Nieman Reports

June 1971

George Chaplin:
Jefferson and The Press

W. Sprague Holden:
The Big Ones of Australian Journalism

Newbold Noyes:
Ethics—What ASNE Is All About

Howard K. Smith:
The Challenge of Reporting a Changing World

NEW CLASS OF NIEMAN FELLOWS APPOINTED

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXV, No. 2 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | June 1971

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

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

"Liberty will have died a little"

By Archibald Cox

"Liberty will have died a little," said Harvard Law School Prof. Archibald Cox, in pleading from the stage of Sanders Theater, Mar. 26, that radical students and ex-students of Harvard permit a teach-in sponsored by Young Americans for Freedom to continue. The plea, which failed, follows:

My name is Archibald Cox. I beseech you to let me say a few words in the name of the President and Fellows of this University on behalf of freedom of speech. For if this meeting is disrupted—hateful as some of us may find it—then liberty will have died a little and those guilty of the disruption will have done inestimable damage to the causes of humanity and peace.

Men and women whose views aroused strong emotions—loved by some and hated by others—have always been allowed to speak at Harvard—Fidel Castro, the late Malcolm X, George Wallace, William Kunstler, and others. Last year, in this very building, speeches were made for physical obstruction of University activities. Harvard gave a platform to all these speakers, even those calling for her destruction. No one in the community tried to silence them, despite moral indignation.

The reason is plain, and it applies here tonight. Freedom of speech is indivisible. You cannot deny it to one man and save it for others. Over and over again the test of our dedication to liberty is our willingness to allow the expression of ideas we hate. If those ideas are lies, the remedy is more speech and more debate, so that men will learn the truth—speech like the teach-in here a few weeks ago. To

(Continued on page 24)

Jefferson and the Press

By George Chaplin

On July 4, 1826, as John Adams lay dying, he whispered, "Thomas Jefferson still survives." It was the 50th anniversary of the declaration of American independence and by coincidence Jefferson died that same day.

But historically, Adams was right—and even today Jefferson's presence is all about us. He lives on and as a contemporary, for we are in a revolution almost as fundamental as the one he helped to start. And his understanding of the necessity of a free press for the preservation of democracy is as sorely needed now as it was in his day.

We are able in this country to speak freely and print freely because of Jefferson. More than any other of his era, he recognized that popular government is built on the freest flow of information. De Tocqueville considered him "the most powerful advocate democracy has ever had" and historian Henry Steele Commager has observed that if "freedom and democracy survive in our generation," Jefferson—already "the central figure in American history . . . may yet prove to be the central figure of modern history."

All men yearn to voice themselves openly, and without fear. The ideal burns so deeply in the human spirit that even those countries which negate it in whole or in part purport to guarantee it. They pay it lip service, they employ the standard semantics but in practice they fail.

The charter of Spain pronounces, "All Spaniards may freely express their ideas." The reality, as we know, is something quite different.

Article 125 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union says —"The citizens of the USSR are granted by law . . . freedom of the press . . . and these civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper . . . and other materials to exercise these rights." Later it stresses that such freedoms are designed "to strengthen the socialist system."

What the Soviet Union really operates by is the philosophy expressed by Lenin in a 1920 Moscow speech: "Why should freedom of speech and freedom of the press be allowed? Why should a government which is doing what it believes to be right allow itself to be criticised? It would not allow opposition by lethal weapons. Ideas are much more fatal than guns. Why should any man be allowed to buy a printing press and disseminate pernicious opinions calculated to embarrass the government?"

Lenin's views currently operate over the entire authoritarian spectrum. The 1970 annual review of press freedom by the International Press Institute reports that "in Latin America press freedom is being bled and battered under the assaults of right and left extremism in a process in which brutality is only equalled by incoherence. The full list of newspapers closed, their offices attached, their journalists murdered, imprisoned or assaulted makes depressing reading."

The Inter American Press Association has reported bleakly that only three Latin American countries had a truly free press—Costa Rica, Venezuela and Colombia. Restrictions elsewhere run the gamut from self-censorship to arbitrary action by government.

In Asia, according to the International Press Institute, press freedom "has many hues, ranging from the Western pattern as practiced in Japan to the rigid control of many

states of which Burma is a typical example.

"Whether such states be right-or-left-totalitarian makes virtually no difference to the operation of the mass media and the journalists employed in them."

So the battle for and against liberty goes on, as it has for a long, long time, before Jefferson and since.

Three hundred years ago Governor Berkeley of the Virginia colony—sounding like a religious Lenin—said, "I thank God we have no free schools or printing; and I hope that we shall not have them these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them and libels against the government. God keeps us from both."

This was typical thinking of British 17th century leadership. It was a time when a license or a "patent" was required to engage in the "art and mystery" of printing. It was a time when the death sentence was not unknown for printers deemed seditious and when pamphleteers were often tortured or mutilated.

But gradually the authoritarian concept of the press began to decline in England. Several reasons are cited in the book "Four Theories of the Press," by Wilbur Schramm, Fred S. Siebert and Theodore Peterson (University of Illinois Press):

"The growth of political democracy and religious freedom, the expansion of free trade and travel, the acceptance of laissez-faire economics and the general philosophical climate of the Enlightenment."

The libertarian idea took hold. Man was a rational creature. Given an unfettered environment, he would successfully reason his way through to a solution of problems. The protection and advancement of his well-being as an individual was not only his objective, but should be the objective of society and of government.

Basic contributions to the evolution and acceptance of this doctrine were made by at least three great Englishmen and one great American.

There was Milton, who advocated free competition of ideas and who believed in the self-righting process, the self-correcting process, of the open society. This concedes man's capacity to make errors, but expresses faith in his greater capacity, through employment of truth, to correct those errors.

There was John Erskine, who defended Thomas Paine for publishing "The Rights of Man."

There was John Stuart Mill, who had a great horror of what he termed "the deep sleep of a decided opinion."

And of course there was Jefferson, who did more than all the others because he dealt not only with ideas but with action based on those ideas and at the highest level of government.

Jefferson was a steady but sensitive man of great intellectual vitality and boundless curiosity. He was a successful lawyer with doubts about the profession, since he felt it taught its practitioners "to question everything, yield nothing and talk by the hour." What he thought of doctors was worse.

He was a man for all seasons—a statesman, a scientist, a farmer, an architect, a linguist, an educator, a traveler, a musician. Small wonder that the late President John F. Kennedy, entertaining the Nobel Laureates at a White House dinner, could smilingly observe that his guests comprised "probably the greatest concentration of talent and genius in this house except for perhaps those times when Thomas Jefferson ate alone."

Above all, Jefferson was a man of great moral passion, but he was also pragmatic. He understood the trials and strains a country must accept if it is to enjoy the benefits of democracy. His faith never wavered.

Frank L. Mott, in his book "Jefferson and The Press" (LSU Press, 1943) says that by the spring of 1776, when he was assigned to write the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson "had grasped the central principles that a free society flourished with the freely flowing intelligence of its citizens; and that communication, on the most extensive basis possible, was indispensable to governments based upon consent of the people. Both as means and as ends, the morality of intelligence would conduct men to freedom and renew their faith."

No one, of course, phrased such views better than Jefferson himself.

In a letter to Judge Tyler, he said: "Man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should therefore be to leave open to him all the avenues to truth. The most effectual hitherto found is the freedom of the press. It is therefore the first to be shut up by those who fear the investigation of their actions."

Jefferson wrote to Edward Carrington that the way to prevent violent reactions by the citizenry to government—he had Shay's Rebellion in mind—"is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people. "The basis of our governments being the opinion of the people, the first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers and be capable of reading them."

Beyond its duty of dissemination of information, Jefferson saw the press in a guardian function, as an agent of the people serving as a watchdog on government. Discussing this role of newspapers in a letter to a French correspondent, he said: "This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning them at the tribunal of public opinion,

produces reform peacably, which must otherwise be done by revolution." And to Charles Yancey, he wrote, "When the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe."

While in the Continental Congress, Jefferson had sought to get Virginia to include in its Constitution the provision that "printing presses shall be free, except so far as, by commission of private injury, cause shall be given for private action."

But a dozen years later, when the Federal Constitution was being debated in the 1787 Philadelphia convention, Jefferson was in France. He had gone in 1784 with Benjamin Franklin and John Adams to negotiate commercial treaties and a year later was named to succeed Franklin as American minister to France.

Nevertheless, Jefferson played a vital role in the discussions of the Constitution. He wrote to Madison, to Washington, to others. He was concerned that the first draft of America's basic code lacked proper safeguards for civil liberties. He cited "the omission of a bill of rights providing clearly and without aid of sophisms for the freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restrictions against monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters triable by the laws of the land and not by the laws of nations."

A bill of rights, he stressed, "is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth . . . and what no just government should refuse." It is ironic that even as Jefferson was urging the guarantee of freedom and openness, the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention were themselves closed to the press.

One day, after a delegate lost a copy of proposals which were before the body, the convention's presiding officer, George Washington, admonished the delegates: "Gentlemen, I am sorry to find that some member of this body had been so neglectful of the secrets of the convention as to drop in the statehouse a copy of the proceedings, which by accident was picked up and delivered to me this morning. I must entreat gentlemen to be more careful, lest our transactions get into the News Papers and disturb the public response by premature speculation."

Since the proceedings were barred to journalists, there is no full record of why the convention did not include a Bill of Rights. Mott writes that "the best source for the reasons which caused the convention to omit . . . all guarantee of liberty of the press is in the Federalist papers.

"There it was asserted that the term 'the liberty of the press' was too vague to have any practicable meaning and that the high-sounding declarations about it would therefore be utterly ineffective." This was certainly the view of Alexander Hamilton, with whom Jefferson was later to clash bitterly.

"Hamilton . . . and others contended that since the Federal government had no powers which were not expressly delegated under the Constitution, there was no need for a provision denying it any control over the press.

"Jefferson . . . and others argued that without the express guaranty of the liberty of the press the Federal government might, through implied powers, seek to control the press. When we reflect upon the number of times the First Amendment has been cited by the Supreme Court against attempted assaults upon the proper liberties of the press, we must admit that time has shown the necessity of that guarantee.

"After the terms of acceptance of the Constitution by the several states had made a Bill of Rights necessary as a series of amendments to the instrument, Madison was entrusted with the responsbility of drafting them. To him Jefferson suggested the following wording, for the one dealing with freedom of speech and the press:

" 'The people shall not be deprived of their right to speak, to write, or otherwise to publish anything but false facts affecting injuriously the life, liberty or reputation of others, or affecting the peace of the confederacy with other nations.' " Madison cut that down to read: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of the speech or the press," and once the Bill of Rights was joined to the Constitution, Jefferson conceded the overall result was "unquestionably the wisest ever presented to men."

Jefferson returned from France in late 1789 for a "visit," only to find himself drafted as Secretary of State in Washington's cabinet, a post he finally accepted with the greatest reluctance. Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury and the hostility between the two soon erupted. Jefferson himself said they were "like two fighting cocks."

