Nieman Reports

December 1967

Responsibility is the Wife of Privilege

By Miles P. Patrone

Charles Morton: One of a Kind

By Louis M. Lyons

Agencies and Issues

By James Whelan

The "Inner Ring" Mentality

By Edwin A. Lahey

New Nieman Selection Committee Appointed for 1968 Fellowships

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXI, NO. 4 DECEMBER 1967

Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

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

Bernard Kilgore

(Editorial from The Wall Street Journal, November 16, 1967)

A man's life story can tell so much about a man—and so little. So it is with the story of Bernard Kilgore.

It's a tale that might have been written by Horatio Alger: Boyhood in a small Indiana town and a fascination with the world brought to the door by the local newspaper; the small Indiana college and the fun of editing the college newspaper; the heady wine of being a 20-year-old reporter in New York City, a 24-year-old columnist, a 26-year-old Washington bureau chief with a public accolade from the President of the United States, a 32-year-old managing editor, of this then small but nonetheless influential newspaper.

And finally, the excitement of building The Wall Street Journal from a circulation of around 33,000 to more than one million, seeing it published in eight plants scattered across the country and grown rich in resources and prestige as the country's first national newspaper.

This is enough to mark a remarkable man.

Obviously Barney Kilgore was blessed with the gift of talent, enough to make him stand out among his colleagues as a perceptive journalist; re-read today, his columns and magazine articles of that time show an astonishing insight for one so young, and an aptness of expression still worthy of envy.

Equally obviously, he had to have other qualities to make older men single him out for responsibilities beyond his years or experience.

The Wall Street Journal of those days was already a long-established newspaper, eminent in its field of financial journalism, which had been proudly built by such men as Charles Dow and Clarence Barron. If, like other businesses, it was suffering the problems of the depression and a changing world, it was still not an enterprise to be entrusted lightly to a young man. Barney Kilgore was chosen because he was also blessed with that rarest of qualities, maturity in youth.

This accounts for his early recognition. It accounts not at all for what he did afterwards with the enterprise entrusted to him.

The secret there was the eye of a poet. As some men look at rivers and see them spanned by great bridges, he looked at the nation and dreamed of crossing it with a single newspaper that each morning would carry the sames news to Portland, Oregon, as to Portland, Maine. No one could persuade him that it couldn't be done, though many tried, because he had a vision.

His perception was in seeing that the nation at work is the same everywhere; labor, capital, enterprise—and the problems that grow out of all three—are the tie that binds. He also believed that those who had to deal with these problems would value a newspaper that informed them in depth and without sensation about the world they live in in all its variety. Such people might not number many in any one place, but he was sure that across the nation their numbers were legion.

In retrospect the vision seems self-evident and its realization simple. It was not so. The building of the dream took a quarter of a century, and perhaps it is not yet finished. It also took a man who saw that soaring bridges

(Continued on page 20)

The "Inner Ring" Mentality

By Edwin A. Lahey

Mr. Lahey, chief correspondent of the Knight Newspapers, delivered this lecture at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, on November ninth. Mr. Lahey is the 1967 recipient of the Elijah P. Lovejoy Award.

I'm afraid I bring no credentials for invoking the spirit of Elijah Parish Lovejoy. Who among us has not supped with the devil? Life for most of us is an untold, unromantic story of quiet compromises, for which the compensation is survival, and not necessarily the loss of your soul if one is prudent.

I should be permitted a measure of self-importance this evening—but I'm always afraid of it—when a notice about this award appeared in the Detroit Free Press, the Michigan state archivist, Mr. Dennis Bodem, wrote for a photograph of me to place in his files. There is a Parish Storrs Lovejoy well remembered in Michigan for his conservation work, and while the connection seemed remote, Mr. Bodem felt that a picture of a Detroit Free Press man getting a Lovejoy award belonged in his collection. While this request did make me feel important, I also had to remind myself that but for the grace of God, some other public agency might be numbering and filing my mug shots, front view and profile.

It is the story of my life that whenever I am being lifted off to the euphoria of self-importance, some cruel incident occurs to deflate me. Something like that happened last spring. I had gone alone to the coffee shop of the Willard Hotel in Washington for luncheon, feeling pretty good for myself. After I had given my food order to a broad shouldered, deep breasted, and assertive woman, I started spraying myself with the mist of self-importance.

I had just been invited to attend the graduation exercises at Miami-Dade Junior College, where a scholarship was to be established in my name; some weeks before I had been the guest of honor at a testimonial dinner in Miami which had inflated my spirit tremendously. Before that I had been given a plaque by the Chicago Newspaper Guild for my contribution to journalism, which for all I knew might have been my departure from Chicago years before, and prior to this event the policemen in Miami gave me a plaque thanking me for having written that the cops frequently were the unsung heroes of civil rights demonstrations.

At about this moment in my reflections, when I had outdone Walter Mitty in my self-portrait, that waitress came by to survey her station. She looked down at me with critical detachment, and said in a loud voice:

"Are you the grilled cheese? . . . . . ."

Since then I have tried to restrain myself when the temptation toward self-importance starts closing in on me.

There is an inevitable flavor of journalism in this convocation, and I am rounding out 41 years as a reporter, so I assumed that the Lovejoy Fellow would be expected to discuss journalism. President Strider informed me, however, that this was not necessarily so. As a matter of fact,

I detected a suggestion that Dr. Strider's world would go steadily on course if he never heard another discussion on journalism, so with your permission and your President's outright encouragement, I shall make my comments on journalism brief.

Many years ago, the rather tiresome pattern of criticism of the newspaper industry by intellectuals was set by the late A. J. Liebling. Mr. Liebling performed an important function, if one kept in mind the fact that he once suffered a traumatic emotional experience from which he never recovered. This occurred when the owners killed the New York World, the glamorous newspaper on which Mr. Liebling worked. Neither Liebling nor the critics who are his intellectual heirs have ever fully accepted the fact that a newspaper, while unique in its role as a business protected by the constitution, is nevertheless a manufacturing process which operates on profit and loss principles. In a private enterprise economy that's the way it is going to work.

The critics tell us that the press is materialistic, flabby, anti-intellectual, and unconcerned with injustice. In this I think they are as bogged down with cliches as many of our own news writers.

A young colleague of mine, Gene Miller of the Miami Herald, won a Pulitzer prize last season for proving the innocence of a forgotten man doing time in the Florida penitentiary for a murder he did not commit. Miller is now at Cambridge on a Nieman Fellowship.

Another young associate, Phil Meyer of the Washington bureau of the Knight Newspapers, was a Nieman Fellow at Harvard last year and learned the language of the computer. He went to Detroit this summer for the shooting. Immediately after the riots Meyer supervised a research crew in drawing up a comprehensive profile of the race rioter. His outstanding job of crash reporting in depth was given the ultimate in awards after the report appeared in the Knight Newspapers; it was reprinted nationally.

But to return to the critics of the press, I'm sure that Gene Miller and Phil Meyer have the same sense of inner assurance when they find themselves in those esoteric discussions about the failure of American newspapers to keep the peasants well informed. They would both know, as do most young reporters, that there is something about our business that keeps them in it, despite opportunities to make more money in public relations or government. They know that after the bridge column, the Lenten menus, and all the other routine stuff is in type, there will be a little space in the paper to give expression to their enterprise, to their sense of justice, to the Lovejoy tradition if you will. It is in this little hole in the form where newspaper people perform what Doris Fleeson describes as the "water treatment," the drop by drop of the printed word until some evil is eroded.

In all honesty I should concede that I am sentimental about this business. The newspaper industry saved me from a life of toil in a railroad yard, and my complaints have always been muted; but I will say before dropping the subject that newspapers and the men and women who work on them are not as devoid of social consciousness or the sense of public duty as our more militant critics tell us.

Permit me now to take off on the subject of the "inner ring" mentality, which is an important element of the atmosphere in your capital city of Washington. By the words "inner ring mentality" I mean that inordinate desire for acceptance which sometimes leads us to self-debasement. The "inner ring mentality" for a Washington journalist is like this: if a Senator or a Cabinet member or a justice of the Supreme Court addresses you by your first name, you take this as the equivalent of being in the state of sanctifying grace. If the President of the United States addresses you in familiar fashion, you are in the stratosphere of "inner ring" acceptance.

After some twenty-seven years in Washington where the importance of being accepted is so overemphasized, I am convinced that the "inner ring" mentality, the inordinate desire for acceptance, can produce more spiritual corruption than any combination of things put together by the world, the flesh, and the devil.

The "inner ring" mentality so prevalent in Washington is a very important fact of political life; historians will ignore it only at peril to their work. As an eyeball witness I would say that the "inner ring" syndrome played an important part in the history of the administrations of the late President Kennedy and of President Johnson.

The late C. S. Lewis put "the inner ring" in context for me in an address he delivered some years ago to the graduating class at Kings College in London. I have persuaded many young newcomers to Washington to read that address by Dr. Lewis to get an idea of the spiritual corruption that could be suffered in the pursuit of that nebulous state known as "belonging."

Dr. Lewis told those students in London that many of them would become scoundrels in their desire to belong. When they entered their professions, they would discover the existence of an "inner ring" in their environment; they would then proceed to barter their souls and to debase themselves in many ways to win admission to the "inner ring." Once inside they would discover that still another "inner ring" confronted them. The process of debasing themselves to crack this ring would begin all over. Finally they would come to the end of the line with the realization that life had been one layer of inner rings after another, like an onion with nothing left when you had finished peeling.

