam at the time, so I proposed to the *Post* that I take a leave of absence to do the thing for *The Atlantic* with the *Post* taking serial rights. I thought I could keep my anchor to windward on the *Post*, do the stuff for *The Atlantic*, run that into a book and maybe have enough money to take three or four months off and do another novel, which is really what I wanted to do. And the *Post* said nix. So I quit, did the thing for *The Atlantic*, which eventually did make some dough, and have been writing fiction ever since. It was published as a series called "Soldiers" and there was a book called *Military Men*. It gave me enough money to last for a couple of years and I've been writing fiction ever since — for ten years.

Question: I can understand about editorial page, but do you miss the action?

Just: I really don't. A friend of mine, Johnny Apple, was covering politics for *The New York Times* in 1972 and 1976. He called me and said, Come along and cover some campaign trips. I ran around with him and he had all the contacts — he knew everybody. I just trailed along in his rather imposing wake. We did that for ten days in 1972 and ten days in 1976. At the end of those ten days, Jesus, I was happy to get back to my location. You've got to have a fascination with the political process, and I lost it somewhere along the line. I didn't care what the Republican chairman in Idaho thought — I didn't give a damn.

Question: Did you get a sense that in fiction writing there's more of a yearning for prominence? I ask because it occurs to me that out of all of the newspapers we read, very few individual articles stay with us, although as a journalist, you grow fond of certain reporters and what they do. Part of the nature of the newspaper business is here today, gone tomorrow, and it's another new paper, but a piece of fiction is yours, and maybe it will be on somebody's bookshelf....

Just: And it stays yours. If the thing is really well made, I believe, no matter what year it was written in, it will last from today till tomorrow. In my view, the best journalism should really seize the moment. If it lasts from today to tomorrow, it's not done properly. You take as much stuff as you can get, you write it as lucidly as you can, you pack it into that column and that's it. You go on to the next thing the next day, and try to update it, try to find what was new. I think that after a while, it loses its fascination — often the new thing that happens isn't awfully interesting, it doesn't tell you very much except it's simply new; it's not durable, it's just new.

Question: Do you think that has anything to do with getting older —

Just: Yes, I do.

Question: — and wanting to settle down?

Just: One's entire life can be a search for order and stability, however peculiarly we choose to do it. Journalism is the opposite of order and stability. Indeed, it is like calculus: it simply describes the various increments of change. If you're at ease with disorder and disharmony — and I think you're a hell of a lot more at ease with them before you are thirty-five or forty years old — you can move with those changes and become part of them. I fancy there were three or four of us in Vietnam who were absolutely in tune with that story because that story was us — we had no trouble following it, grasping it, understanding it: the particular violence and disorder, disharmony, and all the rest of it. Most of the people that I'm thinking of were going through, for one reason or another, lots of disorder and disharmony in their own lives.

Following Nixon's campaign in 1968 was like following a royal procession. You knew in February that he was going to be nominated, there was nothing the Republicans could do to deny that nomination — nothing was going to happen unless he got shot, so you just followed the change each day — the gathering of a delegate here, and an impressive speech there, an editorial endorsement there, getting more money from that guy in Chicago the next week...that's what you were charting.

Question: Who were those three or four guys that you said were also in tune with Vietnam?

Just: You'd have to break them up in terms of the old timers, Peter Arnett and Neil Sheehan, the regulars like Bill Tooley, Johnny Apple, and Kevin Buckley; Morley Safer, Dean Brelis — I know there are other television guys but they are the ones that jump to my mind right now who really were in there in a serious way.

Question: What do you mean by "tuned into what was happening"; what was the bunker view that you had?

Just: You grabbed your own theme of the war and did not allow your coverage to be in any way dictated by events. It was as if you were a single historian writing the history of the war virtually without — and this is really where you are on your feet — virtually without outside influence, the theory being that you were so in tune that each piece was tied in a funny kind of way to the next piece. My theory was that readers would always read every word every day, which is preposterous, but it was my theory, and if they followed them through, and followed that action through a given year, they would have all they needed to know. I think too many reporters allowed themselves to be influenced by the flashy events of the war. In other words, when there was a battle somewhere, they would immediately rush to it, and possibly neglect something else that they'd been working on. There are exceptions to that, when the prime minister gets shot, or Buddhist monks start burning themselves in the streets, and plainly you do that because that's an event so large that it colors everything else. A really good political reporter who's off on a story knows that story so well, he can shape it as he chooses without being moved around by

statements by this side or that side. He knows what's important and keeps his eye on what's important. Those of us who were there were absolutely fascinated by the details of the culture of the country itself, and what was happening to it — it's fascinating, like a fever chart of a disease. We didn't really have time to get at causes. To describe results was really the most useful work that we could do. The causes were better described elsewhere: get at the causes in Washington, get at them in Moscow, get at them in Hanoi.

Question: Is there any reporter today who understands the Iran situation?

Just: Yes, Jon Randal in *The Washington Post.*

Question: Having lived through the Vietnam war and I guess having some expectations that the United States would learn a lesson from that, do you see any fear that out of the Iranian situation right now, we may reinvent the idea that it's us against the world and retrench into this kind of flag waving?

Just: Fortress America? I don't think that's going to happen because I still don't think that Vietnam has been examined as thoroughly as it should. We have yet to look the corpse in the face, so to speak.

Question: Could Iran foreshorten that period of really healthy but uncomfortable examination?

Just: Yes, although it's very hard to see exactly how that would come about, but I take your point.

Question: Why do journalists try to become fiction writers? What made you different?

Just: I don't know what makes me different. I think I know the problem, because I'm still wrestling with it in a strange way. A journalist is really trained to deal with facts, and more than that, a journalist operates under the assumption that one thing will lead to another, and that there is a chain of facts, and if you can find them all out, get all the documents, talk to all the right people, you can assemble a story that cannot be attacked. Fiction is a different process; it does not depend in any sense on the facts. I'm talking about fiction of a certain kind; I'm not talking about thrillers where you describe the les Halles meat markets so you can give versimilitude to Paris, or you give brand names to things so that you locate somebody by class or strata. I think with fiction, the more stuff like that you put in, the worse off you are, or the less convincing you are; the less touching you are. Conversely, the more you leave out, the better, the stronger story is. I'm a great believer in less is more, in fiction of a certain kind. There are lots of exceptions to that — Tolstoy and Dickens and Dostoyevski come to mind right away — but as a general proposition, in telling everything you know, the story is not going to do what you want it to do, what you're trying to do: to touch not the head so much as the heart. I believe it's true, that the more information — data, if you will — that you try to put into the story, the weaker it tends to be.

I think for a journalist, it's really daunting to sit down for the first time in front of your typewriter, and understand that there is no one you can go to who can give you the new lead or beef up the middle, and there's no book or reference book. Everything that you know is in your head and the problem is getting it out of your head. A journalist is not trained to think in that way, is not trained to invent, actually is trained not to invent. If you start inventing, you're a bad journalist, therefore when you write fiction, you have to turn everything you've learned on its head.

Question: Are stylistic skills much different for you?

Just: I don't think that's a problem. I don't write metaphors or use elaborate language. You really have to think through what you're doing, and if you think that you've got a story solid, got the people in mind, you don't even need a plot — just characters and action. The style comes with what you're trying to do, the kind of things that you're trying to say; your style will fit itself around that.

Question: Could you talk a little more about the creative process, because it's so different from writing a newspaper column — what happens when something comes into your mind?

Just: I try to think of two or three people that I'm fond of, or not fond of, wheel 'em up and let 'em go. I like to start with a scrap of dialogue, which I usually throw away, and just see where they take themselves. I love to think that these characters are off on their own. If they were, the book would write itself, but it never does write itself, so it's not that at all. You're writing and controlling. If you think of them in an interesting enough way, they will begin to do odd things, and there are all sorts of peculiar things that come in from your memory. That's all fiction is — reprocessed memory that comes out in a peculiar way. I look through stuff that I know was based on something that happened to me or happened to a friend, and the thing has gotten so turned around on its side — changes in gender, changes in time, changes in attitude — that to go back and try to sort out the

factual event that gave rise to this is an absolutely bogus enterprise.

Question: How do you decide what's going to be a story and what's going to be a novel?

Just: That was only a problem once. I wrote a novel called *Stringer* three or four years ago. It started out as a short story, and then I realized that it was really the last chapter of a novel, so I went back and wrote chapters one through five to agree with chapter six. The problem is that anybody who reads the book can see that this last chapter does not agree with anything else in the novel. The editor and everybody else who read that book said that these two things were of a wholly different weight, texture, touch, tempo. At the time I didn't have enough sense to see that, so it's an oddly structured book — it has five chapters that go along at a certain pace and then you hit this minefield.

Question: You once said that women seem to prefer your fiction more than men do. Do you still believe that and do you know why?

Just: I do believe it and I know that it's true. I used to think it was because I had this wonderful insight into women, and of course, that doesn't have anything to do with it. The reason is that women read fiction and men don't. It is as simple as that. Men think fiction is a waste of time because it is not true in any way in business; that it's a frivolous activity that you do if you're at the beach. If you really want to learn something that will contribute to your business, you go out and read *The Brethren* or *Fortune* magazine.

Question: Do you read fiction?

Just: Yes, all the time.

Question: Now is the time to tell us about your lifelong relationship with Ernest Hemingway —

Just: Is there a journalist alive who at some point or other who has not been influenced by Ernest Hemingway — the life and the work? That style is so beautifully crafted to journalism. Even done badly, you can still pack more in, suggest more — it's infectious, it's like the flu — once it starts, it takes you years to get rid of it.

Question: Have you moved to other models that you think fit you better now?

Just: A much greater model of what I was trying to do with my style is Fitzgerald or Henry James. James is a model not stylistically, but technically — things as simple as moving people in and out of the room, the management of his dialogue, just the way he would deal with three or four people talking at once — how they do that, what particular language he uses is a technical model as opposed to a model for style. After you've been at it, you have your own style for better or worse. You know, you are never so old that you can't pick up a new trick. It still is a kind of trick, a squiggle, in what you're telling yourself.

Question: How and when did you develop the habit of reading fiction, and how did you sustain it in your work hours as a journalist?

Just: I would always try to have something with me on the trips, and to break away from the bar before ten o'clock at night. During the early sixties, I was really hooked on Theodore Dreiser. I guess I read everything — my memory's probably a little off, call it half fiction, and the other half, things that percolated through Washington, which everyone read, because the President of the United States was.

Question: Writing seems like such a lonely business. Do you miss the camaraderie of newspeople?

Just: Yes, yes, that's what I miss. I don't miss the running around, I don't miss the reporting at all.

When Teddy Kennedy made his announcement, I went over to Fanueil Hall — I live only about four blocks from there — I said, "Damnit, I'm going to go watch this thing and be part of the audience for a change." It was the first time in my life I'd ever gone to a political rally when I wasn't covering the thing in one way or another. So, I got over there, and some of the Kennedys came out, some of the Kennedy children, some Secret Service men, and then the newsmen came out and I just had to break out laughing. There's one guy who works for *The Washington Post*, Haynes Johnson, and he and I are somewhat look-alikes except that he's about six inches taller — we sort of dress alike too. So there he was, and it was just like looking at me, writ large. Got his little blue Olivetti, got the cigarette, sort of harassed, hasn't got any hair anymore, running after Ethel or someone, writing in his notebook — I just laughed like hell. He finally came over to me and we arranged to have a drink, when he looked at his watch and said, "Ah, shit, I'm going to miss the bus," and he was off. A forty-seven-year-old man running after a bus, and everybody's running with him, and they've all got their little blue typewriters — marvelous.

There's no group of people I know more jolly, just

generally jolly, than the damn newsmen, more fun to spend an evening with than anybody else.

Question: Did reading fiction have a big impact on your journalism writing mind? What happens if you try to do fiction writing at the same time you're doing journalism, when you switch from one to the other?

Just: During the bulk of the time I was really reporting, I was not writing any fiction.

Question: Do you think it's possible to go back and forth, like that?

Just: For me it was a catastrophe to try to do fiction on the weekend, with a novel particularly. It's a little different with a story, but with a novel once you really lock into it or it locks into you, it's very hard to do anything else that requires typing on a typewriter. Everything else pales by comparison. When the novel begins to move, you have to keep all your faculties. I try not to drink too much because this period doesn't happen very long — it's maybe three or four weeks when everything's out of the garage, and it's going — you don't know exactly where, but it's rolling pretty well. In those cases, to break off or do something else is impossible. That's part A. Part B is I think the confusion of those realms. The techniques used for journalism and techniques used for fiction are entirely different. I think part of the confusion today is that people try to mix them up. I don't believe that works. For example, these "docudramas" on television — I think those producers should be shot. It's an outrage. Fussing with the truth. Likewise I don't have too high an opinion of so-called faction novels by the Watergate crew, nor any of the other romans á clef that are so popular.

Question: How did you train yourself to the other technique?

Just: It's really temperament and training: you do it and do it and do it for four or five hours.

My own failures as a writer of fiction usually come from the inability or unwillingness to think something all the way through. It isn't that in a jam my tendency is to try to find some fact or something — that isn't my problem. It's an insufficiency of oxygen in my head.

Question: What can you tell about an author's frame of mind from reading a novel?

Just: Short stories might be more revealing than novels, because short stories ought to be written in one pinch, one mood — start on a Tuesday and finish on a Friday or Saturday. But a novel really ought to be like a symphony. The novel takes so long that you're bound to go through phases that are not happy all the time, you have to go through them with a novel. I don't know that the novel necessarily reflects that. I don't think you can read a novel and say the author was up during this chapter and down during that one.

Question: How much do you know about where you're going when you're writing — do you just have a general idea of creating the characters and letting them start moving?

Just: I'm very, very vague. I know what I'm up to, I know what it is, I know what I'm interested in for the book, I know what I want the reader's emotions to be at the end point, and I know what I'm up to in terms of what I'm trying to describe. In *Family Trust* I had a pretty good idea of the plot, but that's because I had written it eight years before and thrown it in a wastepaper basket. When it eventually reappeared there was no similarity — no character survived, no plot survived, but the theme was the same.

With a short story it's a little different because it's a briefer span of time physically within the story; the story can take place within an hour or two, or a couple of days.

Question: What was your theme in covering the Vietnam war?

Just: I started out thinking — wrongly, I changed my view — that I had a golden opportunity: working for *The Washington Post*, the only man on the scene, I had no bureau or people that I had to fuss around with.

It became clear after a couple of weeks that there was a lot there that was not in the official consciousness. I thought, Gee, if I could write that in such a way, so knowledgeable, that Rusk and McNamara and Rostow and those guys couldn't fault me on my facts; if I could write it so clearly that the guy driving the cab could also understand what I wrote....The people in the Pentagon didn't understand that when they moved a pin on a map, a lot of people got killed — both sides, civilians, Americans, ARVN's, and others. I thought, Jesus, if I could describe the small details, the ways people actually moved and then when they met the enemy engagement, what it looked like and how people died, I thought that would be especially useful, because when they moved that pin on the map it looked like one thing and when you were there on the ground it was something else altogether. I tried to use that as a base for the rest of the stuff on the theory that it was a war. People died, there was a lot of unnecessary blood.

After the battle, as we all know now, the front didn't change. There was a battle, people died, body bags were taken away — no change.

This was the period when there was a lot of agitation in the cities of South Vietnam and it became clear that the Thieu-Ky government didn't have anybody's support particularly. It became important to describe how that support had moved away and once I had done that, then I could also begin to describe certain facts about it — to the extent that I could understand Vietnamese society. But once every ten days, I had to go back out into the field to do that war form again to show that, Yes, all these things were happening; the Buddhists were burning themselves in the streets; Ky was trying to screw Thieu and vice versa; the Air Force was doing this and that; and every single day some American outpost was being shelled or was shelling and people were dying. They were dying exactly the same way they'd been dying for many years.

Once a month I used to write a column for the editorial page and I would always take the most bizarre incident that I could find, about which no sense whatever could be made, and I would just *report*, trying to give the feeling to the reader that the war was a continuum; that it persisted and grew like a cancer and these funny cells were going berserk inside this body which was riddled with the disease and the cells didn't mean anything beyond themselves. And I could describe these things that were happening with nobody in the middle, with nothing to be made of it, no point except a kind of an ironic point of futility; I thought that if they read that together with the rest of the stuff, after a while they'd get the feeling that the whole place was insane — which it was.

Question: What was the impact? What was the view, so far as you know, of the people you thought you were writing for?

Just: It was wonderful. I came back in the summer of 1966, something of a local hero because I'd managed to get myself shot. I was not in the office fifteen minutes before I had a call from Joseph Alsop, who invited me to dinner — at Robert McNamara's house. Why didn't Mrs. McNamara invite me to her house? Alsop said, Dear boy, it's most important, most urgent that you come to this meeting because we're terribly interested to hear about your life in Vietnam. I said, Swell. When I arrived they'd really thrown out the red carpet. McNamara was there; one of the Bundys, I can't remember which; Ethel Kennedy; Jackie Kennedy was supposed to show up that night but didn't; Alsop was there; McNamara, Mrs. McNamara and there was some other very heavy hitter from the Defense Department or the CIA or someplace. It was really very intimidating because I was under the impression that they wanted a kind of high-level briefing. I was still naive enough to believe that. I even came with notes, I was really going to tell them the way things were.

The party proceeded exactly as all Washington parties proceeded — the women were talking about real estate, the men were talking about affairs of state, none of it had to do with Vietnam. In those days you still separated after dinner — the men went into one room and the women went into the other room. I said, Well now, here it comes, and indeed it did. They sat down and talked *at* me for about two hours about how wrong I'd been. They weren't interested in anything that I'd seen or observed — understandably, from their point of view. They had the cables, cables from the CIA, embassy cables, intercepts of this and that. So I sat there for an hour and a half while these people talked at me about how I wasn't seeing the right things. There are right things out there. If you want to see the right things look for them, if you'd look for them you'd find them and if you'd find them, you'd find evidence of progress, and once you found evidence of progress, then you would see that we were winning.

So I left that meeting knowing that my job was a hell of a lot harder than I thought it was going to be.

Question: At least you know they read it...

Just: They had only gone to that effort because the stuff disturbed them.

Question: Or maybe they needed an extra man!

Question: You were talking about moving in Washington circles. What about the professional problem of being in a social situation with Robert McNamara? Should you be there as a reporter briefing the Secretary of Defense?

Just: Not really, except I did have a theory at the time. It's sort of like the Chicago stockyards — I took everything out of that story but the squeal. I used everything, there was nothing that I could possibly tell that was not in the dispatches. I rarely conducted off-the-record briefings, so everything I had they could buy for fifteen cents and if they wanted to invite me to dinner, that was okay.

I take your point though. You can't live in that town without being a part of that community. At least I don't know anybody who can.

You could almost argue that Washington ought to be organized into two press corps: one whose job it would be to dine out with all these people and do nothing but report the official view; the other whose job would be to find out the truth. The two stories could run side by side: the official view, and the truth.

Question: Could you talk a little more about the process of moving over from being a journalist to being a fiction writer, because there are a number of people here whose minds have been crossed by that thought.