Hamilton was the leader of the Federalists, who were in power, and Jefferson with Madison of the Republicans, the forerunners of the Democratic Party. Jefferson was a states rightist who believed in the virtue of the rural man, Hamilton favored a strong central government run by an elite.

The Federalists were operating a strongly pro-administration newspaper, the Gazette of The United States, edited by John Fenno and financed by Hamilton's making sure it carried all official printing for the Treasury Department. To Jefferson it was "a paper of pure Toryism, disseminating the doctrines of monarchy, aristocracy, and the exclusion of the influence of the people."

Jefferson wanted an opposition paper and Madison suggested its editor—Philip Freneau, a journalist-poet who had studied at Princeton in Madison's class. But Freneau needed money and Jefferson, who had no printing contracts to let, provided it by appointing him an interpreter-clerk in the State Department. Freneau knew French, and Jefferson's rationale—somewhat thin—was that the government

officials and the public needed to know through translation what certain European publications were printing.

Jefferson disavowed any active role in the paper. But this was unimpressive since Jefferson earlier had written his son-in-law that "we have been trying to get another weekly or half-weekly paper set up excluding advertisements so that it might go through the states and furnish a whig vehicle of intelligence. We hoped at one time to have persuaded Freneau to set up here"—in Philadelphia, the then capital—"but failed."

What Jefferson sought subsequently came about, and Freneau's National Gazette appeared October 21, 1791. There was thus the spectacle of the two major cabinet officers in Washington's administration, each with his own newspaper outlet, engaged in clangorous battle. Freneau's lampooning of the administration brought loud complaints from Hamilton and greatly annoyed Washington. Jefferson, while still disclaiming connection with the National Gazette, wrote Washington that "no government ought to be without censors; and when the press is free, no one ever will."

In December, 1793 Jefferson resigned the Secretaryship and, at 51, returned to Monticello determined never again to accept public office. Freneau's paper died and Jefferson sought subscriptions for other Republican papers, fearful that "if these (papers) . . . fail, Republicanism will be entirely browbeaten."

His retirement was short-lived. For he continued to see monarchist tendencies in the government and he actively organized an opposition; thus did the two-party system evolve. In 1796, when Washington left the Presidency, the Federalists put up a ticket of John Adams and Charles C. Pinckney; the Republicans, of Jefferson and Aaron Burr. John Adams, with 71 electoral votes, was named President; Jefferson, with 68, Vice President, presiding over the Senate and serving as opposition leader.

In the summer of 1798, using national security as an excuse—there was an undeclared naval war with France and a great deal of hysteria—the Federalists in Congress passed the Alien and Sedition Acts. The major target was less the "foreign menace" of French agents and aliens than the Republican newspapers which were submitting the Federalist Administration to a drumfire of abuse. The legislation was a calculated effort by the majority in Congress to stifle criticism of government—and thus destroy freedom of the press.

This is not to say that the newspaper criticism was not excessively partisan and often downright scurrilous—for it was. It had been that way before the American Revolution and it continued for years afterward. Even George Washington, a national hero and our only President to receive a unanimous ballot from the Electoral College, was far from immune. Once in office, he quickly felt the lash of reckless newspapers. Jefferson later recalled Washington's reaction: "He said he despised their attacks on him, personally, but there had never been an act of government, not meaning in the executive line alone, but in every line" which had not been abused.

Even when Washington left office, the Aurora of Philadelphia thundered: "The man who is the source of all the misfortune of our country is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens, and is no longer possessed of power to multiply evils upon the United States . . . This day ought to be a jubilee in the United States."

When President Adams was subjected to the same kind of wild criticism, the Alien and Sedition Acts set out to punish any "false, scandalous and malicious "writings against the Government, the President or either house of Congress "with intent to defame . . . or to bring them . . . into contempt or disrepute." The penalty: up to two years in prison and up to $2,000 in fines. One observer writes that "of the 200 newspapers being published in 1798 in this country, 20 or 25 were opposed to the Administration and were also edited by aliens." Under the Sedition Act there were 10 convictions with another five under the common law. Of the 15, eight involved newspaper statements, the rest concerned pamphlets.

Jefferson felt strongly that the legislation violated the First Amendment to the Constitution and if left standing would encourage further surgery on individual liberties. He also felt the Federalists were fully and cynically aware of this. He sent money to aid several defendants. And quietly he helped to draft the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions against the repressive laws, in the process apparently deciding to run for the Presidency in 1800.

On his election, he immediately freed any still jailed under the Alien and Sedition Acts, which expired respectively in June, 1800 and March, 1801. Jefferson's view that the Sedition Act was unconstitutional was shared three decades later by the House Judiciary Committee and in 1964 by the U. S. Supreme Court in a comment in a ruling reversing a libel decision against The New York Times.

Most of the newspapers in America, including the opposing Federalist press, had agreed with Jefferson. But once he entered the White House—he was the first President to serve in Washington, D. C.—the vituperation began, in this case from the Federalist press, which outnumbered the Republican papers about four to one. Every aspect of his life—every act and utterance—was ridiculed or railed at. He suffered an unbelievable "ordeal by canard."

Mott is of the opinion that "probably no great public figure in our history has ever suffered under so scurrilous a barrage of abuse and lies as Jefferson. In the face of this, a man less wise than Jefferson might have been excused for doubting his efforts on behalf of a free press. But while he was personally angered he was philosophically cool about

it and his smashing reelection in 1804 confirmed his view that the people "may safely be trusted to hear everything true and false and to form a correct judgment between them."

In his second inaugural address, after noting the malice of the Federalist press, he reaffirmed his faith in free journalism but saw a need for libel laws for individual redress. Such laws should be under State control; in a letter to Abigail Adams, he wrote: "While we deny that Congress have a right to control the freedom of the press, we have ever asserted the right of the states, and their exclusive right, to do so."

In his retirement, Jefferson read few neswpapers. He preferred the Richmond Enquirer above all, but even in that he said he confined himself largely to the advertisements—"for they contain the only truths to be relied on in a newspaper." Yet to the end, he kept his faith in unfettered expression. Three years before his death, he wrote to Lafayette: "The only security of all is a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted, when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary to keep the waters pure."

Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory had opened the West and with the pioneers moved the press—to St. Louis, to Chicago, to Denver, to the West Coast and to Hawaii, where the Pacific Commercial Advertiser was established as a weekly in July of 1856. Newspapers were changing from political party trumpets to collectors and printers of news. It was a new era, one of personal journalism exemplified by James Gordon Bennett and his Herald and Horace Greeley and his Tribune.

This led in time to the mass circulation wars—notably between Hearst and Pulitzer—and to the development of the modern newspaper as a substantial business venture. Although economic forces have sharply reduced the number of cities with competitive newspapers, today's American press is the best in our history—providing fuller, fairer content and operating on a level of responsibility higher than ever before. But even that is not good enough.

For we live in a society of revolutionary change, where things are moving at breakneck speed, shaking up traditional values, leaving many of the older generation crying for law and order at any price (including disregard of traditional liberties) and many of the younger either "copping out" or seeking to deny others the rights they demand for themselves.

In such a grim and chaotic time, when so much of the news is distressing, and thus resented, it is perhaps natural for many to confuse the messenger with the message, to blame the press—I use the word to cover TV and radio as well—for creating or contributing to the discontent and violence which they report.

It is also perhaps natural that some public figures, either sincerely or with an eye to capitalizing on widespread popular anxiety, should undercut the credibility of the press. This deep public cynicism is not directed to the press alone, but extends to government as well. If continued, it will, as former Presidential press secretary and publisher Bill D. Moyers said in a University of Kansas lecture, "ultimately . . . infect the very core of the way we transact our public affairs; it will eat at the general confidence we must be able to have in one another if a pluralistic society is to work."

While noting that "the press and the government are not allies . . . they are adversaries," Moyers reminds that "how each performs is crucial to the workings of a system that is both free and open but fallible and fragile. For it is the nature of a democracy to thrive upon conflict between press and government without being consumed by it."

It is easier to cite problems than to solve them. To deserve and enjoy public confidence, obviously both government and press will have to be more sensitive and responsive to the swiftly changing nature of our world.

Douglass Cater has observed that the press ought to serve as "an early warning system" for threatening problems, to sense trends early on and not after they have exploded into wide-scale disruption and violence. Had more of the American press done a more enlightened job of anticipating the nature and extent of the revolutions sweeping us in race, youth, education, sex and religion, there would have been more understanding of the fundamental changes now in process and, just possibly, less trauma.

If Jefferson were alive today, in fact as he is in spirit, I am certain he would still be arguing that the press is the best public defender; for it would insist on what Joseph Pulitzer called "drastic independence" and he would urge an unrelenting search for truth. But one could speculate that he would have moved from the libertarian theory of press to the social responsibility theory, which joins freedom with high responsibility.

What Jefferson stood for and worked for in the early days of this republic, and what we can assume he would favor today, have parallels for the nations of Asia from which the Jefferson Fellows come—whatever the state of their development.

Jefferson said the press should be free, but that all men should be able to read. He said, in effect, that freedom of information is the bulwark of all freedoms. He said it at a time when we were a young country, just as many Asian nations today are young, at least in terms of their independence from colonial powers.

Social, economic, political and cultural patterns vary between East and West, and often even between neighboring nations. But what is common to all is the fact that freedom flourishes with light and tyranny thrives on darkness.

We live in a world far more complex than Jefferson's but he holds aloft the torch of liberty, still stirs the minds and hearts of men with his belief in human dignity and equality of rights. His standard is one which all of us in journalism may pursue with honor and devotion and hope.

Mr. Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, was a Nieman Fellow 1940–41. The above is the text of the first annual Jefferson Fellowship Lecture delivered to the Jefferson Fellows at the University of Hawaii. Mr. Chaplin was instrumental in establishing the fellowships.

Notable Quotes

(From "The Press and Its Critics," a speech delivered by Peter Clark to a group of automotive writers attending the recent Society of Automotive Engineers convention in Detroit. Mr. Clark is president and publisher of The Detroit News.)

"Perhaps a time of intense social criticism calls for special press investigation of the phenomenon of criticism itself. And perhaps we would improve the level of public understanding, and better serve ourselves, if we always struggle to report the total context in which criticism occurs as thoroughly as we report its substance.

"1) Do we put the criticism in perspective? How important is it? What moral weight does it deserve? Do we understand the history of the problem at issue and, hence, the history of the criticism?

"2) Do we put the critic in perspective? What are his credentials, his record for accuracy in the public interest—or in the national interest? Do we sometimes allow the critic immunity from criticism? Why?

"3) Do we analyze the consequences of the alternative courses of action implied by the criticism? The critic usually recommends or implies that 'something different' must de done. Do we fully explore its direct effects, its possible unintended side-effects, its costs (in the broadest sense of that word?)

