Nieman Reports

June 1967

Social Science: A New Beat?

By Philip Meyer

also in this issue:

Eugene Patterson

Eric Sevareid

Robert U. Brown

Wang Thi-Wu

William P. Steven

Louis M. Lyons

Nieman Fellowships Announced for 1967-68

NiemanReports

VOL. XXI, NO. 2 JUNE 1967

Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

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

Politics and the Press

By Eric Sevareid

I cannot imagine an occasion in my life of greater satisfaction and moment than this one. I had never thought that I would one day be welcomed before this ancient body, that I would climb this hill in this Commonwealth, which become landmarks on the indelible map of the inner mind when the schoolboy first opens the book of the great American story. Here, more than anywhere else, I should think, began the process of welding the Athenians' art of democracy with the Romans' science of government.

I was a schoolboy on the Dakota prairies where all was new and raw and wanted building. At times, as my understanding increased, I envied those of my generation who were born in places like this, the old and established places, and had, I thought, only to open their minds and arms and inherit it all, ready made. But I am grateful, now, for my origins. At each stage of the westering impulse America re-made itself socially and physically from the beginnings, from the log house and the loneliness, the hand axe and the terrible labors. Something of what your forebears, very long ago, experienced on these shores of rock, my forebears, not very long ago, experienced on those plains of snow and dust. I understood the Pilgrims and what it meant for them far sooner than I understood Harvard and its meaning.

But there was a precious thing we did not have to build, which we took from you. It came through the few books in the library off Main Street; it came through the speeches of the occasional Chautauqua lecturer who appeared in the Opera House above the general store; it came through the talk of my father at the dinner table. New England, Massachusetts, Boston—the great men, their electrifying, illuminating words, as stirring to us then out there as they must have been to your ancestors when they were spoken and written here. They formed the invisible environment in which we lived, the most lasting environment of all. By this mysterious alchemy the miracle of Americanism, of national union was performed, quietly, in secret as it were, across thousands of miles, the invisible cords stretching into every valley and clearing, guiding us, binding us all in the face of the worst that the world and our own worst nature could bring against us.

So it is good to be here, where all seems familiar and reassuring, nothing strange; a place I have, in a sense, inhabited all my life.

I am to talk to you about politics and the press, and their relationship, the high art of governing men and the profession or the calling, at least, of informing and explaining to men.

I represent what is called electronic journalism, to use a phrase I once coined in one of my less graceful moments. It was, with radio, the function of informing and explaining through the ear; and now with television, through both ear and eye. And it has become the most immediate, dramatic, in some ways the most powerful form of journalism. Certainly, the most personal, as the affectionate letters from strangers and the denunciatory telegrams arriving at offices like mine attest every day.

The politician, local or national, the journalist, in print or by broadcast, have more than a little in common, beyond the fact that we make our mistakes in public and have no

(Continued on page 18)

Social Science: A New Beat?

By Philip Meyer

It has been roughly half a century since popular writers first began to announce that the age of social science had arrived. Their recurrent theme was that the natural sciences had brought our physical surroundings under control, and the time had come for the sociologists and political scientists to reshape the social environment. Nothing of the sort ever happened, and maybe it never will. But there are signs that the social sciences, as practiced by a new breed of researchers and technicians, have reached a point where they can have significant effects on our social and political institutions.

Some social scientists have moved from abstract theory building to the development of information with immediate practical application. And some politicians and policy makers are beginning to use this practical information. Understanding and reporting these developments offers a new challenge for newspapers.

The coming together of new social research methods and computer technology provides the public officeholder with two kinds of opportunity. He can use the new, action-oriented research to give a firm factual basis to his policy decisions. And he can use it as an aid in getting elected and reelected.

Scientific voting surveys have been around since the Gallup poll began in 1936. Franklin Roosevelt began using secret survey data in the 1930's. One of the first politicians to make open use of a scientific poll as a campaign tool was Jacob Javits, who hired Elmo Roper to survey his Manhattan district when he first ran for Congress in 1946. Javits called it "invaluable as a gauge of popular sentiment on a wide number of important issues." But a really sophisticated use of survey materials did not take place until 1960.

In that year, Ithiel de Sola Pool, political scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a group of associates formed Simulmatics Corp. and went to work for the Democratic National Committee. Their resources were a fat collection of old survey data, large-memory computers, and previously developed theories of voting behavior. They prepared a computer simulation—a mathematical model of the voting public as represented by 480 specific voter types stored in the machines' core memory—and cranked in the estimated effects of the major issues to see what would happen. Their interpretation of the computer output led to more than a hundred pages of detailed strategy advice.

Pool and the others make no claim that Kennedy did what he did because of their advice. They deny that they had the "incredible influence" which they saw attributed to them in Eugene Burdick's fictitious account, *"The* 480." Yet, the candidate's actions did match most of their suggestions, including the crucial decision to hit the religion issue head-on. And Kennedy did win.

After the election, when the state-by-state outcome was compared with the computer predictions, the simulation was found to be significantly more accurate than the early polls. It was almost spooky, because the Pool group had built the simulation with old data, none of it gathered after 1958.

The model portrayed real life accurately enough to reflect the actual trends in the two years before the 1960 election.

Social scientists are divided on the meaning of Pool's success. Some think he was just lucky. What went on inside the computer was not as important, they argue, as the intuitive judgments made by the men who decided what to put into the machine. Others note that Pool, working on his own and not for the National Committee in 1964, was able to create an even more accurate simulation of the Johnson-Goldwater contest. Politicians are sensing the presence of a useful tool here, and the use of computers in election campaigns is growing. Newsmen who can resist the temptations to denounce these techniques as black art on the one hand or as a fraud on the other, may find, somewhere between, a vital, running story.

Social science has other new applications, beyond the manipulation of elections. These, too, involve prediction and fact finding. Today's developments were foreshadowed in World War II when Samuel Stouffer, Harvard's late pioneer in research methods, ran a morale study of American soldiers for the War Department. Besides becoming a landmark in large-scale social research, it had the immediate practical effect of inspiring the point system for the discharge of soldiers after Germany's surrender. Stouffer's work also laid the foundation for the postwar desegregation of the armed forces.

Today's hottest example of policy-oriented research is a report on the effects of school segregation produced last year for the U.S. Office of Education by James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University. Coleman is another of the new breed of social scientists who dig for facts first and theorize second. He has been described as the outstanding methodologist in social science today. His assignment was to direct the survey provided in Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to trace the effects of lack of equal educational opportunity on members of minority groups.

Under Coleman's direction, researchers went into schools across the land, tested the children, compared the schools and the test results, and used some new statistical tools to sort out the cause-and-effect relationships. It was done in 15 months, a feat that would have been impossible without computers.

The report, a 737-page volume entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity," was released over the Fourth of July week-end. It got scant attention. Reporters who thumbed through it were confronted by hordes of numbers arranged in tables, charts, and graphs. The numbers assaulted the eye and made the brain dizzy.

But there was meaning in those numbers. The Coleman Report offered hard evidence that the popular way of looking at the problem of educational equality for Negroes is just plain wrong. Shunting disadvantaged students aside for special treatment does not help. Compensatory education, the orthodox remedy, has some illusory short-range benefits, but in the long run it deprives pupils of the best thing they may have had going for them: association with children who are better off.

The primary correlate of achievement scores, the report said, is home background. The major educational variable is the social class climate of the school. Put a disadvantaged Negro in a predominantly white, middle-class school, and he begins to absorb the values and aspirations of the majority, and his achievement rises.

Although the message was not brought home to newspaper readers, it did draw the attention of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Members of the Commission accepted the results of Coleman's fact-finding efforts and, with the aid of social science consultants, went on from there to gather more evidence and make their own analysis. Their report, issued in February, rested on the assumption that equal educational opportunity cannot exist in schools which are predominantly Negro. Then came the logical conclusion that only a drastic reorganization of school attendance patterns can bring long-run equality. To achieve such a reorganization, the Commission asked for a law withholding federal aid from school districts where Negroes are bunched together beyond an acceptable proportion.

It was a drastic proposal, and the response was overwhelmingly negative. Editorial writers, Congressmen, and other critics declared that the Commission's assumptions about compensatory education and the effects of segregation just couldn't be so. Their common sense was affronted. None of the critics appeared to be concerned about the research data behind the assumptions.

The argument here is not that social science research findings should be accepted unquestioningly. It is only that something as solid as the Coleman Report cannot safely be ignored. The report's conclusions can be challenged only by finding that the necessary evidence is not presented, that the methodology is inappropriate, or that the deductions do not follow logically from the data.

No such challenge was made or even attempted. The significance of Coleman's findings was not generally understood. The public could not see the difference between Coleman's digging for facts and the arm-chair philosophising which passed for sociology in an earlier era.

The difference is vast and important. Coleman extracted facts from his numbers with statistical tools, such as complex, multivariate regression analysis, which were not available to social scientists a generation ago. These new tools had to be designed especially for the many-faceted variables of social science. Once designed, they needed the development of computers to make their use feasible. In fact, some of the not-so-new statistical devices went largely unused until computers became available.

One example is factor analysis, a method of identifying

the underlying dimensions in a mass of data that may seem chaotic on the surface. Two political scientists made professional history when they applied factor analysis to the 1932 presidential vote in Chicago and published their results in the December, 1935, issue of the American Political Science Review. But the job was so tedious and required so much pencil-and-paper figuring that a second factor analysis project did not turn up in that scholarly publication for another 25 years. The second project was done with computers.

Something new is happening here, and it is happening with accelerating speed. The Mark I computer, Harvard's mechanical forerunner to today's electronic units, was put into operation in 1944. Its operating speeds were measured in milleseconds (one millesecond = .001 second). Today's machines do their work in nanoseconds—billionths of seconds. The fast-breaking developments now are in ways to use this speed through the "softwear" or programming systems.

Until this year, most social scientists have had to struggle with FORTRAN, a computer language invented for chemists and physicists. But at Harvard, a team headed by Arthur Couch is putting the finishing touches on DATA-TEXT, a computer language designed specifically for social scientists. While not simple, it can be and is taught to college sophomores and juniors in sociology. With this language and a ten-dollar program tape, students can make an IBM computer (7090 or 7094) do the tricks that the most sophisticated social scientists used to reject because they were too cumbersome and time-consuming.

The implications are not hard to see. There will be progressively less reason for basing decisions of public policy on folklore and "common sense." The Coleman Report could mark the beginning of a new intensification of the traditional American respect for facts as the basis for action.

However, if the benefits of the new vigor in social science are to be properly utilized, somebody is going to have to get the word to the ultimate policy makers, the public. For newspapers, the situation contains some analogies to the growth of science reporting. Although some papers have had science writers for a long time, the rush to develop this specialty did not begin until the space race showed dramatically how science is changing the world. The new look in social science is not as flashy as a Sputnik, but its long-run effect on people will be greater.

There are also important points of difference between writing about the natural sciences and the social sciences. These differences tend to emphasize the need for competent reporting.

The physical science writer's job is to let the reader know what the scientists are up to and how the results will change his life or that of his children. While he may not be able to operate a spectroscope, he can communicate with the man who does and bridge the gap between scientist and reader. If the scientist says the moon's surface is made of dust, the writer will ordinarily not question this conclusion until another scientist asserts that it is rock.

But the social science writer needs to develop a critical facility. Social science has not yet shaken down to the point where it is easy to identify the fringe operators. There is no equivalent of a local medical society to put the finger on a quack pollster.

The problem overlays a general underestimation of the amount of scientific training and precision that must go into social research. Social scientists themselves are partly to blame. They have tended to oversell their product, make it look easier than it is. They have sometimes reached conclusions that were too sweeping and too quickly accepted.

