Nieman Reports

June 1972

A Commentary on the Press

by Louis M. Lyons

News and the New Bigotry

by John De Mott

✧

The Press and the Political Year

by Erwin D. Canham

✧

The Legacies of Lucius W. Nieman

by Dwight E. Sargent

NEW CLASS OF NIEMAN FELLOWS APPOINTED BY HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXVI, No. 2 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | June 1972

—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.

The Legacies of Lucius Nieman

by Dwight E. Sargent

An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man. This observation, from the pen of Ralph Waldo Emerson, applies in double measure to Lucius W. Nieman, one of the most distinguished figures in the chronicles of American journalism. Mr. Nieman's lengthened shadow includes not one, but two, institutions—The Journal in Milwaukee, and the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard University.

These two legacies, a newspaper and a foundation established in his memory by his widow, Agnes Wahl Nieman, comprise an amazing and inspiring chapter in the history of the profession of journalism. Seldom has one individual projected his influence so creatively.

Lucius William Nieman was born on December 13th, 1857 in Bear Creek, Wisconsin.

His father was of German descent, his mother of French descent, pioneers both, struggling with the rigors of pioneer country. When his father died, two years after the birth of his son, young Lucius went to live with his grandmother, Susan Cuppernall Delamatter. In later years he demonstrated a characteristic quality of appreciation by remarking: "If there is any good in me, I owe it to my grandmother."

Somewhere along the line, his nostrils inhaled a whiff of printer's ink, and he never lost the scent. At the age of twelve, he left home to look for newspaper work. His grandmother arranged with a family friend, Theron W. Haight, for Lucius Nieman to be a printer's devil at the Waukesha Freeman, now run by Mr. Haight's sister's

(Continued on page 24)

A Commentary on the Press

By Louis M. Lyons

The following is the text of the annual Elmer Davis Lecture which Mr. Lyons delivered at Columbia University.

Your invitation confers on me a relation to Elmer Davis that I cherish as a marked distinction. It ranks second only to an earlier recognition conferred, I have to admit, in different spirit.

When I began broadcasting, my colleagues at the long table in the Harvard Faculty Club began razzing me as the poor man's Elmer Davis. I happily accepted the title as much more satisfying than the comment of my old neighbor, Robert Frost. When he heard I was doing a news broadcast, he asked, "What's your slant?"

When first invited here, I accepted blithely. It was several months off. But as the time drew closer my trepidation justifiably increased. For Elmer Davis always had something to say worth saying. Some of us remember those pre-war five-minute radio programs, five minutes to nine; how much more he could say in five minutes than anybody else in fifteen. Every word had an essential function and he could indite an editorial with the inflection of his voice.

I had a couple of humbling experiences with Elmer Davis. First time I met him was the first time he came up to talk to the Nieman Fellows. By then he had a fifteen-minute program, still radio. In my ignorance I asked him whether he spoke from a script or just notes. He looked at me as if he thought I was crazy.

"It's 168 lines," he said, "and if the Chinese act up after I've written it, I have to carve out three lines to get them in."

I remember when he was converted from radio to television. He made no concession to the camera, sat there in his uniform: black jacket, black bow tie, black eyeglass rims under his white hair, reading his piece. The New York Times ran a picture of his first television stint, captioned "Man at Work."

Then—it must have been the summer of 1956—the Times sent me a book to review, about the lopsided press coverage of the previous election. I ended with an observation that things looked better this time for a fair shake all around. But the Times held my summertime review until mid-October, when the political atmosphere had radically changed. It was embarrassing.

Elmer wrote me a letter about it that increased my embarrassment. I wrote explaining the unhappy circumstances. Writing back, he said: "The trouble with you is that the papers you read between Boston, New York and Washington don't give you any sense of the arid press climate through the middle of the country. You ought to see some of my mail from *those* readers."

One thing to note about Elmer Davis as a craftsman is that he was a writer before he was a reporter, and before that a student of language, so that he had the basic tool of his trade in hand from the start. He had soaked in Latin and Greek and the Old Testament, at Franklin College and then Oxford, where he may have encountered the axiom of Sir Philip Gibbs that an essential for journalism is a feeling for the quality of words. This is perhaps more a British than an American trait, which is more typically what I once heard a great American reporter, Frank P. Sibley, tell a student group. To Sib the indispensable thing for a reporter was

"perennial curiosity," a capacity to be interested, never to be bored or blasé about the story, to find zest in the quest.

To capture the inherent interest in the story is necessary to hold the reader long enough to tell him anything, and to let it move on active verbs without fogging it by qualifying clauses or bureaucratic jargon. We tend to go for the facts but too often let the style fall where it may, in a clutter.

The first time I met Turner Catledge was at a Columbia Press Institute seminar. One of the bush league editors ambushed the Times man with a Times lead. The sentence ran on and on, entangled with modifying clauses. But Turner was ready for it. He'd taken it up himself with the reporter he said. But the reporter had grinned and pulled out of his desk a black sheet of the story as he'd written it. The copy desk had added seventeen words to the lead sentence to hedge on it. Turner said he was moving in on the copy desk. Times leads have shortened over the years.

My friend Max Hall, old AP man, now at the Harvard University Press, has kept tabs on Times leads since 1930, by measuring all page-one staff-written lead sentences for the month of January. They averaged 39 words in 1930, still 39 in 1940, 32 in 1950, down to 24 words by 1960, a fairly manageable sentence; then went up a little to 30 words by 1970.

I hope it is not heretical to suggest that the essentials of good journalism are simple—to tell a story, tell it honestly, fairly, competently, concisely enough to fit the space, interestingly enough to hold the reader's attention.

Competence is what you want in the journalist. A basic intelligence that hasn't been blighted by bias, willingness to dig for facts, character to deal fairly with the facts, and ability to use language to tell a story that means something.

The reporter who retains the bureaucratic jargon of a public announcement is usually just not familiar enough with it to risk translating it into a story that means something. Or perhaps he agrees with W. S. Gilbert that

> The meaning doesn't matter
> If it's only idle chatter
> Of a transcendental kind. . . .

The trouble with our writing is that we learn grammar in the seventh grade, when parsing a sentence means nothing to us—a kind of algebra. Then we never hear of it again until our freshman English instructor discovers that we never became acquainted with the parts of a sentence.

Some of the fun and games at our house is to read Theodore Bernstein's "Winners and Sinners" that he circulates in the Times. His winners are encouraging accolades for neat headlines and crisp leads. But the sinners are often fascinating; malaproprisms, botched sentences, clumsy, ungrammatical, cliché-ridden, that miss their meaning. I feel for him in his pains to salvage such sentences. They are often unsalvageable, never worth salvaging. What you need is to start over with a sentence that says what you want. The incredible thing about it is that people who write such sentences ever got on the Times and are allowed to stay there. Where is the copy desk? Bernstein is doing post-mortem copy editing.

It is incredible that people who can't put a sentence together are entrusted with describing how the government and the institutions of society are put together.

The effect of such sloppy reporting as accepts gobbledygook is to corrupt the language. I used to think "finalize" was the ultimate in such bastard words. But I found David McCord in a state of shock the other day after he had seen a memo from a Harvard vice president to departments telling them they must prioritize" their budgets.

Sir Ernest Gowers wrote his sensible little book, *Plain Words,* to make the British bureaucracy sound literate. But now it is in paperback for $1.25 and there no excuse for its not being on every newspaper desk.

My old friend Charles Morton of the Boston Transcript and the Atlantic Monthly used to collect examples of the absurd length smart aleck reporters would go to avoid plain words—"the elongated yellow fruit" for bananas, "the white stuff" for snow. Silly business.

I realize that nobody who has been always involved in journalism can discuss it with enough detachment. Yet detachment is a great need. Objectivity has always been the grail of journalism, challenged now by the impatient demand for advocacy journalism. But there has always been the problem to be objective and still pursue that "passion for truth" that Herbert Matthews espoused as the ethic of journalism. It led to his unhappy contretemps with the Times over his reports on the Spanish Civil War and Castro's emergence in Cuba. It suggests perhaps an inescapable dilemma. Can an institution, depending on popular acceptance, ever be as free as an individual? Can an individual act completely free within an institution? As most of us must live and work in and for and by institutions, this is perhaps an irresolvable riddle. But equally for the institution, whose vitality, progress, character are sustained only by freeing and developing the quality of the individuals who make it.

I had a dim view of the uses of the British Press Council until a judge was chosen as public chairman. Similarly the ethics committees of law or medicine would be more acceptable with a journalist or other layman as chairman. There's the old saying that every profession is a conspiracy against the layman.

But with all our striving for professional standards, there's more amateur spirit in journalism perhaps than in any other profession. We enjoy ringside seats but we are outside the ring. A friend who was in England on an English Speaking

Union fellowship visited the Times of London to ask its editor how they got so many well-done pieces on such wide-ranging special subjects. "Oh," Sir William Haley told him, "England is full of amateurs, happy to write about their hobbies."

Well, we've developed staff specialists and that's good. They know what they are writing about. One paper I read built up a staff of specialists from three to twenty in a space of seven or eight years. This didn't count the critics, columnists or the traditional political and financial writers.

When specialization was new, Eddie Lahey, a perceptive journalist, worried lest the specialist lose touch with the reader's point of view. But generally that hasn't happened, I think. Rather, he knows how to translate the specialty into the readers terms and give a clearer picture than the non-specialist could often provide. This, though most of us have to remain generalists and, in the kaleidoscopic movement of news events, to wrap our minds around a subject for the length of the hearing, the trial or the series, to become as familiar with it as anyone in town; but then, in the happy versatility of the job, to tackle a new topic.

One of the newest specialties may prove one of the most promising. The work of Ada Louise Huxtable, architectural critic of the Times, and of Jane Holtz Kay, first in this field on the Boston Globe, suggests that the concepts of architecture, combining the concrete and aesthetic, may supply a missing dimension to the elusive role of the press to cope with the confusing reality and insistent change of modern life.

An old fogy's concern over the current demand for advocacy journalism is that it could return us to the early partisan and party press when a man read only the paper of his own faction and had his horizon hedged by that.

Ernest Hocking, in his "Framework of Principle," one of the papers of the Hutchins Commission, twenty-six years ago, deplored the labor press and other presses of special advocacy, because they isolated their readers from all but a single outlook. The virtue of a general press was freedom from such single-track bias. Realization of this had nearly eliminated the Negro press before the Negro Revolution revived it as the tool of revolution, as justifiable as the role of our own press in the American Revolution. But the national understanding and acceptance of the condition, attitudes, rights and needs of our minorities are far more effectively advanced through black writers and their impact on their white colleagues in the general press.

It is this, rather than espousal of a point of view, that seems to me the negative aspect of advocacy journalism. For there is bound to be a point of view in any work of the mind. Self-discipline should contain it to dealing fairly with facts.

Any discipline is restraint and will restrain a sophomorish compulsion to make everything personal, an overweening craving for self-expression.

A Tony Lewis or an Abe Raskin or a Homer Bigart doesn't need any exemption from the discipline of objectivity to wrap it all up so that the reader senses the situation. The fellow who resists learning and practicing the discipline of his craft is misplaced. He should be in the advocating business—preacher, politician or lawyer.

But I think we are going to get away from such semantical quibbles. When I first heard of "interpretive" reporting it seemed to me it was just such reporting in depth as the best reporting always was. If Abe Raskin, describing the background of a steel strike, expresses a judgment about it, I, as a reader, welcome it. He's earned a right to it. But if I disagree, I still have his fully informing report. No sensible copy desk would edit Abe Raskin. The problem is to get enough Abe Raskins.

The most honest of our press reflect the confusion of our times that exposes the glib prattle of popular columnists for sterile clichés. Readers find relief in following the endless details of such an elemental story as a literary fraud. It is easier on the mind than to fathom police corruption, welfare fraud, political deception, international anarchy, Jesus freaks and a theology that hails the death of God. Disillusioned youths drug their mind and the more sensitive reject the very terms we live by. A lament for the editorial writer, seeing in a glass darkly, seeing revelation through fog and mirage! Some brilliant reporters find escape and profit in dramatizing the bizarre, which the most ebulliently self-exploitive among them acclaim as having ousted the novel from literary primacy. If that is the new journalism, let us indeed tell sad stories of the death of kings, which is what some of the most creative of our television has turned to.

But to the daily journalist, sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof. Lucky that he need forecast only the weather and let the polls predict the rest.

Leon Edel, illuminating the role of the biographer on completion of his own monumental biography of Henry James—this in the Sunday Times February 14—said:

"I always write a chapter without knowing what the next one will be."

So he lets the story take him where it leads. No anticipatory hedging. This is detachment. It is also ever opening a fresh page. The quality of being unpredictable, whether in article, column or editorial, holds out reader anticipation, in happy contrast to the party line or stuck whistle cliché, endlessly repeated in minimal variation.