"4) Do we take account of the inherent advantages a critic may enjoy? A critic can shift tactics or even shift targets; a defender is confined to a fixed position which he must hold. Moreover, the defender typically receives less, and later news attention than the critic.

"5) Do we consider the cumulative effect upon public attitudes of chipping away more elements of public belief? Are we certain that the news value or moral worth of a criticism outweights the continuing erosion of faith in a time of little faith?

"Perhaps the recent wave of criticism of our profession can do us an unintended service. The first-hand experience of being criticized may help us to see better the damaging consequences of sweeping criticisms which are not placed in perspective. Newsmen are probably the best equipped to place all social criticism in balanced, experienced, mature perspective. In that essential effort our best tools remain those we have always relied upon: accuracy, completeness, and honesty."

(Reprinted from The Quill)

The Big Ones of Australian Journalism

By W. Sprague Holden

Mr. Holden is chairman of the Department of Journalism at Wayne State University in Detroit. He has visited Australia several times to study its newspapers.

Two new Sunday newspapers were offered Australian readers last February, The National Times and The Sunday Australian competitively joining The Sunday Review, another almost-new paper launched in October 1970. The trio of newcomers raised the total number of Australian Sunday and weekend papers to 15; and in the doing brought new emphasis to some old truths about Australian journalism:

- In an area of the globe where newspapers frequently are blatant propaganda organs for jackbooted totalitarian government, Australia—with nearby New Zealand—maintains a press free from government control.
- Australians consume newspapers at least as avidly as the Australian male consumes beer. The 1971 *Australian Handbook* reports that "capital city newspaper circulations, in proportion to population, are among the highest in the world, the ratio being more than 500 copies a thousand people." More about the significance of capital cities, below.
- Australian journalism is dominated by a small group of proprietors. Two of the three new Sundays, for example, were conceived, gestated and born of two of the largest-muscled and wealthiest daily newspaper groups. The third was begun by an "outsider."

The capital-city dailies, then, are the place to begin a discussion of Australian journalism, with geography, of all things, a close second phase.

All Australian metropolitan daily journalism is divided into 15 parts, the general-interest newspapers of the six state-capital cities. These 15 are far and away the most important fact of Australian newspaper life. They dominate because, quite literally, Australia has only big dailies and little dailies. The big 15 are big, indeed; and the little dailies, which number 45 are generally very little. There are no middle-sized Australian dailies because there are no middle-sized Australian cities. Enter geography, and with it perhaps the most absolutely basic factor about Australian life.

Nearly all other important facts about Australia stem from this tri-partite one: one-third of the island-continent's area is man-killing desert with almost no rain-fall ("the dead heart," "the outback," "the never never"); one-third is semi-desert, capable, though sometimes barely, of supporting a few sun-baked towns and a big percentage of Australia's 176,000,000 sheep, basis of her huge wool industry; the third is lush, fertile and pleasant. This last third is chiefly composed of the regions fronting the Pacific Ocean-Tasman Sea in the east; the Indian Ocean coastal areas of the southwest; and parts of Tasmania. In these beautiful regions live more than 90 per cent of all Australians; and 57 per cent of the whole 12 million-plus live in the seaport capitals of the six Australian states.

Sydney, Australia's largest city and capital of New South Wales, has more than ten times the population of Newcastle,

the state's second largest. Melbourne, capital of Victoria, is more than 20 times larger than Geelong, Victoria's second largest city.

Newspaper circulations are commensurate. Sydney's five dailies print about 1,374,000 copies each day; Newcastle's two have a combined circulation of less than 100,000. Melbourne's four daily press runs, ranging downward from the Sun News-Pictorial's whopping 635,565, total about 1,353,000. The Advertiser, Geelong's lone daily, circulates less than 26,000.

Circulation is only one measure of extremes. The two most heavily populated states, New South Wales and Victoria, besides the metropolitans, support respectively 20 and five small dailies. Daily-paper totals for the other states and territories are: Queensland 12, Tasmania 2, Western Australia 1, South Australia, 0, Australian National Territory (Canberra, the national capital) 2, Northern Territory 2, Papua/New Guinea 1.

It must be noted at once, however, that weekly Australian journalism has a long and thriving tradition. For all non-daily newspapers—quardi-, tri-, bi-weekly, weekly and other —the Australian total is 543, with quality of product ranging, as it does in the U.S., from many excellent to a few that are deplorable.

By familiar criteria, Sydney is Australia's "best" newspaper town. It is not only the biggest city; it is also the oldest and the busiest. Americans frequently compare it to New York and San Francisco, just as they see bits of Boston and Philadelphia in Melbourne. Sydney is either ahead of, or shares with, Melbourne pre-eminence in commerce, banking, retail and other businesses, industry, labor unions, theater, other cultural activities and many another phase of Australian life. Sydney newspapers represent extremes in newspaper quality more than any other Australian city, with the dignified and often self-righteously stolid Sydney Morning Herald, Australia's oldest extant daily, at one end of the gamut, two raffish tabloid afternoon competitors, The Sun and Daily Mirror, at the other, and the Daily Telegraph and The Australian somewhere in between.

Sydney is to ambitious young Australian journalists, eager to succeed in megalopolis, what New York was to aspirant American cubs before mortal blight did in all but three of Manhattan's dailies. By contrast, Melbourne journalism is more sedate, with even the Sun News-Pictorial, tabloid and biggest of all in circulation, consorting only delicately with the sin, sex and sensation concept that built up the lubricious New York tabs between world wars. Sydney has its King's Cross, a blend of Greenwich Village and Telegraph Hill-North Beach; and Melbourne has its St. Kilda Road and Collins Street, which epitomize all the correctly formal England that the early settlers brought with them. Comparisons, of course, can be stretched too far.

Sydney has the most newspaper competition, with three mornings and two afternoons under three proprietorships. The Sydney Morning Herald and The Sun are owned by John Fairfax Ltd., a bond as comparably incongruous as would be such a marriage between The New York Times and New York Daily News. The Daily Telegraph belongs to Australian Consolidated Press which means Sir Frank Packer, proprietor of Australian Women's Weekly, the country's most successful magazine (circulation 840,000-plus). Sir Packer also headed the yachting syndicate which, with Gretel I and Gretel II, unsuccessfully contested for the America's Cup. The third Sydney newspaper complex is part of the realm of Rupert Murdoch, son of the late Sir Keith Murdoch, Australia's first major, multi-paper press lord. Rupert Murdoch's companies own The Australian and Daily Mirror, another unlikely combination, the first edited for Australian intellectuals, the second for low-brows. Three years ago, London's raunchy The News of the World was added to the Murdoch's holdings.

Sydney today, is not as lively a newspaper town as it was when Ezra Norton owned the Daily Mirror; and Norton, Sir Frank Packer, with the Daily Telegraph, and Rupert Henderson, then managing director of the Sydney Morning Herald, used to shoot from the hip in irascible temper at one another through their journals. But Sydney is still lively. In comparison to the relatively bland placidity of Australian journalism elsewhere, Sydney was once aptly compared to a zoo by a longtime Sydneyside newsman. The zoo, and its three proprietorships, he declared, gave journalists a choice of working in the tigers' cage, the lions' den or the snake pit. He drew no exact parallels and the metaphor must not in fairness be stretched too far; but it still has a certain aptness.

Melbourne has less competition than it had prior to 1957, the year the morning Argus died of merger. The Herald & Weekly Times, which did the merging, is by far the most extensive journalistic proprietorship in Australia, and it seems to get continually bigger. H. & W. T. owns the afternoon Herald and the morning Sun News-Pictorial, which have the biggest circulations in Australia. It holds a substantial share of The Age. Thus, in its home territory it is in direct competition with only the Melbourne edition of The Australian. The Age management launched Newsday, in afternoon competition with The Herald in September 1969, but it sputtered into extinction in May 1970.

Brisbane's morning Courier-Mail and afternoon Telegraph are also in the Herald & Weekly Time's stable. There is, accordingly, no competition in the Queensland capital. The H. & W. T. controls The Advertiser, only morning paper in Adelaide, capital of South Australia, with only Murdoch's afternoon tabloid, The News as competition. H. & W. T. controls The Mercury, only newspaper in Hobart, capital of the island state of Tasmania; and in 1969 it took over both dailies in Perth, capital of Western

Australia—the morning West Australian and the afternoon Daily News. In Canberra, Australia's capital—not yet a metropolis (pop: 120,000), but eagerly trying for it—the Fairfax Sydney Morning Herald interests own both the morning Canberra Times and the afternoon Canberra News.

Daily newspapers are by no means the only properties of these huge newspaper empires. They wholly or partly own Sunday and weekend newspapers, radio and television stations, book publishing firms, magazines and many other successful enterprises. Name these groups—Herald and Weekly Times Ltd., John Fairfax Ltd., Australian Consolidated Press and the Murdoch companies headed by News Ltd.—and you have named nearly all the effective owners of Australia's metropolitan daily newspapers.

Workers in the newspaper vineyards are almost solidly unionized, a factor occasioning no surprise in a nation where 2,239,100 members of a total work force of 4,856,500 belong to unions, and where the Australian Labor Party is the second largest of the country's three political alignments. The mechanical trades phases are generally under the aegis of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union, which has strong chapels in every newspaper plant.

In news-editorial, The Australian Journalists' Association, founded in 1910, includes on its rolls practically every working journalist in Australia, the few exceptions being mainly persons with religious scruples against union membership. The A.J.A. is divided into eight autonomous districts, which have the final say in all policy matters, including administration by the Federal executive officers. Membership embraces not only all news personnel—including photographers, artists and cartoonists—on all kinds of newspapers, but Hansard (Parliament) shorthand reporters; radio-TV reporters, editors and writers; magazine writers and editors; indeed, nearly every one who works in prose for a living. Largest group addition of recent years was public relations, an industry regarded until lately by old-line Australian editors as vaguely reprehensible, perhaps indecent, and probably best dealt with by a paper's advertising department.

The working relationships between Australian newspaper management and employees are generally good. Printers and craft unionists vis-a-vis their employers have a much more fractious record than news-editorial workers. Serious disputes have disrupted newspaper production half a dozen times over the years, usually in Sydney and usually between printers and management. The only time the A.J.A. has struck major newspapers was in 1967, in aftermath of a decision by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in settlement of a dispute between the A.J.A. and the Sydney-Melbourne proprietors. Sydney dailies were struck for 17 days of August, and for seven days in Adelaide. The newspapers, despite the strike, continued to be published, though in diminished form and volume. But no newspaper in Australia, daily or non-daily, powerful metropolitan or spavined bush-country weekly, has ever suffered a scintilla of the devastating, sometimes mortal wounds, visited by industrial disputes upon American daily newspapers in New York, Detroit, Cleveland and other U.S. metropolises.

Several factors contribute to this state of comparative amity. One is the longtime relationship, now into its seventh decade, between the A.J.A. and the proprietors. Like a long-married couple they know each other completely. Another factor is that the Australian industrial tribunals do an effective job of keeping little disagreements from becoming big work-stopping grievances. A third, is that many top editorial executives on the proprietors' side began their careers as working newsmen and dues-paying A.J.A. members.