Harvard's Stouffer put his finger on it when he said that Americans have a cultural quirk which makes us believe that anyone with "a little common sense and a few facts can come up at once with the correct answer on any subject." For examples, one need look no farther than the Congressional Record, especially when Congressmen discourse on such emotion-laden subjects as public welfare or the punishment of crime or desegregation.

When everyone thinks he can be his own amateur sociologist, the professionals can get away with sloppy work, and they have. Much social science, Stouffer wrote in 1950, consists of "a few data and a lot of 'interpretation.'" The absence of true connection between the data and the interpretation, he added, is hidden by academic jargon. And "if the stuff is hard to read, it has a chance of being acclaimed as profound."

That sort of social science can still be found today, and reporters must learn to spot it and separate it from the work of the growing core of social scientists who have descended from the ivory tower. Newspapers must learn to recognize the new breed which digs for facts and produces solid information which does deserve to be the basis of public policy. This task, separating the scientific from the spurious, is not being done today. Many newspapers, for example, blandly report the outcomes of polls as if all polls were alike. A congressman's poll, which shows that 93 per cent of his constituents agree with him on all issues, is reported without comment, even though the poll is blatantly biased by a host of factors, e.g. loaded questions by the congressman and self-selection by his constituents (if they like him, they are more likely to respond).

Not even the respected Harris and Gallup polls should be immune from searching appraisal. Earlier this year, the two organizations produced opposite results on the relative popularity of Richard Nixon and George Romney among Republican voters. Papers which subscribe to both polls shrugged their editorial shoulders and ran the conflicting reports side by side without comment, in the time-honored tradition of "letting the reader decide." If the highly edu-

cated staff of a metropolitan newspaper cannot interpret such a discrepancy, how can the poor reader be expected to do it?

There is no defense here in the reluctance of pollsters to publish their methodological trade secrets. A paper which buys the service is in a position to insist that it be given the relevant facts on procedure. The real problem, of course, is that no one knows what questions to ask.

Another problem is that many agencies of government—at all levels—while anxious to use research to guide policy making, are reluctant to share its fruits with the public. A recent editorial page of the Washington Post referred to two such cases: a survey of the morale of District of Columbia policemen (the situation was so bad the city government was ashamed to publish the results) and a Harris study of Job Corps dropouts. The latter survey had been leaked to the Post, to the accompaniment of much agonizing by Job Corps officials. Their fears were unjustified, the newspaper properly admonished them. All the survey proved was that their job was tougher than many people realized.

A common excuse for withholding research results is expressed as a fear, sometimes genuine, that the public won't understand. Whatever validity this fear might have would vanish if reporters had some training in social science methodology. There are other, greater advantages to such training.

A reporter trying to pry information from reluctant officials needs to know what he is looking for. A knowledge of the problems of social science research can help here. Social psychologist Thomas Pettigrew of Harvard provided an example when he offered Nieman Fellows a tip for covering educational experiments.

When a new gadget or system of teaching is tried out, Pettigrew said, the research that tests it generally follows a predictable pattern. Students exposed to the new device or system are tested before and after exposure. Then their performance on achievement tests is compared with that of students who were taught in the old way.

Such tests invariably show that the students who get the special treatment do better. Then the educators call a press conference to describe the wonderful new teaching gimmick they have invented.

But what may have happened, Pettigrew cautioned, is that the improvement was not related to the new device at all. Teachers who were using it were unconsciously trying harder. So were the students, who realized they were being singled out for special treatment. This phenomenon is called the Hawthorne effect, after the wire factory where it was first noted in a classic series of experiments. Eventually, the effect wears off and all evidence of better performance disappears. School authorities then put a stop to further testing and lock up their latest results. If a reporter asks about them, he is told the tests are "confidential" to "protect the privacy of the students." A reporter with a social science background is not likely to accept such a response at face value.

Once acceptance is gained for the concept of social science as a beat, the question of staffing it remains. Newspapers will probably have to get social science writers in the same way they acquired their first physical science writers, by growing their own. They will have to assign men to this specialty, and these men will have to start talking to social scientists, reading the literature, and developing the beat. Recognizing it as a beat is the first step.

Fortunately, many reporters now come to their trade with some basic grounding in the social sciences. Those who are not journalism school graduates are often political science or sociology majors. And even the journalism schools, at least those with strong graduate programs, are often able to offer solid work in social science methodology, especially as it applies to public opinion research.

By turning attention to this area, newspapers will be fullfilling their still-developing role of letting readers in on the inside of the decisions and processes that shape their lives. Social science news will turn out few stories of the man-bites-dog variety. But man-bites-dog is not the standard and never was. The biggest news story is the one that shows the reader how his life will be changed. Whether you denounce them as planners or praise them as social engineers, the social scientists as newsmakers are here.

Mr. Meyer has been studying social science at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow this year. He is a member of the Washington Bureau of Knight Newspapers.

A Wurlitzer-Tradition Talker

By Eugene Patterson

John N. Popham looks like a larcenous choirboy, a weathered cherub hunting—but not very hard—for a return to innocence.

The Marine Corps haircut is a gesture to his colonelcy, though the wall-to-wall grin is a denial of sternness. The records show he made nine Pacific landings and got decorated at Tarawa. But Pop is really a very peaceful newspaperman—until somebody shoves somebody.

He has been managing editor of The Chattanooga Times for going on a decade now. Before that he put in 25 years as a New York Times reporter, 12 of them on the Southern beat before anybody else discovered Negroes are news.

He never did look like a New York Times reporter. He wears striped suits, tells improbable stories, and never made an intentional understatement. He savors hyperbole the way some men use whiskey (he takes coffee only), and if he went to Hanoi he would probably punch somebody in the nose.

Popham is, on the whole, as much a Southern institution as Old Grand Dad or Turner Catledge. Virginia-born and yard-raised in a career-Marine family, he speaks that bent Tidewater accent with the brokeback "about." And how he does speak.

When Johnny Popham turns on it's a happening.

He is one of the great talkers in the Wurlitzer tradition. Ask him a question and step back. His eyes flash as if you'd turned up the lights. He emits a gutteral preparatory sound of some deep pleasure, the smile breaks, the hands come up and the music begins. No simple melody for him. As he warms to the theme he begins to weave in the variation, put in the counterpoint and soar now and then in a golden cadenza of such virtuosity that you realize you have activated the master. One of the truly entertaining raconteurs of this mute generation, Popham is a rebuke to the terse and a scourge to the literal. He wants to get it all in —the fact-enwrapped whole in its natal mood, with Muzak.

And to know the whole Popham you have to take him the same way. Wise, warm and gifted, he's held in deep affection. But beyond and behind that, among those who know him, is a regard and respect for the remarkable integrity of the work he has done. Selma, Stokely, King and Col. Penn came way after he and The Times were on to the South story. He was down here before they were, laying down the background whole. He is one of those who did serious work early.

Popham got his Southern insight in New York, of all places. True, he went there with a Southern heritage. His family had used the tools of its Virginia social setting—good conversation, love of reading, respect for intellect. Moreover, the Pophams had a streak of liberalism in them. During Reconstruction his great-grandfather had published his own newspaper in Richmond, The Southern Intelligencer. The paper tried to heal war wounds and build some kind of new society for the defeated Southerner and the new freedman. Great-grand Pop had even been campaign manager for the Confederate general, Billy Mahone, who became Virginia's first postwar senator, running on the Readjuster ticket.

"I guess there was always the threat in the family that the monolithic South was not completely true," he says.

Yet few understand the Southerner better or respect him more. New York formed Popham for that.

He discovered the multi-cultural society on the pavement beats for The Times. He absorbed the Irish agonies in the saloons, the Jewish loneliness walking the East Side streets eating knishes. He learned a great sympathy for the ordeal of a cultural grouping that is tearing down its myth and discovering new American truths.

With that resource from his New York days added to his inborn Southernness, Popham came South like a William Tecumseh Beauregard to watch the destruction of his own home myth.

"You learn (in these groups subjected to change) that the right or wrong posture or stand is something you must take when human beings are opposing tyranny and violence," he says, "but not when they are simply shedding myths that were warming though inadequate. I learned a lot about the phantoms that walk through a man's mind all his life; when he comes to terms with them he builds his structures out of them."

He struck out to know the Negro—a pretty much unthinkable mission in the middle 1940's. He drove 50,000 miles a year around the South, stopping in towns, standing on the corners, visiting the Negro churches, campuses and political meetings.

When the usual celebrated white was imported for a day to make a commencement speech at Tuskegee or Morehouse, Popham covered the speech like the others. But he went back then to the campus and stood by the punch bowl and listened to the unheard people. He wound up in professors' homes for talk into the night, and he began to know and tell the truths white America hadn't known.

Armed with the trust of Southern Negroes, Popham turned to the Southern whites and began trying to put the story together. He gives credit for his own insights to the interpretive help he got from those native newspapermen he calls "the lovely ones"—the Ralph McGills and Hodding Carters and Pete McKnights and Harry Ashmores, and the Harold Flemings and George Mitchells and the young professors who had studied under Odum. He traded his shoe-leather information with them in return for an interpretive "brilliance I could only borrow from them," and he wrote this journalistic synthesis for the nation.

He went hunting his own white child-friends of the 1920's —"the lovely young girls who went to Lake Junaluska in the summer for the Methodist assemblies, the girls and boys who wore on their Sunday jackets the markers that showed their accomplishment as Bible readers, the boys and girls who dreamed and who talked far into the summer night about the world they would explore, the carefree and happy ones—where did they go, how did they feel; did the seeds of their churchly background and courteous Southern manners always fall on barren ground?

"I went searching for them in the sense that I visited with white Southerners everywhere, stood in packed halls making what we call our Southern conversation—the little references that permit you to trace the early life rather swiftly—his recollection of Hi-Y days, of football games, of dancing the Charleston, of wringing the head off the chicken in the backyard to prepare for Sunday dinner, of freezing the ice cream on the back porch in summer—and of course the intimate expression, at this point, of how he really feels about race."

He quickly found those who made the segregationist South less than monolithic—"the agronomist at the state university experiment station, the nutritionist in the high school system, the dedicated church worker, the unassuming technician in a host of new industries and installations. And often it would be a topflight businessman, one of that breed with vision who could take some local challenge to ameliorate things or harmonize the race relations, and would carry it as far as he could go before he lost his 'safe' ground."

It was in those years that Pop learned the white South was not a monolith and the Negro was not a mute, and he laid down the background, for what was to come, as it surely did.

Through all those years, and now at Chattanooga, Pop kept coming back and back to his chief conviction that education is the liberating factor for a group in change. "This more than anything else allows a man to shed that myth and take on new views without too much hurt and with no need for any organized violence."

And he has backed up his work as a managing editor—"one tries to shape a newspaper to the needs of the community"—with outside service on countless committees that support Southern education programs. When he's not hustling off to the corners of the South to help boards plan the programs, he's beating off invitations to talk about them from program chairmen who know of his golden oratory.

He loves to bulge the eyes of young managing editors with tales of his days covering Dewey's gangbusters, Tammany Hall, the Lindbergh kidnaping and Murder, Inc. But he is, above all, one of those really good men who came to the South to see it through—to apply his understanding and his gift to helping his kinfolks at least see things clearly through the ordeal of shedding a myth.

His boy, John N., IV, and his girl, Hilary B., are teenagers making splendid records in Chattanooga. With their getting older, he hopes to get out of the office and visit around the South more. He'll be welcome wherever he goes.

Mr. Patterson, editor of The Atlanta Constitution, won this year's Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing. This profile is reprinted from the ASNE Bulletin.