The journalistic mind needs to be skeptical but not cynical, for cynicism erodes judgment if not character itself. But journalism has always been too prone to accept authority —weather bureau, chamber of commerce, price index, FBI crime rate reports, pronouncements of bureaucrats and special commissions. We have recently been a good deal

abused of that by the Pentagon Papers, the Anderson Papers, the Peers Papers (on My lai in The New Yorker) by Seymour Hersh.

These have confirmed me in a long-held theory of the news that "murder will out." If the Republicans don't tell you the Democrats will; if not the press, then television, or Time, or some quickie paperback, or the memoirs of the ex-official.

The instantaneous universal reach of communication prevents bottling up much for long. The pressure of the ceaseless flow of events from all over makes news suppression increasingly difficult, and equally deters any perverse office bias to censor or distort. For any lid that is clamped on today may explode tomorrow, or the readers see it on television. Scotty Reston said of the investigation of the Anderson Papers leaks, that they would find the subversive villain was the Xerox machine. It is so easy to make extra copies; so hard to police them all.

Only the other day we were deploring chain store journalism, local monopolies, the death of crusading, and the financial bar to any new newspapers.

Who would have predicted that crusading would find revival in The Wall Street Journal and The New Yorker magazine? Or that a change of publisher generations would turn the Los Angeles Times under Otis Chandler from a reactionary, parochial monolith to the vital source of national and international news for several hundred newspapers? Or that the Boston Globe under Davis Taylor would rouse from a half a century of lethargy to rescue Boston from Villard's journalistic poor farm with an insistent civic voice? Or that a host of new little papers would rise in uninhibited response to those alienated from a status quo press?

The underground press has come above ground in some places to offer an alternative to the most stodgy and reactionary papers, as in New Orleans, and to latch on to real community issues in the San Francisco Bay area where the San Francisco Chronicle takes a leaf from Playboy to compete.

As they acquire more resources, competence and responsibility, some of these new papers, finding a new constituency of the young, and the new left, mavericks and individualists, will threaten those papers that fail to provide a civic voice, a concern for the customer as well as the advertiser, a forum for other views than those of the publisher. In what is so far a very limited way, they restore a diversity that had largely been squeezed out of the American press.

The new little papers have already disproved the notion that only a capitalist could start a newspaper. Most are as short of resources as of management talent and editorial responsibility. But some of them are gaining ground where there is local vacuum in journalistic quality.

Some are taking on the role of ombudsman for the consumer and the city neighborhoods whose needs are ignored by city hall. Here the conventional newspaper can compete, can do more. Television can and in a few instances is, by exploring neighborhood problems and airing their voices against the highway bulldozer, the airport expansion, the impersonal bureaucratic neglect of the conditions of living.

Another valuable ombudsman role would be the protection of privacy. The Supreme Court, in the Times-Alabama case of 1964, has given the press practical immunity from libel of public persons. But no parallel law protects private persons from press intrusion; indeed the courts have lamentably and casually bypassed chances to set limits to press privilege to exploit the victim and the innocent bystanders. This is a present gap in our civilization.

The rate of growth of the underground press, one may predict, will largely be determined by two things: the prevailing political climate, reaction increasing dissent; and the success of the conventional press to respond to its newer readership, to occupy all the center and some of the left before these elements secede.

A newspaper is only protecting its own future when it expands its forum role, as The New York Times op ed page under Harrison Salisbury and the Boston Globe's two extra pages of letters a week; where it strengthens and enlarges its investigative role.

The Times's Wallace Turner and the Globe's Spotlight Team demonstrate what thorough, responsible, investigative reporting can be. The Globe learned it by assigning a staff reporter half a year to join the London Sunday Times's trained investigators. It was the London Times whose staff proved up to the job of unraveling the Cornfeld international fraud.

But it is going to take more expertise and more assignment of resources for investigation to cope with the complexities of conglomerates and the relative impotence of regulatory agencies. The journalism of leaks is too sporadic. An alcoholic lobbyist is not always available.

Two Philadelphia newsapermen exposed the sordid story of the Wreck of the Penn Central. But they did it in a book, not in the newspaper they work on. When the sorry mess had gradually seeped through to the criminal courts after two years, The New York Times in an editorial January 17 asked, among other things: "Where was the press in all this, failing as it did, to follow up and investigate the many leads that had indicated trouble?"

This lays on a heavy responsibility. Perhaps too much. But our press makes large claims and its performance in the clutch needs to be appraised.

Readers have a right to ask of the Times editorial, what's the answer?

Pulitzer prizes historically have recognized exposure of

scandal in government, but seldom in business. The suspicion still exists that this is because business supplies the advertising revenue that supports the press. Dependence on advertising gave the newspapers a commercial base and long inhibited it as a force against commercialism. This was the case seventy-five years ago when the muckrakers had to take their issues to a few crusading magazines. But it need no longer be so, with the great diversity of advertising and the dominance of single newspaper ownership in most cities. But the press is freeing itself from advertising pressure. The openness in dealing with the cigarette as a health hazard is a conspicuous demonstration.

The insidious and irresponsible spread of conglomerates into publishing has not only destroyed a series of magazines, but has restricted the independence of publications. A film maker acquires a magazine and liquidates it for speculative profits. A newspaper acquires a magazine and subverts its editorial policy. A magazine invests in a distinguished book company, ostensibly as an investment. Independence is the life blood of an institution that publishes ideas. Independence is threatened by control by a force alien to its intrinsic role.

When Frank Munsey acquired the New York Sun and turned it into an evening paper, Villard said Munsey had caused the Sun to give out a feeble light at night. When the conservative owners of the Philadelphia Ledger bought the independent New York Post in the 20's, Christopher Morley left the Post with an appeal, in his Religio Journalisti, "A little dignity, gentlemen, for God's sake, a little dignity."

To close without reference to television would evidence more obsolescence than I choose to confess.

Following Eric Sevareid in this spot, I don't venture any further into television than my amateur fringe role, for I know little more about it than a syndicated columnist knows about publishing a newspaper.

A television broadcaster knows, however, even without the authority of Walter Cronkite, that the television viewer has to read a newspaper to be informed.

But television has opened up the press. Capturing the first flush of the news, it has forced the press to follow with a further dimension of background and meaning to the event.

Television is at least an elementary check on the press, which can't scamp the news without risk of being exposed by the television screen.

Television of course could be more of a factor. The press criticizes television as it does other institutions. But television provides no such criticism of the press, save spottily in a few isolated localities.

But there has been in New York an innovative program on the press that Channel 13 has been doing in a half-hour weekly program at 7:30 Monday night, repeated Tuesday at 8.

They have been showing the processes and techniques of the press, how the story is reported and edited, both in newsprint and on the air. How a story gets to the front page of The New York Times; how film is edited for a news show; how Time Inc. puts together its cover story; how the press covered Mayor Lindsay in Florida; how William Loeb's Manchester Union Leader covers politics in New Hampshire.

I am told that this has the highest rating of any locally produced public television program, and beyond New York is used on 20 other stations. It is informing, professional and interesting. This is a timely moment for us to appreciate it, because the $300,000 funding by the Markle Foundation has run out, and, as always in public television, the problem is to keep funding to keep going.

I winced a little to hear that it was designed to be different from the conventional news broadcasts. But innovation is what we need, and should celebrate.

One would hope that television, maturing in responsibility and in techniques, will add such dimensions to communication in which it will obviously and inevitably have the more kinetic impact.

I don't need to know any more about television than any viewer to be convinced that the full first amendment independence that the press enjoys must be recognized for television, with whatever accommodation this may require in rationing the air bands. Else with the obviously increasing dominance of communication by television our traditional freedom of communication will diminish. It is even more axiomatic that public television must be so sustained as to free it from such political inhibitions as Mr. Clay T. Whitehead's expressed fear that it may engage in controversial programs. To accept that timid limitation would be to gut its primary public service.

Until Court, Congress or Constitution close the possibility of such a gap in the First Amendment, we must count on our broadcasters to assert and practice the fullest freedom that is so essential to all of us.

Elmer Davis's admonition, "Don't Let Them Scare You," is as timely now as in the 50's. It needs to be pasted on the wall over the desks of all television executives. ~

News and the New Bigotry

By John De Mott

Dr. De Mott is Associate Professor in the Journalism Department at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb.

By over-rating the news value of any viable society's natural and inevitable generation gap, and by over-emphasizing that gap's influence on social conflict today, many American newsmen are contributing to the development of a new kind of bigotry which could rival old-fashioned racism in time.

The development is ironic. Primarily, however, because some of those contributing most to the growth of the New Bigotry are those most outraged over race prejudice and discrimination. So now, as many are beginning to see some light at the end of our dark, long tunnel of neanderthal race relations in this country, we could be entering a longer, darker tunnel.

Every age or generation creates its own new kinds of evil, and as old modes of evil go out of style and become passe or camp, new ways of exploiting other human beings, mistreating others, and discriminating against others are devised. Each age creates, as a part of its particular life style, its fashionable or "in" bigotry. Today's hip or mod bigotry is expressed in the statement "never trust anyone over thirty."

Such bigotry provokes a counter-bigotry, and therefore the premise that "kids are no damned good" becomes acceptable in some circles.

Abused and baited by young radicals attempting to take over the college campus, some professor is certain to sit down and write an article for his local newspaper to be entitled "I'm Tired of the Tyranny of Spoiled Brats," as one professor did a few years ago. Such a reaction demonstrates that there is a Boyle's law which operates in social psychology, too.

Caught in the increasingly volatile generation gap between teen-age bigotry and counter-bigotry are the news media. Perceptive newsmen, sensitive to their own problems as well as those of others, are painfully aware of what the generation gap and its new bigotry are doing to them. In a talk at Kent State University, only a few months before tragedy struck that campus, Norman Isaacs, who was then president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, made these perceptive observations:

> "To the older half of the country, we of the Press are traitors and worse. We are accused of deliberately suppressing good news, of slanting everything to fit our biases, and trying to tear down the nation.
>
> "One might think, in the face of this, that we are, therefore, popular with the younger half of the nation. Not so. The young tend to look on us as being in collusion with the establishment. They are cynical about both Government and the Press.
>
> "Both halves—the young and the old—want us to serve their individual prejudices."

The dilemma described by Isaacs is one to which the press is accustomed, because the real professional in journalism is often criticized by both sides in any argument or conflict.

The professional newsman learns to react philosophically, and, because of his skeptical attitude toward the extremists on both sides of issues resulting from bigoted approaches to problems, he sometimes appears cynical or calloused. Such is the case in this observation made by a newsman asked for his opinion on the generation gap.

> "Whenever I'm asked to arbitrate silly arguments over whether persons over thirty can be trusted, or whether kids are worth a damn, I'm tempted to declare that the premises held by extremists of both sides are quite justified. Persons over thirty cannot be trusted, and kids are no damned good. It's an obvious draw, as are most childish arguments."

The childishness of an argument doesn't prevent it from having a disastrous impact on society, however, so the news

media have a moral obligation to avoid escalating such controversies as much as possible.

Some amount of escalation, and some polarizing of the persons involved, is inevitable. That's inherent in the simple function of reporting the news, and attempting to interpret it.

"Manifestations of the value gap between the generations makes news every single day," Jonathan Cohn, a Harvard student once told a convention of editors. "Newspapers by their very nature broaden the perspective of individuals alienated and yet isolated. They create a common bond between advocates on both sides of the generation gap, and, although not in direct contact with each other, through common experiences, through reading the same newspapers, through reading about each others experiences, this bond is created and reinforced.

"They universalize and publicize a problem which is already universal," Cohn explained.

"Second, newspapers analyze the phenomena they observe," he pointed out. "Obviously, this is part of their obligation and yet very few people consider themselves either young or old. Very few of us can disassociate our thoughts on the generation gap from our own personality and our own values. So, in reading analyses of the generation gap, we're going to construe these analyses in a direction to reinforce our own thoughts. Someone with only tentative sympathies for either generation is going to intensify those sympathies with prolongued media exposure to them.

"In this sense," Cohn added, "because the generation gap is the sort of issue with which we all identify, media analysis of the generation gap necessarily polarizes us in the generation gap."

By making "generation gap" a common pat answer to questions involving the origin of social conflict involving persons of different ages, in their attempts at interpretation of the news, many newsmen are cultivating the growth of the New Bigotry, as they have in the past at times acted to polarize the races and escalate racial conflict.

It all happens quite innocently, of course, as a consequence of our conventional news values; and today's journalism teachers and other college professors are just as guilty as anyone else of perpetuating the news media's traditional over-emphasis on conflict and controversy. At present, perhaps, journalism schools are more at fault than professional newsmen, especially when considering the escalation of conflict that can be attributed to "generation gap." Bigotry which is based upon age reaches its most critical eyeball-to-eyeball stage on today's college campus, and therefore the journalism professor is prone to over-emphasize the existence and news value of the generation gap.