Just: I moved over — took my holy orders so to speak — in 1970. By 1972, I felt it absolutely necessary to get out of Washington, D.C., and in 1973 moved up to Vermont. One problem of a journalist — as opposed to an insurance executive or somebody else — who starts to write fiction is you must begin the process of emptying your mind of episodes, and particularly facts — at least that is the way it was in my case. In Washington I had a fairly wide circle of friends, reasonably well connected and still interested in what was going on in Nixon's campaign or whatever. I had to draw back, or I found myself, almost without realizing it, not exactly imitating page one, but in some funny osmosis having the atmosphere of that particular town bear on me much more than it ought to. The versimilitude of the place is strong.

You have to divorce yourself from your circle, because journalists tend to run together. Three-quarters, I suppose, of my close friends today are journalists, they're all newsies. Vermont took care of that problem, there weren't any up there. Even if you lived in New York, I think you'd have to divorce yourself from your circle because you'd find yourself running around that same track, and the techniques, the tools that you're using to write with are so damn different.

Question: Do you need the company of fellow fiction writers?

Just: No, I don't know any. I don't know a single writer of fiction. For me, I just enjoy the company of journalists.

Question: You talked about fiction as an outpouring of memory. Do you in any conscious way go out and observe and replenish yourself, talk to people, observe things?

Just: That was one of my problems with Vermont — I really ran the well dry up there. I'm not made for the monastic life. I wouldn't have become a journalist unless I had this compulsion to observe other people. But I don't have any desire to go back and do any reporting — I don't have any lust or interest in that and furthermore I wouldn't be very good at it.

Question: Has your experience in Vietnam as a war correspondent created any significant impact in your life?

Just: It's with me part of every day.

Question: How do you discipline yourself to write off in the wilderness — or anywhere else?

Just: I think that the great thing that journalism gives you is discipline. You go out in the morning, you come back with a notebook full of notes, the newspaper is being published the next day so that there's a deadline at seven o'clock. If you're a professional, you will have that story put together without excuse for temperament or tantrum. You sit down in front of the typewriter and get the notes together and write the damn story. That discipline stays with you — at least it stayed with me.

I just followed the notion that each day was a deadline. It wasn't a deadline in that a story had to be finished and typed out — instead of going out and interviewing somebody, I just sort of interview myself at this preposterous desk.

Question: Are you a morning writer?

Just: Yes, absolutely — I don't think I've written a word after six o'clock at night.

Question: What about afternoons?

Just: I try not to, but if the morning went badly, I'll write in the afternoon. I just let it go for as long as it will go. God knows I wouldn't want to burn myself out! □

Beyond the Bottom Line

KATHERINE FANNING

To honor and preserve the memory of Elijah Parish Lovejoy, since 1952 Colby College has annually selected a member of the news profession to receive the Lovejoy Award. The recipient may be an editor, reporter, or publisher whose integrity, craftsmanship, intelligence and courage have, in the opinion of the judges, contributed to the country's journalistic achievement.

For distinguished performance in 1979, this honor was conferred upon Katherine Fanning, publisher of the Anchorage Daily News.

Following the tradition of printing the Lovejoy Award acceptance speech in Nieman Reports, *we present the address given by Mrs. Fanning. Her remarks have been lightly edited for publication.*

Looking back at the record of Elijah Parish Lovejoy and the roster of recipients of the Lovejoy award, I am completely awed to be standing before you tonight. So awed in fact, that I doubt I could have mustered the courage to show up here if it were not for the fact that this award belongs to a host of other people beside me. First of all, it belongs to my late husband, Larry Fanning, Chicago and Anchorage editor, from whom I learned practically everything I know about the newspaper business, and whose clear vision of what a newspaper ought to be and its role in our society has been an inspiration to us at the *Daily News* during difficult years. The award also belongs to the team of twelve to fifteen staffers who stayed aboard during those years when it often wasn't clear where the money for the next payroll was coming from. Their loyalty and sheer excellence have made the *Daily News* a newspaper to be recognized here.

So what I shall say to you is not just my voice, it is theirs as well.

I guess most people think there's something rather special about the particular place where they live. Alaskans are especially prone to this malady. We are fond of mentioning that we have a coastline longer than the whole of the country, that we span four time zones; that if you superimposed our map on the United States map, Alaska would touch the Atlantic, the Pacific, Mexico and Canada. Our mountains are taller, our glaciers are colder, our people younger...on and on go the superlatives. As the first Alaskan newspaper person honored here at Colby, I was trying to think of a message from an Alaskan newspaper to the "Lower 48" as we call you. And I thought of the legend on my daughter's T-shirt. (T-shirts may replace newspapers as communicators one day soon.) It goes like this: *Alaska: Land of the individual and other endangered species.* Of course Alaskans don't have a monopoly on individualism, but there is indeed a frontier sense of bull-headed daring to be themselves, an intensity, a celebration of diversity that makes it one of the most vital places on earth.

It's much like the spirit of the New Englander. And Alaska is even the kind of place that could spawn an Elijah Parish Lovejoy, for Lovejoy certainly embodied that frontier spirit. Those of us in the press today in this country, don't have to face howling mobs intent on destruction of our papers, but there are other threats, no less real. Lovejoy's enemy was visible, the threat immediate. He made a dramatic stand for principle. He may have lost his life but he has inspired us to cherish this most precious legacy that we must never take for granted — a free press.

The threats journalists face today are less dramatic, but they are insidious. We face incremental decisions — small confrontations of large cumulative effect. We stand in danger not from one howling mob but from an increasing plurality of adversaries. To meet them with the courage and integrity of an Elijah Parish Lovejoy requires constant alertness.

Today I'm going to concentrate primarily on challenges to newspapers and particularly those in smaller cities — but of course many of the same dangers confront other media everywhere.

There's no secret roster of foes faced by newspapers — most have been noted before. But I'd especially like to mention three: the challenge of recent judicial decisions, the spectre of superficiality, and the economic squeeze with its corollary, the erosion of competition.

To touch briefly on the first: As we all know, judicial decision is increasingly at odds with the tenets of a free press. A Supreme Court decision authorizing secret pretrial proceedings threatens to exclude the press from vast areas of our judicial process. New interpretations of libel law and the opening of newsrooms to search and seizure, endanger First Amendment rights. The pendulum seems to have swung from the immediate post-Watergate years when the press rode proud and tall to the current trend toward muffling press freedoms. We can never stop fighting these incursions, but we must also be wary that we do not overstep our freedoms with irresponsibility.

Those of us who operate newspapers in this country's smaller cities find ourselves intimately involved in many of these battles with few local resources to fight them. In Alaska we've had a number of attempts to close the courtroom to the news media, and only last year we fought off an

effort to force one of our reporters to reveal sources for a story on real estate fraud.

The second threat to the press I'd like to consider is subtler but, I believe, no less real. It is what one observer has called the celebration of surface. It results, I think, from the explosion of information sources and the competition for the attention of readers.

The publisher of the *Trend Report*, in a talk recently in Stockholm, had some provocative thoughts about the increasing role of information in our society. In listing the ten most important emerging trends in the United States, Mr. John Naisbitt of *Trend Report* says that "the United States is rapidly shifting from a mass industrial society to an information society, and the final impact will be more profound than the nineteenth century shift from an agricultural to an industrial society." Mr. Naisbitt goes on to relate some astounding statistics. He says that in 1950 the number of people in the information sector — or information occupations — was seventeen percent, and now it exceeds fifty percent. He draws the conclusion that the post-industrial society is going to be an information society.

If that is true, the challenge to the press will grow ever greater, because somehow the individual citizen must make some kind of sense out of the morass of knowledge. And the obvious candidate for that role is the local newspaper. This suggestion is buttressed by Mr. Naisbitt's second major trend: decentralization rather than centralization. Isn't it reasonable to assume that this trend is apt to re-emphasize the importance of the localized newspaper?

But with all this information bombarding the public, competition for the attention of readers will continue to escalate. We have learned to live with the traditional competitors of radio, television and general interest magazines, but now we must add cable television, cassette television, an infinite variety of specialty magazines, trade publications, direct mail, nearly instantaneous worldwide telephone service — even CB radios and home video computers. Then there are the myriad entertainment and leisure attractions made easily available in a constantly mobile society. There's a real danger people will become so busy they won't care any more if they have a free press, and before they notice it, those freedoms could vanish or be abandoned from disuse.

In our efforts to please a diverse array of readers, most of whom are in a hurry, we try to cover so many bases that we may lose all real substance. Television can fascinate with the fleeting image, but now we are in danger of raising a generation of nonreaders. Could that mean nonthinkers, too? Newspapers have an obligation to provide more than the fleeting. In-depth reporting, made interesting and vital, can lead to in-depth reading and thinking on a daily basis. In the future, when the very existence of newspapers may be challenged by the proliferation of information, providing real substance can justify the existence of newspapers. They will be the best vehicle to probe the veracity and value of the information barraging us.

Take, for example, a recent story by the *Chicago Tribune* which took the trouble to check its own reports of the crowd count during the Pope's visit to Chicago. Press and television accounts put the crowds at more than a million. However, analysis of pictures by a crowd expert hired by the *Tribune* revealed that no more than 150,000 could have stood in the space occupied.

So, I think the press needs to periodically ask itself: Are we publishing substance or surface? Are we constantly willing to probe beyond the apparent? And can we afford to?

Which leads me to the third danger I want to focus on tonight — the economic peril that has the potential to eliminate competitive newspapers in this country. There's nothing particularly new about this, but it's a challenge with which I'm intimately familiar. And it gives rise to a question I think worth asking: Does true freedom of the press as applied to newspapers mandate a multiplicity of viewpoints? Or do we have a free press where a community is treated to but one view of the world — one brand of editors selecting what stories to cover; one kind of reporter interpreting what happens on the local scene; one publisher vetoing the story he or she doesn't like — is that freedom of the press?

It was A.J. Liebling, I believe, who made the familiar remark that "Freedom of the press belongs to the person who owns one." And I do believe that many of the publishers who do own the only press in a town bend over backwards to be responsible and balanced.

Still, that single press is a fact of life in more and more towns. Eighty-eight percent of American cities with newspapers have only one. Three hundred and eighty cities, or twelve percent have more than one newspaper, but of those, another 126 cities have two newspapers under a single ownership and 19 have two with separate ownerships but a combined publishing arrangement. That leaves, according to the American Newspaper Publishers Association, only 35 cities or two percent of the cities in the United States that have two or more competing newspapers under separate ownerships. Anchorage is one of these.

There are also 1,115 newspapers published by chains or newspaper groups — many in single newspaper towns; 63 percent of the nation's papers are group owned.

Is this alarming?

Al Neuharth, president of one of the largest newspaper chains, Gannett, and this year's president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, thinks not. He told the ANPA convention last spring that there are more than

28,000 media voices in the United States when you include magazines, television, radio stations and daily and weekly newspapers. That's more than twice the number at the turn of the last century. Neuharth claimed that the noise-makers who criticize newspapers for lack of diversity are trying hopelessly and in some cases recklessly to relate today's world of news and information services to the romanticized world of the past, a world of penny political journals, personalized journalism and cutthroat local competition which often resulted in cut-rate journalism. "The fact is," says Neuharth, "very little of that kind of journalism contributed to raising the intellectual level of the people of this land."

I wouldn't presume to argue with Mr. Neuharth, but I do believe that some of the world's highest quality newspapers did spring from precisely that climate of intense local competition and many of the best still are in competitive cities. And I would also like at least to suggest that the towns with competitive newspapers are among the liveliest and most progressive. It seems to me the competition that destroys is the purely commercial competition — never the competition of ideas.

Because of the multitude of media voices clamoring for attention, I venture to suggest that it is even more necessary for citizens to know who to believe, who to trust. If the local newspaper is doing its job properly, and especially if it has a competitor to serve as its watchdog, it can be a major stabilizing factor in a confusing society.

This is especially true in an isolated area like Alaska or Hawaii where it isn't possible to find six or eight daily newspapers from neighboring towns on the corner newsstand. So, possibly, the Alaskan experience is not valid for the rest of the country. Yet, in spite of eleven radio stations, four television stations, pay television by satellite, and three weekly shoppers, there are few citizens in and around Anchorage who would argue that the perceptions of the populace have not been shaped by what has been the dominant daily newspaper — at least until quite recently when Anchorage has become a genuinely competitive newspaper town. And despite all these other media, I submit that the daily newspaper, more than any other single influence, establishes the climate, the mood, the very thought structure of any community.

This is particularly so when the issues are great and complex and the society dealing with them is in a constant flux as in Alaska. Consider for a moment some issues facing a frontier state: the biggest one is the allocation of land — the federal government is converting more than a hundred million acres into national parks and refuges, yet Alaskans are desperate for new lands on which to build a life; there is another pipeline to build — a natural gas pipeline to be the world's most expensive private construction project (we already hold that record from the last pipeline); there is the confrontation between environment and development so immediate and so emotional on the last frontier because of the starkness of the issues and the small population; and there are new potentials — from bottom fisheries to feed the world to energy sources to fuel it. Most recently there is the interesting question of how to handle responsibly a projected $3.4 billion state budget surplus through 1981. These great decisions facing only about 400,000 people require a special commitment from the press: enterprising, courageous, in-depth reporting to fully and fairly inform the people so decisions can be made in a climate of reason.

ELIJAH PARISH LOVEJOY

Born in Albion, Maine, a graduate of Colby College in 1826, and an editor who crusaded strongly against slavery, Elijah Parish Lovejoy was America's first martyr to freedom of the press. He published strong anti-slavery views in the *Observer*, a weekly in St. Louis, and he continued his crusading journalism at Alton, Illinois, where mobs destroyed three of his presses. He was killed the day before his thirty-fifth birthday while guarding another new press. His martyrdom helped to advance the cause of abolition in the North.

There is a special need too, for the investigative report that brings to light some of the excesses and corner-cutting that have grown traditional in some circles of a frontier society.

The press has been described as the central nervous system of a community. Some years ago, sociologist David Riesman emphasized that the newspaper plays a particularly crucial role in a community by defining the terms in which political and social dialogue take place. A newspaper has a character, a personality, a presence that just doesn't apply to the electronic media.

If I might be permitted to quote just once from a very distinguished editor who happens to have been my husband — Larry Fanning described it this way in a speech he gave in the 1960's at the University of Indiana: "A great newspaper has integrity, a social conscience, a sense of mission, responsibility, a volatile engagement with the real world, a joyous, vigorous, exciting quality....Such newspapers establish and confirm the tone of a community, one of the central responsibilities of a newspaper." He went on to say that a newspaper's function of responsibility to its

readers is essential to a self-governing society, that it is a strategically vital institution and that it is and ever must be more than just a business. Anything that weakens the press, that corrupts the press, that diverts the press from this central function is a peril to the American system.

The special sense of mission that applies to the newspaper must never be lost. We need sometimes to ask ourselves whether the economic realities, the challenge of ever-increasing costs and the preoccupation with the bottom line, have obscured the special sense of mission that justifies First Amendment freedoms. It is a question I have been forced to consider.

Of course, the first duty of a newspaper must be to survive. No one has experienced any more dramatically than we have at the *Daily News* the absolute necessity of making ends meet. Somerset Maugham tells us "Money is like the sixth sense without which you cannot make full use of the other five." As the *Daily News* teetered on the edge of oblivion for more than two years, we experienced firsthand that in the news business as much as any other, the exercise of those five senses depends on the availability of Maugham's sixth. But I think we should remind ourselves that a black figure at the bottom line is the means to a free press, not the end.

Our history at the *Anchorage Daily News* has been as prone to peaks and valleys as our Alaskan landscape. Consider that in one year, 1976, the *Daily News* won the Pulitzer gold medal for its series of articles on the powerful Alaska Teamsters' Union, and five months later announced on page one that the paper was broke and would have to stop publication if help wasn't immediately forthcoming.

Let me tell you about this briefly because it illustrates, I think, some of the challenges faced by newspapers.

First the peak: Picture Alaska in the summer of 1975, at the height of the pipeline building frenzy. The state was teeming with the boomers who had come north to get their slice of the bonanza. The lucky who got the nod for a job from the big unions earned vast sums for twelve-hour, seven-day weeks — whether they did any work or not. That summer everyone in Alaska was whispering about the power of Alaska Teamsters' Union 959 and its burly boss, Jess L. Carr, who was tucking away more than a million dollars a week in the Teamster Pension Fund alone. In a short time the union had grown from 1,500 members to 23,000. There were Teamster shopping malls, a Teamster hospital, dental clinic, recreation centers, a legal clinic, professional buildings, jet airplanes — all for the use of Teamsters. We called this reporting enterprise, "Empire: The Alaskan Teamster Story." We described the insidious political and financial tentacles of the Teamsters' reaching into every facet of Alaskan life, of schemes for personal gain by its leaders, of the mysterious giant Teamster-controlled warehouse through which all the equipment for the pipeline — from paperclips to bulldozers — had to pass. We discovered that all the top jobs at the warehouse were held by teamsters with criminal records. We made an effort to tell the positive as well as negative aspects of the Teamster organization. When the series was finished, I was disappointed. We had committed three reporters to it for three months, but it seemed there was so much more. In fact, we were meeting to plan a follow-up when the news came that the Teamster series had won the Pulitzer Prize. You can imagine that newsroom — champagne corks popping, all twelve telephones ringing, calls coming in from all over the world, television and radio interviews, hundreds of telegrams! Then, before we could gear up for the next effort, came the money crunch and we were forced to cut the staff by forty percent. The follow-up investigative efforts had to be dropped.

But in our case, the community did care. After the front-page call for help, about fifty citizens formed a group called the Committee for Two Newspapers who rang doorbells to sell subscriptions and cajole advertisers. One of the Alaska native corporations comprised of Eskimos and Indians loaned us money just in time to keep the doors open.

At that time the large financially successful *Anchorage Times* handled our circulation, advertising and production under a joint operating agreement, an arrangement that in our case didn't work, but which I support as a tool to keep two viable editorial voices in a community. In many places these arrangements have been spectacularly successful.

But *Daily News* losses had increased and sources that had subsidized the paper were no longer available. For more than two years, during which time a lawsuit was filed, there was no revenue from which to operate our twelve-person editorial department. All my own resources, as well as hefty contributions from other members of the family, had gone into the paper. At that time the paper could show no reasonable expectation of profit; no bank or traditional lending institution was interested in talking to us. So we had no choice but to pass the hat. Happily a series of individuals, in addition to the native corporation, were sufficiently dedicated to the ideas involved and to supporting a free competitive press in Alaska that, even though they had no visible assurance of ever seeing their money again, lent us more than $600,000 to keep publishing until the lawsuit was settled about a year ago. This grinding experience had a happy ending; all the lenders were paid back in full with interest.

Let me digress here for a moment. A good many newspaper articles have appeared around the country about the *Ancorage Daily News*' experience and the point is usually made that the paper has incurred very large

financial losses over a number of years. That's all right, as it is a legitimate part of the story. But I used to feel compelled to apologize for those losses, in fact, to feel ashamed of having been responsible for committing several million dollars to what we see as an investment in ideas.