The Changing American Press

By Robert U. Brown

Forty-one years ago in the early morning hours of July 16, 1926, assassin's bullets took the life of Don R. Mellett, the crusading publisher of the Canton (Ohio) Daily News.

Three years later the annual Don R. Mellett Memorial Lectureship was founded by a committee headed by James Melvin Lee, then chairman of the department of journalism, New York University, who also wrote the weekly book review column for Editor & Publisher.

My father, the late James Wright Brown, then president of Editor & Publisher, was one of a committee of three which administered the lectureship fund under the custodianship of New York University. Because of this long association I am highly honored to have been invited to play a part in this year's tribute to Don Mellett.

A lot of journalistic history has flowed under the bridge in 41 years. If you look at the July 17, 1926 issue of Editor & Publisher which carried the story of Mellett's death you could say there isn't much new in the newspaper world.

The Kansas City Star was sold for the second highest price in newspaper history. Another story said "publishers and typographers are still deadlocked in New York over the question of a new wage scale contract."

A young fellow named Louis Seltzer was made chief editorial writer of the Cleveland Press. The Associated Press launched its picture service to newspapers with photos and mats. A weekly editor in Indiana faced jail for non-payment of a court fine incurred in a fight with the local town administration.

John A. Park, publisher of the Raleigh (N.C.) Times, the newly-elected president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, said lack of information on the day-to-day course of business has brought about the ruin of more established newspapers than any other cause. He emphasized the value of accurate accounting records.

Two East St. Louis reporters solved a kidnaping case. Reporters were beaten up by company guards during a New York transit strike. Six months linage gains for 30 cities broke all records. The Federal Trade Commission was divided on a proposal to make publishers equally responsible for carrying fraudulent or misleading advertising with those who place the ads.

The Texas Press Association was trying to define an ideal managing editor. There was a debate in Congress about second class mail rates.

John D. Rockefeller Jr. refused to permit pictures of his family. R. J. Smothers of Holyoke, Mass., claimed two new inventions: one for offset printing and the other for a photo-composition device. And the Canton (Ohio) Daily News, Don Mellett's paper, announced plans for a new building.

Change the names, titles and places and these same stories are being reported today. Newspapers are still being sold at record prices. Poorly managed newspaper properties still have tough going. New York papers are still having bargaining problems with the printers. Second class mail rates are an issue; advertising is under attack by FTC and others; people are still refusing to have their pictures taken or their words quoted in newspapers, magazines and books.

But if you take a broader view you will see that today's newspaper and its problems are vastly different than yesterday's even though the Department of Justice is reluctant to admit it. 1926 marked the end of newspapers' monopoly as the only medium of mass communications. That was the year radio came of age and the first radio network was launched by the National Broadcasting Company. What KDKA pioneered in 1920 had multiplied into 528 stations across the country. In 1946 there were more than 1,000 radio stations and at the end of 1965 there were 4,103. In addition to these AM stations, FM broadcasting which was in the experimental stage during World War II, is represented by 1390 stations.

The first news magazine, Time, was started in the early 20's. It was followed later by others and then the picture magazines which appeared in the 30's. Their circulation grew into the millions and now an advertiser can buy circulation in almost any state or group of states in regional editions. The president of Time, Inc., said recently that 20 per cent of the advertising revenue in Time and Life comes from these regional editions.

Television is almost a johnny-come-lately in this picture. There were six stations on the air in 1946. By 1950 this had grown to 97. Today there are 598 commercial television stations operating with another 100 authorized by the Federal Communications Commissions.

Radio, which started from scratch about 40 years ago, now does an annual advertising volume of over $763 million. Television has grown to more than a billion and a half dollar volume in a little more than 15 years. In 40 years the news and picture magazines have risen to more than $400 million in annual advertising volume.

You may ask at this point: "What does all this have to do with the newspaper business?" In the early '30's the newspaper business, along with everything else in this country, came upon hard times. A lot of newspapers failed to survive the Depression years. There were pessimists who thought that the new and powerful electronic marvel, radio, would spell the doom of almost all newspapers. Why should anyone pay two or three cents a day for a newspaper when they could get the news plus entertainment over the air delivered into their homes for nothing?

But it didn't turn out that way. The newspapers that went under didn't die because of radio competition. Mostly they succumbed to bad management and uneconomic situations that became accentuated by the general Depression. The stronger papers soon found that news reports on the radio increased the appetite of the public for more details in print. The rapidly growing news magazines also failed to kill off the newspapers. The weekly digest of world events could not take the place of the daily report in newspapers, especially the local report which no national magazine can duplicate.

This 40-year rise of three important new competitors should have had a profound effect upon the daily newspaper business of this country. It did. But it wasn't all doom and gloom as some critics of the press would have us believe. They have made a fetish of pointing to what some of them have labelled "The Disappearing Newspaper." They say we had 2001 daily newspapers in 1926, when Don Mellett died, now we only have 1754 dailies. Ergo, a decline of about 250 newspapers means the business is "going to hell in a hand basket." They could have pointed out there were a couple of hundred more newspapers that closed their doors in that period, but it is hard for anyone to admit that a couple of hundred new dailies have been started at the same time.

When you point out that there are more daily newspapers today than there were in 1945 at the close of World War II there is general astonishment. When you add there were three more dailies at the end of 1966 than there were at the end of 1965, in spite of the loss of two more dailies in New York City, it is difficult to believe.

New York City for years has been the horrible example of disappearing newspapers. The phenomenon is so easily explained when you realize there are 31 successful daily newspapers published within commuting distance of downtown Manhattan where the existing four metropolitan papers are published. In 42 years when Manhattan-based papers were declining in numbers from 14 to six, eight other papers published in the boroughs of New York City and Long Island showed circulation increases of 262 per cent; nine dailies in Westchester County to the North increased 246 per cent; 14 dailies in New Jersey to the West increased 170 per cent in circulation. This growth has been accentuated in the last six months by the demise of two more downtown papers.

The next critical comment is usually that the sale of daily newspapers hasn't kept pace with the rise in population. It hasn't. But when you remember that most of our recent increase in population was due to the so-called postwar "baby boom" and that babies never have and never will buy newspapers, then you get a different picture. Compare the growth of the adult population, those between 21 and 65 years of age, with the growth of circulation and you will find that since 1946 adult population has increased 17.4 per cent while daily newspaper circulation has gone up more than 19 per cent.

Those 2001 dailies of Don Mellett's day sold 36,000,000 copies per day. As of Jan. 1, 1967, our present 1754 dailies are selling 61,397,000 copies per day, according to E&P's latest figures. That is an increase of over 1,000,000 copies per day in the last year.

For a long time the critics of the press added to their complaint the assertion that newspapers were losing their influence with their readers. Proof of this, they asserted, was

that a majority of newspapers editorially opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt in four elections and the people elected him in spite of it. It was never a very valid argument and since Eisenhower was elected twice having a majority of the newspapers supporting him, and not necessarily because of it, the argument has stopped.

The gloom and doom philosophy about the newspaper business is finally dispelled by an analysis of advertising volume. In the face of new multi-million dollar competition newspaper advertising volume has increased from slightly over a billion dollars in 1946 to about four billion eight million in 1966. That this represents genuine growth and not just increased advertising rates is shown by the newsprint consumption figures which have doubled since 1946.

That increased use of newsprint also reflects a larger news and editorial product as well. For newspapers of over 100,000 circulation there was a 50 per cent increase in editorial content from 1946 to 1964—from 12 pages on the average to 18 pages. For the smaller papers the increases would be more because over a 10-year period from '53 to '63 the increased use of newsprint in cities of less than 100,000 population was 41 per cent while it was 15 per cent for newspapers in cities of over 1,000,000 population and the national average was only 24 per cent.

What is the reason for this almost phenomenal growth of newspapers in the face of so much stiff competition for the public's increasing amount of leisure time? It didn't "just happen." It has happened, in my opinion, because of the basic and fundamental vitality of The Newspaper as a communications medium. It is something that people need and want enough to buy every day. They used to pay two and three cents per copy, then five cents, then 10 cents. Now George Gallup says that eight out of ten people or 79 per cent of American newspaper buyers would be willing to pay 15 cents for their daily paper.

That indicates to us that they must think it is worth it. This growth has happened also because newspapermen, contrary to assertions, have not been complacent, they have not resisted change. To the contrary they have been improving their plant and equipment to the tune of $100,000,000 per year ever since 1946. They have been improving their product. They have been enlarging their staffs.

I am not one of those who look back with nostalgia to the so-called "good old days" in the newspaper business—to the early '20's and before. Of course, there was great competition between newspapers then. Any town of any size had at least two newspapers. What most people do not realize is that many of them were not self-supporting. They were supported, maintained and subsidized by utilities magnates, traction kings, political parties, political bosses—by anyone who had an axe to grind before the public.

They fought each other tooth and nail. Certainly, it must have been fun. But it didn't necessarily add up to good journalism. It added up to partisanship. For every paper that skinned a politician alive there was another that eulogized him. Our newspapers today may not be as colorful as they were, they definitely are not as sensational, and in my opinion they are better newspapers. Take your file copies of 30 or 40 years ago and put them next to today's editions and it becomes obvious.

If you get the impression I am "bullish" about the newspaper business, it is because I am. There is more opportunity in the newspaper business today than at any time in the last 40 years—not just for publishers and owners but for young people with ambition and talent who want to become newspapermen and women.

Paul Miller, president of the Associated Press and head of the Gannett Newspapers, made this comment last year with which I agree heartily:

"Newspapers today are better—in volume and variety of news and features and editorial matter, in makeup and display, in art and typography and color printing, in public service, in content, in balance, in depth, in accuracy, in responsibility than ever before."

Being better than they were is good, but not enough. Newspapers will have to show steady improvement, keep up with the times, and I think they will. There is proof of this in the fact that up until last year 734 newspapers sent 4,387 newspapermen back to school to seminars of the American Press Institute for refresher courses.

In another 10 years it has been estimated that daily newspaper circulation in this country will exceed 70,000,000: local newspaper advertising will show an increase of 70 per cent to $5.6 billion; national newspaper advertising is expected to reach $1 billion, an increase of 19 per cent.

In the next 10 years your newspaper may be printed differently, it may look differently, and it may be delivered differently than it is today. But it will still be the primary medium of information and communication.

David Brinkley, television commentator, put it correctly to a group of newspapermen a year ago when he said, speaking of his medium: "We are fast. We are instantaneous. You can't get any faster than that. You can't compete with that, so don't even try. But when it comes to covering the news in any thorough way, we aren't even in the ball game. It's physically impossible to do on television."

That is why more than 61,000,000 people buy a newspaper every day.

Mr. Brown is President and Publisher of Editor and Publisher. These remarks are excerpts from his Don Mellet Memorial Lecture given at the Georgia Press Institute.

The Social Responsibility of the Press

By William P. Steven

There are three main characters in the story of the modern American newspaper. And we list them not in order of appearance, but in order of importance: the *reader,* the *owner,* and the *editor.*

The *reader* is the most important because the newspaper is an arms' length business—as long as the reader holds the newspaper at arms' length, the newspaper has his attention. When he puts the paper down, we are through; at that point no more goods are sold by the advertiser; no more information is conveyed from the news; no more ideas are changed by the editorials.

The *owner* is the next man in importance, because without his capital, there would be no payroll, no reporters, no staff to sell advertising, no small merchants to deliver his product—and no editor. Editors, too, like to eat. It is the owner who sets the standard for what the newspaper must be, and it is the editor who achieves that standard, if it is attainable. Should the editor go off in directions other than those the owner wants, no matter how commendable the editor's efforts may be from the standpoint of the reader, there are brief wails of anguish, and the editor is written up in *Time* or *Newsweek*.