The generation gap is not alone, however, in the way its polarizing and brutalizing potential is brought to cruel reality by conventional news values.

To illustrate the problem, let's look at several statements that might be made by a person involved in any kind of controversy involving a "generation gap."

1. Some teenagers are more intelligent than others, obviously.
2. Some adults are not sincere, obviously.
3. Most young people are hypocritical, it sometimes appears.
4. Older people are interested in making money, primarily.
5. College students are spoiled brats.
6. Adults are immoral, or not as moral as younger persons, at least.

Going from statements one through six, it's obvious that conventional news value increases, isn't it? The accusation or charge is more "serious," of course, and manifests a greater "conflict." Conflict is one of the most important ingredients in our traditional concept of human interest, as a news value.

News is, after all, a four-letter word.

So how can anyone expect any newsman NOT to give more attention, space, and circulation to the most "serious" charge made by a speaker, or person being interviewed—especially with the newsman's competition there on the spot itself, set to scoop him if he doesn't note and publicize the most bigoted statement?

The commercial value of intemperate remarks, and the vested commercial interest that news media have in controversy, is recognized by every newsman. The nation's printing presses make much of their profits from controversy, conflict, prejudice, and animosities. Even outright bigotry, at times. The same situation exists in television, radio, and film-making.

Considering the media's commercial interest in controversy, few expect them to overlook extremists.

That's why we have libel laws. Because we've known for many years that newsmen couldn't be expected to solve the problems of bigotry and hate themselves—at the cost of their own livelihood.

But then the New York Times vs Sullivan case decision came along, giving the media of mass communications a new kind of license to print or broadcast almost any kind of irresponsible attack on any kind of "public" figure.

Tragically, the Times decision caught much of our profession unprepared for such a license.

Our standard news reporting and editing practices are based upon an assumption that unfair competition in the coverage of social controversy and conflict is going to be restrained by application of the libel law, instead of through more effective professional discipline.

Until more effective methods of professional discipline are developed to restrain irresponsible exercises in the jour-

nalistic escalation of social conflict, many newsmen are going to continue doing things that give unnecessary aid and comfort to the promoters of bigotry.

And a bigotry which is based on another man's age, rather than the color of his skin, is just as dangerous as racism—and could become just as damaging, in time, as the kind of hate preached by extremists like those of the old Ku Klux Klan.

Resembling the discredited doctrine of white "supremacy," or Nazi Germany's myth of the "super" race, a bigoted super-generation myth appears to have developed recently as part of the elite mentality afflicting some college students. Juvenilistic assertions of intellectual or moral supremacy, based on the simple biological fact of having been born more recently, naturally provoke a counter-bigotry among older persons.

Reacting against arrogant assertions of superior intellect and self-righteousness by young people, some older persons overrate the moralizing or humanizing influence of simple experience in practical affairs, and therefore believe that THEY have the monopoly over virtue and wisdom, rather than the more militant moralists and preachy types among today's college crowd.

Despite the eloquence of their bigotry, and the exposure and circulation it gets in the mass media, today's neo-Puritans are hardly a new breed. Today's college students are no more conceited than those of other generations, since a considerable proportion of the students attending any college have always thought that they knew more than their professors. Encouraged and flattered by the attention given them by American news media, today's students are much more uninhibited in expressing their adolescent frustrations and their sensitivity toward the generation gap.

And there IS a generation gap, naturally, as there has been since the birth of mankind's first child.

Failure to recognize and acknowledge the existence of occasional conflicts of interest between persons of different ages—the real generation gap—would destroy the news media's credibility. The news media must put the generation gap in its proper perspective.

The news media don't often enough point out that there SHOULD be a generation gap. If there isn't a big generation gap between college professors and their students, then there's something radically wrong with the educational process. It's the difference between students and teachers, not their similarities, which gives the educational experience its meaning. The benefits of education are derived from learning to understand and relate to persons different from oneself, not from spending pleasant hours "rapping" with those to whom one "relates" easily. One of the essential attributes of a good teacher is a talent for infuriating his students. College students, like other normal human beings, learn most from persons different from themselves—provided, that they are able to communicate those differences adequately.

Throughout an entire society, it's the differences between individual persons—occupational, ethnic, political, artistic, social, and other gaps, as well as the generation gap—that make life such a fascinating thing. Seen in its proper perspective, and treated as a natural condition of life and source of social strength, the generation gap is no horrifying problem. It's such a problem only when it serves as a premise for bigotry.

Also, the generation gap is bound to become more significant as our urbanized social system becomes more complex. As the things that need to be known by every young man before he is able to take his place in adult society as a contributing member become more numerous, the rite of passage becomes more elaborate and tortuous.

Another obvious aspect of every civilized society's natural generation gap is the matter of self-interest. Every young man's most important asset is his enthusiasm, energy, and familiarity with the particularistic life "styles" of his contemporaries rather than the patience of age, emotional stability, and experience.

Following his self-interest, the older man stresses the importance of experience, stability, patience, and similar assets, while the young man stresses such things as energy and enthusiasm. In an effort to overcome his lack of experience, the young man may even argue that experience is a liability, thereby trying to convert his own most obvious liability into an asset.

Just because the young and older persons do have some obvious differences in natural self-interests does NOT mean that differences between individuals of differing ages—or groups of considerable size—are manifestations of generation gap.

If newsmen are going to be able to put the generation gap in perspective, they're going to have to avoid interpreting every argument between persons of different ages as manifestations of generation gap.

The confrontation between a university administration and militant student power-lusters is NOT necessarily a result of generation gap, but more likely a simple struggle for power which has nothing to do with age. The role of the student—young, old, or middle-aged—and that of the university administrator have built-in points of friction, and that friction would exist if both the university administrator and all of the university's students were of the same age. The fact that college students are practically all teen-agers and university administrators middle-aged men is more or less irrelevant. The frequent conflict between them results from a difference in social role and function, rather than their difference in age. The problem is NOT really a generation gap.

One of the most glaring examples of unjustified use of

the generation gap bit in pseudo-interpretation of the news occurred—of all places—in the New York Times. In printing a photograph showing a policeman manning a barricade keeping teen-agers out of a rock music festival, the Times used the following cutlines: "state trooper and a visitor exchanged glares across the generation gap at a roadblock."

From the photograph, the uniformed trooper appears to be considerably older than the long-haired youth presumably wanting to get through the roadblock, but did the newsman who wrote those lines really think that the relationship between the policeman and the other man would have been different if they had been of comparable age?

To a policeman, it makes no real difference that the person heckling him is 16, 21, or 40; and to persons who see the police as "fascist pigs," it makes no difference whether the policeman is 21 or 65.

One of the most incisive reflections of journalistic awareness of the "generation" gap's nature that has ever been published is a magazine cartoon showing a little old lady and an old man sitting in convalescent chairs on the front lawn of the Sunset Valley Rest Home.

Walking past them is a young man.

"That's Mr. Hawkins," the little old lady says to the old man. "He represents the establishment around this place."

Again, the respective roles played by people explain their differences more often than their ages. For example, if a newsman should find a Republican businessman arguing with his son, a college student belonging to the "new Left," is he justified in describing it as a manifestation of generation gap? If so, then what does he do about the student belonging the Young Americans for Freedom arguing with the middle-aged proprietor of a mod clothing shop? Or one of his radical professors?

Newspapers in the Chicago areas got just such a story when a high school senior of Republican loyalties complained that one of his teachers (a Democratic candidate for the state legislature) insisted on pushing Democratic party viewpoints in class, and discouraged students from expressing support for the Nixon administration.

Generation Gap? Of course not. But let's suppose that the political loyalties of students and teacher had been the reverse. Many newsmen probably would have attributed the conflict to generation gap, encouraging the development of age bigotry, when the conflict is simply a matter of individual political preference.

Except when they're mobilized by alarms based on generation gap, young people have little more in common among themselves than the rest of our country's diverse population.

Evidence that persons in the same age group are almost as likely to see things differently, depending on their family, background, education, training, occupation, politics, religion, etc., as others is manifested in this amusing letter received by Ann Landers:

> "Here's a message for 'Had It,' the mother of a teen-age Cop-Out. 'Keep yourself clean. Respect older people. Accept responsibility. The world doesn't owe you anything. Get moving. Make a contribution.' These are the same rules I was raised by and I'm 16—a member of your son's generation. Apparently you believe all teenagers are alike. You are mistaken."

Further evidence that teen-agers and students can't be stereotyped, that they have their differences like the rest of us, and that they are inclined to resent being seen as members of this or that generation, is reflected in the following letter, written by a coed at Northwestern University who resented being prevented from using facilities there during a student "strike":

> "I speak at this moment, not as any sort of representative for any sort of group or faction or school of thought, but as an individual, and in spite of the trend toward the eradication of such a method of speech, it appears that my own personal time of expression has come. . .
>
> "I am a member of the youth of America, the "younger generation," . . . However, I fear I would gladly exchange my Membership for one in the Senior Citizens, or some like organization.
>
> "Up to this point, with the exception of a few occasions, I have been quite satisfied with the other members of my organization, but since some of them feel that I should no longer be permitted to share in the fringe benefits, a resignation is in line."

On the other hand, one often finds older persons alienated from society's "establishment" or the power structure of a local community who identify with the younger generation, as did the writer of this letter to the editor:

> "What with the antics of the American Legion, the inanities of Spiro Agnew, the silliness of the D.A.R., the neanderthal absurdities of congressional committees (most of whose chairmen are well past middle age)—it is most refreshing to call to mind that before very many years have passed, my generation will be out of policy-making power and will be replaced by another generation with another kind of life style, which places emphasis not on making war and making money, but on making love, and making compassion and human understanding work in the citadels of power.
>
> "God bless 'em! A new and better day is coming—if we can survive the intervening years until they take over."

Comparing that letter and similar ones written by forty-five year-olds complaining that persons over thirty don't listen to college student militants, with some of those written by students themselves, even the most obtuse newsman ought to be able to understand that difference of opinion between persons of different ages aren't always a result of those age differences.

Unless newsmen make a more discriminating use of the popular term generation gap, it is going to be used to explain almost every argument involving persons of different ages, and therefore contribute to a dangerous growth of the New Bigotry.

No responsible news media critic is going to suggest suppressing news involving controversy which has its real basis in age differential. But the news media should avoid attributing differences between persons of different ages to generation gap—a most superficial analysis of interpretation —when there are other causes of the controversy.

Above all, the news media need to make their reporting reflect more often the common concerns of persons of all ages, as the most conscientious newsmen are now attempting to focus their coverage more often on the mutual interests of black, brown, red and white Americans. In every way possible, the news media should avoid polarizing people on the basis of either color, race or age; and discourage rather than encourage the perpetuation of stereotypes of the young, the old, or the middle-aged.

Unlike a particular family, a society isn't made up of generations. Ranging in age from infant to senior citizen enjoying his golden age, individual persons make up the human race, or a society.

Although a particular family has its obvious generations, thinking of an entire society as made up of generations is nonsense. The newsman who attempts to analyze some national social ill as the result of generation gap appears to be assuming that people come into the world in huge groups every twenty-one years or so. It's a superficial analysis, and also one that tends to promote growth of the New Bigotry.

"One of the most diabolic of all the techniques of discord," a commencement speaker once observed in addressing a group of graduating seniors, "is the repeated insistence of 'The Generation Gap.' Frankly, I don't know where the Generation Gap occurs. Is it after high school? After college? After age 30? Or is the trick of this illusion that it automatically impells the listener—any listener—either to identify himself as either young or old, committing him to take sides in a contest, instead of participating rationally in a discussion?

"Teachers of Latin and Greek must be amused," Rexford S. Blazer remarked; "Socrates, Cato, and dozens of other philosophers and critics have pondered over youth and prescribed for its problems only to be succeeded by the young who in turn grow old and raised a quizzical eyebrow at their progeny. Their writing was confined to philosophic observations, without the amplifications of mass media or an opportunity for immediate and direct reply from the young on video tape. It is the accelerated speed of communications in the Twentieth Century that encourages quick, hot replies instead of the more carefully considered reactions of the past. All the more reason, I would suggest, for us to preserve communications at all age levels and to reject divisive slogans like 'Generation Gap.'

"The situation is aggravated, I think," Blazer observed, "by over-emphasis on youth as a distinct class in our society. Even in sophisticated circles, there is accepted an oft-repeated fallacy: half our population is under twenty-five. That's not true, and probably never will be true within our lives. It was true once—very briefly—in 1920. Moreover, our median age is growing older because our birth rate is declining and people are living longer; also an important segment of the under-25 group includes babies still in diapers, school children and immature youth.

"But I'm not talking about statistics," Blazer pointed out, "I'm talking about the cleavage so erroneously implied—perhaps first popularized in a book about nephew and uncle who exchanged life roles. It was called The Generation Gap.