Recently, while reading David Halberstam's interesting chronicle of some leaders of the press, *The Powers That Be*, I came across a couple of interesting facts. Two newspapers of undisputed quality and financial success, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* were, in their formative years, quite spectacular money losers. According to Halberstam, when Adolph Ochs bought *The New York Times* in 1896 it was losing $2,500 a week — not bad for dollars in those days. And *The Washington Post* lost money for twenty-two years every single year from 1933, when it was purchased by Eugene Meyer (father of Katharine Graham). Some of the great newspapers of quality have had serious financial troubles. The demise of the *Chicago Daily News* is one sad chapter and the revival of the *London Times*, a happier one.

Let me return to the *Anchorage Daily News* story. After the lawsuit was settled October 1, 1978, a substantial monetary settlement was paid us and the terms of the settlement included dissolution of the joint publishing arrangement six months later, April 1, 1979. This meant six months to find a building, order and install press and composing equipment, and staff the advertising, production, circulation and business departments. Starting with only twelve members of the staff — all news people — we found it wasn't easy to hire key business-side executives, especially in Alaska, for what seemed still to be a financially precarious operation. With the deadline of April 1 beating down on us we were faced with finding our way through the technological maze. What kind of equipment, presses, computer, etc., to order? And as before, people helped. The Fairbanks *News-Miner* sent us a top consultant on press and technology — no charge. The Lewiston, Idaho *Tribune* sent us a business-side consultant — no charge. In early December we ordered a press and a computerized editing and typesetting system. There was still no building to put it in and not enough available dollars to finance it. Still, the equipment had to be ordered because even then the experts were skeptical that any of it could be on-line by April 1, considering the hazards of shipping to Alaska. There were some offers of money, too. But unless such offers would enable us to publish the kind of newspaper that would make a positive contribution to the community, they couldn't be accepted.

By December the situation was desperate. If solid support could not be found by mid-January, once more there seemed to be no alternative but to close the doors.

In early January a small newspaper group, McClatchy Newspapers from Sacramento, California, expressed interest in our plight. Two weeks later they acquired eighty percent of the *Daily News* and I kept twenty percent with the understanding that I would continue to operate the paper. A week later they bought us a building. By April 1 the press we had ordered in December was in place; the new computerized editing and typesetting system was functioning; the news staff had been doubled and trained on the new equipment; some sixty new wire services, columns and features were available; more than fifty employees in production, advertising and circulation had been hired and the paper had been completely redesigned. It came out on April 2, and most gratifying of all, was instantly well received in the community. Circulation soared from 12,000 on April 1 to about 30,000 in the fall of 1979. There is still a long way to go. The afternoon paper has 45,000 circulation and over three times the advertising linage. But the *Daily News* is now headed toward becoming a viable business proposition and it will survive. Right now the competition between the two Anchorage newspapers is keen, but they have both improved because of it, and the community benefits.

What significance does this Alaskan experience have for the press as a whole, at least in the smaller cities? I think this: It's impossible to generalize that all single-newspaper cities are bad or that all newspaper chains have a negative effect. Competitive newspaper towns and independent ownerships are perhaps the ideal, but I think it's a matter of motive and focus. If the driving force behind American newspapering were to become commercial and superficial, geared strictly toward ever-increasing profits, then I think the mission of the press would be obscured and freedom of the press in danger. But if newspaper operators retain an idealogical commitment of an Elijah Parish Lovejoy, a commitment to a free, courageous, probing, diverse, informative press that serves readers and not special interests, then we will have a free and profitable press. The first business of the press has traditionally been ideas, not dollars. No one remembers what Elijah Lovejoy's profit was. In no way am I suggesting profit isn't desirable. But newspapers have a solemn duty beyond the profit motive and if we let that duty be eclipsed we have lost something very precious. Let's continue to remember Elijah Parish Lovejoy's mission and his sacrifice. Let's focus on ideas and substance as the primary commodity of the press and let's celebrate the achievements of the enlightened American publishers who have successfully operated in the public interest with profits to follow.

I think the American press can be grateful to Colby College for keeping alive the spirit of Elijah Parish Lovejoy. It can annually remind us that our mission extends to values beyond the bottom line. □

The Good News About the Bad News

LOUIS BANKS

Coverage of business news by American reporters is improving.

About three years after I moved out of the media world I found that things look a little different. Out here in a neutral corner, anyone who examines thoughtfully the mass media comes away with very grave doubts and misgivings. (By mass media I mean the daily and Sunday newspapers, the wire services, and television news — particularly network news.) The basic problem is that the media today seems to live in a world of its own — and that's a very odd thing to be saying about an institution that concerns itself exclusively with the affairs of other people. By this I mean that while the press, radio and television newsrooms are avidly concerned with their own rights, they have been all too little concerned with the question implicit in those rights: Is the media fulfilling the role in American life intended by the First Amendment guarantee of a free press?

It does not surprise me that important court cases are going against us these days. I suspect that more of them will. For the courts possibly are reflecting some serious second thoughts about the total impact of the media versus the total health of the American system. Certainly the cruelest blow to the First Amendment's guarantee has come, not from the Berger Court, but from those misguided zealots in Madison, Wisconsin who decided that it was their First Amendment duty to publish a recipe for making a hydrogen bomb.

Sadly, there is another division to my catalogue of concerns about the media today. Television has taught us that the money in the news comes from the delivery of large audiences. Producers, anchorpersons, correspondents and even weather forecasters rise and fall with the Nielsen ratings. This virtually ensures that news judgments contain a large element of show business. If you will read Edward Jay Epstein's book, *News from Nowhere*, you will find fairly strong evidence that this show-biz orientation leads to a subconscious compulsion to keep the political drama going — sometimes by building people up as heroes and then tearing them down as villains. Nothing is as predictable in the life of a president of the United States as the press drumbeat of doom in the third year of his term. How much of this process grows out of editorial boredom and the need for a story? That's a question the media might ask itself — or ask its shrinks. But the larger question is: Can our government govern in today's highly charged world if the media drumbeat spells out a signal to the world that *nothing works in the United States*?

My message is not that the media has too much power. There are plenty of people who think so, but I am not among them. The important question is how that power is used. If the media becomes one large circus, starring the clowns and the acrobats, and depicting the day's or week's events as one big breathtaking ride on the monster coaster — if its standard of success is how many Pepsi's and how many boxes of Preparation H it can sell between the acts — then it has too much power, dangerously too much. We know what happens to nations that are fed on bread and circuses. But if the media can learn to think about itself in terms of the rest of us, and use its many and varied talents to help us understand ourselves, then it will earn its way to the power implicit in its function.

My special interest is in the relationship between the media and economic affairs — or, more narrowly, between the media and business. Both are indispensable elements of any voluntaristic society, and not only our economic and

---

Louis Banks, Nieman Research Fellow '70, is Adjunct Professor of Management, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The above text is excerpted from a speech Prof. Banks delivered last fall at the Foundation for American Communicators meeting in Keystone, Colorado.

social progress, but some of our basic freedoms are bound up in the way that business and the media interact. After migrating from journalism into my no man's land, I came to the tentative conclusions that the relationships between the two were lousy; that both business and the media had a lot to learn about each other; and that the burden of proof was on journalism, because it was woefully behind the times in its understanding of what was really going on in American business in general, and the large corporation in particular.

Let me give you some good news in a bulletin from that front: the recent improvement is enormous. There were a few columnists who wanted to engage me as an enemy of press freedom, and a few corporations that wanted to hire me to come out and tell them how the press was crucifying business. I declined both types of engagements. But my faith in my press friends was born again when I got so many calls and letters from journalists asking for suggestions on what to do about the problem. In broad outline, my advice was simply: Reinvest a large chunk of your fat profits in real editorial talent — talent that understands the business world. Many of them in both the print media and television did just that. Coincidentally, foundations, newspaper publishers and business groups took the initiative in bringing corporate and media people together for weekend discussion sessions. On the face of it these sessions sometimes seemed to make matters worse, but in the long term they yielded real benefits in mutual understanding.

Various fellowships provided opportunities for financial journalists to stand back and think about their work, to hit the books a little, and lay pipelines to thoughtful sources both in business and in the university. One of my friends on a Detroit newspaper is trying now to set up a kind of hot line for business journalists — a list of names of news-oriented academics who might have thoughts about deeper meanings of events and who would be delighted, no doubt, to be called around the midnight deadlines of morning papers.

It was a change in quality of performance that was almost quantifiable. For the last half dozen years I have been one of the judges for the Gerald Loeb awards for financial writing, administered by the UCLA graduate school of management. As recently as three years ago most of the newspaper entries were carefully crafted exposés of business practice, and they usually got the awards. But two years ago you could begin to detect more balance. Less often were complex business situations reduced to struggles between good guys and bad guys. Less often were public interest groups presumed — without discrimination — to be the white hats, combatting the black hats in industry. Miraculously, last year William Tucker, writing for *Harper's*, used investigative journalism to trace a chain of events leading backwards from New York's costly blackout. He traced them step by step through the environmentalist pressures that prevented Consolidated Edison from building an inoffensive pump-storage system in the Hudson River. Behind the environmental hue and cry, Mr. Tucker discovered, were a half-dozen wealthy landowners along that same Hudson River whose motives were very simple — they didn't want their view changed. This year the newspaper standout was a twelve-part series on "Facing Up to Inflation," in the *Louisville Courier-Journal* by Philip Moeller. It was so sophisticated, and yet so tuned to the needs of the average reader, that we checked further. Sure enough, Moeller had recently completed a year at Columbia University as a Bagehot Fellow. Many newspapers — the *Los Angeles Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times* and doubtless some of your own — have modified their view of what a business writer should be. Not the guy or gal who couldn't make it at City Hall or on the police beat. But perhaps freshly minted graduates of business schools or good economics courses, who come equipped with a new generation's dispassionate fascination with the workings of corporate America.

So for the first time in perhaps fifty years there is a glimmer of hope that we may be moving beyond the newsroom assumption that corporations are guilty until proved innocent. (Only the White House still seems to believe that.) These forerunners of a new kind of business and financial journalism have not swapped suspicion for adulation; rather they have graduated to a new order of curiosities about how things work, why they work or fail, what are the costs and what are the benefits for whom and why. And where is it all taking us?

Well, having delivered myself of those left brain thoughts I feel the right brain taking over. Those public relations people among us may be tempted by what I've said to expect only sweetness and light when the telephone rings in the new day. It's probably a safe prediction that rising media sophistication about business and finance will help ease the left brain bias against business. But a financial writer who comes to understand the function of profits will also soon learn how to use the 10-K and the 8-K reports, and all the other goodies of disclosure that the SEC can offer. As I see it, a journalist educated in the fine points of the system will be more understanding of the system — but more rigorous in his/her judgment about the individual firm or financial policy. And journalists reminded that they should justify their work in public interest terms, may apply exactly the same thought to American corporations.

I hope so. As I said earlier, much about our lives and our national future depends on the constructive interaction of business and the media. And if this takes place in terms of national well-being, so much the better for us all. □

Afghanistan: The Crafting of a Crisis

ARNOLD ZEITLIN

The Sovet army's incursion into Afghanistan, identified as a grave danger to world peace by the Carter administration, provides a new generation with the opportunity to witness the manufacturing of a crisis.

This is deemed to be the Soviet's first military thrust into allegedly non-Communist territory since Winston Churchill announced the descent of the Iron Curtain in 1946.

Official U.S. reaction has surpassed the outrage provoked by the Russian invasions of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, and as a result, we are perched on the brink left over from the days of John Foster Dulles.

Although American behavior is resolute, and the media zealous in its reporting, I question the validity of the raw materials that make up the crisis.

President Carter has remarked that Afghanistan has "hitherto not been an occupied satellite of the Soviet Union"; but occupied or not, satellite it has been since 1978. In that year Afghan Communists overthrew the five-year-old government of Mohammed Daud Khan who had twice before wrested control from his cousins, the Royal Family.

As for the danger to the oil fields and trade routes of the Middle East, the Soviet Union didn't have to travel via Afghanistan to pose a threat. From their Caspian oil port of Baku, the Russians remain as always seven hundred miles from Abadan, the Iranian oil port and the gulf. That's as close as they can get from their presumably snug new positions inside Afghanistan.

The indomitable Afghan rebels, of course, win our support as they leap from their scooters to mount their ponies and ride off to resist godless Communism. For Islam in Afghanistan is a darkly feudal, retrograde model weighing heavily on any urges for reformation that exist in that land. Brave as they are, the rebels' belief in Islam makes the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini appear by comparison to be a candidate for the presidency of the World Council of Churches.

As is customary among Afghans, their Communists have been fighting among themselves since April 1978 — that may be as good a reason as any for the Russians to mire themselves in one of the world's flakiest sovereignties.

More compelling reasons for all the exercise about Afghanistan from the White House may exist, but no one has yet made a terribly convincing case for a doomsday stance over a country few Americans have had the time for.

For those with doubts about the Russian presence — even before seven divisions started south in December from the Soviet-Afghan border — there were those three Soviet Embassy officials and one Russian security officer who evidently directed operations outside the Kabul Hotel on February 14, 1979, the day kidnapped U.S. Ambassador Adolph Dubs was killed in a rush to overcome his captors.

That would have been an occasion to turn up the American heat. However, in retaliation for the killing of an ambassador in a country quietly run by a Russian-imposed government, the Carter administration merely refused to appoint another envoy to that post, and reduced the pittance — $15 to 17 million — the United States has provided in economic aid.

Why now the manufacturing of a crisis of the sort not seen since President Johnson's Tonkin Gulf Resolution in 1964?

The incursion was deliciously convenient for a White House stymied by the hostage situation in Iran, already reduced, in the worldweary view of some United Nations diplomats, to a state of make-believe — the need to "invent a weekly event to reassure the American people that something is being done about the captives...."

The Soviet blunder into Afghanistan provided the opportunity for a show of strength Americans demanded but could not manage or afford in Iran. For presidential decisiveness to mean anything to Americans hazy about the geographical location of Afghanistan, the crisis there had to be as sticky and as tremulous as the one in Iran — even if the Russians had been in charge for almost twenty-one months already and were as close to the oil fields and the Gulf from Baku as they were from Herat and Farah.

The escalation of the crisis mood has worked. There is a surge of support for President Carter almost as dramatic as the President's own revelation about the nastiness of the Russians with whom he has dealt for thirty months. As a result, we have a crisis reminiscent of the Tonkin Gulf, that

---

Arnold Zeitlin was chief of bureau for The Associated Press in Afghanistan and Pakistan from 1969 to 1973. He is now with the AP in Boston.

"ideal opportunity," as Doris Kearns wrote in explaining the reasoning of Lyndon Johnson:

"He was able to demonstrate that the 'man of peace' was not a man of weakness or timidity. On the verge of the campaign, the Tonkin Gulf affair allowed this consensus President to speak by his actions to each of his constituencies, satisfying them in one stroke...."

That is why we have in Afghanistan an American prescription for the Russian presence — long-range fighter-bombers and permanently in place defense systems included — that is already deadlier than the disease.

We have calls for increases in defense spending and in military sales to nervous foreign governments.

There is a renewed demand to unleash the Central Intelligence Agency from legislative restrictions against covert activities, without compensating assurance that the CIA role in supporting Afghan guerillas in the first place did not prompt the Russians to move troops from the border.

And the folks who have brought us the return of the Cold War offer an extra added attraction — a revised version of the domino theory. "This invasion is an extremely serious threat to peace," says President Carter, "...because of the threat of further Soviet expansion into neighboring communities in Southeast Asia...."

If a frustrated White House, unable to cope with a genuine hostage crisis, strikes out forcefully in Afghanistan, it may mean upsetting the world's single most important relationship for peace — détente between the United States and the Soviet Union. What is the measure of the "extremely serious threat to peace?"

Few people on earth are as well as equipped as the Afghans to welcome the Russians or any other invaders. For testimonials, see the British, the Pakistanis, the Sikhs, and jog the Czarist memories of the Russians. Afghans are supremely stolid in their ability to ignore advice or direction. A year ago, the Russians already were complaining that they — like the Americans — had been unable to communicate effectively with the Afghans. Who has?

The Soviets are mired in Afghanistan, a beautifully rugged, almost beguiling land destined to become a briar patch of inestimable prickliness. The more Russian soldiers captive in Afghanistan, the better.

They're a lot less dangerous there than on a NATO frontier or a Chinese border. □

Nieman Foundation Receives Ford Grant

The Ford Foundation has given the Nieman Foundation a grant of $160,000 to increase the number of foreign candidates and to support successful candidates who are not United States citizens.

In announcing the grant, James C. Thomson Jr., Nieman Curator, said the new Ford funding supplements an earlier grant of $54,000 provided for the same purpose in 1978. The total Ford funding of foreign Nieman Fellowships now stands at $214,000.

Fred W. Friendly, Advisor on Communications at the Ford Foundation, said, "This grant is not only in recognition of the Nieman program's record of excellence; it is also part of the Ford Foundation commitment to raise the standards of journalism throughout the world. The grant has special meaning because it recognizes the yearnings of mid-career journalists from nations where a free and enterprising press corps is still a dream."

Thomson welcomed the Ford grant as "exactly the assistance we need to sustain the high standards, while widening the geographical scope, of each year's class of non-United States Fellows." Since the Nieman endowment itself is restricted to stipendiary support of journalists who are American citizens, Fellows from abroad must be financed through external funding.

"The Ford grants," Thomson says, "will be used to encourage matching and supplementary funding in nations and regions that have so far been underrepresented in the Nieman program. The generosity of the Ford Foundation will enable us to make a special effort to recruit our first Fellows from Latin America, and we also hope to increase the numbers of Fellows from Africa and the Middle East."

Nieman Fellowships, established in 1938, were first made available to foreign journalists in 1951. Nearly 150 journalists from 32 countries are now included in the total of 625 alumni/ae.

Each Nieman class ordinarily includes a dozen U.S. Fellows from all sectors of the media, as well as from five to eight foreign journalists. Application for Fellowships is made by individual journalists, not through nomination by their employers.

In addition to the Ford grant, major funding for non-U.S. Fellows has come, in recent years, from the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program, the Harkness Fellowship Program of the Commonwealth Fund, and other institutional and governmental sponsors. □

Physique and Freedom

DECKLE McLEAN

Does your body type determine your attitude toward the press?

The conflict between privacy rights and media rights has raised several questions: Which is more important, media freedom or the right to privacy? Are defenders of privacy politically unsophisticated? Are defenders of media freedom brutes blinded by technology? Why do some people prefer privacy while others favor press freedom? Are there any rights and wrongs in this field, or are there only ideological biases?

Working backwards through these questions, one must begin by recognizing that there are ideological biases attached to the issue. The defenders of the press argue a well-known constitutional view: that the First Amendment is the cornerstone of American democracy because it is the mechanism whereby the people gain the knowledge they need to govern themselves. Thomas Jefferson's preference for newspapers without government to government without newspapers is frequently cited. Defenders of privacy often argue that a medium large enough to have become bureaucratized is no longer a free source of information, but has become a servant of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, they continue, is a technology of manipulation, disrespects people as individuals, and can be curbed only if privacy rights are protected.

If there is a clear right and wrong in this matter, it is that extremes are unacceptable: a world without press freedom is a menacing one; a world without privacy, an intolerable one. But when pushed to choose between press freedom or privacy, some people would relinquish the free press, others would sacrifice privacy. As a result, the search for an accommodation of press and privacy rights is a compromise between different kinds of people.