Industrial pacts between Australian newspaper management and employees have a life of three years and are called "agreements" if arrived at by free negotiations, "awards" if they come into being through the offices of an industrial tribunal.

Procedures for renewal follow a set pattern. Consider, for example, the journalists' award/agreement. Prior to the expiration date, Sydney and Melbourne proprietors, acting for Australian newspaper management, and the Federal Executive of A.J.A., acting for its members, file with the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission a Log of Claims. These logs set forth the changes each party desires in wages and working conditions. Negotiations proceed, this quid for that quo, exactly as in the U.S. If agreement is reached, the Commission officially extends its blessing; if not, conciliation is the first recourse. If that fails, the commission arbitrates all matters under dispute. More times than not, agreement is amicably reached without Commission intervention. Thereafter, the Sydney-Melbourne newspaper award/agreement, by "flow-on" action, sets the new pattern for all other capital-city dailies, and eventually for all news-editorial workers throughout Australia.

Two phases of Australian newspapering are unique. One is the cadet program. The other is the grading system. Cadets receive on-the-job training for three years under supervision of veteran journalists, becoming exposed to all manner of news situations. They must learn shorthand and attend classes relating to procedures, concepts and practices. After three years of this highly practical instruction the news fledgling becomes a full-feathered journalist.

The grading system groups all news-editorial personnel into five categories. Neophytes start in D grade. They advance, according to their editors' decisions about their merits, to C grade, B grade, A grade and special A grade. The last is reserved for the very best stars. Each advance brings improvement in salary and status. The 1967 strike

in Sydney and Adelaide was a result of the re-grading to lower levels of more than 100 journalists, a change which management legally had the right to order, but which was regarded by the affected journalists as at least a moral violation of the award's spirit.

The Australian cadet system, highly regarded as a newspaper training device, is by no means the equivalent of the kind of education for journalism that has become a basic part of U.S. newspapering. The cadet learns how to deal with all kinds of news situations; but if, rather wholly on his own, he does not combine his training with university classes, he usually pursues his career without benefit of a liberal arts education.

The penalties and handicaps under which this would place a newsman or newswoman in the U.S. are apparent to most Americans. They are not at all apparent to most Australians. This sorry situation is beginning to improve. Until a dozen years ago, higher education was for only the Australian elite. Among newspaper executives the general attitude was: "Why must a good police reporter waste his time studying literature, science, the social sciences and the arts?" The effective answer was that the journalist with only a High School Leaving Certificate (diploma) continued to operate on police-reporter levels, no matter to what complex and difficult reportorial responsibilities he was assigned.

Until recently, only the University of Melbourne and Queensland University offered Diploma in Journalism curricula; and these, considerably less than the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree, were completed by comparatively few cadets. In the last dozen years, however, the amazing expansion in Australian higher education institutions has worked many changes. Australia had only six universities prior to 1946; now the country has 15 and two university colleges. Total student enrollment went from about 30,000 in the mid-1950's to 110,000 in 1969. Higher education, long scorned by Australian journalism, is beginning to command respectful attention. New journalism education programs are under way or under study. When determined effort supplants lip-service, Australian newspapers will benefit in improved quality.

The structure and organization of Australian dailies are not greatly different from their American counterparts. The business department is the tent for advertising, circulation and routine office business. Australian and American classified and display advertising are similarly handled. Australian newsagents, however, are independent merchants, not company employees; they are licensed to undertake home delivery and area sales of newspapers.

Mechanical operations are compartmented into the familiar units of composing room, stereotype, printing, mailroom and delivery. Australia has kept up well with type-setting (by tape) and with other printing and production innovations. One interesting terminological variation is that the American "mailer" is a "publisher" in Australia.

The Australian editorial department has a table of organization somewhat different from the American and uses different designations for various posts. The managing director is liaison between the board of directors and the newspaper staff, his duties corresponding to, but going beyond, those of the U.S. managing editor. The Australian news editor's responsibilities are like those of the American news editor, except that he is clearly second in editorial command. The chief of staff is in charge of all reporters and reporting, not merely on the city side but of news coverage throughout the state and beyond. The chief sub-editor is the opposite number of the American slot man and the sub editors, or "subs," perform exactly as do American copy readers.

Legman-rewrite teams are little known in Australia. A reporter on assignment calls his office and dictates his stories verbatim to a stenographer who then turns the copy over to the chief of staff. Beats are called rounds and they are worked by roundsmen.

Australian press associations gather and distribute news, but neither the Australian Associated Press, nor the Australian United Press has any connection with the U.S. Associated Press of the U.S. United Press International. Nor do they operate similarly.

The Australian Associated Press (AAP), a creation of the major metropolitan dailies, produces a daily budget of overseas news, brings it by radio to Australia via Melbourne, and distributes it to member papers. It does not gather and does not distribute local or domestic news. The Australian United Press (AUP) gathers and distributes intra-Australian news, but serves only its Australian subscribers and sends nothing overseas. The Queensland Press and the Perth News Bureau do comparable work in their respective areas. AAP works closely with the English Reuter's; and, significantly, AAP's London office occupies a portion of Reuter's huge Fleet Street world wide news room. All major newspapers use stringers, often in combination for two or more cities.

Because Australia started as an ultima thule England, the English influence in newspapers is strong. Broadsheets are truly broad, some of them 11 9-pica columns wide. The tabloid tradition is firmly entrenched, apparently a result of newsprint shortages during World War II. Of the 15 metropolitans, seven are broadsheets and eight are tabloids.

Nine of the mets are morning, six are afternoons. Morning dailies are traditionally "serious," the broadsheets in particular regarding themselves as newspapers of record. The afternoons are more frivolous, lighthearted, slanted toward entertainment and heavy with features.

The attitudes of Australian readers toward their newspapers are much the attitudes of American readers toward

theirs—something of a love-hate syndrome, with the subscriber torn between swearing by and at his newspaper. Typically, he may take a highly moral tone toward too much emphasis on the immoral, the lurid, the hypped-up and the salacious, yet put his money on the line for the kind of a rag he condemns. He is often convinced that a deep, dark conspiracy is constantly a-brewing to keep the "real truth," "the true facts" of important events from being known, the papers meanwhile, in his view, obviously serving up a daily diet of invented fictions, false fabrications and other redundancies. In this, he is much like his American brother.

Political news, which is heart, liver, lights and loins of a free press's responsibility in a democracy, is generally well served in Australia. In the national and in the state parliaments, journalists sit behind and above the speaker's chair where they can miss no syllable of a debate or nuance of a heckler's snarl. To stay on top of the news, they constantly prowl the offices of cabinet ministers, department heads and bureaucrats. In times of crisis—like the drowning-disappearance of Prime Minister Harold Holt; the dramatic fall of Prime Minister John Gorton, struck down by his own tie-breaking vote; and the accession of Prime Minister William MacMahon—the newspaper press becomes almost as important as the government itself.

On their editorial pages most of the big papers align themselves with the Liberals, who are the conservatives, or with the Liberal-Country Party coalition if power lies in the coalition. The Australian Labor Party gets sporadic support. But the Labor press, vigorous and articulate though it is, has no major daily newspaper to champion its causes and trumpet its arguments. All the mets give close coverage to Parliament when in session; none fails to keep vigilant watch upon its own State government, including Parliament, and to a lesser degree upon local-municipal government activities.

An American newsman in Australia usually feels instant rapport with Australian journalists and their product. The makeup of the papers may seem a bit odd, certain headline usages puzzling and the idiom occasionally unsettling ("screw" is wages; you drink in "schools"; you "barrack" your team, you don't cheer it; you never, never "root" for it; and a "bonzer bloke" is a great guy.) But beyond the superficialities there is much common solidity. Australians usually warm to Americans, especially if the American makes even a half-effort to be friendly; they are grateful for our World War II help in the Pacific and they inordinately admire American industrial expertise. Add to all that, homage to identical journalistic ideals of accuracy, dedication to the whole truth, the concept of public business as the whole public's business, pride of performance, response to challenge, and so on, and the basis for good friendship is evident. The Aussie, however, might call it "mateship" or offer to be "cobbers." The new friendship may then be sealed with a middy of bitters at the nearest pub, and the nearest pub is usually not far distant.

As in the United States, daily newspaper journalism in Australia is a profession, an art, a craft, a business, a dedication, a demanding mistress, an exacting master and a splendid refuge for creative talent and for free souls. American and Australian journalism, in all departments, are far more alike than they are different. Even their beginnings were somewhat similar. America's first editor, Samuel Harris, of *Publick Occurences,* was put out of business in 1690 by a colonial governor who couldn't abide uncensored comment by a free press. Australian newspapering began in 1803 with the Sydney Gazette, written and printed under a government censor's eye by George Howe, a convict. Both nations shook themselves free of such suppressions and went on to build newspapers that today are among the freest in the world.

Ethics: What ASNE Is All About

By Newbold Noyes

Mr. Noyes, editor of The Washington Star, was the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors during the past year. The following remarks were made at the annual ASNE Convention in April.

My report to you, as President of ASNE, has to do with the question of ethics in our profession. When I am through, the next order of business will be the report of our ad-hoc committee on ethics, which has spent the past year studying the question of whether this society should establish a committee similar to the British Press Council, to oversee the ethical performance of our member papers. I hope that we may get some discussion from the membership on this question. As some of you may know—particularly those who read the Columbia Journalism Quarterly—I do not believe in a national press council, of the sort that would try to adjudicate grievances against individual newspapers represented in ASNE.

There is, to me, something repugnant about the idea that we as a Society should gang up on an individual editor whose concept of what is best for his newspaper or his readers differs from that of a select committee or even of a majority of the rest of us.

The question of an Ethics Committee or Press Council has nothing to do, of course, with any doubt that we must concern ourselves with the ethics of journalism. ASNE has an excellent Code of Ethics, and each individual member has assumed an obligation to live up to that Code as nearly as he can.

No problem of journalism is more relevant to a meeting like this than is the ethical problem. It is what ASNE is all about. When we get together at our conventions, we should pass up no opportunity to brainwash one another into a sharper awareness of our all too manifest professional deficiencies. This should be a mutual-exhortation society, dedicated to raising our sights toward the better performance of which we all know the American press is capable.

In this spirit of discussion and exhortation, I am daring this year to revive the old tradition that at its annual convention, the president of ASNE reports to his colleagues on the state of the press—or at least gets off his chest the message that seems to him to need delivering.

My message, in brief, is that we are not exactly writing a glorious chapter in the history of the newspaper profession these days—that, as our critics suggest, we have a good deal to answer for at the bar of public opinion.

It is often noted that our readers' confidence in their newspaper press is at a low ebb these days. Not that we are any worse off in this respect than other news media. But newspapers are our responsibility, and neither we nor the public can draw much comfort from the thought that our competitors may be doing even worse than we are.