"In truth," Blazer pointed out, "there are no such distinct separations of ages—but a continuity of ages. Divisions into classes based upon birthdates are arbitrary and unreal."

Dividing the human race into generations is a favorite sport of juveniles living or reared in the affluent suburbs surrounding our large cities, for such suburbs are often inhabited by apparent generations. Since such suburbs were developed more or less as units, with young upward-mobile couples buying the houses at about the same time and rearing their children together, there is more distinction between generations in such suburbs.

Also, there are few aged persons or grandparents, maiden aunts, or bachelor uncles in such suburbs. Just mothers and father, of comparable age, for the most part; and then their children, also of comparable age. Such children form strong peer or in-groups cherishing their togetherness, and sometimes develop a suspicious attitude toward older "out-groups."

College professors and others in the academic community have been impressed at times by how often a student pleading "generation gap" in defense of his failure to understand and appreciate persons of different ages comes from the affluent "planned" suburban area surrounding the large city. Seldom does such a student come from the small town, or the central city, where the social structure is more communal—integrated, in age.

Incidentally, one of the factors contributing most to the communications gap between age groups in this country is the primitive practice of families sending their children away to college, the anachronistic institution of the residential college of liberal arts, and the concept of in-loco-parentis still plaguing our system of higher education.

One of the most helpful things that the media of mass communications has begun to do at this troubled time is start taking a more critical attitude toward proposed expenditures of public funds for things like student dormitories, student union buildings, and other physical facilities

that isolate young people in what amount to huge teen-age ghettos encouraging a ghetto-like persecution mentality.

The enforced isolation of teen-agers into campus ghettos —professors don't live adjacent to the campus anymore, but drive to the office like everyone else nowadays—promotes alienation from the rest of the community, nourishes the self-pity which adolescents feel frequently, and can even lead to development of a paranoic attitude toward those in control of "The Establishment."

"The fly has got to learn to stay alive on a flywheel," as a columnist for one of the nation's amateur newspapers once explained. "Kent State should demonstrate conclusively to anyone who has doubted it up to now that his father and mother will cheerfully murder him, that they have the power and he does not."

Such deep-seated distrust and even hatred of older people has spawned an assortment of specialized media catering to the disturbed juvenile and his bigotry—youth-oriented "underground" newspapers libeling older persons in charge of the despised "Establishment," musical recordings designed to promote the "revolution" of adolescents and the development of a separate sub-culture devoted to their special interests, and self-pity movies like "Easy Rider" and "The Graduate."

To reverse the trend toward increasing distrust and disillusionment by youth, and growth of the New Bigotry, the media of mass communication need to improve their performance in three respects.

First, the media must do a more professional job concerning news involving identifiable age group interests, demonstrating to both teen-agers and older person that all news is reported accurately and objectively as possible—coolly, carefully, fairly, and dispassionately.

In reporting more news in which youth or older persons have a special interest, however, the media must carefully avoid catering to the prejudices of any age group, and therefore encouraging growth of the New Bigotry. We must make the maximum effort to report news of youth in a way which makes it interesting to older persons, and news concerning older persons in a way which makes it interesting to young people.

The easy way to do that, of course, is by writing the news in terms of standard stereotypes, as we did for many years in reporting news of Negroes or blacks. The media must avoid that in every way possible.

Most important of all, the news media should increase their concentration upon news of general public interest, leaving the communication of information furthering the parochial or provincial interests of age-oriented group to specialized media serving those interests. The newspapers or other medium of general circulation can no better serve the special interest of any age group than it can serve the special interest of the Black Panthers or the Ku Klux Klan.

Second, in attempting to interpret news involving disputes between persons of different ages, the media should shun such easy answers as "generation gap,"—except in cases in which the dispute is really a result of a difference in age.

The newsman cannot ignore, of course, the elemental fact that a man's age gives him certain special interests at times, but more news emphasis should be placed on the mutual interests and concerns of those of all ages.

Public opinion surveys like those conducted by George Gallup, Lou Harris, and the College Poll organization disclose that there is little basic difference between the beliefs of persons classified according to age, and sometimes described as generations.

Whenever radical differences in opinion do appear to exist, moreover, they are often misleading, because the focus is so often on means, rather than ends.

For example, suppose Gallup asked people their opinion on whether young people or older people are the most hypocritical. The result can be anticipated, easily. Since there are too many bigots of all ages in our society, a majority of young people would answer that older people are more hypocritical; and a majority of older people would answer that young people are most hypocritical. Unless, of course, one gave all of them a chance to answer "neither" or "don't know."

Would such results indicate a radical difference in attitudes between the generations? On the surface, maybe. But underneath, don't forget, there lies perhaps a universal consensus that people ought to be sincere, that they should not behave hypocritically. The news media should emphasize agreements like that, agreements on basic aims and ideals, rather than the less important or superficial differences of opinion over how well our common objectives are being achieved, etc.

Whenever one really analyses the basic convictions of college students—excepting the conviction of many youngsters that older people don't have the same convictions as themselves—it turns out that students and other teen-agers believe the same things as their parents and other older persons. Reporting on a seminar held at Harvard University, at which youthful "radicals" were invited to explore the needs for reconstituting American society, Charles Bartlett of the Chicago Sun-Times related that "a sense that something is wrong pervaded the discussions. But the evils perceived by students turned out, under scrutiny, to be much like evil perceived by everyone else."

"Ideas for solving our society's problems were explored. So were the possible consequences of each proposal. Grandiose plans dismantled. Myths exploded.

"But the real myth," Bartlett commented, "may be the generation gap, a divergence whose dramatic impact clearly exceeds, at least so far, its implication for change."

Bartlett's report recalls the following observation once made by another journalist:

"The only thing those rich kids playing revolutionary have against the establishment is that they're not running it. If they were given control of the power structure, they wouldn't change a thing. They'd just enjoy having the power, as they'll always resent someone else having it."

The lust for political or economic power isn't the only thing which creates rivalries and conflicts which can be seen unjustifiably as generation gap if the combatants happen to be of different ages.

In interpreting news involving such conflict between persons of different ages, the news media need to explain that much of the controversy and actual conflict in any society are generated by the fact that all human beings want the same things—physical safety, love and approval of one's neighbors, economic security and money, opportunities to develop his personality and civil liberty, power over the forces that effect his life and influence in his community. . . . The list is endless, really.

By virtue of experience and many years spent exploiting the opportunity which came their way, older men hold most of the power in any system. That power is coveted, naturally, by younger men, who become rivals for it. Since most of those seeking power are generally younger than those holding most of it, some generation gap is inevitable. But it needn't degenerate into bigotry. And it won't, provided the media of mass communication put more emphasis on our common concerns and interest.

Third, the media need to communicate the humor inherent in the generation gap, at every opportunity. Bigots of any kind, in any age, can't stand simple exposure of their irrationalities. Persons of any age attempting to stir up hatred against those of a different age should be given little serious attention by news media.

"The advocates of a bigotry which is based on another person's age should be treated in the same way as those advocating bigotries based on race, religion, sex or other similar characteristics. The more attention such bigots are given by news media, the more polarization takes place among people generally.

Like neo-Nazis, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, and similar clowns, the advocates of the New Bigotry are pathetic creatures, unable to see the humor in perennial human predicaments like the generation gap.

Explaining the need for a sense of humor in improving communications between persons of different ages, a newspaper columnist once commented:

> "I've seen up-tight fathers who were rigidly inflexible toward boys their daughters liked, yet they were ostensibly able to laugh about everything else in the world.
>
> "And I've seen hip, sophisticated, cheerful students who were able to laugh at fatigue, dead-end situations in their lives, hard work and broken love affairs, but not at their self-righteous intransigence toward their parents.
>
> "Absurdity, in one form or another, pervades every aspect of human life. Being able to perceive this—and share in laughing about it—is healing. It is also the beginning of self-knowledge."

Young people who take themselves too seriously, and older persons doing the same, are almost certain to become converts to the New Bigotry.

Journalists did not create the social conditions out of which have grown the New Bigotry, of course, even though the media of mass communications have an important role in influencing the course of social change. However, the media must do everything possible to avoid approaches to coverage of news involving the generation gap—and the interpretation of such news, especially—which might facilitate the growth of the New Bigotry.

Most important of all, newsmen should resolve that never again will one of them suggest, as one did in a story about the tragedy at Kent State University, that the fatal shots fired by an inadequate unit of National Guard troops may have been "the first heavy volley fired by a nation now at war with its young."

It was a dark day at Kent State University, but a darker day for newsmen attempting to avoid contributing to the growth of the New Bigotry. ~

The Press and the Political Year

by Erwin D. Canham

Mr. Canham is Editor in Chief of The Christian Science Monitor. The following excerpts are from the text of the 19th annual Lovejoy Lecture at Colby College in Waterville, Maine.

The newspaper press is in very great danger today.

There is the possibility that newspapers as we have known them for a long time in the western world will change form, will indeed go out of existence.

I am not often a prophet of doom. I am not prophesying doom today, if those of us who are deeply dedicated to the task of informing the public through the medium of print respond to the crisis with appropriate action and adaptation.

What are the dangers?

Some are very concrete, others much more subtle. But, in the first place, costs of producing newspapers continue to mount astronomically. Some gazers into the future have speculated that we will have to compress our printed products, and charge something like fifty cents a copy in order to stay in business.

I do not take so dim a view, but none of us can avoid the conclusion that we are caught by opposing pressures: the rising costs of production, particularly of labor, and the constant inroads into national advertising revenues made by television. The two curves fight one another, and catch us in a cleft stick.

What I say here relates particularly to large metropolitan newspapers which depended heavily on national advertising. Smaller papers, and particularly community newspapers, do not have so tough a problem. They can perform services which radio and television cannot effectively carry out. Their utility in the future is less jeopardized.

I do not believe, with our friend Professor McLuhan, that the day of the printed word has gone. I believe written language has great power and value, and will always have it. But if we are to survive prosperously and serviceably, we will have to use our unique tool of written language more powerfully and more responsibly than we have done in the recent past.

That brings me to the second element of the newspaper crisis—the first having been the economic crisis—which I should like to discuss. It is our own basic problem of fulfillment of responsibility, and this is particularly applicable in an election year.

In essence it is the problem of credibility. Mistrust runs through our national society today. Maybe that is why Waterville's most publicized citizen, Ed Muskie, initially chose trust as a campaign slogan. For a newspaper to be mistrusted is a very unhealthy situation. And for mistrust to permeate a nation's blood stream, like a noxious virus, is a disastrous condition.

Newspapers should work hard to restore their credibility. This means much greater attention to accurate reporting. I shall not use the word "objectivity" because I do not believe there is any such thing, but I believe accuracy is a standard which can be relatively if not absolutely sought, and detachment is a quality which will help.

I believe a reporter—and the reporter is the vital person in the news process—should feel a high sense of professional detachment. He is not a participant in an event, he is an observer of it. He has feelings like everybody else, he can have fire and excitement in his handling of the news, but he is a reporter above all and that means he is professionally outside the event, however much he may be bashed or gassed or pushed around. His job is to tell what happens, as best he can, and in a way as nearly as it appears to the participants themselves as possible.

Perhaps this last point is over-simplified and debatable. Certainly an event will look differently in the eyes of the observer than in the eyes and viscera of the participant. But we should strive more vigorously to describe an event so that those who see it will say: "Yes, that's the way it was."

I know this is a counsel of perfection, since every event looks different to every person seeing it, but I believe we could approach the ideal much more nearly than we do.

Very often indeed, participants in events will read about it in the paper and say: "That's not the way it was at all." This builds up mistrust. Part of the trouble lies in our standard definition of news. Generally speaking, news is novelty, sensation, crime, passion, disaster, and the more the better. Nobody denies that such elements find ready access into the human mind: they are interesting, and the newspaper must be interesting or perish.

But that kind of news is not the whole life. The absence of crime in a nearby town may sometimes be more important, hence more worthy to be communicated to readers, than to banner headlines of a gruesome murder halfway around the world. It is difficult to make important news interesting. It takes more professional skill. But it ought to be done much more widely than ever before. The mirror we hold up to life ought to be less distorted. The significance of news to people's lives—significance for good as well as for evil ought to be a part of the definition of news.

New definitions of news will lead us into new and important areas of human life. We should not merely continue to staff beats at police stations and city halls, and of course alert newspapers are not doing so. There has been a tremendous growth of investigative reporting in recent years, often through teams. These have moved into many areas of life which need exploring, but there is a great deal more to do.

News in the past has been event-oriented. It is getting to be more and more situation-oriented. We have been the slave of the event, the servant of time alone, and we have wasted a lot of time just waiting around for things to happen. Investigative reporting about situations is much more rewarding, gets much deeper into significance and validity than merely covering an event. Nothing can more effectively restore the credibility of a newspaper in a community than the uncovering of some situation which badly needs exposure.