Who some of these different persons might be was indicated by William H. Sheldon, the Harvard-connected constitutional psychologist and physician, writing forty years ago. (In psychological circles, Sheldon is regarded as heir to the German, E. Kretschmer, who during the 1920's distinguished three types of human physical constitutions.) Since 1940 and 1942, when his books, *The Varieties of Human Physique* and *The Varieties of Temperament*, were published, Sheldon's constitutional psychology has come to be regarded as more flexible than he thought it was. For example, Sheldon would have been surprised to find a slender person with the gregarious disposition of a fat person. Psychologists in 1979 would be less surprised. Nevertheless, Sheldon's tools for measuring physical constitutions continue to be routinely used by anthropologists to compare dissimilar peoples, and sports experts to analyze athletic performance.

Sheldon put into popular use the terms *ectomorph, mesomorph,* and *endomorph*, to describe skinny, muscular, and chubby physiques. For each, he identified a corresponding temperament: the cerebral, the somatic, and the visceral. From the late 1930's through the 1950's, Sheldon studied these types, temperaments, and their combinations, in the belief that he had found a way to make psychology useful in a practical way.

Privacy figured prominently in Sheldon's work. In fact the love of privacy was listed by him as one distinguishing trait of the slender ectomorph with cerebral temperament. This love, Sheldon said, was a "profound and urgent need," as important to the cerebrotonic as eating was to the

---

Deckle McLean is an assistant professor in the Newhouse School at Syracuse University, New York.

viserotonic. Such persons, he insisted, when they show signs of mental illness, respond to solitude better than to any other therapy.

The cerebral constitution, Sheldon said, was introverted. Cerebrotonic ectomorphs, he said, slept poorly, were tired in the morning, had digestive problems, were "heart conscious," had abnormal calorie requirements, were uncomfortable in social settings, and could not tolerate alcohol. These traits appeared to be crazy or neurotic to other types of people, but, said Sheldon, they were all normal to the cerebrotonic; just as gluttony, frowned upon by everyone else, was normal for the endomorphic viserotonic; and just as heavy exercise — even in the eighth decade of life — was normal for the somatotonic mesomorph, even though other persons thought it silly, immature, or unbecoming.

A full third of humanity, then, according to Sheldon, had a cast of character based on physical constitution (based in turn on genetic endowment), which made them take privacy very seriously — not for reasons of theory, but because their personality health depended on their being free of intrusions, exposure, or overstimulation.

In 1952, Sheldon wrote that American culture was shifting from a cerebral, ectomorphic tone to a somatic, mesomorphic one. He saw the change in the shrinking of bathing suits, because, he said, cerebrotonics do not like to expose their bodies. He also saw it in the decline of puritan Christianity, which, he said, was cerebrotonic in character because it suppressed games and physical exuberance, aggressiveness and risk-taking. He saw it in a survey on depictions of Christ at the Art Institute in Chicago: pictures prior to 1900 portrayed Christ as an ectomorph, while those since 1915 show him as a mesomorph. In a somatotonic era, he said ectomorphs should be protected from "summer camps, progressive schools, and other well-intended institutions of professionalized somatonia." They should protect themselves against overexercise, portable radios, and other intrusions on their solitude.

To a degree, Sheldon's predictions have been borne out. In the mid-1970's, *Psychology Today* magazine carried an article describing shyness as a mental disease. During the preceding decade, group therapy, in which innermost thoughts were revealed, was advocated as the best therapy, and became popular among people bent on self-improvement. It was during the same decade, 1967 to 1975, that "the public's right to know" became a media banner and the details of private lives became standard media fare.

For Sheldon, the accommodation of privacy and free press rights takes the form of a compromise between ectomorphs on the one hand, and the mesomorphs and endomorphs to whom privacy means little — in fact, to whom extensive social contact, whether abrasive or convivial, is a positive craving — on the other. But Sheldon's approach isn't the only one available for identifying the competing special interest groups that lurk behind the free press-privacy issue.

Edward Banfield, a member of a later generation of psychologists, in *The Unheavenly City* (1970), said that the need for solitude and privacy was a social class characteristic, prominent in the upper classes and hardly discernible in the lowest classes. His book was an effort to describe social class in psychological rather than economic terms, and the privacy need was one signature feature of a higher class status. Another higher class characteristic, he argued, was a tendency toward a broad time sense; to think of the present not only as the moment, the day or the year or even as the term of one's own life, but as the epoch running from one's great-grandparents or earlier out to one's great-grandchildren or later. The horror of social class, for Banfield, was that persons of upper-class mentality were often trapped by economic circumstances with persons of lower-class mentality.

Banfield's viewpoint is consistent with the history of privacy law in the United States. The development of that law is usually dated from 1890, the year the *Harvard Law Review* published "The Right to Privacy" by Louis Brandeis and Samuel Warren. The article contained direct

Endomorph meets ectomorph.

criticism of the Boston newspapers' yellow journalistic reporting on New England aristocrats and is suspected to have been an angry but sophisticated response to questionable reporting on Warren family affairs. The article, and the tort law protection of privacy stemming from it, can be criticized as the imposition of upper-class sensitivities on everyone else. In journalistic circles, it has often been an adequate criticism of the privacy right to say it is upper class. The American press has been edited for the average member of the workaday industrial world. It has traditionally been staffed by former members of the lower middle class. And it has devoted itself, from its eighteenth century beginning, to defending democracy against pretentions to privilege. As a result, the press viewed privacy as a form of aristocratic squeamishness; in America, the aristocrats would just have to suffer. If this press attitude is correct, then the accommodation on privacy involves a compromise between the privileged and the ordinary. But if Banfield is right, the lower classes contain many persons as "classy" — in the essential sense — as former aristocrats. And to extrapolate briefly from Banfield, universal higher education, and perhaps the aging of American society, too, may have raised the essential class level of everyone.

Another perspective on privacy was offered by David Riesman, the lawyer turned sociologist, in his book, *The Lonely Crowd* (1950). (Interestingly, Riesman had been law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who in his youth had collaborated on the seminal article of American privacy law.) In *The Lonely Crowd*, Riesman described history as composed of "tradition-directed," "inner-directed," and "other-directed" eras. Most of the world's peoples up to 1500 A.D. lived by tradition-direction. After the Renaissance, Western Europeans and then Americans lived increasingly by inner-direction, until the twentieth century, when a transformation to other-direction began.

Tradition-directed people, Riesman argued, behave in the way approved by their tradition, which was conveyed to them by the persons around them. If they didn't, they were shamed. Inner-directed people behaved according to an inner gyroscope set in motion by a small number of persons, including their parents, and were extremely stable in their course through life, although impervious to most signals from others. When they violated the guidance of the gyroscope, they felt guilt. Other-directed people internalized not a gyroscope but a signal-receiving apparatus, and behaved according to the voices and messages of contemporaries, which they digested and translated into an ever-evolving plan. When their behavior strayed, they felt anxiety. According to Riesman, a cross-section of Western society revealed all three modes. In America, tradition-direction could be found in the rural South and among new immigrants; inner-direction could be found in small towns and small cities; other-direction in large metropolitan areas.

Among these types, said Riesman, only the inner-directed person valued privacy. The other types were more gregarious, and the other-directed person particularly sensitive socially. Nevertheless, Riesman suggested that the other-directed person needed privacy and was challenged to find time for it among social excursions.

According to Riesman, then, privacy was one variable in human psychological evolution. In the twentieth century, the inner-directed person was being replaced by the other-directed person. The former was solitary and naturally private. The latter was supersensitive to others, required contact and knowledge of others, and tended to relinquish even the privacy he needed. Free press, in these terms, would seem be a thing of the future, privacy a thing of the past; and judicial support for privacy rights during the 1970's, an effort to provide the modicum of privacy the other-directed person requires.

Marshall McLuhan, the Canadian scholar of media, also informs the privacy-free press issue, even though he has not discussed it directly. His graph of social evolution is not unlike Riesman's, but he has offered an explanation for the changes; transformations in communications technology that the typographical era which began about 1500 produced a character which one might describe as similar to Riesman's inner-directed person. The "typographical man" was socially stiff, isolated from others, rational, industrious, solitary. He was visual in that he distrusted information he received from any of his other senses. The advent of instantaneous broadcast communication, said McLuhan, rendered the strictly visual person obsolete, and called forth a more rounded character, similar to the one who thrived in the pre-print ages. If this other-directed person was different from the tradition-directed one, it was only because the typographical era had destroyed traditions. The important difference, according to McLuhan, was that the pre-print and post-print personalities trusted the information of all their senses, and had less faith in reason. McLuhan called the post-print world the "global village." In the village everyone knew what everyone else was doing. Privacy was reduced from what it had been in the print-shaped world, when each person experienced himself as isolated, and expected privacy as a valueless fact of life.

What life was like in the pre-literate village — and therefore what one might expect in McLuhan's post-literate global village — is indicated in historical and anthropological records. Early English settlers in New England faced privacy problems with local Indians, who

would walk into a colonial house at any time of day or night. This was the pattern they followed in their own villages. Margaret Mead reported that in Samoa there was no privacy in the Western sense. People slept in houses without partitions, wore little clothing, bathed together, and relieved themselves in public. Similar habits were characteristic of most pre-literate peoples. Nevertheless, individuals in these societies did seek and attain privacy by employing reserve and restraint in dealings with others, by using token privacies such as loincloths; and by retreating to the bush for sexual encounters.

In McLuhan's universe, then, literate, visually oriented people may require more privacy than less literate, broadcast-influenced persons; while the less literate will nevertheless require some privacy.

How do the theories of Sheldon, Banfield, Riesman, and McLuhan differ? All acknowledge that the world is occupied by different types of people, and that some of these people require more solitude and less public exposure than others. For Sheldon and Banfield, however, the differences are more or less permanent: the percentage of privacy oriented people is constant. For Riesman and McLuhan, the differences are in flux, so that at any given moment, the percentage of private people is increasing or decreasing. But all four agree that at any point, there is a substantial minority to whom privacy is important, not as an abstract ideal, but as a basic essential of everyday living.

These are the people who, according to Sheldon, physically suffer at the sound of a portable radio and may be plunged into nervous collapse by publicity, whether good or bad. According to Banfield, they may be the most far-sighted of persons. Riesman suggests they live by inner gyroscopes and do not need frequent signals or messages from or about other people. McLuhan feels they are literate — too literate, in fact, for the late twentieth century electronic era. One might safely conclude that these four men are not talking about quite the same people. Sheldon's ectomorph, for example, might thrive in a literate or inner-directed age, but he could exist in any age, giving his own interpretation to the life of his time. Nevertheless, the four theories are persuasive that privacy is not merely a principle, but is also a constituency, for whom the privacy principle is the statement of a deeply felt need.

What is to be done with this constituency?

Reporters, editors, and media advocates often doubt that this constituency even exists. For example, Don Pember and Dwight Teeter suggest that nowadays people hunger more for publicity than for privacy, so that privacy suits are often disguised libel suits, brought by persons who enjoy publicity but don't like the way they were presented, yet whose grievances would not pass muster as libel ("Privacy and The Press Since *Time* vs. Hill," *Washington Law Review*). Similarly, law professor Harry Kalven criticized the privacy tort as being counterproductive because only publicity seekers would use it, while truly private people, if they existed, would not expose themselves in court to sue ("Privacy in Tort Law — Were Warren and Brandeis Wrong?", *Law and Contemporary Problems*).

This response by some journalists is consistent with Sheldon's suggestion that gregarious character types have no conception of what a love of privacy feels like, and in fact, experience considerable impatience when faced with a person who claims it. That one character type should attempt to impose its temperamental bias on everyone else is not new. Sheldon's view of history, if he can be said to have had an historical view, is a series of such impositions and revolts against them. Ectomorphs have no knowledge of the love of exercise; and with Christian orthodoxy, said Sheldon, tried to suppress it in those who felt it. Similar suppressions of cerebral and somatic needs occurred in Asia, he said, where the visceral character dominated through the agency of Buddhism.

Judicial support for privacy during the 1970's indicates that the American constituency for privacy remains large. In 1971, political scientist Herbert J. Spiro wrote that while "pre-modern" communities had little privacy, and "modern" ones, like England, an optimum of it, "post-modern" societies such as the U.S. and U.S.S.R. were moving away from privacy. In 1979, one couldn't confidently repeat this appraisal of the United States. In fact, the constituency for privacy might have grown to include not only those who were privacy-hungry by virtue of their nervous constitutions or class backgrounds, but also some privacy-negligent persons who had discovered they were about to lose the modicum they needed. Law professor Arthur R. Miller pointed out in 1978 that a legal groundswell to preserve privacy was made necessary by government data banks, commercial surveillance, electronic detection, subliminal advertising, and sophisticated police techniques, as well as by aggressive and cavalier journalistic methods.

As the 1980's begin, it is impossible to predict whether the support of privacy, as a counterweight to press freedom, is a momentary revolt by America's ectomorphs, or a lasting shift of tides. It may be a final effort by remaining aristocrats, inner-directed people, or print era die-hards. Or, instead, it may be a claim by American common people or other-directed, post-print persons, for the modicum of privacy they need. Either way, during the next few years, the balance of free press and privacy will probably change in favor of privacy; not because the concept is attractive in judicial or political theory, but simply because a lot of people need it. □

Yes, You *Can* Fool the People

MAX AWNER

Do people believe what they read in their newspapers?

Surveys have been taken on this question, and many of them have shown a healthy skepticism on the part of readers. But I, in turn, have to be skeptical of such surveys after two informal polls I took, twenty-five years apart.

Both were in the form of April Fool editions of the weekly newspapers I edited at the time. The results were consistent with my feeling, after thirty-five years of reporting and editing, that newspaper readers are, on the whole, incredibly credulous.

On April 1, 1954, I put out an April Fool edition of the *Colorado Labor Advocate*, an AFL weekly. The entire front page — except for two lines — was filled with the most outlandish local, national, and international stories I could dream up. The lead, with a banner head, reported that the Soviet politburo had been wiped out by "a massive cloud of radioactive dust" from the Bikini hydrogen bomb test, carried to Moscow by "a strange quirk in Pacific air currents."

The second lead was headlined "Senate Expels McCarthy," and told how his fellow Senators had "risen up in their wrath" and voted 73 to 23 to toss out the arch witch-hunter.

A large, boxed "bulletin" revealed that a "super-secret recount" had shown that Adlai Stevenson, not Dwight Eisenhower, "was elected President of the United States" in 1952.

Two lines in seven-point type in the lower left corner acknowledged that the whole page was an April Fool joke, and directed readers to "turn the page for the real news."

When telephone calls and letters started coming in, hardly any mentioned these absurd stories. Instead, they expressed general satisfaction at the good (but equally unbelievable) news reported in most of the local stories. A brief item noting that the paper, which had been having circulation problems, had just tripled its subscriptions brought the greatest number of comments — all congratulatory and all serious.

After that unnerving experience, I stuck pretty much to serious stuff for the next quarter of a century. In March 1978, a month before my scheduled retirement as editor of the *Co-op News*, weekly organ of the Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley, California, I felt the urge to perpetrate another April Fool stunt.

For this number, my assistant and I decided to devote all of the first two pages, normally occupied by letters to the editor and other "opinion" material, to a series of outrageous spoofs. The rest of the twelve-page tabloid (except for a few scattered jokes) was straight. Page three contained what ordinarily would have been our front-page stories. The clue again was in small type at the bottom of page one: "Okay, you've had your April Fool fun! Now for the *Real Co-op News*, please turn to page 3."

Max Awner, formerly editor of the Colorado Labor Advocate, *lives in Mill Valley, California.*

The page one lead story was headlined: "Hughes Will Triggers Co-op Takeover of Safeway." It began: "Pursuant to the recently discovered *true* will of the late Howard Hughes, Co-op has taken over the giant Safeway chain and is moving swiftly to convert all individual Safeway stores to co-ops."

The story went on to report that the true Hughes will, written in his own hand, was belatedly found on a crumpled piece of paper in the pocket of the pants Hughes was wearing at the time of his death. The will, it stated, had been authenticated "beyond all doubt" by A. Blockletter Scrawl, a handwriting expert. "The well-known medium and mystic Raspudini, who contacted Hughes' spirit in the billionaire's villa on the River Styx, confirmed that Hughes had indeed written the will and meant every word of it." All of Hughes' two-billion-dollar holdings in the giant Safeway corporation were bequeathed to the thirteen-store (and sturggling) Berkeley Co-op, with the stipulation that the co-op take over the vast Safeway empire.

The story also told of plans for a gala conversion ceremony. At the climax of the festivities, officials of the two chain stores, civic and government dignitaries would ride in a specially constructed overhead railway that connected the two main Co-op and Safeway stores in Berkeley.

Also on the front page were two short but important "news" stories and several briefs. One story said that in consideration of the co-op's financial difficulties, its various suppliers had jointly decided "to be true cooperators and supply all merchandise without cost for the next six months." As a result, the co-op would be able to pay its members a patronage refund of twenty-five percent, "highest in its history." (In actuality, the refund in each of the preceding five years had ranged from zero to one percent.)

The other major story reported that the co-op's board of directors had adopted a new rule under which "white, able-bodied, heterosexual males under the age of 65" would pay twenty dollars to join, but there would be discounts for minority persons, women, the disabled, seniors, gays and bisexuals, ranging from twenty-five percent to a cumulative one hundred fifty percent — "so that the co-op would actually pay certain individuals $10 to join."

One brief reported that the board had tripled the salary of all clerks and reduced the general manager's salary to one hundred dollars a month, justifying the latter with the argument that "since it's more fun to be general manager, his pay should be less."

On page two the regular logo for the letters section was overprinted with the words "Closed for Remodeling." Just below the logo was an "architect's rendering" of a huge stone tablet with the words "Open Forum" engraved at the top. A caption read: "The *Co-op News* Open Forum is closed this week while it undergoes extensive remodeling . . . Beginning next week all letters received will be chiseled into this enormous block of marble, to be preserved for generations. One side of the block will have a heading, 'Thou Shalt,' the other side 'Thou Shalt Not.' Each letter will be classified under one heading or the other. . . A rising young sculptor named Michelangelo Buonarroti has been engaged for the very exacting task of chiseling the letters. Let's have those letters, co-opers! Have your words immortalized in marble!"

Under this was a headline in the standard eighteen-point Open Forum typeface: "This Couldn't Wait." Then an editor's note: "The letter below was received just as remodeling began. It was felt this letter was so crucial that the closed forum was reopened just a crack so the letter wouldn't have to wait until remodeling was completed." The letter began: "Editor: I think the Co-op. . ." Then followed ten heavy black lines of the sort used to edit out copy. Then, "Thank you for this opportunity to express my views on the Co-op." The letter was signed, N. Flagrante Delicto, Gomorrah.

Also on this page was a brief story headlined "Tenant Bites Landlord." It told of a tenant who had filed suit against a landlord who had reduced her rent without sufficient notice. The tenant won her case; the rent was restored to the higher level.

Yes, it was all great fun. But jollity stopped — at least for the editors and the switchboard operator — the day the issue reached the members. The phones started to ring about noon.