Henry Watterson, once editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal,* is said to have defined a great editor as a man of dynamic energy and leadership, a man of acute social conscience, a man richly endowed with the capacity to communicate, and a man with a driving desire to better the lot of his fellowmen—and a man who owned 51 percent of the stock of his newspaper.

I am confident that some of my editor friends, and a number of my past publishers, will be surprised to hear me put the owner as being more important than the editor, and the myth that the editor is more important grows from the stories as to how most newspapers come into being.

I don't know how many of you have been to Lubbock, Texas. It is a thriving college town—Texas Tech—in the high plains of west Texas, the flattest land on our curving, oblate earth. You can see as far in every direction as you can stretch an eyeball. Well, the first paper in Lubbock was called the *Avalanche,* and there is no place geographically less apt to have an avalanche than Lubbock. But the story is that a fiery young citizen, breathing enmity for wrongs inflicted upon him by an unseemly sheriff, established the paper, saying, "I'll bury you, sir, under an Avalanche of votes."

Obviously, this young editor was the owner as well as the editor. And the American community today that is blessed with an *owner* of energy, intelligence, and conscience is fortunate indeed. It was not too unusual when the editor had to be the owner.

A change comes when the enterprise becomes large enough so that a division of duties is dictated; when the owner is concerned with coordination of departments and capital commitments—and perhaps personal or personnel trivia. Then the editor's best hopes can be dulled or denied. It is the owner, not the editor, who decides whether a foreign correspondent who would cost $50,000 a year in salary, travel, and cable tolls, is more important than $50,000 in the bank, $50,000 in extra news hole, $50,000 in better salaries. $50,000 in new presses, or $50,000 in dividends.

The modern newspaper is many kinds of businesses. It is an investment which brings the owner head table status in community and political circles, as well as profit. It is a manufacturing plant that is singularly flexible, and oddly inflexible. It can produce hundreds of thousands of copies each day; the product can be changed many times in pages and in content, but the expensive equipment is really good for only one kind of thing: printing a newspaper. It is also

a sales business. It not only has advertising space for sale, but the advertising is essential to the prosperity of the businesses who purchase it. I have often had to tell an advertiser seeking some silly sop in the news columns, that the advertising he bought was *worth* what he paid for it, and he was NOT entitled to a second helping. It is also a distribution business. It makes more deliveries in its home city every day in shorter time than the postoffice department, and I think with more accuracy, even including the out-of-bounds tosses that put papers in the bushes or the interceptions by neighborhood dogs.

And, in addition to all of these things, it is an information gathering, writing, selecting business which plays a large and significant role in adult education, in shaping public opinion, in explaining what is new and in printing what is news. *This* is the *social responsibility* of the newspaper. This is the point at which it ceases to be just another business and becomes a servant of the citizen, a critic of government, a supporter of causes in the public good.

Ben Bagdikian, the most serious and competent critic of the press, comments in the March issue of *Esquire:*

> "The problem has peculiar agonies for the newspaper because it has to be a godless corporation run for profit and at the same time a community institution operated for the public good . . . This requires a good publisher to have the mixed qualities of John Jacob Astor and Albert Schweitzer."

Justice Learned Hand once said that the dissemination of news from as many different sources and with as many facets and colors as possible is essential for a democratic society. He added: "It presupposes the right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues than through any authoritative selection. To many, this is and always will be folly, but we have staked upon it our all."

In 1910, in the United States, there were 2,200 dailies in 1200 cities, and 53 percent of all urban places had their own daily newspaper. Obviously, many of them had more than one daily newspaper. In 1966, there are 1,760 daily newspapers in the United States, and only 24 percent of the urban places have their own daily. In 50 years, there are fewer newspapers, and many more cities. In only 14 American cities today is there journalistic eye-ball-to-eye-ball competition; a morning paper competing with a morning, or an evening paper competing with an evening. There are 1,500 cities in which there is only one newspaper or one newspaper ownership.

In these cities, the newspaper has become a comfortable local monopoly.

A friend of mine—a cultured, contemplative, and careful editor—a couple of years back got the kind of precipitate early retirement that a saloon bouncer uses in finessing a drunk into the street, and, his friends gathered around and suggested he write a book. It is an excellent one, unusually calm for the circumstances, and he must have titled it, "Ruminations of an Ex-Editor," because when the manuscript reached the hot-sales boys at Doubleday, they promptly changed the title to "The Vanishing American Newspaper." Then every working stiff newsman and every professor of journalism rushed to the book stalls, so he could calculate his chances of reaching an honorable retirement.

The fact is that the American newspaper is not vanishing.

Newspapers have record high figures for circulation and for advertising. And, newspaper companies, as business enterprises are selling for record high prices. But the value of the comfortable local monopoly is clear: the criteria on which a newspaper is priced when it is sold are two: (1) the potential growth of its market, and (2) its "aloneness" in its field.

Let's look back to the fiery young editor who proposed the avalanche of votes. I assume he prospered, or that the editor of the *Lubbock Journal* prospered, for the paper is now the *Lubbock Avalanche-Journal,* a very profitable property handsomely housed in a new building filled with fine machinery, gleaming counters, and matching desks. There are hundreds of newspapers just like it.

There are also hundreds of newspapers which began this way, and, have been handed down from generation to generation as a family business or a two-family business, 'a closely-held corporation,' to use the tax phrase. President Johnson calls it "the inherited press." Unless the property is managed by a dunderhead and edited by a dunce, this comfortable local monopoly handsomely rewards its owners. And because genetic mutations do not produce successions of fiery editorial geniuses, or opera singers, or third-basemen, and because people who own newspapers have the same capacity as the rest of us for a vast and swift accommodation to personal comfort, they tend to become proprietors rather than publishers; convenience is of more concern than conscience; and conservative consistency is more constant than creativity.

This is not an indictment. These people are like other individual businessmen in the same towns, who have a good thing going and a regular foursome at the country club. The difference is that the newspaper is more than a business. The freedom guaranteed by the first amendment, said Robert Maynard Hutchins, is not merely the freedom to make a profit. August Heckscher, once the editorial page editor of the once *New York Herald Tribune,* who now runs the thought-provoking Twentieth Century fund, says that the American newspaper today is in the same position as the American railroad was 20 years ago. The difference is that the railroad is a transportation business for handling freight and people, more freight and fewer people; the newspaper is a communication business for handling information,

ideas, and advertising, but its response to pressure has been like the railroad business—more freight and less for the passenger.

Competition enforces disciplines which comfortable monopoly can ignore. The individual merchant today has to be quick or there is a chain store doing it better. There is not, for example, a locally-owned and operated department store—hard goods and soft goods—in Houston, Texas, the sixtieth city in the nation. There was no Dayton family, as in Minneapolis, tough enough to survive—and Dayton's stores are now going public and expanding. But chain newspapers don't set up shop against the locally owned paper. They wait until it is for sale.

So when the family lines run out, or the two-family ownerships quit speaking, or the desire to summer in Maine and winter in Winterhaven becomes irresistible, these comfortable local monopoly papers come on the market. Since 1945, there have been more than 700 sales of such newspapers. Four out of five of the papers sold have been bought by people who published other papers. *Editor & Publisher,* which ecclesiastizes itself as the Bible of the newspaper industry, calls them newspaper groups. Some harsher-tongued folk call them chains.

Anyway, 44 percent of the 1760 dailies in the United States are now controlled by newspaper groups; 54 percent of the 60 million copies sold every day are produced by multi-paper corporations, publishing in more than one city. Thirty groups control 308 dailies with 24 million daily circulation. The top seven chains in circulation—listed in order of size: Chicago Tribune, Scripps-Howard, Hearst, Newhouse, Knight, Gannett, and Ridder, circulate 15 million of the 60 million copies.

How did this come about with the Department of Justice baying about mergers, and congressmen complaining about bigness? Well, you may not believe it, but it was induced by the Internal Revenue Service and the Tax Court. Internal Revenue takes a dim view of large accumulations of cash in closely-held corporations; it is cash paid in dividends gets taxed twice. Newspapers require large capital investment, and long depreciation periods. They must accumulate more funds than the purchase price of the press, for example, because when the press is 100 per cent depreciated, and the time has come to buy another press, it will take two or three times as much capital to buy the new press. One reason for the fantastic prices paid for newspapers is that the owners literally are selling cash in the bank because the capital gain tax rate is lower than their personal income tax rate. So when Internal Revenue descends and suggests a dispersal or justification for the cash accumulation, the newspaper can either declare dividends or use it for "the reasonable needs of the business." A tax court ruling, reports *Editor & Publisher,* interprets the "reasonable needs of the business" to include the "acquisition of related business enterprises."

It would be as foolish to say that groups produce bad newspapers as to say that Sears-Roebuck does bad merchandising. In a great many cases, chain ownership stimulates good business practices and brings in at least editorial competence, but whether it adds to "the dissemination of news from as many different sources and with as many facets and colors as possible," as Judge Hand said, is open to argument. In any event, some of the great newspapers are in groups: *The New York Times* was purchased by Adolph Ochs with the credit acquired from owning the *Chattanooga Times;* the Minneapolis newspapers own others; so does the *Los Angeles Times,* which is perhaps the most improved major newspaper in the United States in the past 10 years. But the *Milwaukee Journal* and the *Kansas City Star* are employee-owned, and the distinction of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* has been that its editor, Barry Bingham, is also its owner, and he has hired the business managers.

Thus, it is difficult to generalize about newspapers; quite as difficult as it to generalize about colleges or college students. Certainly, when I was a college student, there were some students who should have been indicted for lack of social responsibility, and certainly today there are some newspapers who deserve similar indictment. It is as difficult to pick a percentage or name a degree of undistinction in the case of students, as it is in the case of newspapers. The man who blandly says, "Newspapers are better than ever" is probably as inaccurate as the man who says, "College students are wilder than ever." Newspapers are quite as varied as college students. Some days editors do their homework and other days they suffer silently with hangovers. Some days the news breaks in areas in which the editors have sharp perception, and those days the paper is a peerless leader of superior journalism. You know the feeling. You've creamed some quizzes, too.

There are drones and dullards in teaching as well as in editing, but I think that the researcher with a great concept will have more freedom and better salary in the average college today than a great digging reporter with guts and writing ability will have on the average newspaper.

William Galbraith, Jr. of the University of North Carolina looked up what the "best of the year" graduates as designated by Sigma Delta Chi were doing 10 years after that honorary journalistic accolade. Of the 25 students so chosen, half had NEVER worked on newspapers. Of the 35, after 10 years, only seven remained on newspapers. The median salary of the 35 was $12,600; the average salary of the seven still on newspapers was $8,164. I suspect that there are more great colleges in today's on-rush of knowledge than there are great newspapers.

There are two kinds of college developers—the brick-and-mortar men and the brain-hunters. Now you need some of both. Certainly classes would be small under the spreading

chestnut tree on this campus in this climate, and certainly, the majesty and symbolism of this chapel enrich the emotional quality of educational experience. But just as the great roving, inquiring, electric intellects make a college, so the same kind of talent creates a newspaper that fulfills its responsibility to its readers.

How can one judge how newspapers have done in meeting the needs of the readers? There must be some tests that thoughtful and concerned owners can apply, and that concerned readers can consider. I can think of several, but two will do: what competition has developed, for competition fills a vacuum. That's one. Another: how do newspapers today go about handling, preparing us for the decisions we are going to have to make in a world dominated by science?

This is obviously of the scope of doctoral theses, and I will not burden you with either the detail or the scholarship.