This brings me back to the poltical year. Like everything else, the coverage of politics becomes more complex and more costly. I think we tend to over-do it. Our whole society, as a matter of fact, suffers from what is technically called information overload. This applies above all to the floods of speculative copy which emerge from states like New Hampshire and Florida before the voters of those great states have the opportunity of casting their crucial ballots. I think a good many Americans are going to get very weary of politics before November arrives at last.

But I think that on the whole, this campaign will be covered accurately and honestly. American political reporting has steadily improved down through the years. In the 19th century, most papers were deeply partisan. Their news stories sound like vituperative editorials today. Over the last half century, things have got better.

We have now-a-days three levels of political writing, and they ought to be kept distinct and identified. First is the reporting of events and situations. Next is the writing of opinion and analytical signed columns. Finally come the newspaper's editorials, which express its own opinion. The only difficulty in these categories comes in distinguishing between reporting the analytical or situation stories. Much has been said lately of interpretive reporting. I do not like the term. It smacks too much of opinion, and really belongs in the second or signed opinion or analysis column. But the reporting can be enterprising. It can be reporting in depth. It can legitimately compare a candidate's words today with his deeds in office a year ago. It can investigate, probe, uncover, always with reportorial tools, which are the most devastating tools we possess.

With the existence of news analysis or opinion columns, there is no need for the reporter to go farther afield in the realm of opinion. Interpretive reporting, I think, is a contradiction of terms.

The political reporter has to work very hard to be detached. And when reporters, as so many inevitably are, are rather liberally oriented, skeptical, cynical, and when they tend to build up an adversary relationship to the power-that-be, and when the representative of those powers—like President Nixon—has neither personality nor policies which greatly endear him to political correspondents,—well, when all this exists, the reporter has to work doubly hard not to let his prejudices show. He must be honest and fair. It is even more difficult for the television reporters and pundits, where —as we have been reminded—a facial expression can tell a story. I thought I saw some newsmen being forced rather reluctantly to rise above their prejudices on the recent Nixon trip to China.

Anyway, I think the political reporters will be on their good behaviour this year. Vice President Agnew's spirited criticisms have made us all more careful, and so far as that goes it's a good thing. For the government to threaten use of its regulatory power over the electronic media to control or influence their political reporting would be a total and very dangerous abuse.

There will be severe critics of the behaviour of the media in this year's campaign. There already are. The most sensational event thus far, I believe, was the episode of Senator Muskie's tears as he answered critcisms from the Union Leader in the streets of Manchester, New Hampshire. Most people date Senator Muskie's downfall from that moment. They say the slide started then. And some of them, probably including the Senator, blame the media for magnifying the incident.

Did they? How much of the impact of the episode came

from television pictures, how much from reiterated emphasis and discussion in the print media? It is, I think, very hard to tell. Probably the incident was unduly dwelt upon. News was rather thin in those days. There had been no excitement. Only a handful of people actually witnessed the scene. Without television, I doubt if the national impact would have been very great.

Some Ph.D. candidate will write his thesis about the coverage of Senator Muskie's tears. I do not have the data he or she will have. But I have the feeling that the incident might have reacted to Senator Muskie's advantage if all the other factors in his encounter with the American public had been sufficiently favorable. Tears have helped some public men in our time. Winston Churchill wept freely and often during World War II—his lacrymal flow far exceeded Ed Muskie's and the British people loved him for it. Tears of frustration at an attack on one's wife ought to redound to a man's credit. They didn't help Senator Muskie.

Could the event have been reported more objectively, more dispassionately, less sensationally? Probably it could. But I believe that behind the reporting of the experienced correspondents was an awareness that Senator Muskie is a man of considerable emotional fire, sometimes, I am told, going considerably beyond what you would expect. But so was Lyndon Johnson, for goodness' sake, and even Dwight Eisenhower.

What I think we face here is the phenomenon of a single episode, relatively insignificant in itself, serving as a symbol for a whole complex political situation. It was the same, surely, with George Romney's famous "brain-washing" phrase which seemed to blow him out of contention in the 1968 Republican primaries. It was a sensational phrase, it hit the American public hard, it was ill-advised, and yet it was honest. The same idea, put into slightly different words, might well have helped Governor Romney instead of hurt him. Yet the failure to put the idea differently told voters something about Governor Romney, and probably history was well served.

The undeniable adversary role of the press may lead to an unfair use of power. Some critics of the media are now saying that this adversary role impels the press to tear away at the front runner in a campaign, thus helping to bring him down. We will see whether anything of this sort happens in the cases of Senators McGovern or Humphrey. They say it happened with Muskie.

The adversary role did not hurt Jack Kennedy during his campaigns, nor his brother Robert. I do not believe the general reporting of Teddy's misadventure at Chappaquidick was distorted. The facts, such as they were known, were enough to speak for themselves.

Thus the generally sympathetic press the Kennedys have received raises the familiar charge that many reporters are liberally motivated, sympathetic to the life-style and responsive sometimes to the friendship of the Kennedys, and hence gave them unduly favorable coverage.

The converse is that President Nixon gets a dig whenever possible. I cannot deny the thesis wholly, nor did Theodore White in his exhaustive "Making of the President". We have come a long way from the "one-party press" which Franklin Roosevelt used to attack with great glee and considerable political profit. If the press of the 1930's was one-party, it was chiefly so on the editorial pages. Franklin Roosevelt often dominated page one, despite some publishers' prejudices, just through the dynamics and force of his policies—the news he made so skillfully. And something of the same sort goes for the Kennedys and the other interesting, novel, innovative, shrewd practitioners of the political arts. The instincts and talents and personalities of such politicians are far more significant than efforts at image-making contrived by public relations firms. I do not deny at all, of course, the efforts of the would-be manipulators of the public mind. I believe, however, that they can rise very little higher than their source.

There is an immense burden on the conscience of all of us as we cope with men and events in these complex and emotional days.

News media behaviour this year will have more than a little to do with public credibility toward the media in the crucial years ahead. If we behave worthy of the public trust, we will receive it. And we will be making our contribution to the restoration of faith in our vital national institutions and in the integrity of our fellow man.

That will be worth doing. ~

Hodding Carter, Jr.
1907-1972

(Editor's Note: Hodding Carter, Jr., Nieman Fellow 1939–40, died in Greenville, Mississippi, on April 4th. He and Hodding Carter III, who was a Nieman Fellow in 1965–66, are the only father-son combination to be Nieman Fellows during the thirty-five years of the program's history.

Below is The New York Times obituary, and a reminiscence by Hodding's good friend, Houstoun Waring, a Nieman Fellow in the class of 1944–45.)

Hodding Carter, Jr., the outspoken publisher and editor who won the Pulitzer Prize in 1946 for his editorials against racial segregation in the South, died at his home in Greenville. He was 65 years old.

Mr. Carter had served The Delta Democrat-Times as publisher and editor until the last few years, when he turned over the post of editor to his son, Hodding Carter 3d.

He is survived also by another son, Philip, who had worked for The Washington Post and for Newsweek magazine.

When Hodding Carter was a small boy in Louisiana, two incidents left an indelible impression on the growing mind. When he was 6 he saw a gang of white youths chasing a Negro boy. Several years later he came upon the hanging body of a lynching victim.

As he grew older his life's work took shape—the task of attacking and destroying racism wherever he found it.

In 1946 his struggle was recognized when he won journalism's premier award, the Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing.

Specifically, the award noted an editorial asking for fairness for returning Nisei soldiers.

Over the years his name became a synonym for the battle to correct racial injustice in the South.

Mr. Carter and his wife, the former Betty Werlein, struck out in newspaper work for themselves in 1932. They had but little choice, for the Depression was on in earnest and Mr. Carter, a newlywed, had just been discharged from his $50-a-week post with The Associated Press. The reason was not the economic squeeze but "insubordination."

Their pooled resources came to $367, not enough to start a daily newspaper. They began in Hammond, La., lived over their tiny shop, exchanged advertising space for food and put out their newspaper.

The editorial page attacked Huey Long, then the Democratic Senator from Louisiana and a political power in the state and the nation.

Mr. Carter's district was the only district in the entire state that never sent a Long supporter to Congress.

Mr. Long was assassinated in September of 1935, and early the following year the Carters sold their holdings in Hammond and moved to Greenville, a community of 50,000 in the flat and fertile Yazoo-Mississippi delta.

At the time the racial makeup of the population was about evenly divided.

During World War II Mrs. Carter took a post with the Office of War Information and Mr. Carter joined the Army.

He was assigned to Yank and to Stars and Stripes in the Middle East.

At his discharge he was a major in intelligence.

In an article in The Saturday Evening Post in June of 1960, Mr. Carter remarked that many "friends and well-wishing strangers" could not understand why he stayed in Greenville as he approached 25 years there.

"They are especially commiserative," he wrote, "when a Mississippi legislature resolves that I am anti-Southern and a liar, when a state legislative investigating committee proclaims that I am Red-tainted, or when our most powerful figure in state politics, the elderly speaker of the House of Representatives, intones publicly that I am unfit to mingle in decent Southern society."

"My reassuring answers vary. Sometimes I point out that politicians and newspaper men are not natural allies. But mostly I tell them that whatever the spiritual, mental or democratic climate elsewhere in my state or the South of the nation, it is my happy lot to live in an oasis.

"Greenville was already an oasis when I came here from my native Louisiana. It is even more an oasis now."

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

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

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

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

The Role of the Press in Today's Society

by William F. Kerby

Having been a practicing member of the newspaper profession for more years than I like to recall, the subject of the role of the press in today's society is one about which I not only have strong opinions, but one which I feel is of primary importance to the people of the United States. So I make no apologies for asking you to share my concerns. A free, responsible, honest and financially viable press is essential to the functioning of a democracy and the maintenance of our freedom as a people. The problems of the press are shared by all of us.

The current paradox is this:

Never has any nation had so many newspapers (and news periodicals) of such high quality, with such varied and sophisticated news gathering resources. These publications also have available to them and make good use of the financial resources, the technology and the professional skill to rapidly and accurately assemble and distribute this information.

The other side of the paradox is that never in the history of this country has the press been under such consistent and widespread attack from so many sources.

Every once in a while, I feel compelled to reread the First Amendment, just to reassure myself it's still there despite legislative, executive and judicial actions which appear to ignore it.

How did we get in a situation where the executive attempts pre-publication censorship, where judges bar reporters from criminal trials? Where Congress enacts legislation in clear conflict with the First Amendment?

Is it the fault of the media? In part, of course, it is. With the possible exception of the medical profession and higher education, I know of no important segment of our society which has worse public relations than the press.

But I think the real crux of any credibility gap between the press and its audience is that never before in the history of this country have so many divisive issues arisen in so brief a span. These are issues on which thinking people have very strong and very personal views.

Take a recent case in point—one of our periodicals recently published a long, and in my professional opinion right-down-the-middle, news article on Vice President Agnew and his views on various major public questions. So what happened? My desk soon was piled high with letters about equally divided between denouncing our article for making a hero of the Vice President and those maintaining we slandered a great patriot.

I assure you that any news article on Southeast Asia policy, women's rights, the ecology, student activism, Mid-East policy, etc., results in the same sort of response.

Personally, I figure that when we get attacked by both sides, we must have done a good, honest job of reporting and editing.

But many people today tend to see events in black and white, while in all truth most occur in varying shades of gray. And they bitterly resent the press reporting events which they find disagreeable or at variance with their point of view.

You know that in the old days the messenger who brought word of defeat in battle was quite apt to wind up with his throat slit. We don't go quite that far today, but there is a growing tendency to blame the reporter for news one finds disagreeable.

Various highly vocal and influential groups consistently raise the cry of irresponsible reporting, prejudice, editorialized news.

But with all due allowance for self-interest, I personally know of no respectable newspaper published in the United States today where there is not an honest effort to report the news as it indeed happened.

Of course, newspapers make mistakes. The miracle is that they make so few. Their news is reported and edited by human beings and handled with incredible speed. Sometimes a reporter or editor will allow his personal viewpoint to intrude into a news story. This is bad.

We will never achieve the millenium. But the press of America generally is the most informative, the most honest and most reliable in the world. And it is steadily getting better.

No longer is it possible to count the really good American newspapers on the fingers of two hands. Today many of the finest newspapers in the country are in the 25,000 to 100,000 circulation area. Many put some of our metropolitan papers to shame. But despite this impressive record the attacks on the press go on and on, coming from all sides of the political and economic spectrum.

I'd like to review with you, very briefly, a series of recent events, most of them quite disconnected from one another, but all of which point up a disturbing attitude toward the nation's press, and importantly for all of us, the Constitutional right of the American people to be informed.