- How wonderful about Co-op taking over Safeway!
- That's terrific about Co-op paying a twenty-five percent patronage refund!
- How dare the board of directors discriminate against women and minorities this way!
- Leave that Open Forum alone! There's no reason to leave out members' letters for a whole week.

Most of the phone calls didn't reach the editors; the switchboard operators had been instructed to explain briefly that it was "all a joke." But the reports from the operators made it clear that the "joke" explanation failed to satisfy most of the callers who were either credulous, profoundly puzzled, or simply angry.

Then the letters started coming. In the next four issues the *Co-op News* printed twenty-three of them, about half

the number that were actually received. Members who wrote were almost evenly divided in their opinions. Some believed everything they read; others recognized the joke but didn't think it was funny; and still others got the joke and appreciated the humor.

A few of their irate comments:

"I feel your April 1 newspaper was in terrible taste. Who can defend any organization which prints such offensive junk!"

"If our editors have that much time to relate falsehoods for a joke instead of issuing the real news, what can we believe?"

"I would expect to find such humor on a restroom wall."

"I think you deserve a harsh reprimand from management and the board for your poor judgment." (Actually the general manager had approved of the idea and had seen most of the stories before they were printed.)

One telephone caller was sputtering with rage. When questioned, she confessed that she was not a co-op member, had not seen the newspaper, and usually shopped in Safeway stores — but she had a friend who was a co-op member and had told her about the whole thing. (Incidentally, it was reported that our front page was posted in some Safeway offices, and Safeway employees got a great laugh out of it.)

Two letters intrigued me most. One member clipped out two of the more absurd articles, circled two dates mentioned in them — February 30 and April 31 — and sent them in with an earnest admonition to be more careful in proofreading. She then quoted in full the old children's jingle: "Thirty days hath September, April, June and November..."

The other letter came from a member who apparently had made earlier complaints against the co-op. She wrote that she had "come to distrust the co-op so much" that she believed all the nutty articles. At least, she said, *she* believed; her husband finally persuaded her it was all a joke. To prove her indignation she enclosed the crumpled sheet on which she had started to write in protest before her eyes were opened.

As to the letters praising our efforts, at least three came from fellow journalists. A few of the more extravagant comments:

"An outstanding piece of journalism."

"The most outrageously and consistently funny thing I've read in a long time."

"A gas."

"It renews my faith in Co-op as a place where there is room for joy as well as earnestness."

"The thought that the true will of Howard Hughes was still crumpled up in the pocket of an old pair of his pants was a stroke of genius."

"Let's have an April Fool issue every year, just to see the letters it provokes from mirthless doctrinaires... Innocent merriment provides an unusual litmus test to detect such grim folk. It makes them turn purple."

Yes, our April Fool edition was a joke. But as if to prove that sloppy reading is by no means confined to such sly stuff, another incident occurred just three weeks after the April Fool fiasco. I had written a serious article, a sort of valedictory expressing some straightforward thoughts about our cooperative and the cooperative movement in general. Through an inexplicable blunder two whole blocks of type were transposed, resulting in seven paragraphs that were hopelessly garbled in meaning. I was heartbroken that this, my magnum opus, had come out so pied. When people started to tell me how fine they thought the article was, I asked if they had noticed anything wrong. Of perhaps a dozen persons thus questioned, only two — both of them fellow editors — said they had noticed the foul-up. I wasn't sure whether to be happy that so many people had liked the article, or sad that so many had read it so carelessly.

So what's the point of playing games?

They prove nothing, of course. They do reinforce my long-held belief that it isn't only little Johnny who can't read. Most of the *Colorado Labor Advocate* readers twenty-five years ago were blue-collar workers, with an average education at a high school level. But the literacy level of the typical Berkeley Co-op member, living in an area known for its educational and cultural attainments, must be considerably higher than that; I dare say it is higher than the norm for readers of metropolitan daily newspapers. Yet the response of the two groups to this April Fool nonsense was not really very different. Large numbers of both groups either swallowed the stuff whole, or reacted in anger against anyone who would dare intrude into the pseudo-seriousness of their narrow worlds.

But perhaps our world is the narrow one. Theirs is the big world of the Madison Avenue pitchman, the "official source" and the "reliable informant." Why should we think that our Fun Little Lie will be taken any differently from their Deadpan Big Lie? The Big Lie is, after all, proven true when millions of us buy the pitchman's and the propagandist's products.

Then again, maybe there is hope. After all, one reader of the *Co-op News* did refuse to take the bait when we tried to bamboozle her into believing February has thirty days and April, thirty-one. □

Books

Money Matters

Financial and Economic Journalism: Analysis, Interpretation and Reporting

by Donald Kirsch

New York University Press, New York, 1979. $15.00

by ANN CRITTENDEN

When I first joined *The New York Times* as an economics writer a few years ago, I had a desk next to a battered veteran who had just celebrated his fiftieth year at the paper. One afternoon I overheard him complaining to himself over the typewriter and I inquired as to the nature of his problem.

"They're writing these press releases so good these days," he muttered, "it's getting hard to rewrite them."

I was reminded of this unforgettable introduction to the world of daily financial journalism by Mr. Kirsch's book, which informs us early on that "with the exception of stock-market stories and management interviews, information relating to each of the other eight basic (financial) stories generally comes to the reporter and the news desk by press release from a corporation; or from a brokerage house ...or a communications officer at a federal agency...."

The other eight basic stories a business reporter has to confront, according to Mr. Kirsch, who teaches financial journalism at New York University, are on earnings, dividends, financings, appointments, mergers, meetings, corporate developments and economic reports.

This is a fairly restricted view of what economic journalism is all about. It is fairly certain that any beginning reporter who limits him or herself to tackling these matters will be drawing a tight circle around his or her career. Just for starters: financial writers routinely have to be able to crank out analyses of the impact of complex government legislation on business; profiles of executives, corporations and industries; "business sociology" pieces on the world inside the corporation, and increasingly, articles on the exchange and commodity markets.

On the day I read this book, for example, a glance over the financial news summary on the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*, where Mr. Kirsch began his career, revealed that of the fourteen economic stories meriting a front page reference, only three fell into the traditional corporate news category. Eight had to do with various government actions affecting industry, one dealt with the woes of the dollar, and another with foreign oil supplies.

The truth is that financial journalism now has the world within its range. This happens when times get tough economically; Walter Lippmann, the political analyst of the 1950's, was preoccupied with economic issues in the 1930's. We are in such a time again, and the good economic reporter must be prepared to deal with the broader political and social ramifications of events in the world of politics.

Instead of dealing with this growing centrality of financial news, Mr. Kirsch has written a primer, albeit a very helpful one, on how to decipher government economic statistics and financial statements and how to interpret companies' routine releases on earnings. He includes chapters on the many kinds of information available in public documents that companies have to file with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and summaries on ways to analyze and find information on nine specific industries.

For novices to the arcane world of business, the book provides a readable searchlight through the murky and sometimes misleading mists. It will doubtless be a handy tool for students in the bulging classes on economic reporting in the nation's journalism schools — the audience for which it was obviously designed.

Even sophisticated reporters can learn from Mr. Kirsch's research: I now have a ready reference on the best ratio analyses for banks, on the intricacies of SEC rule 10B-5, and ways of evaluating receivables.

The book tends to overemphasize the importance of equity issues and Wall Street, however, and has almost nothing to say about the other financial markets that have dwarfed the stock market in importance and come to dominate the financial pages in recent years. New stock issues, for example, to which Mr. Kirsch devotes much of a chapter, accounted for only about five percent of funds raised by corporations this year, while bond issues were ten times as important.

Mr. Kirsch also has almost nothing to say about the various tricks reporters learn to pry information out of secretive business executives. My personal favorite is the educated guess; I will never forget telling a Citibank senior vice president that I had documents indicating that they had transferred $4 billion in loans off their books in New York to Nassau for tax

purposes — a sheer guess — and his quick response: "No, it was $1 billion."

Nor does Mr. Kirsch invite the reader to ponder some of the more profound questions having to do with business reporting, including why it is so much harder to ferret out information on private institutions than on government agencies, even though they may have more power over our lives. A good book on those issues has yet to be written.

Ann Crittenden is a reporter in the Business and Financial News Department of The New York Times.

Inflation for Whites, Depression for Blacks

A Survey of Black Newspapers in America

by Henry G. LaBrie III

Mercer House Press, Kennebunkport, Maine, 1979. $6.00

---

by ACEL MOORE

During this country's most dishonorable and oppressive periods of slavery and racial discrimination, the black press stood virtually alone as a media institution which condemned the brutality of the system, the lynchings and murders of blacks in the South by the Ku Klux Klan, and crusaded for equal rights for blacks in the North.

Few whites today know of the long and gallant history of the black press, and many are still unaware of its existence. Henry G. LaBrie III, a white journalism researcher and educator, is an exception.

LaBrie has devoted a decade of research to the black press and his latest effort, *A Survey of Black Newspapers in America*, contains a 72-page listing of the nation's black newspapers that were in existence as of January 1, 1979.

In his 13-page foreword, LaBrie offers a critical assessment of black newspapers and highlights their history, recalling the names of the most prominent publishers and their papers. He explores their various stages of development, the first, from 1827, when the nation's first black newspaper, *Freedom's Journal*, was founded, until 1865. During this time, more than 50 newspapers were started — all but one in the North.

Samuel Cornish and John Brown Russwurm were the publishers of *Freedom's Journal*. *North Star* was published by Frederick Douglass and Martin Delany published *The Mystery*.

Between 1864 and 1900, more than 1,300 newspapers were started, most of them in the South. Ida B. Wells' Memphis *Free Speech*, William Monroe Trotter's Boston *Guardian*, and T. Thomas Fortune's New York *Age* were among the outstanding publications of this second stage.

In his discussion of the third period — 1901 until the time of the survey — LaBrie writes, "Historians of journalism have until recently neglected to mention the presence of a black press in their writings. Yet black Pulitzers and Hearsts came on the scene and crusaded for equal opportunity."

Probably most blacks in America over the age of 35 are familiar with the giants of this third period — Robert Vann's *Pittsburgh Courier*, John Murphy, Sr.'s Baltimore *Afro-American*, for example. Still in existence, these papers reached a zenith in the mid-1940's when they were national publications and provided a mainstay for information about blacks for black families all across America.

LaBrie should be commended for his work and his research. His survey surely helps to set straight the history of the black press in America.

He gets into trouble, however, when he makes critical assessments of the black press today and predicts a gloomy future. "Over 1,500 black newspapers were started during the third growth period. Today only 165 continue," he writes.

LaBrie blames the demise of the black press on a lack of editorial sophistication and a lack of business acumen on the part of today's publishers.

"As a business enterprise, the black newspapers need to become more assertive in the community. Gone are the days when people will patronize these papers because they are owned by a brother...Gone are the days when advertisers will buy space in a black newspaper solely to appease a segment of the community," LaBrie asserts.

Television and economic trends account for the fall-off in newspaper circulation in general. The fact that the majority press is now more responsive to the black community in news coverage and employment of black writers since the civil rights movement of the 1960's has also been a factor in declining circulation.

Declining circulation and an inability to attract advertisers in today's inflated economy, as well as white attitudes about black progress, are other factors cited by LaBrie.

He offers some suggestions for improvement, ranging from changes in layout and editorial content to providing audited circulation figures and readership surveys to prospective advertisers.

A major problem is the inability of these papers to attract and keep young black reporting talent, due mainly to

the fact that white or majority newspapers are recruiting blacks and offer much higher salaries. Prior to the 1960's, the black press was the only avenue open for black journalists.

LaBrie has drawn the ire of black publishers — probably one of the most egocentric groups in black society — who zealously guard their domain against any critics, but particularly against white researchers like LaBrie.

Steve G. Davis, executive director of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, the formal organization of black publishers, had a reaction to LaBrie's criticism characteristic of many of the organization's members.

"We totally reject LaBrie's assumptions that the black press is dying. We are not stagnant as he suggests and we are not standing still," asserted Davis. He made the statement just after returning from the NNPA's annual meeting. Although publishers resent LaBrie's conclusions, many of them do not reject some of his suggestions for improving their product. In fact, the agenda at the meeting included workshops on the very subjects that LaBrie pointed out in his criticism: advertising and circulation.

The facts suggest that LaBrie is accurate in his critique, but his conclusions are based on the assumption that racism on the part of the majority media has been substantially eliminated. In reality, racism still abounds in the majority press, both in employment and treatment of news and information as it relates to blacks. As long as this situation persists there will be a need for the black press, and odds are that need will be met.

LaBrie's gloomy forecast may be logical, but ignores the tenacity of the black press. They have proven that they are survivors.

He implies that if black businesses did the same thing as those run by whites, they, too, would survive. Black publishers and businesspeople are no different from the rest of the black community. If the white business community is suffering from a cold, the blacks have influenza. If the white community is suffering the effects of recession and high inflation, the black community is in a depression.

Acel Moore, a Nieman Fellow in the Class of 1980, is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and has been with The Philadelphia Inquirer *for 17 years.*

Honorable Men and Dirty Tricks

The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms and the CIA

by Thomas Powers

Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1979.
$12.95

---

by STANLEY KARNOW

One of the most fascinating tidbits in this remarkable book is that Richard Helms enjoyed Ian Fleming novels but detested those of John le Carré. The reason, Thomas Powers discloses, is that the former director of the Central Intelligence Agency regarded le Carré as bitter and cynical, because of his descriptions of the mean, sordid, treacherous, lonely and often futile side of the espionage business. Helms preferred Fleming's glorification of the profession; indeed, he even encouraged his notorious associate, El Howard Hunt, to produce cheap thrillers that portrayed the CIA in a glamorous light.

This is not to suggest that Helms was the personification of James Bond, or even Bond's boss, M. On the contrary, Helms probably bears a closer resemblance to George Smiley, le Carré's somewhat sad and cautious bureaucrat in the "dirty tricks" trade. But there has always been a strong streak of romanticism in the CIA, and Helms shared it. Thus the agency became involved in an assortment of Flemingesque operations, such as the effort to "destabilize" the Allende government in Chile and the assassination attempts against foreign leaders like Castro and Lumumba.

The details of these operations have been revealed before, most notably by the Senate Select Committee headed by Frank Church. But Powers, an extraordinarily lucid writer, does a fine job of relating the CIA's role to that of the president it serves. What emerges is worth underlining.

The agency was certainly filled with eccentrics and peculiar soldiers of fortune. In the plan to liquidate Castro, for instance, Edward Lansdale came up with the idea of organizing a Second Coming that would inspire the Cuban people to overthrow their dictator; the Mafia was also enlisted in the project. But in this case, as in others, the CIA was obeying commands from the White House.

Nothing was ever put in writing, since the president can never be held responsible for anything so heinous as an assassination. Yet John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, concludes Powers, were plainly at the origin of the plot to liquidate Castro, just as Eisenhower had demanded the elimination of Lumumba. So Helms and his associates were instruments of higher policy. In one of his rare public statements, Helms told the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1971 that "the nation must to a degree take it on faith that we too are honorable men, devoted to her service."

It would be naive, of course, to

exonerate the CIA from blame for its outrages. On many occasions, we know, agency executives are capable of persuading the president to unleash its operatives, often by tailoring its intelligence to fit the desire to go into action. At the same time, however, it is fatuous to contemplate supervision of the CIA without also devising some mechanism for overseeing its use by the White House. This is the challenge that confronts Congress. But it is a challenge so delicate that I doubt it can be fulfilled. Shaping a law that covers possible illegalities, as many clandestine activities must inevitably be, defies the imagination.

We may, then, have to go on depending on "honorable men," hoping they will function within the same moral framework that guides us all. Given the past record of the CIA and the presidents who use it, this is a flimsy hope. The book's value, however, is in posing the problem even though it may not furnish the answer. Besides, it is darn good reading on a subject that is too often obfuscated by extremes of passion.

Stanley Karnow, Nieman Fellow '58, is a syndicated columnist.

A Narrow Portrayal

Ding: The Life of J. Norwood Darling

by David L. Lendt

Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa. $10.95

---

by PAUL SZEP

J. Norwood Darling, two-time Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonist, was born in 1876 and died in 1962. His career spanned almost fifty years.

He was a wealthy conservative Republican, who, with the exception of two years, 1911 and 1913, when in New York for the *New York Globe*, worked as chief editorial cartoonist of the *Des Moines Register*.

Regrettably, *Ding: The Life of J. Norwood Darling*, deals primarily not with Darling, the stubborn and hard-baked conservative cartoonist, but with Darling, the passionate conservationist.

Technically, Ding Darling was a really fine cartoonist. It is unfortunate that many of the major issues of the day that made up a good portion of the nearly 15,000 cartoons in his career, are never mentioned. We see very few examples of his work other than cartoons centering on conservation. Certainly Darling contributed greatly to the cause of conservation, but the suggestion in the title implies a comprehensive insight into his total life.

David L. Lendt traces Ding's beginnings. His first job was on the *Sioux City Journal*. In 1906, he became staff cartoonist for the *Des Moines Register and Leader*.

As a chronological biography on Darling the conservationist, Lendt, an assistant professor of journalism at Iowa University, has compiled a fairly precise, if one-dimensional, portrait of Darling.

We see Darling's close friendship with President Hoover, his battles to produce wildlife legislation, a stint as head of the Bureau of Biological Survey in Washington from 1934 to 1935.

Darling's cartoons were widely syndicated and he enjoyed considerable fame and notoriety. Perhaps the life of a wealthy Republican cartoonist whose narrow and insensitive ideology led him to oppose such common progressive reforms as the New Deal and the 40-hour work week, doesn't really warrant literary immortality. Maybe Lendt is paying a tribute to the one aspect of Darling's life that, unlike his politics, benefited everyone and that is his only justification for the publication of this opus.

Paul Szep, Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonist, is on the staff of The Boston Globe.

Love and Hate in Asia

A Turning Wheel: Three Decades of the Asian Revolution as Witnessed by a Correspondent for The New Yorker

by Robert Shaplen

Random House, New York, 1979. $15.00

---

by ROBERT TIMBERG

Robert Shaplen (NF '48) was ushered into Asia for the first time by the First Cavalry Division on October 20, 1944. He landed as a war correspondent on the embattled island of Leyte in the Philippines. Recalling the reception afforded him and his American comrades that day by the Filipinos, he writes:

"Even as the rifles were still crackling, they kept pouring from nowhere and everywhere, running down the roads and out of the jungle to hang garlands on us, to shove fruit, whiskey, themselves and their children at us in what was the warmest and most spontaneous greeting I have ever received. The phrase I kept

hearing, over and over again, was 'Lovely Americans, lovely Americans.'"

More than thirty years later, on April 29, 1975, just hours before the triumphant entry of North Vietnamese troops and tanks, Shaplen departed Saigon, this time as a guest of the U.S. Marines who provided the Sea Stallion helicopter in which he and some eighty other Americans and Vietnamese unceremoniously fled that beleaguered colonial capital. No talk of "lovely Americans" attended his leavetaking. Instead, he writes, "The looks of contempt and hatred as well as frenzy on the faces of those Vietnamese that last morning still haunt me."