I said that the "inner ring" type of thinking could in-

fluence national events. Let me illustrate. If you remember 1960, John F. Kennedy had a slight touch of "not belonging" about him; it was the bit about the Boston Irish never having been acceptable to the Boston Brahmins. A great deal was made about the political liability of Kennedy's religion, but these seeming handicaps were exploited beautifully. A lot of people who suffered from a "don't belong" feeling identified with Kennedy, and on election day second generation Poles and Italians, Jews and Negroes, Irish and others were voting against the membership committees of every exclusive country club in the United States.

I think it quite reasonable to say, with the close results in mind, that a careful exploitation of the resentments against the "inner ring" probably elected John F. Kennedy President.

The working of the "inner ring" syndrome can be plainly seen in the career of Lyndon B. Johnson. We see the President on his way up fighting for acceptance, wistful and abrasive in turn as it eludes him, and again we see him as the center of the most powerful and exclusive "inner ring" in the universe, bestowing the blessing of a friendly nod on those striving for acceptance at the White House gate.

Maybe because Mr. Johnson tends to bring out a yawn from me, I never noticed the "inner ring" syndrome at work until I covered him briefly in the campaign of 1964; it then occurred to me that the President's deepest yearning was for universal acceptance. If you listened to Mr. Johnson plead with a tear in his voice to a crowd at a street rally, you had the feeling that he was directing his remarks at some person hidden behind yonder curtain, who might still be holding out on him.

While observing the President's eagerness to find the man who still might not like him, I could only think of an observation of Henry David Thoreau when someone asked him the purpose of his life. Thoreau said in substance that he had long ago lost a favorite horse, a pet dog, and a turtle dove. His life was dedicated to finding them. Sometimes a stranger told him of seeing the horse down the road a piece; sometimes he heard the distant bark of the dog in the woods; and sometimes he saw the fleeting figure of the dove disappearing behind a cloud. He never caught up with them, Thoreau said, but his life was committed to a continuing search.

About a year after noting Mr. Johnson's passionate desire for acceptance, I did some interviewing down in the Johnson country in Texas. It seemed apparent that Lyndon B. Johnson had been nursing a regional inferiority complex for years and fighting the traditional stereotype of the Texan as a loud-mouthed and uncultured yokel. There seemed to be no question but that Johnson had for most of his life felt the bitter sense of exclusion from the inner ring. He had never in fact been accepted by the Establishment until he took the oath of office as President, and by Establishment I mean the men who speak the language of the Bankers Club in lower Manhattan, the language of Long Island, Tuxedo Park, State Street in Boston, Lake Forest in Illinois, Bloomfield Hills and Grosse Pointe in Michigan, the Main Line in Philadelphia, and the Allegheny Club in Pittsburgh.

There are some innocent examples of the operation of the "inner ring" mentality in Washington. The most poignant aspect of retiring for a couple of newspaper friends I know was the surrender of their White House press cards to the Secret Service; all of a sudden they didn't belong. And the day after a Cabinet member leaves his job, a man with a screwdriver comes around to his house and removes the White House phone. The man then feels that he has been cast out of the tribal gates.

You've all heard of the Washington institution known as the "background" dinner. This is a device for recording the thoughts, if any, of some important man without attributing his remarks to him. These dinners are greatly overrated as news sources, but it is generally a crushing experience not to be invited to one, no matter how tedious it is. If you were not invited, you didn't belong that night, and this brings terror to the soul of anyone living in the atmosphere of the "inner ring" mentality.

In my own business I find an inbred tendency in Washington for reporters to form associations on the "inner ring" principle. State Department correspondents, for some reason I have never been able to determine, have their own group, complete with identification cards in plastic. All such "inner rings" of course turn outward with the members united mainly in a set of principles by which others are to be excluded.

The newspaper guild is about the only association in our business that has reversed this process. Years ago it expanded its jurisdiction to take in not only editorial employes, but business office people, janitors, and others with no intellectual relationship with newsmen. Needless to say, many reporters resented the decisions that put them in the same collective bargaining basket with others in the non-mechanical jobs.

I'd like to wind up with a rousing message about the dangers of the "inner ring" mentality, but I won't. After all, you are tonight making me a member of an "inner ring" of Lovejoy Fellows which increases at the rate of only one a year; I know of nobody in my "inner ring" world of Washington who would ask for more exclusivity. I want only to say to those with life still ahead of you that you will never be free of the temptation to win acceptance to the "inner ring." If I am to take advantage as an "old boy" of journalism and offer some advice, I would say belong to the "inner ring" if you must, but first examine closely the hidden charges in the initiation fee.

The Agencies and the Issues

By James R. Whelan

Mr. Whelan is the Manager of the Caribbean Division of United Press International with offices in San Juan, Puerto Rico. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1966-67.

In the years following World War II, the world was rather neatly and sharply divided into three camps.

There were the "good guys," led by the United States, the "bad guys," led by the Soviet Union, and finally, those exasperating "neutral" nations. In the wings were a host of lesser states, colonies and emerging nations, largely faceless and voiceless.

The role of the U.S. foreign correspondent was no less hazardous nor challenging then than at any other period. But in one, very important sense, his job was a vastly simpler one than that of his successors of the present era.

Expressed crudely: the U.S. was involved all over the globe in those days, but the fact of U.S. involvement was rarely the issue. As the world was sharply divided, so, too, were the issues more sharply and starkly stated in whites and blacks. So, the U.S. newsman was able to go about the business of reporting what happened, usually free of suspicion about his motives.

If it were assumed he brought to the task a mind cluttered by national biases, it was a matter of relatively small importance. The U.S.—and its legion of overseas newsmen—had not yet become a political dart board for the rest of the free world.

This is not to imply, of course, that the press of the U.S. was monolithic in its reporting of international issues in that period. The journalistic in-fighting over the China question, or the heated debates over the colonial question, or later, over the proposal to bomb the Chinese Communists' Manchurian bases, for example, all honored the best internecine traditions of the American press.

For a number of reasons not germane to this essay, the emphasis gradually shifted in the late '50's and '60's and much of the debate—abroad as well as at home—centered on the *fact* of U.S. involvement.

With the exception of Antarctica, happily immune so far, landmark examples exist for all corners of the world: the Bay of Pigs, the Congo, Viet Nam, the continuing friction with le Grand Charles, etc.

Now the debate shifted from whether the U.S. had acted effectively or ineffectively, but whether it had the right—or the right reasons—for acting at all.

This has enormously complicated the job of U.S. newsmen overseas. For the U.S.-based news services, it has intensified a growing credibility gap, first and foremost in the developing nations, to a lesser degree in the advanced nations—and more recently (but even less frequently so far) in the U.S. itself.

The international news agencies have wrestled with this problem overseas for years. But as noted, it has intensified in recent years, reflecting the shift in the position of the U.S. on the world stage.

The news agencies were the traditional targets, of course,

because they provide the bulk of the world news to the bulk of the free world's press. The rapid escalation in the coverage of the world news fronts by U.S. syndicates, networks, and individual newspapers and magazines has complicated the situation of the U.S. agencies.

Correspondents for these latter syndicates, networks and publications perform an entirely different function: their coverage is directed at an American (rather than a world) audience. Foreign (and some domestic) critics, however, tend to lump all together in their evaluation of the performance of the American press, attributing to one the sins of the other, indiscriminately.

To state these distinctions is not to claim that one is superior to the other—nor even that either performs its function of informing an American, on the one hand, or world audience, on the other, to perfection; simply that they do have different functions—and operate quite differently.

The special correspondent in Latin America, for instance, is reacting to requests, queries and suggestions inspired by his editors back in the U.S. To an extent, so is a correspondent for a U.S.-based agency—but he is also getting queries, requests and suggestions from Stockholm, Manila or Ottawa or Tokyo.

The failure to recognize these functional and operational differences is an old story in many foreign attacks on the U.S. agencies. The fact that domestic critics often build their own cases on foundations borrowed from foreign critics results frequently in the impression that the debate was dragged home rather badly deformed and bloodied.

One possible reason for this is that, however wise these domestic critics may be in the ways of the American press at home, they very often are innocents abroad when first confronted with the problem at international journalism gatherings.

Most of what I have to say here will reflect my experience with UPI in Latin America, but I believe applies equally well to general criticism—both foreign and domestic—of both major U.S. agencies, and to a lesser extent, to international reporting of all U.S. media.

In talks to several groups of U.S. college students during the past year, I have repeatedly been peppered with questions that reflect a deep distrust of the capacity of the U.S. press to do an honest job where U.S. interests are involved. On coverage of such hotly-debated Latin American stories as Cuba, the Dominican Republic and the Panama Canal riots, there is a suspicion that the U.S. press somehow serves the presumed voracious appetites and reactionary attitudes of U.S. business.

In a word, that the U.S. press structurally is incapable of opposing the Establishment. Not surprisingly, the questioners almost invariably bring to each of those issues their own very strong viewpoints on them. So they are not swayed when told that U.S. reporters covering those stories are themselves sharply divided—and their writing reflects it.

Suspicions do not yield easily to evidence—especially when the suspicions are rooted in deeply-held private prejudices.