Earlier, I outlined some essentials for a free and effective press. One was that the press must be economically viable. It is axiomatic that a publication struggling to make ends meet cannot provide as high a quality news product as one which can afford to spend large sums on reporting and editing.

From the day this republic was born until 1971, it was the consistent policy of the Federal government to encourage and facilitate the rapid and economical distribution of news and information. That policy apparently has now been reversed.

This is a difficult area for anyone in the publishing industry to discuss, because it would appear to be a self-interested plea for special economic advantage. But it is more important to the American people than it is to any segment of the communications industry.

In very simple and direct terms, the fact is that significant elements of the national print media of the United States are today living under a death sentence.

The United States Postal Service, operating on the basis of a cost accounting study which is as mysterious to outside experts as it appears inexplicable, apparently will succeed in raising second class (publication mail) postal charges by astronomical amounts over the next few years. In the case of some large national publications, the increase will approximate 200 percent.

To make matters much worse, the Postal Service also has proposed a policy under which all mail, including news media, would be divided into two general categories. One, carrying a high premium in addition to the vastly increased regular rates, would be delivered on a so-called expedited basis. This presumably would be the same general type of service now accorded first and second class mail. All the rest, the non-premium paying mail, would be delivered on a catch-as-catch-can basis, presumbaly several days later on the average.

I can only state the obvious:

A four-day old newspaper would be pretty useless.

Let me draw a comparison—suppose the automobile industry, for example, were told by the government that (1) the price of steel would be increased by 200 percent; (2) that because the government owned a particular steel company the auto companies would be forced to buy from the high-priced producer and were not allowed to patronize more efficient and hence much lower priced competitors.

One case in point—just recently Andrew Heiskel, Chairman of Time Inc., told a congressional committee that his company's mailing costs would rise $27,000,000 under the proposed new postal rates. The pre-tax profits of Time, Life, Fortune and Sports Illustrated, the four national periodicals published by the company, totaled $11,000,000 in 1970, just a bit more than a third of the proposed postal price increase.

Although two of the Time Inc. periodicals are highly competitive with Dow Jones Publication, I assure you it would be a sad day for us, and for the country, if the Time periodicals were forced out of business or found their audience so eroded by high costs as to become negligible in the information field.

The problems of Time Inc. unfortunately are far from unique.

Another example, currently, is that for the first time in the history of this nation, newspapers have been subjected to economic controls. If improperly exercised, these controls could be used to punish newspapers whose policies are disliked by government and reward those who are "good boys." I am not in any way suggesting that any such thing will be done. It won't. But the power is there.

I am, of course, referring to price control regulations and law which for the first time fail to recognize that governmental power to grant or refuse price increases to newspapers is in contravention of the First Amendment.

I am not here pleading for any special privilege or advantage over other segments of the economy. I am merely pointing out that if "the power to tax is the power to destroy" then the power to grant or refuse price increases is equally the "power to destroy."

There is a well-defined and organized campaign to severely limit the right of newspapers to report all the facts on individuals arrested and indicted for serious offenses. The argument is that such reporting could prejudice the accused's right to a fair trial. Just a few weeks ago in New York City a local judge actually conducted a trial in private (the public and all newsmen excluded) because he said he feared that the reputation of the accused, previously publicly identified as a gangster, would be so mentioned in news stories and that it would prejudice the jury.

Bad habits spread quickly. Soon after the New York City case a judge in Sullivan County, New York, decided that an arson case should be tried in secret. In this instance the

accused changed his plea from innocent to guilty. Nevertheless, a Dow Jones newspaper which circulates in Sullivan County earlier had challenged the validity of the judge's action and the court case will be pressed to a conclusion.

There has been quite a movement to have so-called public-member panels scrutinize local newspapers and give judgments as to whether or not they reflect in their news columns the varying views of special groups. A few newspapers, I am sorry to say, have instituted such experiments.

Personally, I think this is nonsense. It isn't the job of a newspaper to reflect anything except the plain truth. This really is just another example of the current phenomena of blaming the press for news that one doesn't like.

A final example, the celebrated case of the publication by The New York Times of the Pentagon papers. A federal Grand Jury is, I understand, currently in session and may or may not indict the reporter directly involved, and possibly others. More serious than this, however, was the attempt of federal authorities to exercise the right of pre-publication censorship. This effort was, as we all know, rebuffed by the Supreme Court on First Amendment grounds.

In conclusion, I'd like to propose for your consideration my personal credo for the operation of a free and responsible press in these difficult times. It is the basis on which Dow Jones does operate; furthermore, I am certain it is a statement which also reflects the views of the great majority of my colleagues in the news industry.

The Dow Jones Publications and the Dow Jones News Services are operated on the simple principle of providing as accurate, objective and balanced an account of current happenings as is possible in a fallible world.

Obviously, the editorial process involves an endless number of decisions on what and what not to print, how much on each event and how important that event may be in relation to all the other developments during a particular time span. But in exercising this editing function we attempt to keep in mind certain fundamentals:

In selecting what news to print, from among the myriad events of the times, we use our best judgment as to what we think will be important or interesting to our readers, judging those needs and interests from long experience.

We avoid trying to decide on the basis of what is regarded as "good" or "bad" because this does not make an event more or less newsworthy.

Finally, we do not let our views of what ought to be, as expressed vigorously on our editorial pages, color our reporting of the world as it in fact is.

Such a news philosophy does not always win popularity contests, but in the longer run it does win respect.

There are many honest and sincere people who from time to time will argue that this is not "responsible" journalism. But we at Dow Jones would say that any other policy is not only irresponsible but journalistically fraudulent.

Most importantly, we believe that there is no other method by which a democratic people can function and a free economy operate.

William F. Kerby, president of Dow Jones & Company, Inc., delivered the above speech at the University of Michigan.

Book Review

THE BRASS RING: A Sort of Memoir, by Bill Mauldin (Norton, $7.95).

By John Fischetti

Fortunately, Bill Mauldin's a pack rat. He has saved, or knows where he could put his hands on, everything he ever has drawn. He's also a talented writer.

The result is a definitive record of how a great cartoonist evolved. Mauldin emerged from World War II as the best combat cartoonist this country has ever had. And of course he is now the celebrated political cartoonist for The Chicago Sun-Times, and widely syndicated.

And yet his beginning was pretty inauspicious: a little skinny-legged, left-handed, jug-eared jeezler living with his battling parents and older brother, Sidney, on an apple farm in Mountain Park, New Mexico.

Like most cartoonists, including myself, he was drawing early on, and again, like most cartoonists, he had a tremendous desire to make this his life work. It all comes through in "The Brass Ring."

His parents were divorced and Bill was 16 when he and Sidney headed for Phoenix, Ariz. in a stripped-down Model T, to board with a friend of their mother's, Mrs. Beauchamp. The boys enrolled at Phoenix Union High School and Bill did odd art jobs to help pay for his keep. One was really odd: painting whitewalls on the tires of hot-rod jalopies. He branched out to paint nudes on their spare-tire covers.

Impatient to get on with his art career, he dropped out of high school, and his grandparents staked him to a year at the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts.

One of Mauldin's instructors there was famed Vaughn Shoemaker of The Daily News, a two-time Pulitzer Prize winner. To this day Mauldin speaks highly of Shoemaker and his influence on Mauldin's work.

Sensing that ideas would be the toughest part of a cartoonist's job, Mauldin made and sent hundreds of roughs to the leading magazines. He was sharpening up what later proved to be one of the most devastating cleavers in the business.

After his year at art school, he returned to Phoenix and dipped into his first bit of political cartooning. He worked both sides of the street and signed all his cartoons, yet! (I never dreamed Mauldin would be that callow!)

Fifteen months before Pearl Harbor, a high school ROTC buddy talked Bill into joining the National Guard. A day or two after he did so, the 45th Division became a part of the standing army. His first service cartoons appeared in the Division News. Mauldin was an infantryman.

His memorable characters, Willie and Joe, make their first appearance looking stiff and Stateside. The wartime beachheads matured the characters and the cartoonist rapidly.

Mauldin's cartoons attracted the attention of Stars and Stripes, the serviceman's newspaper. In Stars and Stripes they attracted the attention of dogfaces, rear echelon types, brass, the folks back home and national publications. The buzzsaw couldn't be stopped now, not even by Gen. George S. Patton, with whom Sgt. Mauldin had a one-sided confrontation (as enlisted men are wont to have with generals).

He left the general and continued cartooning the only way he knew how. He won his first Pulitzer Prize, the Legion of Merit, national acclaim, and he won them all as a cartoonist, which is all he ever wanted to be.

The book is bountifully illustrated with fascinating family photos and a treasure trove of Mauldin drawings from his earliest scratchings to many of his wartime masterpieces.

If you had the notion that cartoonists are a stereotype you'll learn otherwise—to your infinite delight—in this one-of-a-kind book by a one-of-a-kind guy.

Mr. Fischetti, Pulitzer Prize cartoonist with The Daily News, has known Bill Mauldin since their days on the staff of Stars and Stripes.

(Reprinted from The Chicago Daily News)

The Legacies of Lucius Nieman

(Continued from page 2)

grandson, Henry A. Youmans. If Nieman learned the value of affection from his grandmother, he learned the value of freedom of the press from Mr. Haight, whose paper espoused the cause of runaway slaves.

The peripatetic nature of Nieman's career in the thirteen years between his leaving home and his founding of the Milwaukee Journal may not be appreciated by those who have lived and worked in one place. Many a newspaperman, however, prides himself on his ability to go from job to job. The pride grows from the opportunity to learn the intricacies, and the joys, of newspapering under different tutors. A bit of wandering is a hallmark of a good newspaperman. Lucius Nieman wandered.

After working in the composing room of the Waukesha Freeman, Nieman left to work in the composing room of the Milwaukee Sentinel. He returned to Waukesha to attend Carroll College for a year and a half, traveled to Milwaukee to report for the Sentinel, went to Madison to cover the legislature, where he was honored by his first denunciation as a snooper, took a train back to Milwaukee to become City Editor and then Managing Editor of the Sentinel, wandered off to St. Paul, Minnesota, where he was given one-third interest in the Dispatch. But there was something about Milwaukee, first the Sentinel, then the Journal, that called him back.

In December of 1882, two days before his twenty-fifth birthday, Lucius William Nieman purchased Peter Deuster's half interest in the Daily Journal, just three weeks old. From then until Mr. Nieman's death in 1935, the Nieman career and that of the Journal were scene after scene of high drama. Herewith started the two legacies, the Milwaukee Journal and the Nieman Fellowships. The consistency with which Mr. Nieman practiced the highest principles of journalism made the Journal one of the great newspapers in the country. The Nieman Fellowships, established by Mrs. Nieman's will, have enriched the minds, and strengthened the professional talents, of journalists throughout the world.

Inasmuch as this narrative eventually will take us to the academic groves of Harvard University, let me next mention Agnes Elizabeth Wahl.

She and Lucius Nieman met on Washington's birthday in 1895, an occasion known in the Milwaukee Journal's history as "The day the ladies got out the paper." The latter was a project that would do credit to today's most imaginative promotion directors. The ladies of Milwaukee volunteered to edit and publish the Journal. It turned out to be fifty-six pages, an unheard-of size at that time. The women printed extra pages on silk, and sold them for $100 to $150 a copy. Little wonder that today's newspapers are printed on paper and not silk. So, Ladies' Day at the Journal led to a wedding.

Agnes Wahl and Lucius Nieman were married in 1900, and as this story progresses, it always should be remembered that Lucius Nieman's wealth never would have reached Harvard without the devotion of Agnes Wahl Nieman to journalism, and her abiding respect and admiration for her husband's career in Milwaukee.

The first edition of the Milwaukee Journal under the Nieman leadership stated: "The Journal will be independent and aggressive, but always with due regard for the sanctities of private life. It will oppose every political machine and cabal, venal politicians of every stripe, every form of oppression. It will be the people's paper, and will recognize that its field is Milwaukee, and the state at large. The columns will mirror vividly the life of the metropolis which gave it birth, the humor and pathos, the scenes and incidents which go to make up the day and the year. Above all, it will abhor dullness."

The caveat against dullness ought to be pasted in the hat of every editor today. The same paste could be used for some of the other lessons taught by editor Nieman, lessons in courage and patriotism, lessons in public service, and good writing.

In the Journal's first year, Milwaukee's leading hotel, the Newhall House, burned to the ground. Eighty persons perished.

Firemen could not battle the blaze because of a maze of telephone wires. Firemen's nets were small. Some were rotten. The grisly scene was summed up by the Journal's first word in its headline: "Horror." While others kept quiet, the Milwaukee Journal, courageous and persistent to the end, charged officials and hotel owners with shameful greed, criminal negligence. The Journal brought the scandal into the open.