But let us consider the arrivals in the field of information and ideas during the time in which the number of newspapers has declined from 2200 to 1760—even though the last number is now relatively stable. In the 1920's and 30's there was the development of the information magazine: the weeklies that depended upon fiction failed under the impact of the magazine that depended upon fact: in a dozen years, *Readers' Digest, Time, Look,* and *Fortune,* all came into being. There must have been a vacuum.

Then came radio's invasion of the information field. A paralyzing fear gripped some proprietors. They didn't know whether to refuse to sell Associated Press news to the radio stations, keeping newspaper-gathered news for newspapers, or whether to get a radio station for themselves, and let the AP sell its report. At this point, the newspapers lost first publication of the flash, and they countered with columnists, and wirephoto.

Television followed World War II, and evening newspapers would have been seriously invaded, except that the working day was shortened, and there was some time for the newspaper before the big shows came on. Delivery time became more important than content time—or deadline—for the evening paper. The papers countered by broadening their fields of coverage to match the broadening interests of educated people and curbing their entertainment space. Interpretative or background stories became more important, comics less important. But advertising percentages changed from 40 percent advertising and 60 percent news to 60 percent advertising and 40 percent news. Today the ad percentage is even higher, the news holes on each page are smaller, and the number of pages which have to be locked up early and left untouched have increased. Flexibility in keeping up with the news has diminished. The interpretive and background story now gets more space in meetings of editors than in the columns of papers.

The reader—the consumer of news and information—certainly has been willing to supplement what he has spent for newspapers with purchases of magazine subscriptions, of radios at home and in automobiles and of television sets. And in the last 10 years, book sales have doubled, the number of books on social and economic subjects has increased more than six times, and 30,050 books were published in 1966. Since World War II, the sales of newspapers per family has dropped 18 percent, and the American Newspaper Publishers' Association can prove that newspaper circulation has kept up with population only by comparing total circulation figures with the 21 to 65 age group—ignoring papers read by folks in the golden years, and ignoring the tidal wave of youngsters who have reduced the average in the United States to 26, and who can read.

It seems to me that the reader has been saying quite clearly to the newspaper owner for some time that newspapers may be better than ever but they have not been good enough.

But this is history.

Are today's newspapers good enough for today?

Adult—that is, electorate—education is of such importance that Dr. Clark Kerr, while chancellor of the pre-Reagan University of California system, began the Godkin Lectures at Harvard by saying: "Knowledge has never been so central to the conduct of an entire society as now."

Or consider the opening sentences of McGeorge Bundy's article which led the January issue of *Foreign Affairs:* "The end of 1966 finds the United States with more hard business before it than at any time since 1962. We are embattled in Viet Nam. We are in the middle of a true social revolution at home. We have undiminished involvement with continents and countries which still refuse to match our simpler pictures of them. It is not surprising that one can almost hear the nation asking where it should try to go. It is Viet Nam that gives the situation its special edge . . . but Viet Nam is not the place to begin. It is better to begin with ourselves, and to ask ourselves again what we want—and *should* want—in the world."

On March 15, 1966, social scientists of Stanford and Chicago University published results of a poll of attitudes on Viet Nam. The poll was made by the respected National Opinion Research Center of Chicago, and the sample was adequate. One of the questions was:

"As you understand it, who are the Viet Cong—the government we are supporting in Viet Nam, the South Vietnamese communists, the North Vietnamese, or who?"

The answers were shocking:

3.9 percent said the government we are supporting.
29.0 percent said South Vietnamese Communists
40.0 percent said North Vietnamese
10.2 percent gave other answers
16.5 percent said they didn't know.

Thus, in a national sample of 1,474 adult Americans, readers of today's newspapers, listeners to radio and watchers of television, 71 percent could not identify the Viet Cong correctly. How well equipped is the adult electorate to make the judgment McGeorge Bundy suggests—to ask ourselves *what* we want and *what* we *should* want—in the world?

Ten years ago three professors at Cal Tech—Harrison Brown, a geochemist, who now is foreign secretary of the National Academy of Sciences; James Bonner, a biochemist, and John Weir, a psychologist, surveyed man's natural and technical resources and wrote a provocative book, "The Next Hundred Years." Next week, the same authors are going to correct their judgments in a two-day seminar called "The Next Ninety Years."

I understand that their principal confession is to be that they erred because of timidity. Things just could not have happened as fast as they did.

What has happened? Let me turn to a favorite quotation from a French mathematician, Bertrand de Jouvenel, who wrote in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist:*

"There can be no civilization unless society affords ample credit to men of thought. As their character changes, so does society. In the history of European civilization, it is easy to observe; first, a long era during which the men of thought were all men of God, clerics; then a gradual emergence of men of law, who finally became the most favored and dominant type of intellectual. As we tie great changes in political ideas and institutions to this displacement, we, therefore, have good reason to predict great changes from the supersession of the jurist by the scientist as the most favored and dominant type of individual."

What this Frenchman is saying is that Christianity was kept alive for us through the Dark Ages by the clergy; that the democratic form of government which gives us freedom of expression and opportunity came to us from the predominance of the jurists. And now, he says as he marks the rise of the scientist, we are going through the second great cultural change since the time of Christ.

The world of the scientist is a world that we are not only beginning to understand. It is a world, wrote J. B. S. Haldane, "not queerer than we imagine, but queerer than we *can* imagine." It is a world in which truth comes hard. A little jingle defines the methods of science: "We err, and err, and err again—but less, and less, and less."

Do you think that a public which has not been able to identify the Viet Cong can have any real feeling for this gigantic change as man reaches out to control his environment, and perhaps even reshape himself? Yet, this is our future.

Do you think the public understands the full implications of nuclear power—that we are not in a 'cold' war, but that we are in a perpetual stalemate between national nuclear powers because every and any nuclear war is devoid of victory? You may have seen the sardonic bumper sticker, "Peace in 1984: with us, or without us."

Do you think the public understands the population explosion—with populations in Latin America going up 3 percent a year, and those in Asia and Africa going up 2.5 percent a year? Do they understand that this population growth is the result of beneficent science—medicine suddenly broke the balance between death-rate and birth-rate?

Do you think the public understands that hunger—starvation—is an imminent menace, that the world has produced less food than it has consumed every year since 1961?

Do you think the public knows that peaceful nuclear energy has now turned the economic corner, that in 1966 there were more nuclear utility installations ordered in the United States than traditional installations? That at Oak Ridge a molten salt pile has been on the line for more than three months, not only producing economic power, but producing more fuel than it burns—that this is as near to perpetual motion as man may ever come? That this means that in 15 years at the most, and six at the least, power costs can drop from 4 mills per kilowatt to 1 mill per kilowatt? That with this kind of energy, there are no more mineral shortages, because a ton of ordinary granite yielding only 4 parts per million of uranium and 12 parts per million of thorium will produce the energy equivalents of 50 tons of coal and enough energy to process the next ton of granite and have energy left over? All of this is done by controlled fission, and within the last three weeks, the most qualified official of the Atomic Energy Commission has said that controlled Thermonuclear energy—that's *controlled fusion*—involves solving three interrelated problems: two are now solved and there are interesting possibilities for the third?

These are events that will change the nature of nations, that will change the relations between nations, that will touch the lives of every single one of us, that should have been hammered into our heads by some newspaper, by some radio, by some professor, by some television show. We *must* understand.

The question is not whether newspapers are better than ever. They may be. The question is whether—to use a phrase from J. Robert Moskin—they are good enough to "help people understand this crazy, fast-flipping, space-walking, color-hating, napalm-spewing, leisure-loving, quicksand world."

This brings us to the dilemma: there is a lack in bringing understanding by private news agencies, and there is a necessary insistence that the agencies stay private. What are the solutions? There are no easy ones. There are probably none that will be done by the reader alone, the owner alone, or the editor alone.

Government has power over radio and television, that it does NOT have over newspapers. Licenses to channels and

frequencies are on an annual renewal basis, and a requirement is that certain times be allocated for public service programs. You do not hear many of these. But someone might explore the idea that in a city with one television station that it give one full hour of news *without* commercials or interruptions *in prime time*. If there were two or more stations, the time would be varied so there would be no overlap. As competent witnesses as Walter Cronkhite and David Brinkley have publicly said that the present half hour shows are superficial in the quantity of their news coverage—they are so slick, says Cronkhite, that maybe the public is fooled, but it isn't informed. One of these half hour shows is the equivalent of four columns of newspaper type.

Newspaper proprietors would not like this idea, because it means more competition for reader time. So what could be done for the newspapers? Media Records keeps precise records of advertising lineage and 'unpaid' space—that's news—and the government could take the five-year average and simply say that it would rebate say three percent of the corporate tax (which is 48 percent) if the newspaper added two full pages a day of unpaid content. There would be no dictation as to what this content would be, so freedom of the press would not be involved. If the newspaper wanted to use the extra space to prove it belonged to the froth estate instead of the fourth estate, that would be its privilege or its peril. But the reader would benefit in most cases, and editors would be put to work to use this space intelligently.

Some foundation somewhere in this country might try "seeding" a few bright specialists onto newspapers. The Salk Foundation at San Diego captured some of the world's most exciting minds with an utterly exciting proposal: come to us, you have lifetime tenure, a space to work on whatever interests you, a large, comfortable salary, funds for assistance and travel. Suppose you took some of the brightest young men in the country and from a foundation put them out as kind of intellectual ombudsmen; they could not own any stock of the paper, they could not hold an executive job deciding what would be printed or not, but they could not be fired. They would live in the community, work on the paper, contribute ideas, articles, speeches, and stimulation. It would be interesting to see whether some proprietors would turn down this sort of brain transfusion.

Newspapers can increase the amount of news hole for 'hard' news by simply eliminating coverage of what Daniel Boorstin calls the "pseudo-event." He means the dinner given to get something in the paper. Newspapers would also have more space for news if the postoffice department—and this is Ben Bagdikian's suggestion—would enforce Title 39, of the U.S. Code, section 4367, which reads: "Editorial or other reading matter contained in publications entered as second-class mail, for the publication of which valuable consideration is paid, accepted, or promised, shall be plainly marked 'Advertisement' by the publisher. Fine $500." There would be a notable shrinkage in sports coverage of winter training camps; travel editors would stay home and interview other travelers, and fashion writers might depend on the press services and the local department store buyers.

The Audit Bureau of Circulations now audits newspaper sales, the Media Records counts the lines of advertising, the Post Office requires an annual statement of copies circulated and printed—why not, in the case of single ownership, in the case of the comfortable local monopoly, require publication annually of the names of the owners and the shares they hold, and of the financial and earnings statements of the property?

The reader would then know the name and address of the owner; he would be able to judge whether he was getting a fair shake. *Editor & Publisher* reports an 'average' paper as making 23 percent profit before taxes—and that makes a big difference. Or, let us suppose that the Federal Communications Commission encouraged the telephone companies to develop a neat, silent news printer which you'd have in your home. You mean a press wire right to the sofa? Sure. You have an electric light there, don't you?

It might not be too large a device, for the news could be miniaturized before it was sent, and enlarged when read. "With a little further work along these lines, we could easily reach an electron-microscope reduction by 100,000 times in each dimension," says John Rader Platt, "so that an ordinary page of print—book size—would shrink to about 1 micron by 2 microns in area. One square millimeter, the area of the head of a pin, which for years has been the cliche of comparison of all such discussions—could then hold 1,000 books of 500 pages each."

These ideas may frighten proprietors who own equipment suitable only to publish newspapers. Some of them may make some rather ridiculous responses to these proposals—responses like the one which Gerald Ford, the house minority leader gave in Stockton, California, last February 12, when he said: "If Abraham Lincoln were alive today, he'd turn over in his grave." But these proposals will not frighten editors who are in the INFORMATION business. They will welcome the prospect of better engaging their skills, and better interesting and informing their readers.