I would call this kind of criticism "issue bias"—perhaps the most common of all. Such criticism is far from limited to college students, of course.

Let me illustrate with a foreign parallel of this kind of criticism.

Early in 1960, Chilean university students directed a widely-publicized letter to visiting President Eisenhower, summing up their aspirations and complaints with U.S. policy in Latin America.

One of the lesser-noted passages of that voluminous document read:

"We know and applaud your recent official declaration, serene and respectful, with regard to the self-determination of the Cuban nation, but so different, unfortunately, from the campaign of hatred, calumny and distortion broadcast by the two large North American news agencies, and stridently repeated by the Latin American press which serves the selfish interests of the groups which feel themselves threatened . . .

". . . it seems to us that it is plainly immoral to classify the Cuban revolution, its government or its social fulfillments, especially the agrarian reform, as 'Communist.' We shall not enter into useless details, but it is scandalous and terrifying to observe that the North American news agencies, and not a few U.S. legislators and public figures, attack agrarian reform in Cuba as being 'Communist.' "

Castro was then the students' hero, and one does not throw stones at heroes, even when merely reporting what the hero does or says. Or, as the concept is commonly expressed in Latin America, if you are not my friend, you must be my enemy.

This kind of criticism flourishes, of course, where there is a poorly-developed tradition of an independent press and objective reporting.

I did not measure it at the time, but a lasting impression was made then by the sheer volume given over on UPI's Latin American wires to Castro's own speeches—a source of equal distress, I might add, to those in Latin America who opposed Castro even then. It will be remembered that Castro at that time was a frequent and marathon performer on Havana television and his speeches were faithfully monitored and reported.

Much of this criticism springs from a misunderstanding of the function of an independent press. Much of it also is dishonest and mischievous, stimulated by those who would like nothing better than to discredit the international news agencies.

If they could achieve this, then the free flow of information across borders and continents is threatened in the measure that all attempts at international reporting for international audiences becomes suspect.

Totalitarians and tyrants of every stripe obviously would prefer to spread their version of "information" through official propaganda mills. But to this category belong still another, less-obvious and more-challenging type.

These are the leaders of nations struggling to build democracies on the quicksands of poverty, subversion, ignorance and politically and morally-bankrupt traditions.

To them—misguided democrats, some in more stable societies might say—simple, straightforward reporting may play into the hands of their enemies, who stage events for the sole purpose of weakening a struggling government by bad publicity.

I have in mind the running battle of President Betancourt of Venezuela with foreign correspondents. Because of its position of strength in Latin America, UPI usually is the first target of official (and unofficial) wrath, and I was frequently blasted by official spokesmen for stories we had filed.

During the same period we were accused of giving aid and comfort to the Communist terrorists, our office in Caracas also was attacked four times by those same Communist terrorists. Despite such frequent brushes with the Betancourt government, I was later accused by Communists in Panama of being a paid hack of the Betancourt government.

These paradoxes—built around the "issue bias"—tend to lure one into smugness about the actual objectivity of his work. Still, I have often wondered—high heresy of journalism!—where aloofness from cause and effect in the best traditions of independent, let-the-chips-fall-where-they-may journalism but practiced now in a world of manipulation of the press through manipulation of events, where such "honesty" becomes downright dishonesty?

But this theme, worthy I believe of the most careful and thoughtful study, would lead us far afield.

If the "issue bias" underlies the most common type of criticism of the U.S. news agencies, the more penetrating and provocative theme is the notion of the national, built-in bias.

Mr. Louis M. Lyons, writing in the September 1966 issue of Nieman Reports, ranged over most of the major facets of this form of criticism.

"Our nationalist biases are in degree inescapable," he wrote, "and we may not have them more than others, but our interests and involvements are more pervasive than any other. Our policy counts more than any others.

"This policy," he continues, "rests basically in the images we, the public, have in our heads. Bias in reporting from the most sensitive areas, Moscow, Cuba, on China, United Nations debates, may be largely unconscious by the reporters and unconsciously absorbed by the readers.

"But it is intensely important that our correspondents be disciplined instinctively on guard to reduce their biases in such reporting to the irreducible minimum. This is not always the case."

Later on in the same article, Mr. Lyons quoted Christopher Rand of The New Yorker as speculating that when American reporters manage to overcome the subjective American bias and "learn to float free and almost denationalize himself," both readers and editors will react.

"He would be rushed home," Mr. Rand is quoted as saying, "to be reindoctrinated. If he learned detachment his readers would think him cold and negative. They would be disappointed not to be stirred up one way or another about things, and the reporter would be lucky to survive."

In my eight years as a foreign correspondent in Latin America, I never heard of a single such instance. It might be argued that none of the scores of American foreign correspondents I knew in Latin America had learned to "denationalize" themselves, but the fact is they saw and reported stories from widely and often diametrically different angles and perspectives.

Furthermore, even if there were such a thing as a monolithic viewpoint among American reporters on U.S. foreign policy—or even a consistent degree of consensus on the major issues—such a nation of national bias must assume that U.S. newsmen are somehow more narrowly alike in their outlook towards major world issues than Americans as a whole.

Where, for instance, is the evidence of such uniformity of views—under the banner of national bias—in the generally dreadful job of reporting the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic? Friendships of long-standing among newsmen were shattered because of acrid disagreements on this issue.

I do not believe, either, I am merely confusing the concept of national bias with that of attitudes on specific, official policies, precisely because these biases would be meaningless unless they manifested themselves on policies, among other things.

Mr. Lyons raises in his article several other questions.

He speaks, for instance, of his encounter with the editor of a French language paper in Montreal a few years ago at a conference on communications in Canada. Cuba and Algeria were top news then, he remarks.

"The Canadians," he reports, "expressed some concern that their news on Cuba came through American news services. We were on one side of the issue with Castro. The one quite contented member of the conference was the editor of a French language paper in Montreal.

"He said he has both the Associated Press and Agence

Francais (sic) and 'I'd no more use AP on Cuba than Agence Francais on Algeria.' He had a chance to use the more detached report. But mostly we don't have such a chance."

To the contented conferee and to Mr. Lyons, it is pure logic that if the U.S. is on one side of an issue, then the U.S. news agencies must be on that side, too. The traditional independence of American newsmen—even the economic and mechanical realities of operating an international news agency, a point we will get to in a minute—collapse under the weight of inevitable "national bias."

The two U.S. news agencies operate strictly on their own commercial resources. Agence France Presse receives a substantial annual subsidy from the French government.

This is not to imply that the hundreds of AFP correspondents around the world, many of them among the world's best journalists, are paid propagandists. But it does say something about the possible intrusion of policy added to what Mr. Lyons feels is inevitable national bias.

It also seems questionable to equate the probable independence of financially-self-reliant news agencies with that of a government-subsidized agency.

Again, in the case of the Dominican intervention, DeGaulle was severely critical of the U.S. It may be sheer coincidence, or the result of superior reporting, but the fact is that AFP was widely hailed around Latin America for its coverage of the story. Such applause came almost exclusively from those who opposed U.S. intervention, in other words, those with a rather strong point of view of their own.

It was little noticed that practically all of the major reporting damaging to the U.S.—like exposing the State Department's list of Communists allegedly involved in the rebel coup—was done by American reporters and duly relayed by the U.S.-based news agencies.

Still later, Mr. Lyons relates his experience at the 1966 International Press Institute's Asian conference on the press in developing countries.

"Every nation that can afford it," Mr. Lyons remarks, "has its own foreign news service. The Japanese do, the Indians. But most Asian lands cannot afford it. They are served by foreign news agencies, now mostly American. So they must see the world through alien eyes, chiefly American.

"This is irritating to their journalists, their governments. It causes misunderstanding, arouses suspicion. The Asians at the conference in Manila could not understand the need of the American press to have American correspondents in their countries to communicate to Americans in meaningful terms.

"They suspected the American correspondent was reporting in the context of American foreign policy. Else why not employ a national of the country as correspondent?"

Mr. Lyons adds that "after exploring the press in Asian countries, an American could understand this."

In these ten sentences, Mr. Lyons has touched on several levels of the credibility gap problem facing American-based news agencies. (I have used U.S., or American-based throughout; if only to suggest that these agencies are more international, for a number of reasons I will deal with, than is generally conceded.)

First, the matter of national news services. If the international news agencies are victims of "national bias," then presumably national agencies would also be. The fact the bias was home-grown would contribute little to the cause of genuine understanding. Furthermore, there are few governments around the world more likely to keep hands off news agencies than the U.S. government.

On a higher level, the economics of operating an international news agency dictate that to remain viable—and independent—a truly international agency must derive a large percentage of its income from the vast and wealthy U.S. market.

Neither the Japanese nor the Indians, by the way, operate anything approaching international news agencies. Rather, they maintain correspondents in some major world capitals and news centers. On this scale perhaps the concept of a foreign news service for every country that can afford it makes some sense.

Trouble is that step two of this process frequently involves closing the market altogether to the international agencies, requiring them to distribute their product through a single outlet, the national agency. What happens to the cause of free and unfettered flow of information in such circumstances is best left to speculation.

What is clear, however, is that the loss of markets weakens the international agencies financially, weakening in the process their capacity to do the global reporting job someone must do.

Still another issue: the hiring of nationals instead of Americans. America obviously does not have a monopoly on good newsmen. There are, however, problems. The case for or against individual American publications on this score is one I will not deal with here.