Said the Journal: "Nothing rash should be done, but the responsibility must be fixed, and the guilty persons, whoever they may be, must be held in strict account. Bury the dead, relieve the suffering so far as possible, and then let stern justice be done." This was newspapering at its noblest. The Nieman brand of journalism was becoming evident.

In another memorable onslaught against official corruption, Mr. Nieman's Milwaukee Journal began what was to be an eight-year fight against state treasurers who pocketed interest on state funds. Every two or three weeks the tenacious Journal would print an editorial, charging that the state had been cheated out of $35,000 a year, or exposing some other scandalous fact. It did indeed take eight years, but the Journal won. Those who talk about "the new journalism"—whatever that means—might reflect with profit on "the old journalism" as practiced in Milwaukee ninety years ago. The newspaper's role as the conscience of its community is a changeless concept.

It is frequently charged that newspapers emphasize scandal, and play up the sensational, in order to increase circulation and make the publisher rich. In that context, look at what happened at the Milwaukee Journal in 1896. A Democratic newspaper for seven years, the Journal bolted from the Democratic party, and refused to support William Jennings Bryan on the silver issue. The Journal lost a third of its circulation, but it never wavered in its course.

It was at that time that Mr. Lucius Nieman decided that his newspaper must be politically independent. I am sure that those of you who have been acquainted with it in the past twenty-five years, would agree that this has been its course, not only during the remainder of Mr. Nieman's life, but during the stewardship of three subsequent publishers: the late Harry Grant, Mr. Irwin Maier, and Mr. Donald Abert.

During that eventful first year, the Journal ran an advertisement for an exhibit called the "Chicago Museum." Advertising is the lifeblood of a newspaper. The "Chicago Museum" was a sort of freak show that opened in Milwaukee. It presented the seven "Sutherland Sisters," whose hair dragged on the ground, and a man with a transparent head. The main feature was the famed "Zulu Warriors," who "were so wild that they had to be kept in a cage." Children trembled at the sight. It was a great attraction, until a resourceful Journal reporter walked into a pool hall and found the "Zulu Warriors" dressed like dull and dignified Americans, sedately playing pool. The advertisements were cancelled, an editorial exposed the frauds, and the show was closed. Perhaps this was the beginning of today's campaigns known as "truth in advertising."

Came World War One, and Mr. Nieman and the Milwaukee Journal faced one the most critical crises in their fifty-three-year association. Americans were getting ready to fight Germans. In Milwaukee and Wisconsin were many Americans who were either German immigrants or sons and daughters of German immigrants. Loyalties were divided. When a German submarine sank the Lusitania in 1915, President Woodrow Wilson said: "America stands for freedom of the seas without curtailment and will contend for that freedom, from whatever quarter violated, without compromise and at any cost."

Many descendants of Germans, understandably, were left in a state of confusion. Propagandists capitalized on these confusions. Many German language newspapers, as well as the pro-German newspapers printed in English, and the German-American National Alliance, were not shocked by the sinking of the Lusitania. They approved Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare.

Lucius Nieman had to make up his mind. He did. He decided to combat the pro-German propaganda, knowing he would make enemies.

F. Perry Olds, a Harvard graduate and a student of languages, was employed to translate German newspapers for a series of documented exposures. The Journal was not anti-German. It was pro-American at a time of great peril. It was denounced as "The tool of the allies," and threats of boycotts were frequent. The Milwaukee Journal answered that it was not challenging the loyalty of the great body of citizens of German descent. It was condemning the propagandists who were trying to mislead the people. The Milwaukee Journal translated hundreds of passages from German-language newspapers, and explained the techniques of the German propagandists.

In 1919, the Milwaukee Journal received journalism's highest award, the Pulitzer Prize, for its courageous fight against wartime anti-Americanism in Wisconsin. It was the second year in which Pulitzer Prizes were awarded.

With a directness typical of the publisher, Mr. Lucius Nieman explained his campaign against German propagandists during World War One:

"The situation in this country and here in Milwaukee and Wisconsin grew out of the exceeding boldness and insolence of men who put Germany before everything else in the world, and the stunned silence of men who did not think as they did . . . with the outbreak of war in Europe, the German propagandists made so much noise, they claimed such numbers, they threatened with such insolent confidence, that men were deceived with regard to their real strength. . . .

"As the voice of a community and commonwealth, our duty was plain. No thought of courage came to us. A fight was forced on us, and we had but the alternative of sinking into contempt. . . ." This was the voice of responsible newspaper leadership.

The spirit Lucius Nieman instilled in the Milwaukee Journal did not die when he died. Although one does not judge the quality of a newspaper by Pulitzer Prizes alone, it is significant that the Milwaukee Journal has won three additional Pulitzer Prizes since Mr. Nieman's award in 1919.

The second came in 1935, when cartoonist Ross Lewis was cited. In 1953 Austin C. Wehrwein won the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting. In 1967 the Milwaukee Journal won its fourth Pulitzer for meritorious public service in connection with its campaign for conservation. This is a remarkable record. It bears witness to a consistency of public service, that has made the Journal a consistently admired newspaper throughout the country.

Returning to Ralph Waldo Emerson's allusion to man's capacity to lengthen his shadow, in Milwaukee today at 333 West State Street stands the lengthened shadow of the man who said about the Journal:

"The editorial columns of this paper are independent of

party, clique or boss. The Journal is no party organ, nor will it be. Infallibility is the baseless claim of partisanship; neutrality is the device of cowardship; independence, the Journal understands, is the honest endeavor to uphold the right and honest man whenever and wherever found. The maintenance of honesty in news columns a Journal owes to its readers. The maintenance of honesty in opinion it owes to itself."

The Journal is the first of two legacies bequeathed to journalism by Lucius Nieman.

The other is at Harvard University, where the Nieman Foundation brings fifteen to twenty newspapermen to Cambridge each year to broaden their professional horizons.

Mr. Nieman died on October first, 1935; four months later his widow Agnes Wahl Nieman, died, leaving a nine-page will that created journalistic history.

Mrs. Nieman generously made charitable contributions to Children's Hospital, the Art Museum, the Milwaukee Public Library. She left thousands of dollars to friends and relatives, and remembered her chauffeur, and her cousin, Alice Neyma-Galletti, living in Italy.

She also remembered her husband's historic contribution to journalism, and dedicated a major portion of her resources to her husband's memory.

On page six of the will Mrs. Nieman said, "All the rest . . . I give, bequeath, and devise to the President and Fellows of Harvard College, of Cambridge, Massachusetts. I request that such gift, bequest and devise be used to constitute a fund to be known as the 'Lucius W. Nieman and Agnes Wahl Nieman Fund,' which shall be invested and the income thereof used to promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the United States and educate persons deemed specially qualified for journalism, in such manner as the governing authorities of Harvard College from time to time shall deem wise."

This unprecedented invitation arrived, by letter carrier, on the desk of the President of Harvard University.

The next move was up to Harvard's president, Dr. James Bryant Conant. He conceived the idea of bringing a dozen journalists to Harvard to study anything they wished. In his wisdom, he decided that the journalists would not be required to have degrees. In his words, "No newspaper owner or managing editor was going to ask a prospective employee about his degrees. Therefore, the Fellows I envisioned would obtain no tangible rewards for their year in residence. The tanglible benefit obtained by listening to lectures and discussions would have to suffice. The Fellows would be free to listen to lectures or not, as each saw fit. There would be no requirements for the completion of a paper, and no examinations."

Harvard was skeptical of the idea. After all, weren't journalists drinkers, illiterates, wanderers? Newspapers were skeptical. After all, wasn't Harvard an enclave of PH.D.'s, stuffy scholars, and pot-bellied pontificators? Hints of a basic incompatibility between the world of journalism and the world of scholarship prompted Dr. Conant to call his idea a "dubious experiment." He said, "I broached the idea to some members of the corporation, some deans and some faculty members. Some liked it, but no one reacted with enthusiasm. I recall a meeting at the president's house of three or four men who represented the Boston papers. After I had expounded my idea, and have been subjected to cross questioning, the verdict was as follows: 'We have no better suggestion; you might as well try what you have in mind, though it will probably fail.' "

With all that cold water thrown at his proposal, by newspapermen and Harvard officials, it is a wonder indeed that Dr. Conant persisted. But persist he did. In 1938, page six of Mrs. Nieman's will was translated into the Nieman Fellowships. President Conant's idea became reality. Out of three hundred and nine applicants, nine journalists were invited to come to Harvard for a year. Their salaries and tuition would be paid by the Nieman Foundation.

Among those in that first class was a young man by the name of Edwin Lahey, a rough and tumble labor reporter for the Chicago Daily News. His most conspicuous academic distinction was that he worked as a switchman in the Chicago railroad yards instead of going to high school. Skeptics became more skeptical—until they became acquainted with Ed Lahey, one of the great journalists of his generation. Harvard professors discovered that his facility with the English language was truly professional.

Instead of his studying the professors, they studied him, meeting with him regularly. The sessions were known as the Lahey clinic. Ed Lahey became a legend. While listening to a pedantic instructor talking about Shakespeare, Nieman Fellow Lahey could stand the pontification no longer, and said, "I'm nuts about Shakespeare. I read everything he writes, as fast as it comes out." Thanks to Ed Lahey, skepticism turned to approval.

Ed Lahey helped to integrate the scholar and the journalist. The Nieman program was on its way. At the end of the first year, the Lucius W. Nieman Fellows knew that Harvard University was a center of scholarship, and the source of unrivaled opportunities for newspapermen to strengthen their professional competence. Harvard University, in turn, learned that a good newspaperman is just as much a searcher for truth as a professor, and frequently, like Ed Lahey, and Louis Lyons, masters of the English language.

The experiment looked less dubious, and a second class of Nieman Fellows was appointed. There were to be more trials and errors, and shifting of emphases, but the Niemans of Milwaukee had added a new dimension to journalism education.

On Monday, September 18th, 1972, the thirty-fifth class of

Lucius W. Nieman Fellows will assemble at Harvard and prepare for a year of academic life whose goal is to elevate the standards of journalism. Dr. Conant commented as follows on the program he created:

"An unexpected bequest to improve journalism led to the invention of the Nieman fellowships in journalism. As a university president, I invented a special kind of scholarship when scholarships were not in favor, and a special type of professorship without portfolio in days before cross-fertilization of departments had begun."

So much credit is due to the professional performance of Mr. Nieman, the devotion to high standards of Mrs. Nieman, who created the Foundation, and the genius of Dr. Conant, that it is easy to overlook others who contributed to the success of this program.

They include the first curator, Archibald MacLeish, and his successor for twenty-five years, Louis M. Lyons. Of MacLeish and Lyons Dr. Conant said, "without the insight of these two men, this scheme might well have failed."

Although the program at Harvard has remained essentially the same since 1938, variations and improvements have kept it in tune with a changing world. Under Mr. Louis Lyons' direction it was decided to bring a half-dozen foreign journalists to Harvard. These were sponsored by institutions other than the Nieman Foundation, but the qualifications were the same. Called Associate Nieman Fellows, they have come from South Africa, Burma, Belgium, Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, Canada, Germany, Australia, New Zealand, and England. In this manner, Harvard University and the Nieman program have been able to make significant contributions to the elevation of the standards of journalism throughout the world. In return, the Associates have contributed much to their Fellow Nieman Fellows and the Harvard community.

Another innovation has been the appointment of a Nieman Research Fellow. Inasmuch as regular Nieman Fellows must be less than forty years of age, journalists in their forties and fifties were not eligible. Three years ago, the Nieman committee nominated, and Harvard University appointed, Mr. Louis L. Banks, fifty three, as the first Nieman Research Fellow. He was then the Managing Editor of Fortune Magazine, and is now the Editorial Director of all Luce Publications. Establishment of this precedent makes it possible for the Nieman Foundation to broaden the scope of its contributions to the world of Journalism.

Nieman Fellows study subjects of obvious interest to the journalist: political science, government, history, economics and law. They also concern themselves with less obvious but equally pertinent subjects such as anthropology and architecture, business and music, French and American literature, the culture of Canada, city planning—the list is endless. There is no such thing as a typical Nieman Fellow, except that the people selected are the caliber of journalists the selection committee hopes will translate a year at Harvard into greater service to the profession of journalism. The list of four hundred and sixty-five Nieman Fellows includes the unschooled but literate Ed Lahey, a man with a Harvard degree and a Pulitzer Prize such as Anthony Lewis of the New York Times, and the Managing Editor of the Paragould, Arkansas Press, Circulation 5000. What they have in common is a desire to learn, a desire to stretch their minds, a devotion to the newspaper as a central force in our society.

Each Nieman Fellow plots his own course, seeks his own level among the multitude of academic offerings and cultural resources in the Cambridge-Boston area. A successful Nieman Fellow, whether he came to Harvard with a Ph.D. in history from Princeton, or five years of covering the police court in Hackensack, will find at the end of the Nieman year that he has changed, grown, matured intellectually.