This loss of confidence has, of course, been widely discussed in the profession, and various suggestions have been advanced as to what is the matter. The most frequent suggestion seems to be that we have foresaken time-honored principles of objectivity; that public confidence is being eroded by a wave of activism sweeping through our news rooms. I do not agree. We will hear more on this subject later, and I don't want to get into that argument now. There are, however, some other elements of our performance that seem to me particularly suspect. These are not, certainly, our only transgressions—but they will do for a start.

For one thing, it is obvious that we are lazy and superficial in much of our reporting. Often we do not even bother to challenge ourselves with the difficult question as to what really is going on. We rely, instead, on certain stereotypes as to what makes a news story, and we are content when none of these pat, easily-covered happenings is omitted from our news report.

Why is a speech, a press conference, a court decision, a congressional hearing always news, while the real situations behind these surface things go un-noted? Why? Because it is easy that way, and because that is the way we have always done it. Editors and publishers may fault the deskman who overlooks a handout—but who will miss it if he fails to ask the question that illuminates the cause of the handout? We do not even bother to cover the surface events in any but the most superficial way. Look at what we do with speeches, for instance—have you ever seen a news story which really reflected the content and intent of a speech? The reporter, doing as we have taught him, looks for one startling or contentious or silly statement, and there is his lead. He backs it up with one or two direct or indirect quotes, adds a couple of paragraphs as background, and there's your story.

I sometimes think we ought to consider directing reporters to put just one paragraph in each speech story which says, in effect: "Here, regardless of the rest of this news story, is the gist of what the poor man was trying to say."

Look at what we did with the Panther story. Is it not a mortifying reproach to our professionalism that we had to wait for a graduate student writing in The New Yorker magazine to report the facts behind the vendetta myth that we ourselves had propagated? I know there are those who argue that our bad performance in this instance reflected something more than laziness and gullibility. Personally, I doubt it.

I know that I, as one editor, didn't want to believe that 28 Black Panthers had been murdered by the police. But I let our newspaper keep repeating merely that Garry, the Panthers' lawyer, said it was so. That fact was the handout —and to get at the facts behind the handout would mean a lot of work. Well, I have long ago stopped being amazed at my own inertia and stupidity, but I am truly amazed to find that all my fellow editors were, on this particular story, as inert and stupid as I was.

Look at our basic concept of news. Not only do we devote 80 percent of our time and space to the sorts of stereotyped happenings I have mentioned, but we also insist that these happenings are newsworthy only if they meet certain stereotyped standards. There is no story in a speech or a press conference or what-have-you unless it involves conflict or surprise.

Before a situation is worthy of our attention, it must burst to the surface in some disruptive, exceptional (and hence newsworthy) event. Even when we know what is happening under the surface, we are forever waiting for a traditional news peg to hang the story on. What are we thinking of, sticking to such old-fashioned concepts in a time of revolutionary movement? If we have so little faith in the intelligence of our readers, how can we expect them to have faith in us? No wonder the readers constantly feel that events are overwhelming them, unawares.

Noting all this, a Canadian Senate study of the mass media recently proposed this touchstone for good journalism: "How successful is that newspaper or broadcasting station in preparing its audience for social change?" Speaking as a conservative, that sounds a little loaded to me. Change, we must have, yes—but the trick is to give our readers a basis, factual and intellectual, for assessing the paths of change into which they are being pushed, for making rational choices while the choice still is theirs.

I think the worst of our lazy and superficial performance today is that we of the press are allowing ourselves to be manipulated by various interests—some for change and some against it—some powerfully in support of the system, some destructively seeking to tear it down—all clever in the business of playing on our weaknesses, our laziness, our superficiality, our gullibility.

No doubt the Pentagon easily makes suckers of the press —but no more easily than the New Left does.

We are, it seems to me, tragically failing to develop for our readers any meaningful perspective on the activities of such special pleaders. Newspaper readers, which means ordinary people, need and deserve the information, the understanding, which will permit them to sort out the forces at work in society and to decide where their true interests lie. That, I think, is what we should be trying to give our readers, not a built-in cheery acceptance of the need to change the system.

In any event, there has got to be a better answer than the one we are offering now. Today, our reflex action to the sensational statement, the thing that goes wrong, the anomaly—our reflex action to the man-bites-dog thing insures that the man will, indeed, bite the dog if he wants to get on page one. In this process of letting the kooks on both sides determine for us what constitutes tomorrow's news—and the kookier their activity, the bigger the news—in this process, I say, we are giving our readers a view of society and its problems that even we know to be false. Can we blame our readers for sensing that something is wrong with our performance?

It is wrong for us to approve a top head on page one for a black leader who wants to kill whitey, while we relegate to page B-21 (if we print it at all) a story about the black who has been working for 15 years, quietly and effectively,

to persuade the white establishment to help abolish the ghetto.

It is wrong for us, with regard to one cabinet wife who persists in the illusion that she is Marie Antoinette, to give her more space than we give to the combined constructive efforts of all the other women connected with the administration.

We have got, I think, to try for a more sophisticated, a more serious, perspective on our jobs. We cannot keep saying that we are merely spectators of the unfolding scene, charged with transmitting it to the public. We are not just spectators. We are the people who must, whether we like it or not, decide what is worthy of public attention, and who must determine the way it is to be presented.

The difficulty of this task has made it convenient for us to hide behind simplistic, even childish, formulas as to what is news, the simplest and most childish being that this after all, is what people naturally want to read. We must find new techniques for this honorable craft, techniques which will permit us to convey the truest picture we can develop as to what transpires. I do not know what these techniques are. If I did, I would be putting out a better newspaper today than I—or you—put out. But I know that we must grow up, must change, because our readers are changing and growing up. They are demanding more of us now, and they are entitled to more from us than they are getting.

I don't fear for the future of the news media. I don't fear what government might try to do to us. We are strong—stronger than government, in fact.

A government of the people needs a press for the people. If it ever comes to outright war between our system of government and the free press, it will not be the free press which goes under. This is what I truly believe.

So it is not out of a sense of weakness that I urge the need for increased responsibilty on the part of the press today. On the contrary, it is our strength which makes it imperative that we take our responsibilities more to heart. We do not need formal machinery for this. We do not need to police ourselves with press councils and lists of rules—cringing in the expectation that if we don't do it someone else will. If they dare, let someone else try.

What we do need is for each of us, individually, to do the kind of ethical, inquiring, soul-searching job on our own individual newspapers that no press council could ever do.

We must all, individually, assume greater responsibility for our collective performance. It is an important challenge.

If we fail, of course, it will not simply be our newspapers which fail. It will be the whole concept of the people as masters of their fates which goes down with us.

The Challenge of Reporting a Changing World

By Howard K. Smith

I am rarely introspective about my craft—that of gathering and disseminating information for the public. I much prefer reporting to meditating about reporting. But for the purpose of this talk I have had to become introspective. And the generalization that emerges from long thought is that I am not happy with the state of Journalism in America today.

My generalization surprised me when I arrived at it, for what I have all along thought to be our central problem we have in fact met successfully.

What I have long felt to be our main problem was the rapidly growing complexity of the world we report on. Could we acquire the scholarship and background to comprehend a time swept more drastically by Change than any in History? Well, I am convinced the answer is Yes. We have done so with greater success than I expected.

Forty years ago, just before I joined this profession, the mental furnishings needed by a journalist were rather simple.

He had to know nothing of the mysteries of economics. The government's budget was tiny. We not only thought it unnecessary, we thought it an evil, for government to try to influence the free inter-play of business and finance.

Well, now Government has a huge budget. The federal budget—only 3 billion dollars in 1930—is to be 230 billion next year. Hundreds of new laws require the government to play a dominant role in the economy. A reporter today without a pretty good foundation of economics would be lost in Washington.

Then a reporter had to know nothing about science and technology. Government played no role in those fields. Today, government with its contracts with industry and its huge budget for ever more sophisticated military equipment, its space programs, its growing responsibility for ecology, is the prime mover in science and technology.

A reporter without some understanding of those fields would not even know what questions to ask, much less how to explain the answers to the public.

Forty years ago, a Washington reporter had to know almost nothing about foreign affairs. We were, proudly, isolationist. It was a positive virtue to be oblivious of a world that had disappointed us so badly in World War One.

Now, we have been catapulted into the outside world and are neck-deep in its problems. A reporter without first-hand information about the politics and sociology and complex interplay of foreign nations would be useless in Washington.

As I said, my fear had been that we—the eyes and ears of the public—could not change, broaden, deepen, as rapidly as complexities grew.

But I think we have done it. If the average reporter does not carry in his mind an encyclopedia of all the new things he must know, he does know exactly where to go to get it, and he knows what questions to ask to find out. It has been a remarkable achievement.

Why, then, do I feel dissatisfaction with our progress?

The answer is, with all our newly widened scope, I do not think we always give the public a rounded, whole picture of the times they live in. I think it tends to be a selected picture, and sometimes a distorted one.

Let me be quick to add that I charge no reporter with dishonesty. I think that, if anything, the present generation of national reporters is more conscientious than the previous one.

The trouble is not intent. It is a subconscious but mighty addiction to a negative tradition of reporting.

In our hearts we remain dedicated to the simple adage: it is not news when a dog bites a man—that is normal. But it is news when a man bites a dog—that is unusual; something has gone wrong.

We remain conditioned to go after the oddity, the spectacularly different thing. Generally we become interested only when things go wrong. Our prizes, like the Pulitzer prize are given for exposés of such things. Our chances of getting our story on the front page are better if our story is negative in nature.

Now, a steady diet of negative news about a nation whose history—with all its imperfections acknowledged—has been mainly successful, gives a false picture. Moreover, eternally negative news is depressing and spirit-eroding. It tends to make a people less able spiritually to meet its problems.

Let me be specific. Race has been a supreme issue in the 1960's.

I think if you were to sit down with a bound volume of any newspaper in any year in the late sixties, and spot check its stories on race questions over the months, you would conclude that we are ham-handed in dealing with the problem, probably evil and racist in our nature, and certainly failures in solving the problem.

You would read of race riots, of white segregationists overturning Negro school buses, of white ethnic suburbs in arms against black residents, of cities burning, of Panthers and police in eternal war. It is a portrait of ignominious failure.

But consider the period from 1965 to '70 whole. What is the essential truth?

Indubitably the record is one of tremendous progress. After 300 years of discrimination, stagnation was broken. A black man became a member of a President's cabinet. A black man came to sit on the Supreme Court. In the South, black men won over 500 sensitive local offices for which, before that, they could not even vote.

Business and universities cast a wide net to recruit black youths. Negroes appeared increasingly in leading roles on television and in the movies. A black actor won the Oscar for best actor. Blacks have been rising above the poverty level of incomes faster than poor whites.

Remember the "white backlash"? That cliché was invented by reporters in 1964 when George Wallace won high votes in some primary elections. The purport of it was that there was going to be a violent reaction by whites against all this progress by blacks.