Rather, I will talk about the recruiting of nationals for the news agencies, supposedly international by definition.

A minor, mechanical problem. Most Americans sent overseas by the agencies learn the mechanics of wire service work in U.S. bureaus. The absence of such internal wire services in many countries means that men locally must not only be trained in international journalism, but in the mechanics of wire service work, too.

A more serious problem. Especially in the developing

countries, nationals not only are liable to be subject to direct, official pressure, but also psychological pressure.

Many of them feel inevitably and deeply involved in the major issues of their own countries, and, where the educated elite is limited, often grew up with the same policy makers they are supposed to write about. In an atmosphere where the Fourth Estate concept of the press is only superficially understood, if at all, this is a matter of no little consequence.

In Venezuela and other Latin countries where I have had a chance to observe, it is standard practice to identify a newsman first by his political affiliation, and secondly by the newspaper he represents.

There is still another kind of complication. I recall the recent tale of woe of a U.S. television crew filming on location in Europe. Local technicians refused to cooperate because they felt the script portrayed their country in a bad light. I have never heard of a U.S. camera crew with any compunction about filming Chief Parker and his hounds—or anything else that might tarnish the U.S. image.

These are some of the problems. Nonetheless, the fact is that both UPI and AP do make a considerable effort to recruit outstanding nationals. Of the 20 UPI bureaus in Latin America, ten would be classified as major—and Latin Americans manage four of those ten bureaus. Latin American writers in all of the bureaus contribute a substantial portion of our total Latin American output.

Leading Latin American writers are included on our teams covering all major inter-American conferences. One of UPI's best Latin hands, Carlos J. Villar Borda, a Colombian, was among UPI writers covering such controversial events as the Dominican crisis and 1964 Panama Canal riots.

Mr. Lyons made still another point deserving clarification.

"These dispatches," he writes, "written for American readers, returned on the world-wide circuit of the American syndicates and wire services to the very lands from which they reported, to come under close scrutiny at their sources. This is a communication phenomenon whose consequences evoke little discussion and less concern."

As noted already, the debate is new to the U.S. It is an old one to news agencies in much of the rest of the world.

In the case of the news agencies—unlike the syndicates which are newcomers to the field of overseas distribution —it is not quite true that the dispatches were "written for American readers."

Insofar as it is humanly possible, the dispatches are written for international readers. The agencies, after all, distribute their product in more than 100 lands around the world, and they would not long survive writing for American audiences alone.

Furthermore, the system of relays and separate regional circuits means that the news agencies usually edit the news for specific regions. Most of UPI's report for Asian newspapers, for instance, is edited in Manila.

In the case of Latin America, the editing is done by an all-Latin staff in New York, most of them drawn from UPI's Latin American bureaus. The editor of the service for Latin American newspapers and radio and television stations is an urbane Argentine lawyer, Raul Muniz Moreno, a man fluent in seven languages and of long UPI experience.

In making these points, I am not trying to evade the obvious: of course a major share of the emphasis is for reporting for the American audience. The American market is the biggest and richest, and heaviest consumer. A certain percentage of this kind of U.S.-aimed reporting inevitably seeps into the world reports of the agencies.

But again, no agency man would long survive in Latin America, for instance, if he didn't think first and foremost of the Latin American market, because Latin America is far and away the biggest consumer of Latin American news. Little known, too, is the fact UPI, for instance, also makes the same kind of "special effort" for markets other than the U.S. UPI maintains Latin American specialists, reporting primarily for Latin America, in Washington, New York, London, Rome and Paris.

At the very beginning, I suggested some of the factors complicating the role of U.S. newsmen—and the U.S. news agencies—in the present-day world. A credibility problem does exist, and the gap is likely to widen.

To be useful, constructive, the debate about the problem must focus on the real issues, while exposing the shibboleths.

But it is, I believe, a terribly important challenge to the U.S. agencies. Their ability to meet it will tell a great deal about the chances for survival of a free flow of information throughout the world in the future.

For however large or small their inadequacies in the past, it seems clear that the U.S. agencies—because of the free traditions, of American journalism, because of their financial independence and tremendous international experience—are uniquely suited to guarantee that such a free flow of information does survive.

Responsibility is the Wife of Privilege

By Miles P. Patrone

Mr. Patrone is the chairman of the American Newspaper Publishers Association Labor Relations Committee. He delivered this speech to the International Typographical Union's convention on September 5, 1967.

At your convention last year, somewhere along the line I said: "I can think of nothing finer than to observe my tenth anniversary with ANPA in the knowledge that we have made true and complete progress in the betterment of our relationships." I have observed my tenth anniversary with ANPA. Last year's hope has not developed into a reality, but I do see some hopeful signs.

No great or significant strides have been made in the betterment of our relationship, but I am convinced that we have had some success.

We certainly are not approaching the millenium which would mean that from here on in publishers and local unions will sit down at the bargaining table and in perfect amity and wisdom arrive at a perfect conclusion. This is a most imperfect world. So far as our own business is concerned, the imperfections stand out glaringly. Long, involved, and protracted negotiations are all too evident, even when successfully concluded. Although the vast majority of contracts are renewed successfully and daily relations in most newspapers continue without incident, open conflict occurs all too frequently.

So far in 1967 to date, we have had 16 separate work stoppages in newspapers—ranging from extended chapel meetings that interfered with the publication of the newspaper to extended strikes resulting over disputes in new contract negotiations.

This unhappy total does not take into account the 18 work stoppages at the World Journal Tribune in its all too brief struggle for survival.

I do not point this record out to moan and cry and to view with alarm. Outsiders view newspapers with alarm. They point their finger at our seeming inability to solve some of our problems and gratuitously offer us a one-shot penicillin cure for all our problems.

The hopeful note I refer to is that since I last saw you, the ANPA and your Executive Council and officers of other craft unions have continued to improve the bridges of communication between us. As a result, several times during the past year in situations that were getting tight, telephone calls originating from either source have sometimes led to conversations that have in turn prevented trouble.

One other significant event occurred which demonstrates the better bridges of understanding to which I refer. That was the establishment and the first-time functioning of the Publisher-Union Standby Committee in the Toledo strike situation.

We cannot lay claim to a perfect operation by any means. But we did, with sincerity, hard work, long hours and candor manage to negotiate to a solution ending the strike.

Here I want to express my appreciation to the International officers who came into the picture and to compliment them for their dedication, patience and perseverance under the most trying of circumstances. And I don't want

to forget those members of the Labor Relations Committee who contributed so much in that situation.

Conflict is no stranger to our business. We have had it in the past, we have it now, and we'll have it in the future. But conflict comes only when one party uses it as a method to force an answer to a problem to which it has not yet found an intelligent solution. Impatience is substituted for patience. But what happens when conflict fails to force a solution? Then the better solution is delayed. I am not, in any sense, advocating that a union give up its right to strike. I believe firmly that you should retain that right, a right to be used with the utmost reluctance and only in the most extreme circumstances. I would not advocate removing that right any more than I would stop advocating that an employer who is struck has a right to publish if possible. Again, I do not think that right and ability should be abrogated in any way. I consider so-called striker replacement laws as attacks on that right.

Whether we like it or not, ours is a mutually dependent relationship. We both are striving for the same goal— a prosperous business and an equitable distribution of that prosperity. Our dispute is over how we travel to that particular point and how it should look when we arrive there. Any attempt by either party to damage the other becomes a self-inflicted injury.

So isn't it ridiculous to substitute muscle for reason?

So we must meet over the bargaining table to map the route. The question is at what price will the union sell its labor? Its corollary question is at what price will management pay that labor? Only reason, logic, merit, understanding and patience can assign values to the components of the equation so it can be finally reduced to the X equals Y figure that we both agree on.

Certainly you are concerned with the increased cost of living that you believe has eroded the past wage gains you have made and consequently seek added wage increases.

But any wage increase, and especially one beyond and above any current or anticipated cost of living without a commensurate increase in productivity, is the wrong answer. It is so easy to say "Pass the added costs on to the advertiser." That, however, is not so easy to do. The attempt generally is self-defeating. Newspapers, as an advertising media, have a value which is measured in the market place by comparisons with other media, and newspapers are constantly in a struggle with these other media for the advertising dollar.

When the cost of newspaper advertising in the opinion of the advertiser gets too high, those dollars flow to radio and television. Printers set no TV or radio commercials. The answer to higher wages must be increased productivity to allow us to compete and to offset the added expense either in the form of greater flexibility in the operation of the plant and/or in the introduction of new technology.

For some years now we have been concerned with technology new to the newspaper business. Certainly changes are taking place in the way that we produce newspapers. They must. We cannot drive an oxcart in a jet age. More will take place. Publishers, in an attempt to give the best possible product and to offset increased costs, are investing hundreds of millions of dollars a year in new equipment. This cannot and should not be stopped. It may be delayed temporarily by unions' restricting the use of this new equipment, but as sure as an increase in taxes, the changes will go forward.

The retention of work practices and introduction of contract language that restrict the ability of a publisher to introduce and utilize new technology to maximum efficiency only has long-term adverse effects. When you do this, you place a mortgage on both our futures, and both of us will have to pay off the original cost plus interest.