In this, his tenth book, Shaplen seeks to chronicle and to make sense of the more than three decades of Asian revolutionary struggle he has witnessed, most notably as Far Eastern correspondent for *The New Yorker*. "What had happened over those thirty-odd years," he asks, "to provoke such an abysmal change in attitude, to cause love to turn to hate?"

The book is a major undertaking, an attempt in separate chapters to look at each of the nations of Southeast Asia, along with Japan and Korea, in the aftermath of the Vietnam war and amid the shifting but critically important relationships between the United States, China and the Soviet Union.

The result is a valuable background source served up by a literate, thoughtful observer. William Shawcross, in a review for the *Manchester Guardian*, notes that "when younger journalists were assigned to Vietnam in the '60's, it was often to Shaplen's work that their editors referred them." Clearly the detailed panorama Shaplen projects in *A Turning Wheel* will be equally useful on a broader scale.

Shaplen has combined a palpable affection for his subject with painstaking research, long experience and enviable access to Asian leaders of the postwar era. Perhaps his finest achievement this time around is his masterful ability to evoke the individual identities of the nations of Southeast Asia, an area of great cultural diversity, while at the same time delineating the factors which draw them together and set them apart — often simultaneously. Beyond that, he places each in historical context, explains the problems which confront them separately and together (big power competition, Vietnamese militancy, internal racial differences), and suggests courses of action to insure their survival. Thus, for example, in arguing for sustained and delicate diplomacy to bring about the unification of North and South Korea, he writes, "To do nothing about the situation as both parts of Korea become stronger militarily and glare down each other's throats is to court disaster."

Shaplen is a somber, perhaps somewhat chastened, expert whose appreciation for the kaleidoscopic quality of Asian events has deepened over the years. If he thinks he has some of the answers, he also is sensitive to the prospect that Asia in the 1980's may take on a thoroughly unpredictable cast. "Whatever the United States or the other major powers do," he says, "the revolutionary wheel in Asia will surely continue to turn in its own way, but in what direction is difficult to tell. There are, indeed, wheels within wheels, and they all turn in their separate ways toward different destinations."

Other reviewers have chided Shaplen for not leavening the book with more anecdotes and personal reminiscenses. I share in the complaint. The loss is felt even more keenly when he shows what he can do when he allows himself such extravagances. For example, in a section on China shortly after the end of World War II, he writes:

"The longer I stayed in Shanghai, the more disturbing it was to witness the stark contrasts between rich and poor. While the wealthy Chinese who had returned from the western provinces, and the wealthy foreigners who had returned from abroad, or the ambitious newcomers who had come to Shanghai for the first time as postwar carpetbaggers, slid about in shiny black oversize sedans and occupied sumptuous flats and houses in the old French quarter, it was not uncommon on cold mornings to see the frozen dead bodies of beggars and infants on the city's downtown streets."

There are other striking recollections in the book. Unfortunately, far too few.

Robert Timberg, Nieman Fellow in the Class of 1980, is a reporter with the Baltimore Evening Sun.

Politics and Personalities in the Court

The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court

by Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong

Simon and Schuster, New York, 1979. $13.95

---

by JAMES BOYD

The subtitle to *The Brethren* is misleading. This is not a book about *the* Supreme Court as an institution but about *a* Supreme Court — the court of Chief Justice Warren Burger.

The book begins with the 1969 retirement of Chief Justice Earl

Warren and runs through the Court's 1975 term. Hardly a catalogue of cases, *The Brethren* focuses on politics and personalities, woven among the major issues the court faced each term.

The Brethren carries us through the Burger court's attempts to come to grips with such important subjects as abortion, busing, Nixon's tapes, the Pentagon Papers, rights of the accused and capital punishment. And, along the way, we are given a good many glimpses of the personalities that compose this court: the competitive Justice Byron R. White; the tired and disappointed Justice Thurgood Marshall; hesitant but dedicated Justice Harry A. Blackmun; gool ol' boy Justice William H. Rehnquist who takes his law seriously but not himself; frustrated Justice William J. Brennan Jr. who becomes increasingly shrill and inflexible once deprived of the contrast provided by Justice William O. Douglas.

None of the justices are spared. Some are more present than others, but all display their warts and beauty marks — their humanity.

Parts of *The Brethren* were not easy to read. Consider, for example, the sad tale of Justice Douglas, incapacitated by stroke, alternately lucid and incoherent, yet insisting on participating in court matters. Douglas has always been a giant of a man, a hero to me, and I was touched by Woodward and Armstrong's account of his incapacitation. How ironic, how cruel of the gods that this mountain man, who in his youth conquered polio by forcing his legs mile after painful mile over the foothills and mountains of Washington State, who loved the freedom of the outdoors more than anything except possibly the court, should be reduced to this slow process of withering away. By all rights Douglas had earned a quick going, beside a trout stream in the Cascades. But it was not to be. As I say, it was not pleasant reading, but I do not begrudge the authors that, nor think they have somehow profaned Douglas. Reading this did not make me think the less of him, rather more.

That judgment also goes for the court as a whole. To the extent that it captures the weave of the court, *The Brethren* is really a testimony to the greatness of the institution.

I suggest that while *The Brethren* does not answer the whole question of how the court works, it certainly provides its readers with a thoughtful basis for appraising the court's actions, for understanding how seemingly crazy-quilt decisions come to be made.

Woodward and Armstrong did not, by publication of *The Brethren*, subject the court to either unseemly pressure or the nation to economic manipulation. To quote from the introduction, "To ensure that our inquiry would in no way interfere with the ongoing work of the court, we limited our investigation to the years 1969 to 1975. We interviewed no one about any cases that reached the court after 1976."

Indeed, I don't think harm to the court is the issue at all. I think those who would stand shoulder to shoulder in defense of court secrecy and against *The Brethren* are acting on a much less elegant motive: They're repelled because two mere journalists, two infidels from the grubby environs of newspapering, have invaded their territory, their court.

That the book is not a great book causes me no problem because it is journalism, and 99 percent of journalism is not great. The sooner that fact is recognized by reader and journalist alike, the better. With the occasional exception such as Walter Lippmann, we are not scholarly inquisitors. A vast gulf separates us from academe, with only occasional bridges linking the two. We journalists are indeed mundane people who take our history on the fly, without footnotes, and transcribe it for other basically everyday people who want their information presented simply, concisely, in monosyllabic English.

I liked the book. I absolutely wallowed in its pithy gossip, soaked up the personalities of these men like a sponge and was fascinated by the political and intellectual processes leading to important decisions.

I don't know if it is The Truth in every detail, and, frankly, Scarlett, I don't give a damn. I'll take the book for what it is — the application of journalism to one of the nation's great institutions. I'm happy it was done and glad I got to read it.

James Boyd, Nieman Fellow in the Class of 1980, is editorial page editor of the Idaho Statesman, *Boise.*

A Multitude of Voices

In the Public Interest
A Report by the National News Council

Volume I, $2.00; Volume II, $5.00

National News Council, New York, 1979.

---

by RAY WHITE

At its beginnings in 1973, the National News Council troubled many in the press. Some news operations, in fact, declined to cooperate with the council as a matter of policy.

In the most significant declaration, *New York Times'* publisher Arthur Ochs Sulzberger said "...We will not be a party to Council investigations (of press complaints)...We will not

furnish information or explanation to the Council. In our coverage we will treat the Council as we treat any other organization: we will report their activities when they are newsworthy."

Sulzberger said the "real threat to a free press" is not journalism's own failures, but rather government hostility and pressure. "The presence of the Council is not materially going to help us meet these real threats," the publisher said. "Indeed, we are convinced that the operation of the Council will only serve to divert attention from them."

His assessment of the "real threat" may sound a bit melodramatic today, but seven years ago it sounded authentic. The Nixon-Agnew administration was engaging the press in a war that included the class battles of Watergate and the Pentagon Papers, and the relationship of press and government had advanced beyond "adversary."

Independent of Sulzberger, a task force of the Twentieth Century Fund, a New York research group, agreed with his assessment of the problem, but not with his solution. The fourteen-member task force — nine of them from news organizations — recommended what the *Times* publisher would later reject: "an independent and private national news council... to receive, to examine and to report on complaints concerning the accuracy and fairness of news reporting in the United States, as well as to initiate studies and report on issues involving the freedom of the press."

Judging from the two volumes of published reports, *In the Public Interest*, the council's aim was to function as an escape valve for public frustration and discontent about the press. The reports make clear that the council's concern and purpose was to insure a free press. What is suggested more subtley and indirectly is that a public who can turn to a National News Council for redress of press wrongs will be less likely to support a government seeking to restrict the press.

The council has ruled on 154 formal complaints in the past seven years. (More than four thousand other complaints were handled, says the council, but never got to the formal stage.) About a third of these were made against television networks, roughly a quarter against newspapers, and the rest in descending numbers against news services, wire services, magazines and other organizations. After weighing the complaints and putting them to a vote, the council found about 25 percent of them to be "warranted." The results were published regularly in a special section of the *Columbia Journalism Review*.

The complainants are a mix. Most of them appear to be private citizens disturbed by what they perceive to be press political bias.

Others are lobbyists or spokespersons for business and labor. Not a few are individuals or groups aligned on one side or the other of such polarized issues as abortion or fluoridated drinking water. Surprisingly, there are few elected officeholders or politicians among the complainants, and even fewer individuals complaining of how the press treated them personally.

Collectively, the complainants appear to be people who can't or won't understand the role of the press. So apparent is their bias, so faulty is their reasoning, so illiberal is their spirit, that common ground of any sort seems impossible.

Sorted out, however, and considered individually, the complainants become more sympathetic. Some of them, of course, turn out to have legitimate gripes. But for the most part, they are simply people. Some of their most cherished beliefs or convictions or trust have been battered about, and they are fighting back in the best way they know. We would need to do a lot more than merely provide a National News Council to eliminate the tensions that exist between the press and these people; we would need to dismantle the press.

It is time for members of the press to consider the very real possibility that the low esteem and distrust that much of the public has for them is inevitable if the press is to aggressively pursue and publish or broadcast uncomfortable but valuable truths. The press is most valuable when it finds good reason to break the consensus; that is, when it becomes unpopular. Perhaps public feeling is a reliable barometer of how well the press is doing its job. When discontent is high; so is the job rating. Journalism is essentially a revolutionary activity.

The council, like the task force that recommended it, is made up of diverse and accomplished individuals. In addition to high level editors and news executives, there are judges, educators, members of the clergy, businesspeople and union officials. Their decisions on complaints appear eminently reasonable and scrupulously fair-minded, and their conscientiousness shines through in their conclusions. They believe in the council.

One of their members, Richard Salant, vice chairman of NBC and former president of CBS News, said at a news conference he wished there had been something like the council when CBS produced the controversial docmentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

"I just wish," said Salant, "that there had been somebody there — nonpolitical, professional, systematic — to whom I could say, 'Here, this is what they're saying, and this is what we say, and — you tell us; you tell the public.' I would have appreciated it very much. It would have been an important service to me, and to my associates who worked on it."

It is precisely such society-ordered, pseudo-official bodies as the National

News Council that the First Amendment warns and protects against. It is precisely the spirit of the First Amendment that Salant and others of like mind about the council fail to grasp. While the First Amendment encourages the cacophony of voices editorial writers and constitutional scholars are wont to talk about, the National News Council would rather encourage harmony — by pointing a finger at discordant voices.

Now it may be argued that this idea of a multitude of voices is more an idea than reality, that the national news organizations are so few and so powerful that they require a countervailing force in the form of a news council. The fact is that the communications industry in the United States is booming. A few of the big city dailies still have their problems, but there are more newspapers, television and radio stations, and magazines than ever before. Radio stations and magazines especially are thriving, having learned to attract relatively small but well-defined audiences. A technological revolution involving cable, satellites, fiber optics and other scientific miracles will provide an explosion of information outlets. In the meantime, as powerful and relatively few as the national media are, they have each other to keep them competitive and honest.

Moreover, if the big organizations were abusing their power, the council's experience should at least have suggested as much. It is surprising to find so few individuals who felt they were personally mistreated by the press.

Sulzberger was right. The real danger to a free press has come not from its own failures or from a resentful and frustrated public, but from the government — although it isn't likely that the publisher had the courts in mind when he made his statement.

And how does the council feel about the courts? In 1975, council chairman Stanley Fuld, himself a noted jurist, was pleased to note, in a foreword to the first council report, that Chief Justice Warren Burger had made what amounted to favorable references to the council in a major press opinion. This suggested, said Fuld, "that the Council is one of the stones in the wall protecting the media's First Amendment rights against government encroachment and is not, as some seem to say, a Trojan horse which somehow has slipped inside that wall."

Thanks anyway, judge, but I hope you won't be offended if some of us continue to find the National News Council troublesome.

Ray White, Nieman Fellow '76, is editor of the Washington Journalism Review.

Drawing by Handelsman

Letters

PLAUDITS

It is rare that a writer conveys deep feelings in an informative travel article. "China Homecoming" [*NR* Winter 1979] is a social history of one person and a meaningful evaluation of a society, as seen by one who could never forget his ties and his family's achievement in that ancient nation.

As a travel document of the group, it is great fun. As an account for those who are eager to learn all they can about China today, it is of considerable importance.

Bernard Rubin
Boston University
Boston, MA

A couple of thoughts on the Winter 1979 issue:

First, the Lippmann dedication must have been a great day. The picture of Louis tossing the champagne bottle is a winner, and all the warm dedicatory talks were just right.

Second, that's a delightful article by Susan Trausch on the trauma of learning to use electronic equipment in the newsroom. Your readers might be interested to know that Ms. Trausch is a National Endowment for the Humanities Professional Journalism Fellow at Stanford this year.

Harry Press (NF '56)
Stanford University
Stanford, CA

THE CELLULOID NEWSROOM

I want to commend you on a fine issue, readable as hell. I particularly enjoyed Chairman Thomson's entertaining and educational tour of the People's Republic.

But as much as I enjoyed the article "In the Flicks" by my erstwhile colleague, Frank Van Riper, I must take scholarly exception to his statement that the best newspaper movie ever made was *The Day the Earth Caught Fire*.

I know there are differences in the world of scholarship, but I must respectfully say that Van Riper is suffering from a case of gross Popcorn of the Brain if he fails to admit that the best newspaper movie ever made was *Call Northside 777*, starring Jimmy Stewart. This black-and-white flick captured the grubby atmosphere of pre-VDT newsroom, and was brilliant in the casting of shy, mumbling Stewart as the tired but dogged reporter whose efforts ultimately free a wrongly convicted man. Stewart even dressed like his suit pockets had holes in them.

The movie was based on an actual Chicago case. The film is usually shown every six months or so on television, usually around 2:30 A.M.

The *Fire* movie was a turkey of epic proportions, made by a bunch of Brits who had been obviously dipping into the brandy and found a gimmick (the cosmic heat wave) that would allow the heroine to shed her garments.

Jimmy Stewart didn't shed anything, but you knew that he was two car payments behind. Lee J. Cobb played the M.E. and you could smell the cigar smoke in his office.

Edward C. Norton (NF '73)
Institute for the Analysis of Trivia
Ridgewood, NJ

FUTURE BUSINESS

A response to our request for a Walter Lippmann stamp has been received from the Postmaster General. He states that Lippmann will be ineligible for commemoration until ten years after his death, *viz.* 1984, or else on his centenary, 1989.

Peter Davison
The Atlantic Press
Boston, MA

W.L. WOULD HAVE BEEN PLEASED

An important segment of the Walter Lippmann Papers here has to do with the Nieman Fellowships. The Winter 1979 *Nieman Reports* has been placed in the Walter Lippmann Nieman file.

I was very impressed with your program on September 23rd; the idea of a Walter Lippmann House was just perfect, and W.L. would have been pleased indeed.

Robert O. Anthony
Advisor to Walter Lippmann Papers
Yale University, New Haven, CT

Although I read about the Dedication of Walter Lippmann House in the public press, the coverage in *Nieman Reports* was much more inclusive and interesting. I enjoyed very much having an opportunity to read it.

Edward R. Farley, Jr.
Princeton, NJ

COMME ÇI, COMME ÇA

Some observations from the trenches: The lineup of speakers for Nieman affairs is impressive — good work.

Nieman Reports is pretty fair — when it comes. Topics are right but you can go easier on the Far East and edit with more courage. Happy New Year.

John Strohmeyer (NF '53)
Bethlehem, PA

Nieman Selection Committee 1980-81

Four journalists and three faculty members of Harvard University have been appointed by President Derek Bok to serve on the committee to select American Nieman Fellows in Journalism for the academic year 1980-81.

The Fellowships provide for a year of study at Harvard for persons experienced in the news media, and the Fellowship awards will be announced early in June.

Members of the new committee, whose chairman, *ex offico*, is the Nieman Curator, James C. Thomson Jr., are:

Donald R. Dwight, senior vice president and publisher, the *Minneapolis Star and Tribune* in Minnesota. He graduated from Princeton University in 1953, and for the next two years was on active duty as a lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

In 1955 he joined the staff of the Holyoke (Massachusetts) *Transcript-Telegram* as a reporter, and in 1957 he was appointed assistant to the publisher. From 1963 to 1966 he was associate commissioner in the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. He returned to the *Transcript-Telegram* for three years as general manager and associate publisher. In 1969 he became Commissioner of Administration and Finance for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and from 1971 to 1975, he was Lieutenant Governor. He was named vice president and associate publisher of the *Minneapolis Star and Tribune* in 1975.

His publications include "State and Local Resources: Allocation and the Aging," in *The Gerontologist*, and he was a contributor to the book *The State and the Poor*.

Mr. Dwight is a director of Newspapers of New England, Inc.; the Recorder Publishing Company, Inc.; the Pillsbury Company; the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, and the Downtown Council. He is Chairman of the Board of the Guthrie Theatre and a trustee of Twin Cities Public Television. He serves on the Policyholders Advisory Committee of the New England Life Insurance Company, and the National Advisory Council of Hampshire College.

He is a member of the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Minneapolis Metropolitan Advisory Board of the National Alliance of Business.

William R. Hilliard, assistant managing editor, *The Oregonian*, Portland. He received the A.B. degree in journalism from Pacific University in 1952. From 1951 to 1953 he published the Portland *Challenger*, a weekly newspaper in the predominantly black section of Portland.

Mr. Hilliard joined *The Oregonian* as copy boy in 1952. He was promoted to a reporter in the sports department in 1953, and named a general assignment writer in 1954. He was made city editor in 1971, and assistant managing editor in 1975.

He has been an editor-in-residence at Washington State University, Depauw University, Brigham Young University, and the University of Oregon. He has twice served on the nominating jury for the Pulitzer Prize in journalism, and has been a judge for the Robert F. Kennedy Journalism Scholarship. He was a participant in the Law and Media Seminar sponsored by *The Wall Street Journal* at Princeton University, and the seminar on Minorities and the Media sponsored by Northwestern University and Gannett Newspapers at Northwestern University.

Mr. Hilliard is a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Board of Trustees of the Urban League of Portland, and the Columbia River Council of Girl Scouts, and a past member of the Board of Directors of the Portland Branch of the NAACP and the National Urban League. He served as chairman of the National Conference of the Urban League in Los Angeles in 1978 and Chicago in 1979.