Well, it never happened. In the Presidential elections that year, the anti-backlash candidate won the biggest landslide in our history.

In the off-year elections two years later, we were told—now, the backlash is coming. What happened: two blacks won mayoralty elections for the first time in two cities. And the white backlash candidate in Boston, Mrs. Hicks, was soundly beaten by a civil rights candidate.

So it has been since. There is no backlash. The Rights revolution goes on triumphantly.

The trouble is, bland success in working on this problem does not fit the formula of news; sporadic failures do fit the formula, and we dwell on them.

Let me draw examples from the most intensely controversial issue of the Sixties: the Vietnam war.

We reporters pride ourselves that no war has ever been covered so thoroughly. Every evening at the cocktail hour, television has brought more vivid action reports than has been so with any war ever. Every morning's papers are chock-full of details from our first uncensored war of the present century.

But have we really covered the whole war? The answer is—No. We have intensely covered one-third of it, only the American one-third.

Our war reporters deserve great praise for their physical courage and persistence. But they have covered until recently only a fraction of the war. There has been almost no coverage of the South Vietnamese one-third of the war—though their operations and casualties have been greater than ours. And there has been, of necessity, no coverage of the North Vietnamese third of the war . . . though a frequent reminder by reporters that they too were killing and suffering would have given a fairer and more nearly truthful account of what was happening.

I remember the ordeal of Khe Sanh, the Marine outpost near the DMZ in 1968, surrounded and pounded for seventy terrible days. We saw vivid daily pictures of Americans suffering. At one point, Robert Kennedy, then running for President, cried out—why don't the South Vietnamese help; it is their war?

Well, almost as an after-thought, it came out. The South Vietnamese were in besieged Khe Sanh too, fighting at our side, suffering casualties. We had seen fit to give only the most passing notice to that.

I note the reams of space and hours of time we devote to the atrocity of My Lai, involving Americans. That is as it should be. But I also note that we rarely mention the daily atrocities by the North Vietnamese. With them, atrocity is a regular method of warfare.

Contrast our attention to My Lai with the paucity of information about the mass graves of victims of Communist terror opened up in Hue in 1968. I have seen almost no pictures and heard only the barest information about that.

I don't want to argue the merits and wrongs of our involvement. I merely want to note that we have not covered that war whole. We have covered the daily story of Americans killing and being killed—a searing experience

that polarizes our public into un-reasoning Hawks and Doves and makes rational debate extremely difficult.

It has been often and rightly noted that the Vietnam war in the U.S.—the debate on it here—is more consequential than the Vietnam war in Vietnam. For it is here that the outcome will be decided, not there.

Have we reported that debate accurately and fairly? In general, we have not.

Let us go back to 1966. Then the issue in the debate was not our involvement; most Americans accepted that. The debate was—is there not a cheaper, less costly way to fight?

So passionate was the wish to have a cheaper way, that the press latched on to General Gavin and a letter he wrote to Harper's magazine, seeming to favor a less costly "enclave strategy." That is—withdraw to coastal enclaves and just defend them at little cost.

In February 1966, General Gavin was invited before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to explain his better way. Every report I read on his testimony credited him with this new strategy, and also with opposing the involvement in general.

Was that accurate? The answer must be no. Let me quote the hearings of the time. General Gavin wandered all over the map of ambiguity. At last Senator Symington, thoroughly confused, sought to pin him down. This colloquy followed, I quote:

Symington: I will make my questions as short as possible and would appreciate your answers being as short as possible . . . I would run through the letter with you, if I may . . . the editors say "he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam"; is that true?

Gavin: No, it is not true.

Symington: Then they say you want "a halt in the escalation of the ground war". Is that true?

Gavin: No, it is not true.

Symington: They say you recommend "withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast"; is that true?

Gavin: Not true.

Symington: I wonder why the editors deceived us as to what your thoughts were?

Gavin: I do not know. I suggest you bring the editor in here and talk to him.

So, the truth is, General Gavin had no cheaper way. He did not even oppose bombing or escalation. Yet Harper's reported the opposite; and so did most reports on that testimony by reporters in Washington. The public was left with the picture of the Administration blindly and stupidly resisting a better plan offered by General Gavin.

One of the great clichés of the Sixties was the Credibility Gap. It was news when it seemed the President was lying. It was not news that he was trying his best, seeking peace talks and being fairly candid about a most complex situation. Evidence of candor was played down; evidence of deception was blown up to mammoth and untrue proportions.

The Credibility Gap was born in Johnson's election campaign of 1964. It was said that he promised in that campaign not to get us more deeply involved in Vietnam; but once elected he broke his word and did.

Well, what did Johnson say in that famous promise? It was made in a speech in Manchester, New Hampshire. Here is what he said:

"As far as I am concerned, I want to be very cautious and careful and use it *only as a last resort* when I start dropping bombs around that are likely to involve American boys in a land war in Asia . . . We are not going north and drop bombs *at this stage of the game*. And we are not going south and run out and let the Communists take over."

No promise. Just a hope that he could avoid further involvement.

But as with Woodrow Wilson who promised to say out of World War One, and as with FDR who said our boys would not be sent abroad, the situation changed. North Vietnamese began pouring down into South Vietnam after that. They conquered two-thirds of Laos and held decisive regions of Cambodia. They launched a guerilla movement aiming to take Thailand. They launched a bloody coup that same year to seize vast Indonesia.

Johnson faced the prospect that the monsoon clouds, then descending, would arise on a Southeast Asia in Communist hands. Every Kennedy Liberal (except George Ball) advised him to go in. And every Liberal in the Senate—including George McGovern and William Fulbright—voted him the authority to go in.

There was no deception. Though that is the impression we got.

The Credibity Gap widened with news story after story about attempts to negotiate peace in Vietnam. The stories all followed a pattern. Some third country arranged a peace meeting. The North Vietnamese agreed. Then Johnson would order special bombing attacks on North Vietnam and cause them to withdraw their agreement to talk.

I have been at great pains to research those stories. There is little truth in them.

Let me tell you about the most spectacular case. On February 3, 1967, the Washington Post—which paper incidently created the term, Credibility Gap—reported on its front page that Poland had arranged talks to begin in Warsaw. The Communists were agreeable. But in the nick of time, the story said, Johnson ordered an attack on Hanoi. Angry, the Communists withdrew and refused to meet.

That story was repeated a thousand times in newspaper after newspaper. It became the basis for book after book

about Johnson's treachery. It is now widely accepted as established fact.

Now, let us go ahead two years. On December 5, 1968, the same paper published another story. It said new evidence cast doubt on the original report. North Vietnam had in fact never even considered agreeing to any talks in Warsaw.

Unfortunately this second story, nearly two years later, was not, like the original one published on the front page. It was buried with the ads on page 26.

I do not think reporter or paper were dishonest. They were simply operating on our formula. A story that the President was lying to perpetuate war was news. A story that, in fact, nothing had happened—there were no arrangements for peace talks for Johnson to agree to—was not news. So it got no attention. Meanwhile, Johnson's reputation had been damaged beyond repair—wrongly.

I could go on citing instances. Adlai Stevenson, our UN ambassador, was reported to have arranged talks. He was allegedly turned down by the Administration. So he became disillusioned with Administration policy and considered resigning. His death intervened.

But no one paid much attention to Stevenson's actual words. Three days before his death, Stevenson wrote some dissident intellectuals as follows:

"(the) purposes and directions (of American policy in Vietnam) are sound. I do not believe that the policy of retreat in Asia or anywhere else in the world would make any contribution whatsoever . . ." He criticized the policy of pulling out of Vietnam saying it would "set us off on the old, old route whereby expansive powers push at more and more doors, believing they will open until, at the ultimate door, resistance is unavoidable and major war breaks out . . . This is the point of the conflict in Vietnam."

As said, the original story that he was opposed to policy was widely reported. The true story in his own words, was not.

Well, I have made my point. I don't want to over-make it.

Please do not think that I am suggesting that negative journalism—tracking down and revealing things that go wrong—is unnecessary. Quite the contrary, it is much needed. Knowing that reporters are watching with a skeptical eye helps keep many officials honest who might not otherwise be. This kind of investigative journalism has uncovered some egregious mis-use of defense funds. Indeed had we been more sedulously skeptical, some disasters like that at the Bay of Pigs might have been forfended.

Nor do I say that press and television never report the positive aspects of things. I recall a spectacular instance from the time of Joe McCarthy. At that time, the press used to headline McCarthy's attack on whatever individuals or institutions. It occurred after awhile to a reporter on that same Washington Post that we were creating an impression of institutions termite-ridden with Communists or friends of the Communists. He proposed to his paper that it withhold McCarthy statements from print, until it had sent a reporter to see the victims, and got a full answer or rebuttal. Thereafter the Post never printed a McCarthy statement without running alongside it the response of the person or institution attacked.

My point is simply that all is not negative in this reasonably conscientious and constructive and successful nation. We do not report enough of the other, often more important, aspect of our times.

In passionate issues like Race and War, too great devotion to the negative can have consequences damaging both to clear thought and to purposive action.

I make an earnest plea to my profession to seek ways of reporting the positive. In a sense I guess I am only saying that we should tell it like it is, and it is often better than we say it is.

Mr. Smith, ABC news commentator, made the above remarks at the University of California in Riverside. He was the sixth annual lecturer in a series sponsored by the Press-Enterprise Company in Riverside.

Book Reviews

FREE PRESS/FREE PEOPLE: The Best Cause, by John Hohenberg. Columbia University Press, 514 pp., $9.95.

This book explores the state of the press in the world and the conditions that impinge upon its independence, perhaps as thoroughly as has been done by a single author.

John Hohenberg finds the hold of the independent newspaper weakening almost everywhere. As he believes an independent press basic to a free society, he seeks the causes of its decline in influence, and ventures proposals to revitalize it.

He surveys the press, throughout its history, but primarily in the US, Europe and the Commonwealths, from the vantage points of secretary to the Pulitzer Advisory Committee which he has held for 16 years. In earlier books he has gleaned the best of American journalism, such as comes to the Pulitzer Committee.

This time he undertakes a vastly larger scope. Its nearest parallel is Lord Francis Williams' "Dangerous Estate," which is English. Its sheer informational mass of what has been happening to and in the newspaper is impressive, his interpretation of trends and their causes can open up endless argument. But it is sophisticated, balanced and concerned.

Much of the detail is familiar as detail—governmental restrictions, controls and suppressions in varying degrees under various ideologies; economic pressures that have squeezed out much of the diversity of the press in mergers; competition of television; labor union resistance to innovation in technology that would have saved the lives and jobs of most of the newspapers of New York and many other cities; the complacency of affluent publishers; and finally a point that he makes much of: increasing public unpopularity of dissent and opposition to governments having to cope with the dangers real or believed, in a nuclear and divided world.