But, before that can come to pass, what do you do? You participate. You are the readers, the listeners, the watchers of information media. Learn to express yourselves. Learn to write the brief, pointed, inquiring letter. Become a specialist yourself in some worthwhile phase of community affairs, and hold your local newspaper responsible to be a specialist, too. A hundred thousand intelligent college students who would write a letter of criticism, of comment, of challenge each month would have an enormous influence. This impasses of a news-starved press, of the comfortable

local monopoly, of the necessity to avoid government control, will not be unlocked by law, but by influence. That influence is in your hands and minds. For, as Robert Russell wrote: "The blacksmith pounds the anvil, but the anvil also pounds the blacksmith."

Mr. Steven, former editor of The Houston Chronicle is now a science consultant.

Politics and the Press

(Continued from page 2)

hiding place. About eighty years ago James Russell Lowell wrote: "In a world of daily—nay, almost hourly, journalism, every clever man, every man who thinks himself clever or whom anybody else thinks clever, is called upon to deliver his judgment point blank and at the word of command on every conceivable subject of human thought."

About a *hundred* and eighty years ago, John Adams wrote, sardonically, of the Congress: "every man in it is a great man, an orator, a critic, a statesman; and therefore every man, upon every question, must show his oratory, his criticism and his political abilities."

Not quite on every subject or question anymore, for the journalist or the politician. Among both, the specialists have developed. But on a frightfully large number of subjects and questions. It will always be this way; it has to be this way. You require no explaining why a world of specialists only would be a jungle, the world of our final floundering. Serious statesmanship and serious communication with others cannot exist without the generalist, the man of the broad and liberal experience and teaching, the philosopher, homespun or literary, of the human condition.

The general politician and the general journalist—we are jacks of all trades and masters of none save the trade of being jack of all, a trade by no means easily mastered. We must always know enough of what is old to recognize what is new, enough of what has been good for man to sense what is going to harm him. People like you work the cutting edge of history; people like me along with you, live at the growing points of society. And we live together, in a frequently miserable marriage of necessity as restlessly close as any two elements society knows. You make a bit of history every day; we write the first rough draft of history every day. Together we compose the invisible environment of the American mind, make the community weather, sound the tones of the day. And frequently, we detest each other, because as in any marriage, we happen to have certain conflicts of interest. These can be ameliorated but never solved. They would be solved only in the event that one side or the other abandoned its responsibilities, in which case, I fear, this free society would be free no longer.

The relationship is a daily improvisation as are most of the creative tensions in American political life, including those I would suppose, between executive and legislative and judiciary.

In the national capital, where I live and work, the relationship is severely exacerbated at the present time. The phrase "credibility gap" has become a tiresome cliché already, but the very fact of its existence suggests that the condition is unusual. It is unusual only in degree, but I must say that in a quarter century of reporting Washington I have never seen it in such a high degree as this. The press—print and broadcast—is in part responsible because it has not always understood what the administration was saying and has, on these occasions, translated caution to mean dissembling. But the press is not very different from what it was in the capital five, ten or twenty years ago. It is the governing personnel that has changed the most. And the President is the key to this. It is not only that he is unusually sensitive to criticism by nature, not much given to a humorous recognition of his mistakes and bred in the manipulative techniques of the corridors of Capitol Hill—it is also that he is the kind of master personality to whom other personalities, other egos, exist chiefly as tool and extensions of his own. He therefore has created a certain

claustrophobic feeling in the Administration, a certain spirit of intimidation which encourages his lieutenants and assistants to release what news is favorable and to withhold what is unfavorable, in order both to protect the President and to protect themselves from the President.

We had some of this under President Kennedy who could also be quick of temper and sharp of tongue and who also tended to divide the journalists into friends and enemies; we had some of it under Eisenhower, not much under Truman, and, unless my memories of those days are faulty, very little under Roosevelt in whose administration powerful personalities—like Ickes, Hull, Hopkins, Wallace —were not only permitted to exist but who spoke out powerfully, often against one another, sometimes even against their chief.

A credibility gap, a lack of trust between the federal government and the press and people—this is a most serious thing, one not easily put right. But I have the feeling it is magnified because of the context in which it exists. This President is at the low point of what may be only another political cycle of a familiar kind. He has rapidly escalated the military effort abroad and it seems caught in a log jam; he has rapidly escalated his domestic welfare projects at home and they seem caught in a log jam. For the time, at any rate, the people have small sense of affairs moving, here or overseas. If and when they begin to move, we will all feel that in our spirits; the press generally will forget its present pique, will give credit when it is due, and then, I think, we may all forget that phrase, "credibility gap."

But I remain a journalist and instinctively I side with the press in the ultimate squaring of this particular account. So I shall defer any full flowering of sympathy with officials who feel badly treated by the press until that marvelous day, when I wake to see public officials complain that this newspaper or that commentator has bestowed greater praise upon him than they deserve, which, indeed, happens frequently. That will be a day to remember!

Bad blood between those who govern the people and those who monitor the governors and report to the people is nothing new in the American story. It is a condition we have never lived without. George Washington sickened of the treatment he received from much of the early American press. Thomas Jefferson, who said once that he would choose newspapers over government if he could have but one or the other, left the White House as a reader of only one paper, the Richmond Enquirer, and that chiefly for the advertisements because, he said, they contained the only truths to be relied on in a newspaper.

I think news reporting of government has greatly changed since then. So, I fear, have the advertisements.

But that there has been a substantial growth in the quality of American journalism is as clear to me as that there has been a substantial growth in the quality of our legislatures, state and federal. You would have to search hard for a Jefferson or a John Adams in the Federal Congress of today, but you must search hard, also, to find much corruption by money, to find sluggards, drunks, the boors and the ignorant. The pace is too fast, the load too heavy, our public affairs far too complicated to afford such men, anymore.

I believe the American press to be better educated, more responsible and alert than it has ever been. I am aware of certain recent strictures, including the remark of Professor Arthur Schlesinger, late of these parts, who said that after working in the White House he could never again take seriously the testimony of journalism on important government decisions. Its relation to reality, he said, "is often less than the shadows in Plato's cave."

The professor's charge was answered years before it was made, by Mr. Walter Lippmann who said, "The theory of a free press is that the truth will *emerge* from free reporting and free discussion, not that it will be presented perfectly and instantly in any one account."

The ultimate burden must fall upon the individual citizen. If he wishes to be well informed he must read *widely* in the press and listen *widely* to the broadcasts. No one example of either can serve him more than very partially.

The press is indeed powerful. And is therefore dangerous indeed. Power in any form carries danger within it somewhere; and, as John Adams tried to warn his countrymen long ago, "power always thinks it has a great soul." But if there is an imbalance of power in our country today, I beg you to consider whether it is the power of the press that has been doing the growing at the expense of the others, or the power of government, specifically the federal government and more specifically the Presidency, which acts more on its own in direct ratio to the fatefulness of the decisions to be taken, the Cuban missile decision, and the decision to make a major war out of the Vietnamese guerrilla war, very much included.

Power is required if we are to do anything, good as well as evil. But we had better, you and I as well as Presidents, be frightened of the power we have; the real danger begins at the point where we are no longer frightened. If it is true, as a Frenchman recently said, that in this life men must choose between anxiety and boredom, all those of us who hold a fragment of power had better be anxious. This is an anxiety of an evangelical nature, our saving grace. We cannot have it both ways; we cannot ask authority over the minds and lives of others, rather direct in your case, indirect in mine, and also ask to sleep easy in our beds.

No doubt we would all sleep, if not well, a little bit easier if we could use our instruments, law and communications, better than we do. I am a more credible authority on the failings of my field than on those in yours, so let me glance around my own house which has a fair proportion of glass in its walls. I began broadcasting news and impressions

about the news twenty-seven years ago when the great war was starting and at the scene of it. I might have remained with the printed press and its established comforting traditions. But something exciting was happening, the beginnings of the first new form of journalism in a very long time. We all then found it nerve-wracking, difficult. We were an odd lot—some of us, like me, better reporters than speakers, others the reverse. But we were, I think, essentially responsible, under the intuitive caution and common sense of the leaders, like the late Ed Murrow, who set the tone and the guidelines for the new profession. We had to create a tradition, as it were.

The obstacles were, and are, enormous. One is the basic nature of the broadcasting industry. In this country, many newspapers were founded by men with something particular to say and who wished to say it. A lot of them became simple business properties as they were handed down through the generations, but a meaning, a mystique had been established. Radio and then television stations were started simply and purely as business. Their owners then found themselves, often to their surprise and confusion, custodians of free expression, regents and guardians, along with publishers, of the First Amendment, but with their role and rights still somewhat obscure by reason of their existence through specific government license, not true in the case of the papers.

Then, too, by the nature of the structure, the news functions of networks and stations constitute only a department in a great entertainment industry. The news people live in constant competition with the entertainment people for budgeted funds. Even more acutely, they must compete for time, for minutes and hours, and in a more decisive way than a managing editor competes with the advertising department for a newspaper's space.

I am sure that broadcasting and the printed press are much more complementary than competitive to one another. Most comparisons between their output are rather meaningless. Their opportunities and limitations are wholly different. A newspaper's space can be expanded, but there are only so many hours in the day. A newspaper's space can be contracted, when there is little news to give, but broadcasting must live with the fifteen minute quarter-hour and the thirty minute half-hour.

A newspaper can use its space concurrently, broadcasting must use time consecutively. Page one, that is, can show you simultaneously a variety of news items, some played prominently, some obscurely, and the reader's eye can skip about to take its choice. Broadcasting must deliver one news item at a time, so that the story of a bus accident at Fourth and Main receives essentially the same prominence as the story of a great revolution in China. A newspaper can offer details including many statistics because the reader can go over it all again if need be; the broadcaster cannot because the listener cannot.

Daily newspapers have radically declined in numbers; broadcasting stations—radio especially—have radically increased. There are probably now too few of the first, too many of the second. In any case this double phenomenon obliges a negative answer to those who contend that stations, because they use public airways under government license, have no right to editorialize, on the news, while newspapers do.* Most do it badly, timidly, but that, too, may change with time. If they have this right, as common sense says they do, then they have the right in full and may properly endorse political candidates, a matter now much in contention.

It is not proper that the more numerous and pervasive medium should have fewer liberties than the less numerous and pervasive, but it is not proper, either, that it should handle its liberties in careless manner. Radio is a case in point where news is concerned. There are now so many radio stations, they have sprung up so quickly that professionalism with the news has taken hold only here and there. News is thrown on the market as quickly and cheaply as recorded jazz or used cars or deodorants. These hourly little swatches of news, delivered in the self-conscious baritone of youngsters just out of their high school or college speech class—these I would call the "non-news programs." People tune into them, I think, not to know what has happened, but what has *not* happened. To make sure that the atomic bomb has not fallen, that bubonic plague is *not* sweeping the nation. It would be as useful just to ring a bell every hour on the hour and have someone cry, "All's well." It would also provide time for an extra detergent commercial.

I am not at all sure that radio news is getting better. Television news by the networks and the larger stations I think *is* getting steadily better. The original trouble with it was that its managers fell in love with the pictures and some of its practitioners fell in love with their own image on the screen. What didn't move, wasn't news. An idea wasn't news, because you couldn't put a camera on it. A number of broadcasters thought—and some still do—that they had to perform the news. So we have seen too many character actors and too few minds of character in action. This is changing, steadily for the better. We are learning that a few thoughtful words can often be more revealing than ten thousand pictures and that the people welcome them.