Edward S. Harkness gave millions of dollars to build the houses at Harvard University when A. Lawrence Lowell was president. Referring to Mr. Harkness, Dr. Conant said, "If Mr. Harkness was president Lowell's ideal benefactor, Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman of Milwaukee might be considered mine. The Yale alumnus made possible the realization of a plan the president of Harvard had been evolving for some years. The widow of the founder of the Milwaukee Journal led me, by the terms of her will, to recommend the creation of the Nieman Fellowships in Journalism—an invention of which I am very proud. . . . My indebtedness to Mrs. Nieman I have made clear. It is the indebtedness of an inventor to a person who challenges his ingenuity."

This inventor contributed a dramatic moment to Nieman history on a November evening in 1967. Dr. Conant had conducted a seminar in the traditional meeting house of the Nieman Fellowships, the Signet Society building in Cambridge. Among the guests was Louis Lyons. At the conclusion, it seemed appropriate to remind the gathering that none of us would be assembled at that time on Dunster Street if it had not been for the pioneering of Louis Lyons.

Louis, with typical—but not false—modesty, turned to Dr. Conant with a congratulatory gesture and said, "It was *his* idea." Dr. Conant, with equal graciousness and candor, bowed to the curator of twenty-five years and replied, "Around Harvard, ideas are a dime a dozen, but it takes somebody to carry them out." Any discussion of the Nieman legacies must include the names of Conant and Lyons.

Those of us concerned with the Nieman Foundation and, I can assure you, those who edit and publish the Milwaukee Journal, do not view this heritage with complacency, or as the completion of two journalistic achievements, however notable. The legacies, rather, present a continuing challenge to those who attempt to carry on in the Nieman spirit. They represent a lengthening shadow, of a man who had the

tenacity and the talent, the integrity and the intelligence, to build institutions worthy of society's respect and support.

It is the obligation of those of us entrusted with the stewardship of these institutions to keep faith with the inventors who created them.

The above address was given by Mr. Sargent to the members of the Harvard Club of Wisconsin, at its annual meeting in Milwaukee.

Freedom from something is not enough. It should also be freedom for something. Freedom is not safety but opportunity. Freedom ought to be a means to enable the press to serve the proper functions of communication in a free society.

Zechariah Chafee, Jr.
The Press Under Pressure
[Nieman Reports, April 1948]

Puzzlements

by Vermont Royster

Among editorial writers and other journalistic pundits it's almost unthinkable to let anyone think that as they think things over they don't know what to think.

The nature of our work casts us in the role of professional amateurs. Few of the tribe are experts in anything, and of course none can be experts in everything. Yet the tribal custom calls for some comment one day on the question of Red China, the next day perhaps on the policies of the Federal Reserve Board and on another day some opinion on the proper size of the Defense Department. Rarely is one of the clan found wanting in that duty .

This is not as outrageous as it may seem. Every thoughtful citizen has his own opinion on most of these matters, as indeed he should, however unexpert he may be. The journalistic commentator differs only in that he is not distracted by having to tend the store, lay bricks or remove appendixes.

This confers on him no special wisdom. His only claim to public attention is that he has the time to make an occupation of every man's avocation. That, and the fact that most of the affairs of this troubled world are too important to be left to the experts anyway.

Yet with all of that, there are some things that remain a puzzlement no matter how much time you have to think about them. Brood as you will, you cannot find the right or wrong of them. The solution eludes the mind. They passeth understanding. To wit:

The troubles on the Indian subcontinent. Here Hindus are slaughtering Moslems, and Moselms Hindus. The Pakistanis oppressed the Bengalis and the Bengalis in turn cut the throats of Pakistanis. India makes war on Pakistan with no martial provocation, ostensibly to save the Bengalis.

But the war lays waste to the countryside, unleashes a wave of wholesale killing and leaves an Indian army of occupation in what used to be East Pakistan. Meanwhile, the big powers choose up sides; Russia here, China there and the U.S. in the middle.

Where is the right or wrong of it? Searching the past for some clue leads only to more confusion. The partition of Pakistan (East and West) created a political monstrosity, but so did the partition of India itself. Yet who could have made that continent all one, when the slaughter now is as nothing to the slaughter then. The British did it by force, but who would say the British should have stayed there forever?

And where is the man wise enough to know now the way out of it all?

Or take the Irish question. Surely it is beyond understanding that in the 20th century Catholics and Protestants, Christians all, cannot live together without blowing everything up. The more you think about it the more you are brought to sorrow.

So too with the Israeli-Arab confrontation. When you try to find the "right" or the "wrong" of it, all depends on what point in time you choose to begin. In its present form the

hatred has been with us all of our century, and much of it is as old as time itself.

But it is not only in far off places, or in matters of such slaughter, that there are things to overwhelm the mind. Here at home also are problems that remain a puzzlement.

Some have to do with the prosaic but excruciating problems of economics. Forty years ago more than 12 million people in this country had no way to earn their daily bread. The problem then, or so it seemed, was to raise prices and wages. Since then the best minds of our times wrestled with that problem, and today the problem is to restrain wages and prices; on that score, inflation did its work well.

Yet withal the plague of unemployment remains. No one has found any solution for it except the dole or forced labor, which substitutes one misery for another. Clearly unemployment remains the great unanswered question of economics. I cannot pretend to answer that which eludes the likes of Milton Friedman and Paul Samuelson.

There are other problems even more excruciating because they cannot be answered even with a dole. Why must every parent today agonize in fear that his child too may go the way of the heroin addict?

The usual explanations will not suffice. Dope-pushers we have always had with us, victims also. But now it is not a matter of the ignorant, nor of the unfortunate at the lower end of the economic scale; the drug problem touches every segment of society, the informed, the educated, the affluent. The victims begin it with no excuse and knowing that there is no way out.

The war in Vietnam, which is blamed for so much, is sometimes blamed here. That does not explain why it happens now rather than another time. We have had greater wars with more men involved, more dead; and wars, as in Korea, as frustrating, confusing and as hopeless of victory. Nor does it explain why the drug culture reaches into places and among those far removed from either war's fear or its temptations.

If the Why? escapes us, so does the solution. Halting the drug traffic proves daily futile, and how do you change the whole outlook of people?

This last question is the most nagging. For if you could change the attitude of Moslem and Hindu, of Arab and Jew, of Catholic and Protestant, of old and the young, of black and of white, of those who labor and those who hire, of those who govern and those who are led—well, if you could do all that, then the other answers might not be so elusive.

Be that as is may, everywhere you turn you meet problems that defy the mind. Some are merely intractable; others defy even comprehension.

Perhaps this confession is just a product of senescence, for it's true that when I was younger I was surer of the answers to things. Or at least more ready to accept the simple solutions offered by others. Whereas now I am at loss how to answer a gentle reader who brought up these problems, noted above, and thus sparked these meanderings.

The gist of his letter was that if I was so all-fired smart why didn't I solve these problems and save Messrs. Nixon, Muskie and Humphrey a lot of woe.

About all I could reply, in a moment of unwonted humility, was that after a long time observing this troubled world there are some things still bewildering. The more you think about them the less you know what to think. And if that be treason to the tribe, make the most of it.

Mr. Royster's remarks are taken from his column, "Thinking Things Over," which is reprinted with permission of The Wall Street Journal.

Nieman Notes

1940

Hodding Carter, Jr. died in Greenville, Mississippi on April 4, 1972. (See page 18.)

Carroll Kilpatrick of The Washington Post was the first recipient of the Merriam Smith Memorial Fund award, for his story on President Nixon's announcement of his plans to visit China.

1941

Alexander Kendrick, after 23 years with CBS News, has retired. Previously he had been with the Philadelphia Inquirer from 1929–45, and the Chicago Sun foreign service, 1945–48.

1947

Fletcher Martin, press attaché with the American Embassy in Nairobi, has been assigned to a new post in Mallorca, Spain.

1953

John Strohmeyer, editor and vice president of the Bethlehem (Pennsylvania) Globe-Times, won a Pulitzer Prize for his editorial writing in a campaign to reduce racial tensions.

1955

Albert L. Kraus, formerly Assistant Financial and Business Editor of The New York Times, has become editor of The Bond Buyer.

Henry Tanner of The New York Times has been assigned to Cairo. He previously was bureau chief at the United Nations.

1962

Kevalram R. Malkani, editor of the weekly Organiser, has been appointed editor of The Motherland, the latest English daily from Delhi.

1965

John Corry of The New York Times has won a 1972 Society of the Silurians award in the Feautre News category for "Life on 85th Street."

1966

Ralph Hancox, editor of the Reader's Digest in Canada, has been appointed vice president of the Reader's Digest Association (Canada) Ltd. He joined the company in 1967.

1967

James R. Whelan, assistant managing editor of The Miami News, has been awarded a special citation by the Overseas Press Club for best reporting on Latin America in 1971.

1968

H. Brandt Ayers, with Thomas H. Naylor, has edited You Can't Eat Magnolias, a collection of essays by twenty-three Southern leaders.

Gerald Grant, formerly a research fellow in sociology in Harvard, has been appointed associate professor of education at Syracuse University.

1969

John J. Zakarian, editorial writer of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, received the 1972 Alumnus of the Year Award from Southern Illinois University's School of Journalism.

1970

Rosemarie King, wife of **Larry L. King,** died of cancer on June 8th in Washington, D.C.

1972

Mike D. Flanagan, formerly chief of the Tulsa World's Oklahoma City bureau, has been named Washington correspondent.

Mrs. Carol Liston, who was a member of The Boston Globe's State House Bureau, has been appointed assistant to Globe editor Thomas Winship.

Nieman Fellowships 1972-73

Twelve American journalists have been appointed for the thirty-fifth class of Nieman Fellows for 1972–73 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.

The 1972–73 Nieman Fellows are:

Kevin P. Buckley, 31, Newsweek correspondent. Mr. Buckley, who holds a degree from Yale University, plans to study contemporary American history and Chinese affairs.

Wayne Greenhaw, 32, reporter for the Alabama Journal. He is an alumnus of Mexico City College and the University of Alabama, and plans to study political science, government and economics.

James O. Jackson, 32, Moscow reporter for United Press International. Mr. Jackson was graduated from Northwestern University. He proposes to study Russian, the history and politics of the Soviet Union, and Latin America.

Peter A. Jay, 31, correspondent for The Washington Post. Mr. Jay has his degree from Harvard College, and proposes to study American and Western European history and government, law and literature.

Michael R. McGovern, 32, national staff reporter for the New York Daily News. An alumnus of the University of Chicago, he plans to study American history and politics, criminal and Constitutional law.

Edward C. Norton, 35, reporter for The Record, Hackensack, New Jersey. He has his degree from Fordham College, and at Harvard will concentrate on criminal law, psychology and sociology.

J. Michael Ritchey, 29, reporter for KERA-TV, Dallas. Mr. Ritchey was graduated from Southern Methodist University, and will study economics, criminal law and American politics.

Carl W. Sims, 31, editor of The Bay State Banner. He has his degree from Howard University, and plans to study American politics, government and law.

William Stockton, 29, science writer for The Associated Press in Los Angeles. He was graduated from the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, and proposes to study science history, the new biology, physics and astronomy.

Luther R. West, 29, Florence reporter for The State, Columbia, South Carolina. Mr. West is an alumnus of Spartanburg Junior College and Furman University. At Harvard he will study sociology, local and national government.

Edwin N. Williams, 30, Jackson reporter for the Delta Democrat-Times. An alumnus of the University of Mississippi, he plans to study economics, American history and contemporary literature.

Charles R. Wyrick, 35, reporter for Newsday. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago, Marshall University and Fenn College. Mr. Wyrick proposes to study American history, anthropology and psychology.

The Fellows were nominated by a six-man committee whose members are the following: John Hughes, Editor of The Christian Science Monitor; Richard H. Leonard, Editor of The Milwaukee Journal; George C. Lodge, Professor of Business Administration at Harvard University; Robert M. White II, Editor and Publisher of the Mexico (Missouri) Evening Ledger; William M. Pinkerton, Assistant to the Vice President for Government and Community Affairs; and Dwight E. Sargent, Curator of the Nieman Foundation.

Harvard University also has appointed three Associate Fellows from Korea, the Philippines and South Africa.

The Associate Nieman Fellows are the following:

Jin-Hyun Kim, 36, Business and Finance Editor of Dong-A Ilbo, Seoul, Korea. Mr. Kim was graduated from Seoul National University, and will study sociology, economics and mass communication.

Jose U. Macaspac, Jr., 35, senior reporter with The Manila Chronicle, the Philippines. He was graduated from Manuel L. Quezon University, and proposes to study political science, economics and law.

Alfred F. Ries, 39, political correspondent of Die Burger, Cape Town, South Africa. He has his degree from the University of the Orange Free State, and at Harvard plans to study American history, political science and mass communication.