In view of this last factor, so recently exploited by Vice President Agnew, it is interesting, almost to the point of paradox that Hohenberg's remedy is a return to concern for the poor and the disadvantaged as in the earlier papers of Scripps and Greeley and Pulitzer. Hohenberg says nothing of the underground press or the demands of many young journalists for "advocacy journalism," but the essence of both is implied in his statement that a new kind of American society, emerging out of the uproar of the sixties, has a right to a press with a new philosophy.

What he asks is in considerable degree provided by those newspapers that have become a civic voice, and there is more of this between Washington and Boston than elsewhere, save in such scattered oases as Louisville, St. Louis and Milwaukee. Much of what Hohenberg prescribes for the newspaper is demanded of other institutions—more staff and more public participation on management boards or executive councils, a great effort to bring into the paper the ablest and most committed young people, and to make the job more attractive by opening up the paper to the full strength of their investigations and questions.

Hohenberg avoids or evades the semantics of definition of an independent newspaper, which indeed would call for different definitions in different countries. Since 1791 the American newspaper has been independent of anything but its ownership. But he explicitly separates the "individually owned newspapers" from those whose editors are subject to the absentee control of chain or group ownership. By 1970 more than half of all American dailies were in chains or groups whose ownership enjoys obvious economies

of operation. But without roots in its community it is hard for the unit in such a chain store operation to be accepted as a civic voice, even when the central control cares about anything but the balance sheet. Nor as he observes, does it contribute much of vitality to fill the Op Ed page with a prudently balanced set of syndicated views.

For all his cataloguing of the forces that have diluted and decimated the independent newspaper, Hohenberg is hopeful of its future. He insists it is essential to an open society. He draws on the testimony of Cronkite and Brinkley that television can't do the full job of the newspaper. He sees a prospect that labor unions will learn restraint in blocking the technology that modern communication requires. He believes the era of mergers that have reduced most big cities to a single newspaper ownership has about run its course. He cites the great success of The Wall Street Journal by innovation both in content and production.

He sees a chance that American newspapers will accept the Press Council, that in Britain, serving as ombudsman, with a public chairman, appears to have reduced mistrust of the press; and he feels that responsible publishers in a monopoly or near monopoly situation are increasingly accepting the role of the newspaper as a public trust.

All this and much more makes it a stimulating and suggestive book, and it is immensely informed.

—Louis M. Lyons

The Obituary as a Work of Art

There is, up in northern New Hampshire, a small weekly newspaper that, for some obscure reason, I subscribed to a year ago. After reading it regularly for a few months, I noticed that the townsfolk had an unusual characteristic; they died of but two causes: a long illness, or a short illness.

Intrigued, I wrote the editor to inquire what it was that spared his people from cancer, heart attacks and the more usual messengers of death. He replied that most obituaries are submitted by the funeral directors, "who are professionally addicted to routine euphemisms, presumably designed to spare the survivor any possible distress over the passing of their loved one. I presume that these stock phrases are a result of same."

And he went on: "They do present difficulties at times, as for instance recently when a man who resides here was found dead in a New York hotel room having fastened a noose and hanged himself from a peg on his bedroom door. We reported him as dead of asphyxiation under circumstances being investigated, which was the literal truth, but something less than the truth.

"As a matter of fact," he continued, "this belies your allegation that we have only two types of causa mortis. The real fun comes when a respected citizen meets his Maker not by way of long illness or short illness, but because of a very short illness in the form of suicide or homicide. In such cases, small-town journalistic practice demands that the cause itself be passed over in one hasty sentence. We then proceed to describe the profusion of flowers at the funeral, the high esteem in which said citizen was held by his townsmen, etc."

That is the way with many a newspaper, big and small. Their obituaries record the vital statistics about the deceased (though often, as in New Hampshire, the cause of death is not listed), mention how he achieved fame (or, occasionally, infamy) and state the high esteem in which the citizen was held by the world, or at least the community. Nothing but good is said about the dead; and not much space even is allowed for the good.

But not so at The New York Times. A major obituary in The New York Times is a work of art. It states the unsavory aspects of the deceased's life as well as the savory. It brings out little details to make big points. It often discloses wholly new material about the man and his life. It can run to thousands and thousands of words, all of them fascinating.

Such was not always the case. Until 1965, Times obituaries were thorough but wooden. But then a copy editor named Alden Whitman was given the not-very-desirable job of obituary writer, and he wrought a revolution. He began interviewing likely subjects, and they proved amazingly cooperative. They didn't consider him a ghoul at all; rather, they provided him with fascinating material—it was frank, because the subjects knew they would be dead by the time it appeared, and it was thorough, because all men hope to have long, biography-like obituaries in The New York Times. "I know why you're here, and I want to help you all I can," Harry Truman told Mr. Whitman in 1966. The former President then spent most of a day recounting his life.

Mr. Whitman has since talked to more than 30 notables around the world, some of whom now are dead. He has taken the obits of these and others and put them in an unlikely new book, called, appropriately enough, "The Obituary Book" (Stein & Day, 284 pages, $7.95). The dust

jacket bills it as an "unusual and surprising reference work," but it is more than that. It's a readable collection of biographies.

The book is good because the subjects are interesting; they range from Dorothy Parker to Father Divine. But it is good also because Mr. Whitman is a first-class writer and biographer. A good obit, he says in his introduction, should be constructed as a whole and written with grace, capturing, ideally, its subject's unique flavor. And then he provides 37 graceful examples.

Example: "Adlai Ewing Stevenson was a rarity in American public life: a cultivated, urbane, witty, articulate politician whose popularity was untarnished by defeat and whose stature grew in diplomacy."

Example: "Times changed, but Norman Thomas appeared steadfast. He spoke to the mind; he appealed to ethical sensibilities; he thundered at malefactors; he counseled with doubters; he goaded the lethargic and chided the faint of heart; he rallied the committed. If his moralism was stern, his manner was gentle and his words were good-humored. But the message—and Mr. Thomas always had a message—was the need for reformation of American society."

Example: "Charles-Edouard Jeannert-Gris, whose professional name was Le Corbusier, was as contentious in his manner as he was influential in his architectural ideas. 'I am like a lightning conductor: I attract storms,' he said."

At times, it is as if he is writing about himself. Writing of Andre Maurois, Mr. Whitman said:

"He regarded biography as an art, and to it he applied a sophisticated and vivacious mind and the keen perceptions of a man who had begun his literary career as a novelist." In a headnote, Mr. Whitman stated, "I must say that I admired Maurois, and I think the obituary shows it." (Each obituary in the book is accompanied by a brief headnote, stating date of death, conditions under which the obit was written and, sometimes, Mr. Whitman's little asides. Discussing Elizabeth Arden, for example, he noted: "For her acumen and her oddities, she was an obituarist's dream.")

The book is all the more interesting if a reader knows something of Mr. Whitman. Little about him is included in his book, because, of course, he is still alive. But a while back, Gay Talese, a former colleague of Mr. Whitman on the Times, came out with a wonderful book called "Fame and Obscurity" (World Publishing) that included an essay about Mr. Whitman. The essay was entitled "Mr. Bad News," and it should have been included in "The Obituary Book."

According to Mr. Talese, "Mr. Bad News" can't remember who's alive and who's dead. "This is part of an occupational astigmatism that afflicts many obituary writers," says Mr. Talese. "After they have written or read an advance obituary about someone, they come to think of that person as being dead in advance. . . . Furthermore, he admits that, after having written a fine advance obituary, his pride of authorship is such that he can barely wait for that person to drop dead so that he may see his masterpiece in print."

Mr. Talese adds that Mr. Whitman has a "marvelous, magpie mind cluttered with all sorts of useless information —he could recite the list of Popes backward and forward; knew the names of every king's mistress and his date of reign; knew that the Treaty of Westphalia was signed in 1648, that Niagara Falls is 167 feet high, that snakes do not blink; that cats attach themselves to places, not people, and dogs to people, not places."

Mr. Talese doesn't say why Mr. Whitman has sucked up all this data, but the obituary writer offers a hidden clue in his new book. One way to get your obituary in the paper, he says, is to be an eccentric. And what's his definition of an eccentric? A marathon dancer, he says, or perhaps a person "who can recite the list of Popes backward to St. Peter."

—Michael Gartner

'Liberty will have died a little'

(Continued from page 2)

clap down or shout down a speaker on the ground that his ideas are dangerous or that he is telling a lie is to license all others to silence the speakers and suppress the publications with which they disagree.

Suppose that speech is suppressed here tonight. Have you confidence that all who follow the example will be as morally right as they suppose themselves to be? History is filled with examples of the cruelty inflicted by men who set out to suppress ideas in the conviction of their own moral righteousness. This time those who have talked of disruption have a moral purpose, and may indeed be right in their goals and objections. But will others be equally right when they resort to the same tactics? The price of liberty to speak the truth as each of us sees it is permitting others the same freedom.

Disruptive tactics seem to say, "We are scared to let others speak for fear that the listeners will believe them and not us." Disruptive tactics, even by noise alone, start us on the road to more and more disruption, and then to violence and more violence, because each group will come prepared the next time with greater numbers and ready to use a little more force until in the end, as in Hitler's Germany, all that counts is brute power.

And so I cling to the hope that those of you who started to prevent the speakers from being heard will desist. You have the power to disrupt the meeting I am quite sure. The disciplinary action that will surely follow is not likely to deter you. But I hope your good sense and courage in doing what's right will cause you to change your minds—to refrain from doing grievous and perhaps irretrievable harm to liberty.

Answer what is said here with more teach-ins and more truth, but let the speakers be heard.

Letters To The Editor

To the Editor:

I read Prof. Scanlon's interesting article on the Davey Report in the March, 1971, issue of Nieman Reports.

In a reference to The Toronto Star he says we have advocated an Ontario Press Council but we have "never done anything specific about it."

This is not so. On January 16, 1969, we invited the publishers of all Ontario newspapers to a luncheon at the Royal York Hotel to discuss the formation of a Press Council. The publishers represented at the meeting were strongly opposed to the idea and voted against my suggestion. Since that time I have been in continuous contact with five or six publishers on this matter and I hope that in the near future some positive action will be taken to create a provincial Press Council.

Beland Honderich
President and Publisher
Toronto Star Limited

To the Editor:

Mr. Honderich is quite accurate in criticizing my comments. I neglected to discuss the situation with him and was not aware of the luncheon.

I trust you will run his note and include my apology.

T. Joseph Scanlon
Director
School of Journalism
Carleton University
Ottawa

To the Editor:

Professor Scanlon in the March 1971 issue of Nieman Reports ('After Keith Davey—What?') comments that the legislation dealing with Reader's Digest in Canada is too complex to explain briefly.