In these past few years, we have managed in some instances to handle this problem. Unions and publishers, to some degree, have been able to agree on a method of introduction of new technology, and both have learned that new technology does not automatically mean a wholesale reduction in jobs. The experience in the newspaper business, to the contrary, belies any such statements. Certainly we have had new technology, and just as certainly, the number of employees in newspapers has not been materially affected.

One may blindly conjecture as to the number of jobs that might be lost if there had been unlimited acceptance of new technology. One can count specifically the number of jobs lost forever when a newspaper folds. How much technology would it have taken to eliminate the 2600 jobs at the World Journal Tribune?

As new technology and new processes are introduced, inter-union jurisdictional disputes will arise as long as unions continue to cling to long-held jurisdictional philosophies even when a new machinery may cross formerly well-delineated jurisdictional lines. However, we cannot stay the hand of new technology. If, in fact, jurisdictional lines are crossed by machines, why can't an individual employee cross with the machine? I submit that a re-evaluation of union policies may be needed.

These problems can be handled, but it requires new understanding between us. More than ever, the process of collective bargaining these days requires mutual respect and trust—for the proposition that someone else can honestly differ with your interpretation of a set of facts. It also requires a sincerity and desire to straight-forwardly and candidly state your case. And finally, there must be an understanding of the other persons's viewpoint as seen from his side of the fence as well as your own, so that you can understand the needs and the pressures that bear on him just as your needs and pressures bear on you. Solutions

in negotiations will come much more reasonably under these conditions than where people are figuratively shouting and waving their arms. Very often people beat a drum loudly in the hope that listeners will cover their ears and not notice that there is no music.

Today's problems are different from yesterday's and as they differ they require different solutions and new methods of seeking solutions. A healthy pragmatism rather than a clinging to past dogma will help.

I cannot agree that the ends justify the means in collective bargaining. I am referring specifically here to actions taken by certain unions, yours included, in using pressure tactics, such as refusal to work overtime, slowdowns, and prolonged chapel meetings during the course of negotiations or in protest of an alleged grievance. This is of overriding concern to me.

I have said it elsewhere, and so I say it to you. Such actions are totally wrong. They inflict almost irreparable harm on the long-range relationships between employer and employe. That it can sometimes gain its immediate end is evident. However, I ask you, if your cause is so right, if your position is so sound, then why not follow the peaceful grievance procedures of a contract to settle a dispute that arises during the course of a contract? A third impartial party could not but find your position so unassailable that he would rule in your favor.

Again, I say to you, pressure tactics are wrong. You agreed to a contract. In negotiating that contract, there was give and take on both sides. The contract was agreed to. Generally the publisher gets one thing out of negotiations—your promise of industrial peace during the contract term. This was a result of your negotiations. You cannot and should not during the course of that contract select which portions of it you wish to abide by and ignore the others. A contract is an entity, the components of which are not to be sorted over, obeying the clause to your liking and rejecting the clause that is not. You have the privilege of an equal voice at the bargaining table.

Responsibility is the wife of privilege.

With responsibility must come the concomitant of self-restraint. And this restraint is particularly needed where an employer bargains with many unions. Nothing but continuing turmoil results when a dozen unions peer over the shoulder of a negotiating union, waiting for it to make its settlement and then stepping in with "me too—only more!" Either we, management and unions, must learn to operate our labor affairs with self-discipline or someone else is going to impose the needed discipline upon us.

Not too long ago, a Gallup Poll, for example, showed that 68 per cent of the public supported the idea that no strike be permitted to last for more than 21 days. At the end of that time, if labor and management had not reached agreement, a court-appointed committee could dictate terms to both sides. What an outlook to contemplate—placing our future in the hands of people who do not understand the quirks and foibles of our business, its aims, its ideas, and its goals, and who surely would not understand or appreciate the long-held jurisdictional philosophies of your union and others with a stake in this business.

Were the Gallup Poll held today, I feel sure that the percentage would be even higher. The recent railroad strike has done much to add to the growing public disenchantment with strikes.

So I think we must keep in mind as we negotiate and in our daily relationships that we need to find not only the carrot of practical solutions, but also to avoid a situation that may lead to the stick of a public body beating us both into submission. It might be later than we think.

We are on the threshold of a most significant era. Change is upon us. We must adapt. Our actions today will either shape the future to our mutual benefit, or will contribute irrevocably to constant discord. It will require skill, wisdom, intelligence and a true desire to build a compromise. And this takes time. It will take more courage to advocate compromise than war. But that decision in greatest part lies with you, the membership of the various unions. We on the ANPA Labor Relations Committee have in the past indicated our desire to work with your officers to reach solutions. We will continue to seek these solutions. They will be found, I have no doubt. However, they must be practical and workable solutions. Let me refer to at least one partial solution that we have found with the pressmen's union. I am referring to the International Arbitration Agreement, which is 67 years old. Recently the Labor Relations Committee of ANPA and the Executive Board of the pressmen met regarding this document and to recommend its continuation to our memberships.

I know of your reluctance to accept this agreement, but I submit to you that an arbitration award, even though not to your liking, is infinitely better than a strike which you may win or which you may lose.

Certainly it is not the panacea for labor difficulties. But used as an adjunct to good, hard, fair collective bargaining, it can lead to solutions not otherwise obtainable short of a strike.

I repeat the willingness and desire of the ANPA Labor Relations Committee to meet with your officers at any time and as often as needed to explore any and every avenue that may lead to equitable solutions. I urge you on the local level to also demonstrate the same willingness and desire to achieve accord.

There is no lack of ability in our newspapers that prevents the solving of our problems. But we must show the desire, willingness and courage to forego parochial interests in the interest of long-range mutual benefits. We can do it—if we want to.

Charles W. Morton: One of a Kind

By Louis M. Lyons

Charles W. Morton, former associate editor of the Atlantic, died September 23 in London, while on a vacation trip with his wife, Mildred.

Four of his long-time friends spoke at a memorial service in Cambridge, September 29: Edward A. Weeks, former editor of the Atlantic Monthly; Louis M. Lyons, former curator of the Nieman Fellowships; Oscar Handlin, professor of history at Harvard, and Edwin O'Connor, author of "The Last Hurrah."

Mr. Lyons' talk recalls Charlie Morton's close association with the Nieman Fellows.

Robert Manning concluded his tribute to Charles Morton for the newspapers with the statement:

"He was one of a kind."

This describes now the hole he leaves in our community.

It is this intense individualism that his friends have always felt about Charlie Morton. This was his style and he was a stylist. He expressed it in his innumerable crotchets, in his wry humor, in his particular taste in clothes, in food and drink, in places to go and the places to stay, and in the people you should not miss meeting.

A discriminating man.

He was a Bostonian by choice and we have a right to rejoice in the choice. From Omaha, unsatisfied with his father's hardware store, it was his quest for a chance to write that led him here and sustained a painful struggle, valiantly shared by his wife, Mildred, to get a footing. The institutions that came to occupy most of his life, the old Boston Transcript and the Atlantic Monthly, identify him with those most particularly Bostonian.

His impact on them, however, was of a special quality and it was indelible. He relished all the idiosyncrasies of Boston ways, even those that pricked his thorniest observations. He had a zest for life and expressed it with a complete candor and a choice of expletives that had its charm.

Nothing Charlie Morton gave his attention to was anything trivial. It occupied his full interest, commanded his precise investigation, until he had wrapped it up and given his judgment on it. And that was it. It stuck in your mind as a definitive experience when you had heard Charlie's ukase on the matter.

The title of one of his books, A SLIGHT SENSE OF OUTRAGE, understated his attitude toward all that offended his sensibilities. Bob Manning describes his "profound distaste for the bogus, the pedantic and the self-interested argument. He forced us (his Atlantic colleagues) to look

sharply at the world's congenital foolishness. He made us laugh."

He had almost total recall for the bizarre and the ridiculous. It was as though such experiences had been exposed on a sensitized plate. And he could convey such impressions, their flavor undiluted, to a delighted audience, whether of living room or banquet hall. He could have done it in pantomime if his voice had failed. For he could express more with a shrug of his shoulders or a deprecating spread of his hands than most could say in a column. I once saw a Harvard Club dining hall full of members of the National Conference of Editorial Writers doubled up in convulsive laughter, that became for some physically painful, at Charlie's reminiscence of life on the old Transcript. The Transcript, with its oddities and anachronisms, with its, to him, utterly weird attitudes, and personnel that seemed to him proper contemporaries of the Mad Hatter, was an unending source of hilarity to him. Yet he belonged on the Transcript, if on any newspaper of that era. Its cast would have been incomplete without him.

His Transcript years, nearly a decade, made his introductory chapter in Boston. They added up to a youthful episode, his 30's, and in the 30's, that dismal decade. But on a paper that had more editors, two flights up, than reporters, three flights up, Charlie found full rein to experience everything that was going on; and it all stayed with him. He became one of the most competent reporters in town; and he escaped the final febrile days of the Transcript, because Social Security came in. Charlie became one of the charter members of the regional office and soon knew as much about its ins and outs as anybody.

It was from this interlude in bureaucracy that Ted Weeks acquired Charlie for the Atlantic, to balance the editor's own special talents and interests. There, Charlie presided for a quarter century over the happily titled department, "Accent on Living," and gave his own accent to its lead piece every month. "Accent on living" is the most descriptive term for Charlie Morton. Everything he did, wrote or said, bore his special accent.