Gerald Holton, Mallinckrodt Professor of Physics and Professor of the History of Science, Harvard University.

Dr. Holton received the A.B. degree in 1941 from Wesleyan University and the M.A. degree in 1942. At Harvard University he received the A.M. degree and the Ph.D. degree in 1948.

Gerald Holton's research interests are primarily the physics of matter at high pressure and the history of physical science. His research in the history and philosophy of science has centered on Albert Einstein and his time, and he is best known for introducing the thematic analysis of scientific work.

Dr. Holton is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, was the Academy's editor from 1957 to 1963, and the founding editor of its quarterly journal, *Daedalus*. He is a Fellow of the American Physical Society and of the Academie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences. He is currently also Visiting Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he is helping to establish the new College of Science, Technology and Society.

In past years he was National Science Foundation Faculty Fellow at the University of Paris, Exchange Professor at Leningrad University, and visiting member at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. He has been a member of the Board of Directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, of the Board of Governors of the American Institute of Physics, and of the Boards of Trustees of Wesleyan University, the Boston Museum of Science, and

the U.S. National Commission on UNESCO.

Dr. Holton was honored by Wesleyan University by the award of its citation for outstanding achievement as scholar and teacher, and he received the distinguished service citation of the American Association of Physics Teachers. He was awarded the Robert A. Millikan medal in 1967 and the Oersted Medal in 1980. He has also received several awards as producer of documentary films on the work of physicists.

Among Dr. Holton's books are *The Scientific Imagination: Case Studies; Thematic Origins of Scientific Thought: Kepler to Einstein*; and the college text *Introduction to Concepts and Theories in Physical Science*. He also founded the review journal *Science, Technology and Human Values*.

Dr. Holton is the originator and co-director of the Project Physics Course, which developed a new national physical science course for colleges and schools. The course materials are being used by about 200,000 students in the United States, and adaptations have been published in a number of foreign countries. He has also participated in Harvard's General Education courses and has been vice chairman of the Committee on General Education.

Lance Liebman, Professor of Law, Harvard University. Mr. Liebman graduated from Yale University in 1962, received the M.A. degree in 1964 at Clare College, Cambridge, England, the LL.B. degree at Harvard University in 1967.

From 1967 to 1968 Mr. Liebman was law clerk to Justice Byron White of the U.S. Supreme Court. For the next two years he was assistant to the Mayor of New York City.

In 1970 he joined the faculty of the Law School, Harvard University and teaches courses in property law, social welfare law, and real estate finance. He is also a Research Associate at the Institute of Politics and a member of the faculty of the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

He is co-author of the books *Decentralizing City Government* and *Property*, and is a successor trustee of the Yale University Corporation.

Jack (John H.) Nelson, Washington bureau chief, the *Los Angeles Times*. He attended Georgia State College, and was a Nieman Fellow at Harvard University in the Class of 1962.

Mr. Nelson began his newspaper career in 1947 as a reporter with the *Daily Herald* in Biloxi, Mississippi, and after serving in the United States Army from 1949 to 1951, he joined the staff of the *Atlanta Constitution*. In 1965 he was named chief of the *Los Angeles Times* Atlanta bureau, and in 1970 he was transferred to its Washington bureau. He was appointed chief of that bureau in 1975.

He is a six-time winner of the Georgia Associated Press Sweepstakes for the best story of the year. He was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1960 for a series of articles exposing the irregularities in the world's largest mental institution at Milledgeville, Georgia, and he won the Drew Pearson Award for Investigative Reporting in 1975.

He is the co-author of *The FBI and the Berrigans, Censors and the Schools* and *The Orangeburg Massacre*.

Jo (Josephine D.) Thomas, Miami and Caribbean bureau chief, *The New York Times*. She received the A.B. degree from Wake Forest College in 1965 and the M.A. degree from the University of North Carolina in 1966. At Harvard University she was a Nieman Fellow in the Class of 1971.

From 1966 to 1969 Ms. Thomas was a reporter with the Cincinnati *Post and Times-Star*, and in 1971 she left to join the staff of the Detroit *Free Press*. In 1977 she became a member of an investigative reporting team in the Washington bureau of *The New York Times*. In October 1979 the *Times* named her Miami and Caribbean bureau chief.

As a general assignment reporter with the Detroit *Free Press*, she wrote much about labor and organized crime. In 1973 she won the Robert Kennedy Foundation award for a series of stories which resulted in the first court hearing on the legality of performing psychosurgery on those who are incarcerated. For two consecutive years, 1974 and 1975, she won the Detroit Press Club Foundation award for distinguished newspaper reporting within the state of Michigan, for her work in disclosing scandals in Detroit's trucking industry, and for an expose of fraudulent union activities.

Emily D. Vermeule, Samuel E. Zemurray Jr. and Doris Zemurray-Stone Radcliffe Professor, Harvard University. Ms. Vermeule was a graduate of Bryn Mawr College in 1950. She received the M.A. degree from Radcliffe College in 1954, and the Ph.D. degree in 1956 from Bryn Mawr. She studied at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, Greece, 1950 to 1951, and at St. Anne's College, Oxford, England, from 1952 to 1953.

She has been an instructor in Greek at Bryn Mawr College and Wellesley College as well as Associate Professor of Classics, Boston University, and Professor of Art and Greek, Wellesley College. She was a Guggenheim Fellow in Athens, 1964 to 1965; a James Loeb Visiting Professor of Classical Philology, Harvard University, 1969; Sather Professor of Classical Literature, University of California, Berkeley, 1975; and a Senior Fellow, Dumbarton Oaks.

Ms. Vermeule was named Director of the Harvard University-Museum of Fine Arts Cyprus Expedition in 1971, and has excavated several other sites, most recently those at the Athenian Agora, 1965 and Thera, 1967 to 1968.

She is a member of the Board of Trustees, Radcliffe College, and the

American Association of Arts and Sciences. She is vice president (Humanities) of the American Philosophical Society, and she is a member also of the Archaeological Institute of America, the Society for Promotion of Hellenic Studies, the American Philological Association, and a corresponding member, Deutsches Archaologisches Institut, as well as a Fellow, the Society of Antiquaries.

She is the author of many articles and books on archaeology. Her newest book is *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*.

About twelve Fellowships will be awarded to American journalists for 1980-81. Each grant provides for nine months of residence and study at Harvard, beginning in September, for journalists on leave from their jobs.

The current Nieman class includes twelve Fellows from the United States and six Fellows from foreign countries.

The 1980-81 class will be the 43rd annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. The Fellowships were established in 1938 under a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of *The Milwaukee Journal*.

James MacGregor Byrne 1909-1979

This magazine does not ordinarily note the deaths of people who were neither Nieman Fellows nor major journalists. But in the case of James MacGregor Byrne (Harvard A.B. 1931, LL.B. 1934) who died suddenly and peacefully on November 30, 1979, we cannot be silent.

Mr. Byrne, a former lawyer and retired Foreign Service Officer, came into the editors' lives back in late 1974, right after the death of Walter Lippmann (Harvard 1910), when some of us had already been trying for a while to devise an appropriate memorial to Lippmann within the Nieman Foundation — which he himself had helped to create.

"Jimmy" Byrne, you see, was the brother of Lippmann's late wife, Helen, and was also executor of Lippmann's estate. (Helen Lippmann's other sibling, Phyllis, is Mrs. Gardner Cox of Cambridge, Massachusetts, wife of the noted painter.) And Jimmy Byrne shared our enthusiasm for some kind of Lippmann memorial at Harvard in connection with the Nieman enterprise.

In the ensuing months and years Mr. Byrne became not only an enthusiast for the acquisition of One Francis Avenue and an advisor on its restoration; he also contributed time, energy, ideas, and substantial money to the Walter Lippmann Memorial Fund drive launched in September 1977 to endow Lippmann House — and was one of the drive's fifteen sponsors.

Finally, in the spring and summer of 1979, he became the chief counselor for the planners of the September 23rd Dedication ceremony for the House on what would have been Lippmann's 90th birthday. It was Jimmy Byrne who worked with us through endless telephonic brainstormings about speakers and logistics. ("Why not just a garden party, with tea and perhaps some punch?" he had early suggested.) A gentle spoken "Well, I'm not sure..." was quite enough to keep us away from some "inappropriate" speaker (or, more precisely, away from what Lippmann wouldn't have liked). As for things like music at the ceremony? — or religion? — Byrne would give a terse and unequivocal "No" on behalf of his late brother-in-law; Lippmann was bored by music, and he was not a believer.

Byrne and his wife, June, were present at the Dedication, moving from their summer months in Northeast Harbor, Maine, back to Washington's Maryland suburbs. Their presence that day — along with Phyllis Cox and that of other Lippmann in-laws by extension (the only family Lippmann had left) — went publicly unnoted: Jimmy Byrne had asked not to speak, nor to play any role, nor even to be seated with the honored guests on the dais. But he loved the ceremony and judged it to be precisely right in tone and content. "It was a grand slam, no less," he wrote three days later, "I've never seen anything like this go off so well..."

It was typical of this gentle, strong, lovable man of taste and humility that he designed the final Lippmann celebration, declined recognition for doing so, and then quietly slipped away forever.

We are all in his debt; and James MacGregor Byrne will long be remembered at Walter Lippmann House.

—J.C.T.Jr.

Nieman Notes

NIEMAN DIRECTORY

A complete directory of Nieman Fellows is available through the Nieman office. The booklet consists of an alphabetical listing of Nieman Fellows with their most recent address, and a chronological listing of each Nieman Class.

The cost of the Directory is $6.50; send orders to the Nieman Office, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138.

1940

Word has been received from GLENN NIXON who writes, "The year 1979 will be etched in our memories forever." He goes on to say that the past twelve months have brought them the happiness of their first grandchild, but also sadness in the death of Glenn Richard Nixon, 34, their only son, who was killed in a motorcycle-car accident in Boise, Idaho.

Surviving are his parents, Glenn and Irma Nixon, and three sisters, Jean Diane MacDonald of Menlo Park, California; S. Kathleen Arsenault of Brockton, Massachusetts; and Barbara E. Nixon of Riverside, Connecticut.

Glenn adds a note that he spends most of his time on his free-lance writing.

The Nixons' address is 224 Riverside Avenue, Riverside, Connecticut 06878.

Apologies are owed to CARROLL KILPATRICK, whose last name was incorrect in the last issue of Nieman Notes in *NR*. To set the record straight: Carroll Kilpatrick is a Nieman Fellow, and Clayton Kirkpatrick is a member of the Nieman Advisory Committee.

1942

SANFORD COOPER writes: "Life is pretty much under control. I have two nice homes (Holmes Beach, Florida, and Great Cacapon, West Virginia). The home here is halfway up a mountain overlooking the Cacapon River. We have thirty-six acres with nothing but our house and a forest on them, and the stream is alive with fish. The closest neighbors are a mile away. I still write, and I think I'll publish the book next year, hopefully."

1943

FRANK R. KELLY is the author of *Starship Invincible: Science Fiction Stories of the Thirties*, published by the Capra Press, Santa Barbara, California. When Frank wrote these stories more than forty years ago, Lindbergh had just flown the Atlantic and the Space Age was a writer's dream. America was deep in the Great Depression and young Kelly, just out of high school, worked in a box factory. He escaped his dreary job by writing about space voyages. His imaginings, collected in this book, have proven to be remarkably prophetic.

MILLARD C. BROWNE has retired as editorial page editor of the *Buffalo* (New York) *Evening News*, after thirty-five years of editorial writing on the *News*, which he joined shortly after his Nieman year. Previously he had worked on the Sacramento (California) *Union*, after getting his bachelor's and master's degrees at Stanford University.

With his wife, Jane, he is off to England where he will be affiliated with Wolfson College in Cambridge. He will look into the varying constraints on press freedom in Britain and the U.S. After his English stint, the Brownes will make their home in Menlo Park, California.

Mr. Browne is a former president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

TOM GRIFFITH, Newswatch columnist for *Time* magazine, writes that during New Year's weekend, he was in Cambridge and "got in to see Lippmann House, with Louis and Totty. Looks great!"

1945

A.B. GUTHRIE Jr. is the author of *No Second Wind*, published in February by Houghton Mifflin. The book is described as a Western novel of suspense, a sequel to *Wild Pitch* and *The Genuine Article.*

HOUSTON WARING, editor emeritus of the Independent Newspapers, Littleton, Colorado, writes: "I saw LAWRENCE WEISS ('49) at the Denver Press Club. He is executive director of the Colorado Bar Association...

"Besides working five and a half days a week, after fifty-three years at this desk, I have launched a Town and Gown Society at Arapahoe Community College, a six-thousand-student institution three blocks from the office. We have eighteen intellectuals from the community dine monthly with eighteen academics. A member gives a paper each month. Fun for all!"

1946

Virginia B. Hewlett, 67, wife of FRANK HEWLETT who is Washington correspondent for the *Salt Lake Tribune*, died on May 9th. She had been in poor health for several years.

During World War II Mrs. Hewlett spent three and one-half years as a prisoner of war of the Japanese in the Philippines.

In 1970 she received national recognition for her story entitled "I Was a Flag Burner" featured on Flag Day by the Scripps-Howard newspapers. She related how she and three other Americans had burned American flags to prevent them from falling into the hands of the Japanese military forces when they entered Manila on January 1, 1942. This WW II story created special interest when it was printed in the seventies since it was brought to light at a time when opposition to the Vietnam War was at its peak, and American flags were being desecrated by protestors.

Virginia Hewlett is survived by her husband, Frank, a daughter, two brothers and a grandchild. The family has asked that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the journalism scholarship fund of the National Press Foundation.

Frank Hewlett's address is 3412 North Thomas Street, Arlington, Virginia 22207.

1947

FRANK CAREY, who retired from the Associated Press in 1974, is a journalism consultant at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

1949

ALAN BARTH, editorial writer for *The Washington Post* for thirty years, died at the age of 73 on November 20th. He is described as "a quiet man who slew dragons, a man of reason driven by passion ...a master of advocacy." Mr. Barth advanced his liberal political views tirelessly over four decades in books and speeches, in articles, and in his editorials. He won a Sigma Delta Chi award in 1947 for distinguished service to American journalism, and an American Newspaper Guild award in 1948 for distinguished editorial writing.

Mr. Barth was honored at a special dinner last March (see *NR* Autumn 1979). Surviving are his wife, the former Adrienne Meyer, a son, and a daughter. Mrs. Barth's address is 3520 Rodman, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

1950

JOHN HULTENG has resigned from the faculty of the University of Oregon after serving there for 22 years as professor of journalism, and twice as dean of the School of Journalism. He joined the faculty of the Department of Communication at Stanford University as professor of communication.

In 1978 he underwent extensive radiation treatment for cancer; he returned to the classroom on a part-time basis in 1979. His fourth book, *The News Media: What Makes Them Tick?* was published by Prentice Hall, Inc., in 1979.

1951

SYLVAN MEYER, president and publisher of *Miami* magazine, reports: "I founded the city magazine here in November 1975 — finally getting it profitable and up to 24,000 paid now. I could write a book but I don't have time."

HUGH MORRIS retired in December as assistant director for publications of the Legislative Research Commission in Frankfort, Kentucky, where he had worked for the past ten years. Before that, he had spent almost 24 years reporting from that city for the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. Recalling his 34 years of legislature-watching, Morris said that the most dramatic change has been the strengthening of the General Assembly in relation to the executive branch.

A lover of gadgetry and electronics, he will continue his hobby as an amateur radio operator in his retirement.

1952

JOHN M. HARRISON, professor emeritus of journalism (Pennsylvania State University) writes: "The whole business of getting one's life reorganized for retirement has proved a bit more complicated than I'd anticipated, even though I'm thoroughly enjoying the independence it provides...

"Shirley and I have been doing a good bit of traveling — notably a Smithsonian trip to Russia last May and June. It's a fascinating place and we'd like to go back again, after we've managed to master a bit of the language. We'd hoped to have a reunion there with Lee and PEPPER MARTIN, but...they weren't arriving until a couple of weeks after we left....

"I'm also moving ahead with research on a biography of 'Gold Rule' Jones — the fabulous one-time mayor of Toledo."

1953

KEYES BEECH sends word from Bangkok, Thailand, where he is Southeast Asia correspondent for *The Los Angeles Times*. "After the *Chicago Daily News* folded I tried retirement but, as you can see, it didn't take. All the best informed people here and in Hong Kong think the Chinese are preparing to 'teach' Vietnam another 'lesson.' It will come, they say, when Hanoi launches its dry season offensive to eliminate the Pol Pots."

Bob Frazier of Oregon is the title of a book recently received at the Nieman office. This collection of columns, editorials and informal essays by ROBERT B. FRAZIER is material that was originally published in the *Eugene Register-Guard*, where Mr. Frazier was a staff member for twenty-seven years. His writings were selected and arranged by Charles T. Duncan, and they were published by the *Eugene Register-Guard*. The book will be reviewed in a future issue of *NR*.

Mr. Frazier died in 1977 (see Nieman Notes, sent with James Thomson's September 1979 newsletter to alumni/ae).

WATSON SIMS, editor of the *New Brunswick* (New Jersey) *Home News*, has been elected a vice president of the Home News Publishing Company.

1956

H.Y. SHARADA PRASAD, Director of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication, New Delhi, is the author of *A Manual for News Agency Reporters*, published in 1980 by Allied Publishers Private Limited, India.

The manual is described as the "first comprehensive survey of the special requirements of news agency journalism ...a pioneering effort in that news agency journalism has rarely been treated as a separate discipline."

Mr. Prasad, in his acknowledgments and thanks prefacing the book, mentions CHANCHAL SARKAR ('61).

1957

HALE CHAMPION, former Undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has been appointed senior advisor to the president of Harvard University and to the Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

ANTHONY LEWIS, columnist for *The New York Times* and Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School, was in California for a month last fall to watch the filming of his book, *Gideon's Trumpet*, for a television drama to be part of the CBS Hall of Fame series.

Mr. Lewis' book was published fifteen years ago by Random House. For seven years, between 1957 and 1964, he had covered the Supreme Court for *The New York Times*. He wanted to write the story of a case that would explain the workings of the Supreme Court, and in the case of *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, he found the perfect vehicle.

Lewis had covered the 1963 trial of Clarence Earl Gideon, an obscure, poverty-stricken convict, after Gideon's plea to the United States Supreme Court had caused the court to reverse an earlier decision, and to hold that the "due process of law," guaranteed under the Fourteenth Amendment, entitled a defendant to counsel,

whether or not he could afford a lawyer. This landmark case, which changed the course of American legal history and the lives of countless thousands, is the subject of Mr. Lewis' book.

In the television version, Lewis ended up playing a small part — the role of himself. Henry Fonda plays the part of Gideon. The film is scheduled to be shown on the air this spring.

By speaking lines in the production, Mr. Lewis became eligible to join the Screen Actors Guild, but he has not yet done so. "It was fun and interesting taking part in the film," he said, "but I have no more desire to act."

(The above excerpts are from an interview with Anthony Lewis by Polly Woollcott Murphy last autumn in the *Vineyard Gazette*, Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.)

1962

PETER H. BINZEN, former metropolitan editor of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, will resume his "Human Side of Business" reports from earlier years, contribute regularly to the business pages, and take on other writing assignments.