We have some built-in problems, the answers to which we haven't yet come upon. One is the problem of dealing with a complex news story with the simplicity demanded in a hard news program. The printed press has the same

* Stations should editorialize, as stations, and more and more do.

problem. Long ago it invented the so-called "all purpose" news story technique which puts the most dramatic single fact in the lead, following it with the less dramatic but often essential facts so that any editor can cut off the story where he wishes. Editing from the bottom up. That is the way the news agencies in particular do it. As James Reston of The New York Times points out, this practice sharpens and inflates the news. It encourages, he remarked, not a balanced but a startling presentation of the news. Time after time, with a complicated story, the result is distortion.

The same is true of the picture medium. I was extremely conscious of this last spring in Vietnam. Buddhists staged some riots in Saigon and Da Nang. The TV cameras wheeled up. They focus, of course, on whatever is most dramatically in motion. They act like a flashlight beam in the darkness. Everything else around, however vital to the full story, is lost in the darkness and ceases to exist. The pictures could not show you that a block away from the Saigon riots the populace was shopping, chatting, sitting in restaurants in total normalcy. The riots involved a tiny proportion of the people in either city; yet the effect of the pictures in this country, including in the Congress, was explosive. People here thought Vietnam was tearing itself apart, that civil war was raging. Nothing of the sort was happening.

Our problem is to find the techniques that will balance the spot news and the spot picture and put them in proportion, and without letting hours or days go by until we can do a special report or a long documentary to explain it all as it really is. This is one reason television news is going back to the daily commentator or "analyst" as they are now called. The men who were used heavily and quite well in the hey-day of radio.

I could talk at great length about these practical challenges and responses, but perhaps to no great purpose. The true challenge, the deep and abiding problem is something of a very different order. It is to see the world not only steadily and whole, but *as it is,* not as our minds have been conditioned to believe it is. To think closely about this is, very often, to feel one's heart sink.

Why has this been called the "age of the journalist"? Why are most of the really enthralling, best-selling books no longer novels of fiction but accounts of real events and real persons? It is because history is moving in geometric progression, because public events more and more dominate private lives, because the most vivid imagination can scarcely compete with the daily realities. Whatever men can think of doing, science and technology now permit them to do, and they do it.

As journalists we are not keeping pace with the realities; we report them but we do not truly understand them, so we do not really explain. I have read much and listened much but I do not understand what will really happen, to what end, when we have men on the moon; I thought I knew something about China but I am at a loss to perceive the inner meaning of the present convulsion in the world's biggest country. I have closely followed the civil rights story but if you asked me now to explain what lies in the deepest recesses of the heart of a Negro boy in an American ghetto, I could not tell you. I am sure they will build the supersonic jet passenger plane but I cannot tell you whether it will improve human life or make it just a bit worse. I am told by experts that a given business, or for that matter, the federal government, can grow to any size at all and under the modern methods of management, operate just as efficiently as when they were small, but I don't know why and I don't quite believe it. I have read much and seen much of the country called Vietnam but I have never dared try to explain, for want of conviction, why the South Vietnamese fight with poor spirits and the Northerners with determination.

Here lies a credibility gap that is really worth talking about. Constantly, our measurements of things fall short of the realities the people see. It is not that we hide or alter the truth; it is that we often cannot penetrate the truth. It is deep in our American faith to believe that progress, human and material, must inevitably spread here among ourselves and in the distant impoverished lands. It may be quite as likely that catastrophe is approaching, not the millenium. But, poor creatures that we are, we cannot say even this for sure.

My immediate fear is that the gap lies not only between the journalists and the truth but between our national leadership and the truth. I fear the intellectual lag; I fear that yesterday's truths have become today's dogma. Is Mao Tse-tung's China really to be compared with Hitler's Germany? Is Vietnam really today's Czechoslovakia? Does communism always and everywhere require physical containment or does it not have within itself its own built-in braking mechanism, its own containment? Is it true today, as the administration believes, and as seemed very true in the thirties and forties, that peace and freedom are indivisible? Or is it the real truth that peace and freedom will continue to coexist with war and tyranny as they have coexisted through most human history?

Up to what point is it the responsibility of the United States to try to renovate the economies, the institutions, the ways of life of distant and alien societies, and can this, in fact, be really done? Is democracy an exportable item at all? It is the basic faith of our foreign policy that peace, democracy and material progress are not, each of them, merely good in themselves, but interdependent. I try to find evidence from history that this is so, but I find very little.

Could it be that we are making a gigantic mistake, that we fail to perceive what Archimedes perceived? The Greek mathematician, with his levers and pulleys and screws, said that he could move the world—if he had a place to

stand. He knew he did not. He knew his feet had no separate foundation, that he was in and of the world. As a country, we often seem to think that we stand in a separate place. Perhaps this is why we talk about "conquering nature" or "conquering space." But we are of nature, we are in space. We talk of renovating, uplifting almost all the world, of creating what Secretary Rusk calls a "world order" to govern relations between the nations. But we are in and of the world, with our due share of ignorance, sloth, fears, dangers, prejudice. So much so that we have not been able to renovate our own society, the fearful problems of which pile higher and higher.

Again and again we must remind ourselves of that truth which John Adams perceived as he walked this hill, long ago: "Power always thinks it has a great soul." In that thought lies the secret of the terrible, sometimes fatal mistakes made by every great national power in the past. If our country is indeed the last, best hope of man, it is imperative that somehow, some way, America prove to be the exception, in the long litany of power misused.

We are involved in all this together, you of government, we of the press. We think of ourselves as practical men and we see with much the same eye. We have read our economics, our political science, our sociology. The federal government, like the American press, habitually sends men of that training and cast of mind to foreign places and they habitually measure affairs and prospect in those places with these instruments, the only ones they know. And time after time their diagnoses and remedies prove to be wrong. Today's Africa is the best example of this I know. The preparatory work, helped along by many Americans as well as Europeans, the planning for political institutions and economic processes was done with dedication, yet in one place after another it was all blown to pieces when independence came.

For the critical forces there had little to do with institutions, with politics or economics; they had to do with ancient traditions, profound emotions. The local witch doctor often proved a better judge of his people and their needs than the traveling expert from M.I.T. Among foreigners there it was the anthropologists who were closer to the truth with their predictions, and the psychologists, the philosophers and the poets.

I believe the American State Department must think hard about this. I know the American press, broadcasting included, must think hard. It must develop the new generation of journalists in a different way, with our training but much more besides, including the most exotic languages of Asian peoples, much history, philosophy, comparative religions, psychology and world literatures. For America is now everywhere in the world, touching everything and we shall not understand what we are doing in this new and revolutionary world unless we find fresh eyes and ears.

It was of this that Dr. Charles Malik, the statesman of Lebanon, was speaking, some years ago before a gathering of journalists in New York. He perceived then what I have been able to perceive with clarity only recently and after much renewed travel abroad.

It so happens, he said, that precisely at the moment when they are most desperately needed, the liberal arts are in a state of crisis. "Do you think," he asked, "that the coincidence of these two crises—the special crisis of the liberal arts and the general crisis of the world—is purely accidental?

"If you aim," he said to us, "at the real truth in your mediation, not the obvious truth, not the superficial truth, but the deep, hidden tragic truth; if you always faithfully bring out what is ultimately at stake today, namely that there is a rebellion of the elements against all that you have held true and holy and sacred for thousands of years—then," he said, "I believe you will put the entire world in your debt."

That, I am afraid is the real dimension of the task that faces the man of the press today, especially in this earth-shaking nation of the United States. In considerable measure, it is also the task of the American man of politics.

I am not sure that either you or I have chosen the most completely satisfying work in which we spend our days—though I suspect neither of us would want it different. I can only suggest that neither one of us is likely to die of boredom.

This address by **Mr. Sevareid,** CBS News National Correspondent, was delivered before a joint session of the Massachusetts State Legislature.

Nieman Fellowships 1967-68

The President and Fellows of Harvard College have awarded Nieman Fellowships for the 1967-68 academic year to twelve American journalists and three foreign journalists. They will receive grants for a year's study at Harvard in the program established under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee Journal.

The Nieman Fellows for 1967-68 are:

Jerome Louis Aumente, staff reporter, The Detroit News. Mr. Aumente, 29, is a graduate of Rutgers University and Columbia School of Journalism. He plans to study urban development and Canadian affairs.

Harry Brandt Ayers, Managing Editor, The Anniston Star (Anniston, Alabama). Mr. Ayers, 32, was graduated from the University of Alabama in 1959. He will study constitutional history and economic development.

James Bellamy Ayres, reporter, The Boston Globe. Mr. Ayres, 32, was graduated from Harvard College in 1956. At Harvard he will study conservation and urban development.

Thomas Ambrose Blinkhorn, editorial writer, The Milwaukee Journal. Mr. Blinkhorn, 31, attended the University of Cincinnati and was graduated from Marquette University in 1957. He plans to study economics, political science and monetary policies.

Allan Thomas Demaree, reporter in the Washington Bureau of McGraw-Hill, Inc. Mr. Demaree, 30, is a graduate of Princeton University, class of 1958. He will concentrate on the legal side of economic policy making and fiscal policy and business trends at Harvard. Mr. Demaree holds the Nieman Fellowship supported by the Price Waterhouse Foundation for business and financial writers.

Gerald Paul Grant, National Education writer, the Washington Post. Mr. Grant, 29, earned degrees from John Carroll University and Columbia School of Journalism. He plans to study the sociology of education, economics and history.

Philip Dean Hager, reporter in the Los Angeles Bureau of Newsweek Magazine. Mr. Hager, 30, is a 1959 graduate of the University of Oregon. He will study urban affairs and the administration of justice at Harvard.

Edmund Barry Lambeth, Washington correspondent for Gannett Newspapers. Mr. Lambeth, 35, received his B.S. and M.S. from Northwestern University. He plans to study space science and urban development.

Jacob Charles Landau, reporter for Newhouse National News Service in Washington. Mr. Landau, 33, was graduated from Harvard College in 1956 and received his law degree from New York University Law School in 1961. At Harvard he will study constitutional law and American history.

Catherine Patricia Mackin, reporter for Hearst Corporation in Washington. Miss Mackin, 27, attended Washington College and received her degree from the University of Maryland in 1960. She plans to study history and political institutions. Miss Mackin is the only woman assigned full time to the White House.

Floyd John McKay, reporter, The Oregon Statesman (Salem, Oregon). Mr. McKay, 31, was graduated from Linfield College in 1957. He will concentrate on international relations and government.

Gene Edward Miller, reporter, The Miami Herald. Mr. Miller, 38, graduated from Indiana University in 1950. At Harvard he will study criminal law and history. Mr. Miller was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for investigative reporting and a Sigma Delta Chi award this year.

The Nieman Fellows were selected by a committee of six, including: Creed C. Black, managing editor, Chicago Daily News; Robert W. Chandler, president and editor, The Bulletin (Bend, Oregon); Robert Lasch, editorial page editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Theodore R. Sizer, Dean of Faculty of Education, Harvard University, William M. Pinkerton, News Officer, Harvard University; Dwight E. Sargent, Curator of Nieman Fellowships.

The Associate Nieman Fellows are:

Lewis Chester, managing editor of the "Insight" department of the London Sunday Times. Mr. Chester, 30, is a graduate of Oxford University. His Fellowship is sponsored by the Harkness Fellowships and he plans to study American and British political and economic affairs.

Michael John Green, Editor of The Friend (Bloemfontein, South Africa). Mr. Green, 37, attended the University of Cape Town. His Fellowship is sponsored by the United States-South Africa Leadership Exchange and he will study international affairs, race relations, economics and music.

Thomas Sheerer Sloan, staff writer for the Montreal Star. Mr. Sloan, 38, was graduated from the University of Toronto with a B.A. and M.A. degree. He is sponsored by Ford Motor Company of Canada and will study economics, sociology, international affairs and communications.