I am sorry that he thinks so, since one of the most frequently misunderstood aspects of the Reader's Digest's position in Canada has to do with Section 12A of the Canadian Income Tax Act. This is frequently and misleadingly referred to as a "special privilege" for the Digest. The Digest, of course, since it is incorporated in Canada, pays taxes at the same rate as any other Canadian company. The idea that it does not arises out of Section 12A which was passed in 1965 as a measure to help Canadian magazines. To discourage firms from advertising in non-Canadian periodicals circulating in Canada, the cost of doing so was made non-deductible as a business expense. In passing the legislation, however, Parliament recognized that there were publications with an editing, printing and publishing history in Canada (the Digest among them) which put them in a category apart from those foreign magazines which circulated, but which did not edit, print and publish here. Thus advertising in the Canadian editions of the Digest is on the same basis as for other Canadian publications.

Since this legislation was passed in 1965 as one *result* of the 1962 recommendations of a Royal Commission on publications, that Commission could have hardly asked that 'tax privileges' be withdrawn from the Digest as Professor Scanlon says. The Royal Commission's position was simply that the Digest should be treated as a foreign magazine—a position which the Special Senate Committee (which Professor Scanlon discusses) reiterated last year. Because of what has now grown to nearly 30 years of editing and printing in Canada, and because of a direct and indirect staff of some 1300 people in this country, two successive governments have disagreed. As a result, the Digest in Canada, now 30 percent owned by Canadians, is 'not deemed to be non-Canadian' under the Act.

Ralph Hancox
Editor
The Reader's Digest Association (Canada) Ltd.
Montreal, Quebec

To the Editor:

I would agree with Mr. Hancox that the situation is not really complex: *Reader's Digest* has a special privilege as does *Time* and that's clear. The complexity is around the fact that no one, from merely reading statute law, would be aware of the situation or the amount of debate and pressure that led to the present situation. In writing the article, I did not think these matters were relevant to a general summary and my reference to "complex" was designed to make clear I was not covering the matter adequately. I can appreciate Mr. Hancox's concern about a nationalistic recommendation which would, presumably, adversely affect his business interest in Canada.

T. Joseph Scanlon
Carleton University
Ottawa

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard presented a Sigma Delta Chi Foundation lecture at the University of South Carolina. He has completed his eighth year as Ferris Professor in the Humanities Council at Princeton University.

1942

Robert Lasch, Editorial Page Editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has retired. He is the only journalist in the world who has been a Pulitzer Prize winner, a Rhodes Scholar, and a Nieman Fellow.

Edward M. Miller, Managing Editor of the Portland Oregonian, has retired. He served that newspaper for 44 years.

1946

Frank Hewlett, Washington correspondent for the Salt Lake Tribune and Honolulu Star-Bulletin, has been elected chairman of the Standing Committee of Congressional Correspondents. The committee supervises operation of the Senate and House press galleries, and also handles press coverage arrangements for the national political conventions.

Robert J. Manning, Editor in Chief of the Atlantic Monthly, delivered the commencement address at St. Lawrence University and received an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters.

1947

Frank Carey, science writer for The Associated Press, has been named winner of the 1970 Medical Journalism Award of the American Medical Association. The citation was for his five-part series on the most common ills that affect man.

1950

John L. Hulteng and Roy Paul Nelson have written *The Fourth Estate,* an informal appraisal of the news and opinion media. It is published by Harper & Row. Mr. Nelson is at the University of Oregon, and Mr. Hulteng is the retired dean of the School of Journalism.

1951

Edwin Guthman, National Editor of the Los Angeles Times and a Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter, is the author of *We Band of Brothers,* a memoir of Robert F. Kennedy, published by Harper & Row. Mr. Guthman joined Attorney General Robert Kennedy in the Justice Department in 1961.

1954

Richard Dudman, Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has written a book about his experiences in Indochina covering the Cambodia incursion with two other reporters. They were taken prisoners and released at the end of six weeks. Titled *Forty Days with the Enemy,* it is published by Liveright.

1957

Anthony Lewis, London Bureau Chief for The New York Times, was cited by the Overseas Press Club and given the best magazine award for his piece on Biafra in the Times Magazine.

1959

Philip Johnson, news director of WWL in New Orleans, has won a Peabody Award for a documentary he wrote and produced in Israel. "This New Frontier" is about the war, the country and especially the people.

Mitchel Levitas, Editor of the New York Times Magazine, has been named Assignment Editor of the New York Times. He succeeds Sylvan Fox, who left the Times to take a job in Jerusalem with the Israeli Foreign Ministry.

1960

Reg Murphy, Editor of the Atlanta Constitution, and Hal Gulliver, Associate Editor, are the authors of *The Southern Strategy,* published by Charles Scribner's Sons. The book examines some controversial aspects of the recent political scene.

1961

Aubrey Sussens, formerly Assistant Editor of the Rand Daily Mail, is managing director of Group Editors Limited, a publishing and public relations house in Johannesburg.

1962

John Hughes, Editor of the Christian Science Monitor, has been elected to membership in the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

S. J. Kleu received his doctorate in economics at the Harvard Business School. He is now an executive with the South African Board of Trade.

1963

Allister Sparks, formerly political reporter for the Rand Daily Mail in Johannesburg, is now Assistant Editor.

Paul Kidd has been selected by the United Nations to carry out a special reporting assignment in the South Pacific. After six years as correspondent for Southam News Services of Canada in Latin America and the United States, he has been transferred from the New York Bureau to head the Toronto Bureau.

1964

Robert C. Steyn, formerly political correspondent for Cape Argus, is now on the public relations staff of the University of Cape Town.

1965

Kwon-Sang Park, editorial writer for the Dong-A Ilbo in Seoul, has been promoted to Managing Editor.

1966

Louis Louw, after having spent three years in London as Bureau Chief of Die Burger and its associate papers, has returned to Cape Town as the Parliamentary Columnist.

1967

Richard H. Stewart, a member of the Boston Globe's Washington Bureau, has been appointed press secretary to Senator Edmund S. Muskie. Mr. Stewart, a member of the Globe staff since 1960, has been covering Congress and national politics since 1967. In addition to his duties as press secretary, he is one of Senator Muskie's policy advisors.

Tertius Myburgh has been promoted to the editorship of The Pretoria News. He was Assistant Editor of the Natal Daily News in Durban.

1968

Gene Miller, reporter for the Miami Herald, has written, in collaboration with Barbara Jane Mackle, *83 Hours Till Dawn*. The book is a chronicle of the bizarre kidnaping of Miss Mackle, and is published by Doubleday.

Michael Green, formerly a reporter with The Friend in Bloemfontein, is an Assistant Editor with the Natal Daily News in Durban.

1969

Pedronio O. Ramos, Editor of The Philippines Times, has planned and organized this new Filipino newspaper in the United States.

J. Anthony Lukas, reporter for The New York Times, has written *Don't Shoot—We Are Your Children!* Published by Random House, it is the story of the lives of ten disaffected young Americans.

Harald Pakendorf has been named Editor of the Rhodesian edition of the South Africa Financial Gazette in Salisbury. Mr. Pakendorf was political reporter for Die Vaderland in Johannesburg.

Paul Hemphill has collaborated with Ivan Allen, Jr., former Mayor of Atlanta, in writing *Mayor: Notes on the Sixties*. Simon and Schuster are the publishers.

1970

John Ryan, formerly head of the Durban Bureau of the Rand Daily Mail, is now assistant to the Editor of the same paper in Johannesburg.

J. Barlow Herget, who was Assistant City Editor for the Arkansas Democrat, has been named Assistant City Editor for the Detroit Free Press. Nieman Notes in the March issue erroneously listed him with the Arkansas Gazette.

Carl Cobb, Boston Globe medical reporter, was named first prize winner by the American Academy of General Practice for his article "Solving the Doctor Shortage," written for the Saturday Review. The award was presented for the best article reporting on family medicine and health care during 1970.

1971

Frederick V. H. Garretson has been awarded an American Political Science Association University Fellowship for Public Affairs Reporting. He will study for three months at Oxford University.

Theunissen Vosloo, formerly political correspondent for Die Beeld, is now News Editor of Rapport, a nationwide Sunday newspaper that began publishing last fall, and will cover the gradual introduction of television to South Africa.

Jerome R. Watson, reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times, and Sam Washington, have been named winners of a Robert F. Kennedy Journalism Award for their series which spotlighted problems at state schools for the mentally retarded.

Nieman Fellowships 1971-72

Twelve journalists have been appointed for the thirty-fourth class of Nieman Fellows for 1971–72 to study at Harvard University. The program was established under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of The Milwaukee Journal.

Harvard University also has appointed an Associate Fellow from South Africa.

The 1971–72 Nieman Fellows are:

John S. Carroll, 29, Washington correspondent for the Baltimore Sun. Mr. Carroll, who holds a degree from Haverford College, plans to study United States foreign policy, American history and economics.

Robert E. Deitz, 30, associate editor of The Courier-Journal, Louisville. He is an alumnus of the University of Kentucky, and will study law and American literature.

Mike D. Flanagan, 31, State Capitol Bureau Chief, Tulsa Daily World. An alumnus of North Texas State University, he plans to study government and the role of the states in the federal system.

Hugh D. S. Greenway, 35, United Nations correspondent, Time-Life News Service. Mr. Greenway was graduated from Yale University, and proposes to study the history and tradition of China and the Far East, and economics.

John W. Kifner, 29, national correspondent, The New York Times. He has his degree from Williams College, and will concentrate on government and American history.

Bobby J. Lancaster, 27, columnist for The Arkansas Democrat. Mr. Lancaster is an alumnus of Little Rock University, and plans to study anthropology and sociology.

Carol F. Liston, 33, State House Bureau, The Boston Globe. Mrs. Liston has degrees from Bennington College and Columbia University, and will study American and European history and government.

Gerald J. Meyer, 29, reporter for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Mr. Meyer has degrees from St. Louis University and the University of Minnesota. He will concentrate on economics and American political history.

W. Jefferson Morgan, 31, reporter for the Oakland Tribune. He is an alumnus of the University of California at Berkeley, and plans to study economics, law, business and finance.

R. Gregory Nokes, 33, news editor with the Associated Press in Buenos Aires. Mr. Nokes was graduated from Williamette University, and proposes to study government, urban affairs and foreign policy.

Eugene V. Risher, 37, White House correspondent for United Press International. Mr. Risher, who was graduated from The Citadel, will study modern American history and foreign policy.

M. Lee Winfrey, 38, reporter for the Detroit Free Press. He has degrees from the University of Tennessee and the University of Iowa, and will study urban affairs, race relations, and the history of Europe and China.

The Associate Nieman Fellow is:

Stewart S. Carlyle, 41, Natal editor of The Financial Mail, Durban. He proposes to study politics and economics, race relations, modern business techniques, and United States history.

The Fellows were nominated by a six-man committee whose members are the following: Robert C. Bergenheim, Manager of The Christian Science Monitor; William Block, President and Publisher of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette; Howard H. Hays, Jr., Editor and Publisher of the Riverside (California) Press-Enterprise; Ernest R. May, Dean of Harvard College and Professor of History; William M. Pinkerton, Harvard University News Officer; and Dwight E. Sargent, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.