The Atlantic and the world it opened to him, as well as its own personal relationships, made the most satisfying existence a lad from Omaha could have concieved, when he was reading Mencken and trying his 'prentice hand at pieces for the Julius Haldeman blue books.

Charlie said of the Atlantic, "There was never a moment on it when I would have exchanged places with anyone anywhere."

I shared Charlie's reporting days and early appreciated his crackling conversation. Our acquaintance ripened over a long murder trial, out of town—O, 35 years ago—when we lunched together every day. I became aware then of a special responsibility he felt over his connoisseurship of food and drink, as of people and everything else. There was nothing generalized about his preferences. The camp kitchen at South Milford served the most exquisite toast and the most fabulous chocolate pudding to be had on the North American continent. Number Seven St. James's Place was the most satisfying lodging in London. No detail escaped him. If he came to dinner, his bread and butter letter to your wife was still savoring a perfectly cooked roast and a memorable sauce.

He equally savored good talk and contributed the best of it. A long generation of Nieman Fellows at Harvard relished Charlie's conversation. He somehow became a kind of adjunct of the Nieman program. He had an instinct for discovering any special talent among them, and these choice ones he kept in touch with. Years later on returns to Cambridge they had two targets—to go to lunch with Charlie Morton and to call on Professor Schlesinger. The present editor of the Atlantic was a discovery of Charlie's, more than 20 years ago, when Bob Manning was one of the youngest of Nieman Fellows. Manning was just the man the Atlantic needed on its staff. Much intervened, in the way of New York magazine salaries and Jack Kennedy's demands in Washington. But Charlie cultivated his hopes down the years and his cup ran over when Mannings's addition to the Atlantic was achieved in time for his preparation to carry the continuity of the editorship, after Ted Weeks.

Charlie must have bought his house in Cambridge about the time I became involved with the Nieman Fellowships. Saturdays, in early days, Charlie would drop in at the office in old Holyoke House. After a deprecating reference to the inadequacy of my surroundings, he would brief me on the condition of journalism—sad enough—and what should be done about it. Then he would indicate the people I ought to inveigle into a session with the Nieman Fellows. He would spot a special flavor in a cartoonist. He would know if a distinguished British journalist was around. British journalists were among his favorite people, and the appreciation was mutual. The editor of Punch was an admired friend and Charlie saw to it when occasion offered that the Nieman Fellows had a chance at him. His antennae were so sensitized that he could detect humor even in a British magazine.

Our Saturday session woud move on to lunch at what he then considered the only fit place for lunch in Harvard Square, a small Chinese restaurant over the Western Union, where you could get chop suey for 35 cents and for another 20 cents a glass of rice wine that was just right for conversation.

I wasn't sure that Charlie didn't choose this spot for its approximate privacy. For he chose Saturdays to indulge his sartorial enthusiasms, which his sense of the fitness of

(Continued on page 26)

The Reardon Report

By J. Edward Murray

Mr. Murray, managing editor of The Arizona Republic and the chairman of the Freedom of Information and Press-Bar Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, made these remarks before the American Bar Association in Honolulu.

The Reardon report contains a 700-word set of instructions to police and sheriffs telling them what news they can and cannot release concerning crime and accused criminals.

I hope to convince you that this Reardon blueprint strikes at the heart of free press by making the policeman, instead of the crime reporter and his editor, the judge of what the people should know about crime.

This would be a revolutionary reversal in our free press tradition. The classic function of the press is to find out everything it can about government, about law enforcement.

That's what the free flow of news means, what the reporter can find out, not what the public servant wants to give him on a platter.

The Reardon Committee would deliberately disrupt that free flow by giving the policeman a set of rules and putting him in charge.

That's our main objection to the Reardon proposals.

The Reardon report would do other things which are highly questionable. It would put prior restraint on opposing counsel as sources of crime news. It would virtually insure the closing of all preliminary hearings. And it would carry a threat of increased use of the contempt power.

To editors, these too are objectional sanctions. But they are also controversial matters about which judges and lawyers presumably know more than editors do.

Concerning the police and police news, however, editors and reporters claim equal knowledge with judges and lawyers.

I ask you to consider whether the distinguished members of the Reardon Committee may not have looked at this problem too much from the perspective of the legal profession at the expense of other sectors of the society.

Also please consider, if you will, that they may have looked at it almost exclusively from the perspective of the criminal lawyer, that highly specialized practitioner of the adversary system who comprises less than 2 percent of the nation's 300,000 lawyers.

I ask you to consider whether the Reardon Committee, in pursuit of its highly commendable goal of making it easier to get impartial jurors, may not be doing something it doesn't want to do at all.

It is my sincerest conviction as an editor that if you allow the Reardon Committee to put the management of police news in the hands of the police themselves, you will seriously damage our democratic processes, including law enforcement and the administration of justice.

To begin, you will poison the stream of crime and police news by deliberately managing that news at its source.

We won't even let the President manage the news of his own political image without a hue and cry of press criticism.

How can we think of giving the right to manage crime news to every town constable and marshal?

Because of the very nature of police work, the policeman tends to want to operate in secrecy. The Reardon Com-

mittee would bless that tendency. It would give policemen, who are neither lawyers nor editors, an abbreviated set of rules of evidence and put them in charge of what the American people can know about crime and about police performance.

Now, managed news can be many things. Its main objective is to make the manager look good.

But only unmanaged news is really news. Anything else has an identifiable, self-serving odor which the ultimate consumer eventually recognizes and rejects.

I dwell on this point because I fear that the legal scholars on the Reardon Committee simply do not realize that you cannot manage the news a little bit, you cannot suspend the First Amendment temporarily, you can't tell the editor that someone else is going to decide what is news. At least, you cannot do these things without undermining free press.

And if the press is not free, the people will soon know it. Then they won't trust the press to tell them the whole story in times of crisis. A crisis like the presidential assassination. Or Watts. Or Newark. Or Detroit.

Crime news and public order are closely intertwined. And the credibility of a truly free press must be carefully protected.

Turning to another point, if you accept the Reardon recommendations, you will upset the present system of checks and balances.

As the system now works, the policeman checks the criminal, opposing counsel check each other, the judge controls the trial, and the press checks the whole process and reports to the public. Fully informed, the public can control policemen, opposing counsel, judges and the press.

The Reardon restrictions literally bomb this equation.

The police would be watching the police reporters, instead of vice versa.

Counsel on both sides would be muzzled. The adversary system, which is already overburdened with technicalities, would be even further divorced from reality. Common sense factors in the equation would be canceled by the detailed controls placed on police and press.

There would be no one left to tell the public the plain truth of what happened when a crime occurs. The facts of who is accused, what kind of person he is, who saw it, what do the police actually know about it, and so forth.

Now, for a moment, let's turn to press scrutiny as it affects fair trial.

We of the media contend that, if you adopt the Reardon sanctions, you will cripple the press as a watchdog of law enforcement, as the traditional enemy of secret arrest and the traditional friend of fair trial.

Let me cite you that now famous quotation from Mr. Justice Tom Clark's decision in the Sheppard case:

> "A responsible press has always been regarded as the handmaiden of efficient judicial administration, especially in the criminal field. Its function in this regard is documented by an impressive record of service over several centuries. The press does not simply publish information about trials but guards against miscarriage of justice by subjecting the police, prosecutors and juducial processes to extensive public scrutiny and criticism."

The press, however, cannot serve as a watchdog over the criminal process if it can't find out what is happening. And it will be able to find out little that is either useful or critical if the police are managing the police news, if opposing counsel are tightly restricted as news sources, and if preliminary hearings are closed.

The greatest damage would be done at the crucial begining stage of the criminal process when the police and the prosecutor are functioning as both judge and jury, deciding whether cases shall be pressed or not, whether charges shall be reduced or not.

Here is where the press has often aided justice, sometimes through independent investigation paralleling that of the police, sometimes by discovering that the wrong defendant is in custody, or that a defendant is being mistreated, sometimes by finding political chicanery in the prosecutor's office, sometimes by turning up overlooked witnesses.

One reason the press has been able to do these things is that it has had the cooperation of policemen and lawyers.

The Reardon restrictions would kill that cooperation.

Another reason the press has contributed to open justice is that it has been able to print unrestrictedly the full story of crime and those accused. As a result, the general public has often been encouraged to come forth with new facts of crucial importance.

The Reardon Committee would stop all that too. It would blueprint crime news in advance, leaving the public in the dark as to how much is really known about a case.

And then, at the next stage, with the preliminary hearing held in secret, the way is opened to false rumor, speculation and gossip. These, certainly, can only be detrimental to fair trial.

Therefore, although the Reardon report itself generously acknowledges the value of close press scrutiny of the criminal process, I must repeat that the press feels that it would be handcuffed by the Reardon restrictions.

To be more specific, these restrictions would suppress information which the public needs and has a right to in certain criminal cases.

Crime news, like most other news in these times of revolutionary change, is mercurial. Almost no crime of interest to the public is exactly like any other crime.

And yet the Reardon report constitutes an informational

straitjacket for all crimes, stipulating a list of unconditional negatives:

—Nothing on the prior criminal record or the character or the reputation of the accused.
—Nothing on the contents of confessions or the results of tests.
—Nothing on the identity, testimony or credibility of prospective witnesses.
—Nothing on the merits of the case and especially nothing regarding guilt or innocence.