Book Review

Two Messages from the Media

By Louis M. Lyons

THE ARTILLERY OF THE PRESS

by James Reston

HARPER & ROW, N.Y. 116 PP. $3.95

DUE TO CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND OUR CONTROL

by Fred W. Friendly

RANDOM HOUSE, N.Y. 325 PP. $6.95

A timely coincidence brought James Reston's book on the press and Fred Friendly's on television out together. Both these star performers in the media have written double-barrelled books. Each tells an inside story that reflects the high drama and tension of his encounters in reporting the great issues of our times. Then each undertakes to analyze the problems of his medium to keep in central focus for the public the main issues. Each is concerned that the job is not being done well enough. These are the voices of experience.

Their books are as different in tone and pace as the difference between the vivid excitement of TV and the serious mien of the New York Times. Friendly is giving his swan song after his explosive departure from CBS. Reston's book is his 1966 lectures to the Council on Foreign Relations. Friendly's lusty exuberance dramatizes his controversial role that has turned him to charging crusader. Reston is content to illustrate his lectures with a few of his pungent encounters with LBJ and the circumstances that brought some great beats or leaks to the Times. Reston too could have produced a best seller had he kept on with the stories he could tell. But he had other fish to fry. Addressing a "saving remnant" of the serious minority, he was concerned with what is required of a press to meet the public need to be informed.

The story Friendly has to tell is the most vibrant chapter in television. For it is the great saga of the Edward R. Murrow programs that Friendly produced. Friendly shared in all the epic battles with the top brass of TV and the sponsors, over "See it Now," the challenge to Senator McCarthy, "The Harvest of Shame," the security case of Lieutenant Radulovich, the great Oppenheimer interview, and all the rest. Finally a blow-by-blow, hour-by-hour suspense story of the struggle that ended in the CBS business office vetoing Friendly's insistence on clearing the air for live coverage of the Fulbright hearings on Vietnam. This was the final irreconcilable conflict between controversy and commercials. Friendly lost and left CBS.

Columbia University created a TV chair for him. McGeorge Bundy took him into partnership for the Ford Foundation plan to finance a broadened dimension of educational TV. Senator Pastore welcomed Friendly as a star in the hearings on "public television." The name came from the Carnegie Commission Report on TV, a parallel plan to the Ford's to provide for a greater depth and quality of non-commercial TV. Friendly had written his own blueprint for this. It is the final chapter in his book. He became at once its most articulate advocate. The issue on which he left CBS is indeed the very crux of the case for public television, to free it from the restraints imposed on commercial TV by its need to reach always for the largest possible denominator of the mass market. Friendly is eloquent about this. It holds the promise of new dimensions in TV, to explore all the issues, to experiment in all the arts, to afford free chance of full expression in all that interests and concerns the American public.

It also describes what Reston asks of the press, that it shift a larger share of its emphasis from exciting and entertaining, to informing its readers.

The present processes and methods of the press lack capacity to inform adequately or to appraise and criticize the vast power of government, Reston says. "The President always has an edge on the press" from his ability to create news, to dominate his press conference and to use television. The quest for crisis headlines to sell papers every day is incompatible with meaningful reporting of foreign policy, which is not planned to meet daily deadlines, he says. The need is to analyze and explain the causes of the headline crises. A few direct quotations from Reston's critique are in order:

"We are going to have to twist ourselves around and see the wider perspectives of the news. We are not covering the news of the mind as we should."

"We must try to keep the issues for decision clearly before the public, a task that is not really being done in the present jumble of the average American newspaper.

"The modern newspaper is searching for a new role, or should be. That role, I believe, lies in the field of thoughtful explanation. We should let our reporters use their minds as well as their legs, on serious inquiries, and then print their findings. If we do, we will undoubtedly attract and keep more sensitive and perceptive men and women."

This, he concedes, is going to take some changes in attitude by those in control of the news. For "the pressures today are running in favor of the conformist majority that offers the popular and easy answers. In every newspaper and network are reporters and editors who feel that they are not really reporting the larger dimensions of our time, but mainly the brutality and contention and frivolity of our time. My hope is that the best elements in our press will prevail over the worst. My fear is that they will become divided, exhausted and corrupted. This danger is very real."

But Reston's mood changes in the course of these lectures. In a more buoyant mood he sees an increasing opportunity for a more serious press because "the serious minority is growing and will be an increasingly influential and commercially powerful element." The real question is whether the newspapers are paying enough attention to this group of their readers. I do not believe that they are.

"We need more open pages, preferably next to the editorial page, where the best minds of the world will give their analysis of current development . . . where we could find philosophers worrying, not about the particular bill of today, but about the issue of the decade."

And if anybody protests that this is the role of the monthly or quarterly, rather than with the daily newspaper, Reston's answer is:

"The great opportunity of the daily newspaper is that it reaches a mass audience at the fleeting moment when they are paying attention."

Mr. Lyons. Curator of the Nieman Fellowships until 1964, is now a news commentator for WGBH in Boston.

The Press in Free China

By Wang Thi-wu

The press in Free China is growing steadily in both quantity and quality.

There was only one newspaper—the Taiwan Hsin Pao, a morning daily—published in Taiwan in September, 1945, when the island was restored to the Republic of China Government as a result of the end of World War II.

There are 32 newspapers today. They include 25 morning, five afternoon and two English-language dailies. Their facilities have been improved tremendously from the underdeveloped ways toward modernization.

The sharp competition among newspapers has not only stimulated their circulations, but also improved the quality of their contents. The responsibility of journalism has been established. Improvements are also made in their management.

Taiwan has an area of 14,000 square miles. Its population today is 12.9 million. The combined circulation of the 32 newspapers is 920,000. Compared to the population, there is one newspaper for every 14 persons.

In 1951, the total circulation was only about 200,000. The newspapers then consumed only 280 metric tons of newsprint a month.

But 15 years later, today, the circulation has been increased more than three times. The consumption of newsprint jumps to 1,300 metric tons a month.

The rate of circulation increase in recent years is about 10 to 15 per cent a year. Some newspapers even have a higher rate.

Main reasons for the rapid growth of circulation are: development of economic reconstruction, prosperity of the society and higher educational standards.

The advertising revenue of the newspapers in Taiwan was relatively small before 1961. Until the Second Asian Advertising Congress held in Tokyo in 1961, newspaper executives and commercial circles in Taiwan were not aware of the importance of advertisements in newspapers. Many modern advertising agencies have been established. The advertising revenue has been increased by 15 to 20 per cent a year in the last five years. The total advertising revenue for 1966 is estimated at 5 million U.S. dollars. However, this amount is still less than half of the circulation sales.

Another feature of the development of the press in Free China is improvement of the facilities.

For example, my paper, the United Daily News, cooperated in 1960 with a local machinery works—the I Chang Machinery Works—in manufacturing high-speed rotary presses. Because of the cheap cost and prompt delivery, more than 30 rotary presses have been manufactured since 1960 for other newspapers not only in Taiwan but also in Southeast Asia. This kind of press can print 60,000 double folio sheets an hour. It can also print four colors.

In 1965, the United Daily News further cooperated with a Japanese machinery works—the Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho—for the manufacture of the first full automatic Chinese monotype. The use of the monotype, which replaces the traditional hand-setting, is an epoch-making event in the history of printing in China. Later, the official Central Daily News of Taipei also purchased this kind of composing machine.

Other improvements of facilities include the high-speed automatic plate casting machine, the electronic engraver for photos, and the monitoring of radio newsphotos and teletype wire news copies. Many newspapers hire chartered planes to deliver their papers to distant areas from Taipei every morning.

The size of a regular Taiwan daily is two folio sheets, containing eight pages. Extra pages are added on special occasions. Most papers publish weekend supplements and different editions for regional circulation. The United Daily News and the Central Daily News are the only two papers which publish overseas edition for Chinese communities abroad. The overseas edition is airmailed every day.

One promising fact for newspapers in Taiwan is that they are making money now. All newspapers lost money 15 years ago. But they have gradually picked up circulation and increased their advertising income in the last 10 years. This contributes greatly to the growth of the press in Taiwan.

The cause of the fast development of the press in Free China is manifold.

The main reasons are: the efforts made by the working journalists, the high quality of contents and the enterprising management.

Other causes include economic prosperity, a higher literacy rate and modern communications.

Above all, the most important factor is the existence of the freedom of the press in Taiwan.

Foreign friends of the Republic of China have gradually become aware of the fact that newspapers in Taiwan do enjoy freedom of the press. Some people had more or less misunderstanding in the past that newspapers in Free China were controlled by the government. In fact, newspapers in Taiwan today enjoy freedom of the press no less than their colleagues in any other countries.

There is no censorship of any kind in Taiwan. This has been repeatedly reported by foreign correspondents.

Independent and privately-owned newspapers share 70 per cent of the combined circulation. They are free to comment on and to criticize the government policy and to publish readers' suggestions for improvement of government administration.

For example, the United Daily News, the largest independent newspaper in Free China, has never been interfered with by any government officials in its publication of news and editorial comment.

Recently, it published a series of editorials, reviewing the implementation of constitutional politics and making constructive suggestions.

The articles strongly criticized the government administration and parliamentary councils on certain subjects. One editorial called for development of public opinion in order to fill up the deficiency of the parliamentary representative system. Many of the suggestions have been considered and accepted by the government authority.

Some people claim that Taiwan has no freedom of the press. I categorically deny it.

I tell you the truth that my colleagues in Free China enjoy full freedom of the press. But one thing you have to know that we, the people in Taiwan, are unanimously anti-Communist. For the freedom of the people and security of the nation, the anti-Communist stand does not violate the principle of the freedom of the press.

Taiwan is an island which is under constant threat of Communist aggression from the China mainland. All people in Taiwan are working hard toward their supreme national goal—the recovery of the mainland and the liberation of their compatriots from the Communist tyrannical rule.

Under such a circumstance that war could happen at any time, naturally no one would speak for communism. Everybody knows that communism is the source of all evils and it brings the people only destruction, slavery and disaster.

My colleagues in Taiwan are fully confident in the future of the press in China.

All of us are sparing no effort to defend the freedom of the press.

Therefore, I sincerely hope this Institute should give full support for those journalists from Taiwan who want to be admitted into this organization.

This will greatly encourage their efforts toward the development of the press and the defense of the freedom of the press.

Mr. Wang, the Publisher of United Daily News of Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, delivered this report to the Fifteenth International Press Institute General Assembly in New Delhi.

Nieman Notes

1944

Leigh White, editorial writer for the Minneapolis Tribune, will join the University of Connecticut journalism department as lecturer in September.

1948

Robert Shaplen, a writer for the New Yorker, received one of the three 15th Annual Columbia Journalism Alumni Awards for "distinguished service to journalism" by graduates of Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.

1949

Alan Barth, editorial writer for The Washington Post, is the recipient of the Florina Lasker Civil Liberties Award.

1953

Watson S. Sims, formerly general executive assigned to World Services of AP, has been appointed deputy director of AP World Services.

1955

William J. Woestendiek, former assistant executive editor of the Houston Post, has been appointed managing editor of Think, six-time-a-year publication of International Business Machines Corp. published in Armonk, New York.

1956

Richard L. Harwood, reporter for the Washington Post, earned two major citations for 1966; the George Polk Award for national reporting and the Sigma Delta Chi Distinguished Service Award for Washington correspondence.

1957

Hale Champion, State director of Finance for the State of California, has become a Fellow of the Institute of Politics in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

1962

John O. Emmerich, Jr. has been promoted to editor of the editorial page of the Houston Chronicle.