JOHN HUGHES, former editor of *The Christian Science Monitor*, left last June to operate his own newspaper on Cape Cod. He is now starting a second paper, the *Yarmouth Sun*, a full-service weekly, initially delivered free to 12,000 homes and businesses in the town of Yarmouth.

The circulation area of the *Cape Cod Oracle*, a paid 8,500-weekly which Hughes bought two years ago, abuts Yarmouth.

1964

ROY REED, most recently in the London bureau of *The New York Times*, writes: "A note, a brief report, on this pilgrim's progress: I left the *Times* after fourteen years and came home to Arkansas in January 1979. Installed Norma and me on our old worn-out farm at Hogeye and started teaching journalism part-time at the University of Arkansas. I'm doing a little farming, a little writing and a little teaching, and the combination adds up to about one hundred fifty hours of work a week.

"Just when I think I've caught up, the cattle find a hole in the fence or the tractor breaks down or *The New York Times* calls up to assail my conscience over a promised, unfinished, free-lance story.

"This has been the busiest year of my life. I love it."

1965

RAY JENKINS, special assistant to the President, was the subject of a newspaper interview with Martin Tolchin in *The New York Times* recently.

"There are striking similarities between my childhood and Jimmy Carter's," said Jenkins. "...In reading his biography it's almost like reading about my own boyhood. We fished in the same creeks, came from the same type of family, grew the same types of crops."

The article continues, "Besides the complexity of the job, Mr. Jenkins is also struck by what he regards as the precision and formality of the press office, which many White House reporters regard as chaotic...

"'There's no margin for error whatever when you're speaking for the President,' Mr. Jenkins said. 'Every word is weighed with the utmost care...'

"Mr. Jenkins, who serves as a press aide with the title 'special assistant to the President,' observed that the acronym is painfully clear."

Ray Jenkins joined the White House staff last September after thirty years as a journalist, mostly in Montgomery, Alabama, where he was executive editor of the *Montgomery Advertiser-Journal*. (See Nieman Notes, *NR* Winter 1979.)

ALEX MALDONADO, executive editor of *El Mundo* (San Juan, Puerto Rico), has been elected to the board of directors of the Inter American Press Association.

1966

ROBERT H. GILES, executive editor, *The Democrat and Chronicle* and *Times-Union* (Rochester, New York), conducted a survey of the behavior, aims and habit patterns of 650 editors and their spouses. The results of this first sociological study of its kind were compiled by computer and presented by Giles and his wife, Nancy, at the Tulsa convention of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association last autumn.

If the findings are accurate, the typical managing editor is between 36 and 55 years of age, earns between $25,000 and $35,000 annually and rates his [sic] job below his marriage and his family in importance.

1968

GERALD GRANT is on leave for eighteen months from Syracuse University as senior associate in the Office of the Director, National Institute of Education, where he is writing a report on "What Makes a Good School."

Mr. Grant is co-author with David Riesman of *The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College*. Published in 1978 by the University of Chicago Press, the book won the Borden Award of the American Council on Education. Last August Jossey-Bass published Grant et al., *On Competence*.

Grant adds: "I also recently published an essay of interest to Nieman colleagues: 'Journalists and Social Scientists: Continuities and Discontinuities,' in *On the Making of Americans*, edited by Herbert Gans, Nathan Glazer and Christopher Jencks, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979."

EDWARD LAMBETH has a new address. He has moved from Washington, D.C., and is a professor in the School of Journalism, Ernie Pyle Hall, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

JACK C. LANDAU, director of the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press and Supreme Court correspondent for Newhouse Newspapers, has been named winner of the 1979 John Peter Zenger award given by the University of Arizona. The Zenger award annually honors "distinguished service in behalf of freedom of the press and the people's right to know." The silver and turquoise Zenger plaque was presented to Landau, the twenty-sixth recipient, in Scottsdale, Arizona, in January at the annual convention of the Arizona Newspapers Association.

1969

LARRY ALLISON, editor of the *Long Beach* (California) *Independent* and *Press-Telegram*, was elected vice president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association at its fall meeting in Tulsa.

RICHARD C. LONGWORTH, reporter with the *Chicago Tribune*, won the Gerald Loeb, John Hancock and University of Missouri Awards for economic and business reporting for a six-part series on world trade, written with Bill Neikirk.

Longworth reports that last summer he visited Larry Allison in Long Beach, California. "He's editor of the papers there, is renovating and reinvigorating them in a very impressive way. He and Patricia live in a magnificent beachfront house, with the sea up to their front yard and a minstrel's gallery with harpsichord."

1972

JEFFERSON MORGAN reports: "My latest book, *The Die Song*, a light entertainment about a mass murderer who killed thirteen people in Santa Cruz in the early seventies, is scheduled for March publication by W. W. Norton in New York.

"Jinx and I continue to write a column together for *Bon Appetit* magazine, and we both have been writing for *Travel & Leisure, Réalités, Reader's Digest,* and *Woman's Day*, among others."

1973

MICHAEL RITCHEY has joined the staff of the *Fort Worth* (Texas) *Star-Telegram* as a special assignments writer. A former public television newsman, he has been running his own home-building and remodeling business since 1977.

1974

NED CLINE, former head of the Raleigh (North Carolina) bureau of the *Charlotte Observer*, re-joined the staff of the *Greensboro Daily News* as assistant managing editor last July.

Cline had covered state government and politics for more than six years for the *Daily News* before moving to the *Observer*.

1975

ANDREW DRYSDALE, editor of the *Pretoria News* (South Africa), wrote a postcard to the Nieman office last autumn, "Guess who we have visiting us? None other than GUNTHER VOGEL [ZDF, Mainz, West Germany]. We have had a good week together remembering old times and friends. We are hoping to be in Europe next year with SHERYL FITZGERALD and the HAWPES. How many other takers? Love, Norma (Drysdale), Andrew and Gunther."

SHERYL FITZGERALD, health specialist reporter for *Newsday* (Long Island), also sent a postcard, from Germany, dated September 1st. "Vogel and I are just resting before going on to the rest of the booths at the Wine Market. Wish you were here..."

RANJAN GUPTA, area correspondent in New Delhi for *The Boston Globe*, NBC Radio (New York), Radio New Zealand and the *Sydney* (Australia) *Morning Herald*, is the author of *The Indian Ocean: A Political Geography* published by Marwah Publications, New Delhi, India.

1976

DALE A. BURK writes from Stevensville, Montana. "All's well with the Burks. As you know, we've committed our lives to a work-retreat ministry on a ranch owned by our church — the Easy Yoke Ranch in the Bitterroot Valley. I'm managing the ranch and writing free-lance, doing a column for the paper I used to work for (*The Missoulian*), and am at work on a couple of books and manage to do a couple of magazine articles a month.

"Beginning December first I also will edit a magazine of Christian thought and opinion, untitled as yet but to be patterned somewhat after *Sojourners*, the politically oriented magazine published in Washington, D.C.... We all are in good health and praise the Lord that we can live and work in our beloved Montana."

GUNTER HAAF, science editor of *Die Zeit* (Hamburg, West Germany), sends the Nieman office a snapshot of the four Haafs — Gunter, Elga, Nicholas Alexander, two, and Susanne Margarethe, one, with a note. "At the turn of the decade this is to show you the program of the Haaf family. Have a good time and another successful decade!"

JANOS HORVAT, head of TV films section, Hungarian Television in Budapest, has been promoted to the Film Department. He now deals with all the television movies produced abroad, and continues with his previous work, doing interviews for radio and television programs.

He and his wife, Anna Belia, are the parents of Sara, born July 16, 1979.

ARNOLD MARKOWITZ, reporter on the *Miami Herald*, sent a note during the hurricane season last fall. "I'm being whipsawed by weather. Hurricane David cost me a weekend and three days of vacation. I returned yesterday, and today, I'm back at it with Frederic...lead rewrite of material from far-flung correspondents, plus wires, and a story that changes about six times a minute right on the deadline, with every edition. I'm getting sick of hurricanes."

DAVID McNEELY, reporter with the *Austin American-Statesman*, has been named bureau chief for the Cox Newspapers Capitol bureau in Texas. McNeely had been acting bureau chief.

1977

CASSANDRA TATE, formerly a reporter with the *Lewiston* (Idaho) *Morning Tribune*, has moved to Seattle, Washington, where she is doing free-lance writing. She says, "At the top of this house is a large, airy loft which is (painfully slowly) turning into my office, from which I'll write any number of critically acclaimed and commercially successful books and otherwise indulge my fantasies."

Her address is 3133 35th Avenue, South, Seattle, Washington 98144.

JACK WHITE has been transferred from the New York office of *Time* magazine to Time-Life News Service in Kenya. His address is P.O. Box 30421, Nairobi, Kenya.

1978

KENNETH FREED, staff writer for *The Los Angeles Times*, sends a letter dated last September. "I have spent two years in Iran...arduous and exciting, to say the least...I was the first American tossed out of Iran for being anti-revolutionary and anti-Islamic....But in the way things are done in Tehran, I wasn't told I had been expelled until after I left on my own.

"One other piece of news. I had a mild heart attack in July; no big deal, but a bit scary. My progress and prognosis are excellent and the doctors tell me I should be back on the basketball court by November."

DANNY SCHECHTER, newscaster with Boston radio station WBCN, was honored with a New England regional Emmy for Outstanding Public Affairs series, for his work on the "Joe Oteri Show." The award was presented to him during the televised broadcast of the Boston/New England Chapter of the National Association of Television Arts and Sciences on December 1st. Danny's reaction to being honored with an Emmy will appear in a future issue. The now defunct "Joe Oteri Show," a nationally syndicated ninety-minute weekly talk show originating in Boston, had outlets in Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago and San Francisco.

Mr. Schechter in January joined the staff of Boston's Channel 5 WCVB as one producer of a new two-hour live all night television show.

FRANK SUTHERLAND Jr., formerly a reporter with the *Nashville Tennessean*, has been named city editor of that paper. He also was re-elected a regional director last fall at the annual convention of the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, in New York City. Sutherland's Region Twelve covers Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee.

Natilee Dunning Sutherland sends word that she is writing and editing on a free-lance basis. She and Frank expect a new baby in June. Kate, their daughter, born shortly after the beginning of their Nieman year, is now two years old.

KAROL SZYNDZIELORZ, senior columnist on foreign affiars, the *Daily Zycie Warszawy* (Poland) sends a postcard from France. "Warmest greetings from wintry Paris. I have been working on a World Newspaper Supplement, under the auspices of the United Nations..." Later, in another note from London: "I am editing the U.S. supplement of my paper, traveling a lot. Right now [I am] at Wilton Park Sussex. The subject of the conference is energy..."

1979

TOMAS DILLEN, executive producer and director, Swedish Broadcasting Corporation (Stockholm), made a documentary film with Anders Ribbsjoe in 1977 for Swedish television. Titled "John Albok, Merchant Tailor," it was shown recently in the United States nationally over the Public Television Service as part of their "World" series.

The film is the story of John Albok, a hard-working immigrant in New York City, in large part during the Great Depression. A review in *The New York Times* says, "The Swedish filmmakers have treated Mr. Albok with the quiet, unaffected dignity he deserves."

Tomas Dillen and Ulla Tegelmark were in this country before Christmas and visited, among other Niemans, the Michael McIvors in Toronto, and Peggy Simpson in Washington.

PEGGY ENGEL, government reporter with the *Des Moines Register* in Iowa, recently has been transferred to the Washington bureau of that newspaper.

JOHN HUFF, capital correspondent, Columbia bureau of the *Greenville* (South Carolina) *News*, writes, "My three girls (big and little) are doing fine back down here in the South, putting up famously with Daddy's refusal to readjust to civilian life. We all four find things a little dry after Boston and Niemanry, though."

FRANK VAN RIPER, Washington bureau correspondent for the *New York Daily News*, sends the following:

"The class, or at least a surprisingly large contingent of it, held a post-Thanksgiving dinner in the still-being-renovated townhouse of PEGGY SIMPSON in Washington, D.C. Among those present to make a delicious ham disappear were: Emily and GRAEME BEATON; Mary Fran and BILL GILDEA; PEGGY ENGEL; NANCY DAY; MIKE McIVOR; MICHAEL McDOWELL; and FRANK VAN RIPER.

"McDowell hopped down from New York...McIvor made a surprise appearance (from Toronto) since he was in town to cover the Washington end of the Iranian hostage drama. He came toting champagne that was used to toast, among other things, the birth of Joshua David McIvor (mom Carol Bishop is doing splendidly) as well as a prospective year's tour in Washington for all three, as Mike covers the 1980 presidential campaign for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

"Bill Gildea's editing chores for *The Washington Post* include putting out two special supplements on the Olympic games; the upcoming winter ones in Lake Placid, New York, and the summer games in Moscow.

"Peggy Simpson, covering Washington for the *Boston Herald American*, has been covering Ted Kennedy on the road about as much as Frank Van Riper has been covering Jimmy Carter's town meetings and other media events. She headed out for ten days with EMK almost as soon as she unloaded the dishwasher after her Nieman dinner.

"Frank Van Riper's White House coverage hasn't curtailed his freelancing. Besides *NR*, he also has appeared — or will — in *The Sunday New York News Magazine, Us* magazine and *The Smithsonian*."

1980

JUDITH STOIA, editor of the "Ten O'Clock News," WGBH-TV (Boston) is the author with Pamela Bullard of *The Hardest Lesson*, to be released by Little Brown in March. The book deals with the desegregation experience of eleven youngsters in the Boston school system, and shows the emotional wear and tear on these pupils. The conclusion: "There are no easy answers."

RANDOM NOTES

RICHARD LONGWORTH ('69) informs us that five alumni reminisced about their Nieman year at the annual gourmet dinner of the Harvard Club of Chicago last fall. Speaking were: VANCE JOHNSON ('41); TOM PUGH ('61); ED ROONEY ('60); CLIFF TERRY ('70) and Longworth himself.

*

In December a post card arrived in the Nieman office from Seoul, Korea, signed by four alumni — KEVIN BUCKLEY ('73), SE HYUNG CHO ('66), JAEHEE NAM ('68) and JIN-HYUN KIM ('73) — with a message from the Korean Fellows...

"So enjoyed tonight with Kevin — reminiscent of Cambridge!"

*

Six Nieman alumni are among the fifty-five editors named by Dr. William J. McGill, president of Columbia University, to make up this year's Pulitzer Prize nominating jury for journalism. They are:

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL ('57), editor, *The Gainesville* (Georgia) *Times*; NORMAN A. CHERNISS ('59), executive editor, *The Press-Enterprise*, Riverside, California; JOHN O. EMMERICH Jr.('62), editor-publisher, *The Greenwood* (Mississippi) *Commonwealth*; REG MURPHY ('60), editor, *The San Francisco Examiner*; RALPH OTWELL ('60), editor, the *Chicago Sun-Times*; and JOHN HUGHES ('62), president, Hughes Newspapers, Inc., Orleans, Massachusetts.

*

In San Francisco at Thanksgiving time, Tenney Lehman was hostess at a last-minute, informal gathering of local Niemans. Meeting at the Press Club for drinks were: BOB DE ROOS ('49); Hazel and OSCAR BUTTEDAHL ('40); MARY ELLEN LEARY ('46); Maureen and FRED GARRETSON ('71); Jinx and JEFF MORGAN ('72); BOB MAYNARD ('66); Gertrude and BILL GERMAN ('50); and Eileen and RON JAVERS ('76). HARRY PRESS ('56) had turned his ankle on the tennis court that afternoon, so he and Martha were unable to be there.

Tenney joined WALLY TURNER ('59), PHIL HAGER ('68) and Bill German for luncheon one day; and another, she and Mary Ellen Leary had a leisurely meal on the waterfront in Sausalito.

*

Nieman alumni/ae were well represented in the December 10th issue of *Time* magazine. The Press section was solid with Niemans. The lead piece, "A Diplomat on the Podium," commenting on HODDING CARTER ('66) and his position as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, was followed by "Private Affairs: A Columnist for the Home Front," discussing ELLEN GOODMAN ('74) and her newest book, *Close to Home*. The Newswatch column by THOMAS GRIFFITH ('43) occupied the rest of the two-page section. The photo for the American Scene section (Los Alamos: A City Upon a Hill) credited to STEPHEN NORTHUP ('74), a photographer for *Time*.

*

A series of articles spotlighting "dangerous doctors" — alcoholics, drug addicts, incompetents and psychopaths — practicing medicine in Florida has won a team of three reporters and an editor with the *Miami Herald* the Newspaper Guild's Heywood Broun Award for 1979.

Niemans on the team are reporter GENE MILLER ('68) and special projects editor WILLIAM MONTALBANO ('70). The other reporters are Carl Hiaasen and Patrick Malone.

The award — $1,000 for the four, a citation for the *Herald* — was presented to Mr. Miller, representing all concerned, at a luncheon at the National Press Club on January 28th.

It is the second time Miller has won the award. A series leading to the release of two persons unjustly convicted of murder won him the Broun prize for 1966.

*

Five Nieman alumni/ae participated in a three-day conference titled "Nominating a President: The Process and the Press" sponsored by the Institute of Politics and *The Los Angeles Times* at Harvard University in February.

HALE CHAMPION ('57) served as moderator for one of the round-table discussions, "The New Hampshire Primary." CATHERINE MACKIN ('68), correspondent with ABC News; JACK NELSON ('62), Washington bureau chief, *The Los Angeles Times*; and HEDRICK SMITH ('70), Washington correspondent, *The New York Times*, were members of Champion's panel. JAMES DOYLE ('65), Washington deputy bureau chief, *Newsweek*, was a member of another panel, "Covering the Issues."

In an attempt to improve the public's understanding, the symposium examined the presidential nominating process and brought together the perspectives of two groups — those who run the campaigns and those who cover them.

NIEMAN LIBRARY GIFT

As a unique contribution to the Walter Lippmann House, Daniel D. Chabris (Harvard 1948) of Armonk, New York, has given a collection of the works of Walter Lippmann for the Nieman Library. The thirty books which he presented were published between 1913 and 1917. They are in superior condition; many are first editions and have their original dust jacket.

On behalf of the Nieman Foundation, James C. Thomson Jr., Curator, accepted this unusual and valuable gift with much gratitude.

One of the most comfortable tasks carried out at this desk is compiling news about Nieman Fellows, even though it is often like trying to hold a piece of mercury which rolls, separates, and rejoins itself endlessly. Our mail house tells us *NR* has the largest turnover in address changes, even though it's one of their smallest accounts.

Nieman Notes is compiled from your letters (we love them) and from the reports of a few conscientious Nieman class scribes; the rest is gleaned from publications, and bits and pieces picked up here and there.

We very much want to know what you're doing and where you are; let us hear from you, please.

—T.B.K.L.

Printer's Mark
Manutius Aldus, Venezia (1494)

NIEMAN REPORTS
(USPS #430-650)
P.O. Box 4951
Manchester, NH 03108

Second-class postage
PAID
at Boston, Mass.
and additional entries

MOVING???

Attach your mailing label here:

New address:

Name _____

Street _____

City/State/Zip _____

Country _____

Mail to: Nieman Reports Subscription Service,
P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108