No self-respecting editor will ever accept that list of prohibitions without numerous qualifications and exceptions.

Take the Detroit riots as an example.

Picture, if you will, the busy Detroit police chief, or one of his subordinates, Reardon restrictions in hand, telling the reporters and broadcasters what to say about the character and reputation and past history and prior criminal records of the suspects arrested for sniping and arson and looting.

Does that make any sense?

How can the bar ask the press to ignore all prior criminal records at a time when recidivism is probably the main factor in the rising crime rate, when something over half of all offenses are committed by repeaters?

Concerning confessions, the press has moved far toward the bar's point of view. Nevertheless, there are times when the general public has a right to be informed of legitimate confessions.

Suppose one of the 5,000 persons arrested in Detroit, after having been warned of all of his rights, had duly confessed that he was part of a carefully planned, nationwide conspiracy to start Negro insurrections wherever possible.

Should this nation have waited, should the other 14 states which had rioting that week, have waited for many months until that man came to trial before being told that he had confessed?

Should the chief of police decide whether that confession should be made public?

To me, those questions answer themselves.

Suppose that Lee Harvey Oswald had confessed. Or that Jack Ruby had confessed conspiracy. Such confessions could not have been withheld.

Sometimes the identity, testimony, and credibility of witnesses is the essence of crime news. This was the case when millions saw Ruby shoot Oswald on TV, and for legal purists to say Ruby could not have had a fair trial because everyone knew he did it, is to do violence to common sense.

Occasionally, guilt or innocence is inescapable and so must be reported. In the Phoenix suburb of Mesa last November, Robert Benjamin Smith, 18, was apprehended in a beauty parlor with the bodies of four women and a baby girl. He told the police: "I shot some people. The gun is over there. I wanted to get known, to get myself a name."

We reported what he said. The Reardon restrictions would have suppressed it.

Justice Reardon has often made the point that all of this information is only embargoed, and will eventually become available at the time of the trial.

The press has many answers. Timeliness is one of the main factors in news, and you can't interest the public in stale information after the fact. Less than 10 percent of felony cases ever come to trial, so the full story is lost forever on the other 90 percent. And, press scrutiny stands little chance of correcting mistakes after the criminal process has completely run its course.

The point here, and the main freight of my remarks, is that you cannot reassign to someone else the editor's function of deciding what is news.

If you do, the result is disastrous for free press.

This has been dramatically demonstrated during the past year. Across the nation there have been scores of instances of suppression of legitimate news by policemen and by judges who have over-reacted to or misinterpreted the Sheppard decision or tried to anticipate the formalizing of the Reardon restrictions.

Thus encouraged, defense counsel have been quick to contribute to the confusion by crying "prejudicial publicity" whenever they had little else to go on.

So, even with the Reardon restrictions still in the tentative stage, these policemen and these judges and these defense attorneys have acted as if the rules of our free and open society had already changed, or were about to change, as if free press were finally to be cut down, at least in this one area.

Press freedom is precious. And, except in time of war or great national emergency it is an indivisible, all-or-nothing freedom. The first hint of censorship poisons it. And, as the dictatorships illustrate, censorship itself is a contagious thing. A little breeds a lot.

Therefore, I ask you to believe that American Bar Association approval of the Reardon restrictions would increase a hundred-fold these sorry examples of news suppression and these equally sorry examples of defense counsel claiming "prejudicial publicity" just because they have nothing else to claim.

I also ask you to believe that the adoption of the Reardon restrictions will certainly interfere with, and possibly destroy, what a large segment of the press believes to be the real solution to the Press-Bar controversy.

This is the cooperative approach which begins with a dialogue between Press and Bar and ends in either a state-

ment of principles or a set of voluntary guidelines designed to preserve both Free Press and Fair Trial.

Of the 21 states which have initiated such dialogue, nine now have successful working agreements, eight others are ironing out specific details, and four are in the beginning stages of their discussions.

Additionally, individual newspapers have adopted voluntary guidelines to minimize potential prejudice, as have the Columbia Broadcasting System and the Radio-Television News Directors Association.

The Reardon proposals have already slowed progress toward cooperative agreements, and, if adopted, would certainly increase hard-line opposition to a common sense solution.

If the editor decides what is news, he can and will cooperate whenever possible. If someone else tries to decide what is news, the editor fights back because free press is threatened.

Let me close by urging the formula for a cooperative solution which has achieved a loose consensus from the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

We want full disclosure of all details at the pre-arrest and arrest stages. We offer maximum cooperation at the pre-trial and trial stages.

From the bar, we make four requests:

1. Neither sanctions against, nor interference with, the police at the pre-arrest and arrest stages.
2. No closing of public records, neither police blotters nor police records of criminals nor any court records.
3. No increase in the use of the contempt power against the police or the press.
4. A sensible and decent respect for the general public's right to be represented at all times in open court by a responsible press which is not unnecessarily restricted from doing its reporting job.

In return, when a case is actually coming up for trial, usually months after the arrest and formal charge, we want our member newspapers to give full cooperation to the bar by withholding from publication possibly prejudicial material so that the selection of impartial jurors will be easier.

Bernard Kilgore

(Continued from page 2)

need sound engineering, and the underpinning of his dream was as eager a quest for technological advances as for journalistic excellence.

Most of all, to achieve such a thing required patience, often courage and always the power to inspire others. For of course the building of the new enterprise required the skills and talents of many men. It was not a one man's labor, only a one man's vision.

Of those personal qualities of Barney Kilgore the outline of the story tells very little. In this century there have been other men, too, who made great impress upon the journalism of the times. Some of them were very dramatic personalities, easy to write about, and they became as well-known as their handiwork. Not so with Barney Kilgore.

He was, strangely enough for so dynamic a leader, the gentlest of men. There are those who have worked with him a lifetime, and who bear witness to his stubbornness with an idea, who have never seen him lose his temper or make those flamboyant gestures that make for legends. By the nature of his work—from reporter to prominent publisher— he walked with the peers of his time, and he was known and respected by all. Yet he always walked with them shyly, just as he was shy with those who worked with him.

Somehow among those gifts given him was the boon of self-containment, if not always self-content. There was a demon in him about what he wanted to create; his pride in his newspaper was as great as that of a composer for his symphony, and so was his jealousy for it. Yet he had not the slightest need for self-aggrandizement or personal publicity to nourish an uncertain ego.

Thus his work is more famous than himself. If you ask what he did, you need only look at this newspaper you are reading simultaneously with more than a million others in cities and villages all across the land and at the other publications of the Dow Jones family on which he put his mark. If you ask what manner of man he was, his friends can only tell you he had a touch of genius and was to the full measure a gentleman.

Such men are rare.

* * *

I'm Not a Candidate

By Art Buchwald

It's probably too early to announce it, but I have decided not to run for President of the United States on the Republican ticket. In so doing I join a long list of distinguished men who are also not running for President, including Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Gov. Ronald Reagan, Sen. Charles Percy, former Vice President Richard Nixon and Gen. James Gavin, who have all publicly stated they are not interested in the office. (Romney still hasn't made up his mind.)

Like all these men I am terribly embarrassed by my many well-meaning friends and supporters who have opened up campaign headquarters in cities throughout the country, and I would like to dissassociate myself from their enthusiasm and ardor.

I've done everything possible to persuade them that I wish to remain in my present position where I can do the most good for the people.

But these supporters refuse to take no for an answer, and all I can do is keep denying I am a candidate for the Presidency right up until the Republican convention where I would probably not even accept a draft.

It's true that I've been leading President Johnson in the Iowa polls, but everybody is leading President Johnson in Iowa, so I must in all modesty say that although I'm pleased, I'm not surprised.

There are those who say that I have accepted speaking engagements in all parts of the country as a method of lining up delegates. This, of course, is a dastardly accusation. The only reason I have been making these trips is to meet the American people so they can see what sort of man they could have had for President if I were running for the office, which I am, of course not doing.

But at the same time, like all other men who are not running for the Presidency, I am disturbed about the war in Vietnam, rampant crime in the streets, wasteful government spending, the credibility gap, and our hippie youth who have forsaken the true values of the American way of life.

There are great urban problems to be solved, but let's not forget the farmer or the old people on Social Security or our gallant forest fire fighters.

The question that the American people will have to ask in 1968, and I can't answer it because I'm not a candidate, is, are we moving with the times, or are we being pushed aside by events that will eventually smother us and make us a second-rate power, in a world where the only thing the Communists understand is strength.

I have been asked by those who put their country above everything else if I would reconsider my irrevocable decision not to run for the presidential nomination, and I have told them that it would be unfair for me to even consider it when Rocky, Dick, Ronnie, Charles, and Jim have all announced that they were not candidates for the same office.

So if you get invited to a fund raising dinner, or a political rally by the "Citizens for Buchwald" committee, I want you to know I had nothing to do with it, and I repudiate their efforts and would nip the groundswell in the bud if I only knew how.

(Reprinted by permission of Mr. Buchwald.)

Price Waterhouse Foundation To Sponsor Another Nieman Fellow

The Price Waterhouse Foundation has announced that it will sponsor a Nieman Fellowship for a business and financial writer for the academic year 1968-69. Newspapermen seeking this award must file the regular application provided by the Nieman office at 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, and be chosen by the Nieman Selection Committee appointed annually by Harvard University. This year the Nieman Fellow sponsored by Price Waterhouse is Allen T. Demaree of McGraw-Hill Publications (Business Week Magazine).

Book Reviews

By Louis Lyons

By Prescription Only
by Morton Mintz
Beacon Press, Boston. 444 pp. $3.95

This paperback is much more than a reprint of Morton Mintz' 1964 book, "The Therapeutic Nightmare." It brings up to date the performance of the reformed Food and Drug Administration in protecting the public in the use of drugs. His first book was an immenseley useful and very successful exploration of the dangers in the only nominal regulation of the vast and various products of the drug producers. "The Therapeutic Nightmare" was the product of Mintz' own concerned reaction as a reporter, to the scandalously ineffective protection afforded on new unproven drugs. The book was the product of his Nieman year at Harvard. It started out as a magazine article and grew into a book from the dimensions and importance of Mintz' close studies of this obscure and complex area of public regulation.

As a reporter Mintz had shared with the Kefauver committee the frustration of awakening public concern and congressional action to deal with the scandal of sloppy adminstration, inadequate staff and conflict of interest in the Food and Drug Administration. The explosion of the thalidomide tragedies finally forced congressional action. Secretary John Gardner brought in a new epoch in drug regulation with the appointment of Dr. James L. Goddard. Mintz now carries his story three years along to chronicle what has been done, and also to develop further the insistent problem of dealing with the vast commercial power of the drug enterpreneurs and their pressures on congress, their close ties with the medical organizations and their slick advertising appeal for products and prices that need close analysis.

This is as powerful a book as his first and much more complete, in its cataloguing of prescription drugs and the way they are tested, regulated and marketed.

Mintz explores the problem as one who would strengthen the hands of those who carry the huge responsiblity of public protection from the dangers of unproved drugs.

" A related theme", he notes "is the great need for informed reporting and auditing in the lay press. There is a tendency to report the arrivals of drugs, but not their departures, to conjure up a sky which has silver linings but no clouds. The press often fails because of inabilty to recognize that quackery is practiced not only by barkers at carnivals, but also by men with doctoral degrees who are members and officers of prestigious medical-scientific organizations, who are shielded from detection and criticism by such organizations, by public officials and by govermental, corporate and organizational secrecy and public relations. It is, I think, a disturbing and revealing commentary that in the entire Washington press corps, there is but one lay reporter whose assignment has included sustained reporting about the Food and Drug Administration's regulation of prescription drugs and related matters."

This is a good deal more than a book about drugs. It is a most revealing investigation of the problem of regulation for the protection of the public. It is vital journalism.

Henry Cabot Lodge
By William J. Miller
James H. Heieneman, Inc., N. Y. 445 pp. $8.50

When Henry Cabot Lodge failed to follow up the coup of his write-in triumph in the 1964 New Hampshire primary, Bill Miller found himself with no campaign for his intended campaign biography. Bill's enthusiasm for Lodge

had been ripening for a dozen years. He had shared experiences with Lodge as a journalist, in the Second World War, in the Atlantic Institute, and in the 1960 Presidential campaign. As chief editorial writer on the Herald Tribune, Bill had responded to Lodge's dramatic confrontations of the Soviets at the U. N. In 1964, affluently established as vice president of Federated Department Stores, Miller took time out to join a devoted little band who launched the Lodge movement.

As it faded, Bill came to tell me that he was going to do a book on Lodge anyway. It was too good a story to throw away. My response was less than excited, and it remained so when the book came in the mail three years later. But one day I idly picked it up and was caught at once by the vigor and sensitive quality of Bill Miller's writing. This led to realization that he had enlarged the dimensions of his biography to explore the unique role that the Brahmin caste long held in Massachusetts politics, which Lodge by his own vitality and political adaptation revived for a generation. Against his tribal background, Miller shows the emergence of a conventional patrician into an effective modern politician. It is a good story. Miller's reportorial instinct misses none of the color and drama of the political in-fighting it took for Lodge at 34 to down the fading GOP organization, to get the chance to beat Jim Curley for the Senate. Years later Lodge out-maneuvered the conservatives of the party again to steer the nomination of Eisenhower. Miller relishes the resilience and political astuteness of Lodge. After three elections to the Senate, his political career in Massachusetts was blocked by the magic name of Kennedy. But his U. N. performance qualified him for the Presidential ticket of 1960, and even after another Kennedy defeat he became ambassador to Vietnam, which looked to Miller and others in the popularity polls of 1963 as a post to quailfy him for Presidential availability.

Miller feels about the Nixon-Lodge ticket of 1960 as Senator Borah did when in 1924 he was asked if he would go on the ticket with President Coolidge.

"Which end?" Borah asked.

Miller feels Lodge was on the wrong end. But it was not in the cards that the GOP would give its banner to an internationalist of the Eastern Establishment. The crusade that Lodge had ignited with Eisenhower's nomination had died of inanition under Eisenhower.

Lodge's failure to follow up the New Hampshire primary victory is an enigma that Miller does not explain. This may be because of his then confidential relation to Lodge. Or maybe there is nothing to explain. Lodge's choice to stay on in Vietnam may have been simply a sense of duty, as Miller implies. Or it may have been an assessment of the situation. Lodge had scored off Goldwater—off Rockefeller too. But it would have been irrational for an Eisenhower Republican to go on contesting primaries with Rockefeller. If Rockefeller failed and deadlock ensued, Vietnam would have been as strategic a place as any for a possible Dark Horse. Such an explanation would be blasphemy to Miller, and indeed there is no visible support for it.

Another unanswered question is, at what point Lodge moved out of the orbit of his grandfather's isolationism to become an activist with Sen. Vandenberg in bringing their party into realization of a revolving world. Lodge in his youth had stubbornly defended the old senator's course. The old senator, on the untimely death of Lodge's father, had taken charge of the grandson's education and steered him to journalism which he held a better preparation for politics than the law. After a year on the old Transcript, Lodge moved to the larger sphere of the Herald Tribune which brought him international assignments. This, with his later war experience may well have shaped his later position.

I would have been better attuned to the book without the patina of admiration Miller has given it. But a man is entitled to his own hero worship. What might have been a quickie campaign biography developed into a book of substance to add to the lengthening shelf of the works of Nieman Fellows. Bill Miller was a Fellow in 1940-41 from the Cleveland Press.

Be Kind to Our Language

By Harold Martin

Mr. Martin is the President of Union College in Schenectady, New York. He is the former Director of English A at Harvard.

The usual argument against hackneyed expressions is esthetic. Fowler calls them a "stale offense," and so they are, but the fault does not end there. As George Orwell warned, and as contemporary experience with ideologies fully documents, stereotyped language may offend more than the sensibilities.

Orwell cited "to liquidate" as an example of vicious euphemism and hardly had he condemned it for gilding the fact of political murder than it became an almost casual term for getting rid of anyone or anything.

Bad as it was in the beginning, it became worse; what once was deliberate concealment of meaning by appropriation of an innocuous word to noxious purposes became a usage both flippant and almost unconscious—a semantic rake's progress, one might say.

The example is instructive though perhaps a bit historic and misleading. It is true enough that words have been used immemorially to conceal as well as to discover meaning, especially when dirty work is afoot ("pacification" and "defoliation" point to activities considerably more summary than most of us are likely to associate with foliage and peace).

Yet it is equally true that the concealment is short-lived. Before the euphemism has really settled into the language as one of its conveniences, most of its users know well enough what it indicates.

The significant corruption may lie exactly there—not so much in boorish irritation of our taste-buds or sinister hypnosis by Big Brother as in public consent to cliches and jargon and cant. The appetite for pat phrases is particularly keen in our day because the spew of words by print, airwave, and billboard is so continuous and pervasive that novelty alone has savor.

Let someone—he need not be important—come up with a striking phrase on Monday, and by Wednesday it will have become every man's banality: what survived being brainwashed after Korea was speedily debriefed after the first Gemini flight and has been escalated ever since. The infection of such terms rises from the general eagerness to keep up, to be in touch, to sound as well (or as recently) read as the next man.

The contagion apparently results from a kind of compulsive ingenuity in the infected. He converts the passive shut-in of simpler times to the active drive-in—first movies, then restaurants, then (shades of Morgan!) banks.

His life takes a political turn: the placid sit-in turns protean in shapes of lie-in, kneel-in, pray-in, sing-in, and even swim-in. Lookers-on contribute the teach-in and the view-in; and drop-outs, the tune-in, the be-in, and the love-in. A heal-in may, one hopes, give the coup de grace to this particular inanity, but prediction of a die-in may be premature.

Prefixes do almost as well as suffixes and appear to be even more elegant—that is, more popular among those who like their cliches to have etymological flavor. Kerr's multiversity sired a dozen imitators, among them miniversity, a word of questionable parentage on both sides since it obviously had miniskirt as dam. When ministate has already appeared, can miniman be far behind? Among academics, micro- and macro- and metahunt for attachments like tractors rolling into superhighway trailer parks.

The true breed however, the real stultifiers and thought-stoppers (out of show-stopper by clock-stopper?), need neither pre- nor suf-; like fungi they have a mysterious life (half-life?) of their own. What frontier and hawk and dove and enclave have not already inundated, sociology has drowned in anomie, alienation, commitment, and dialog. Imposion, impact, and thrust rise as readily to the lips of the political analyst as to those of the physicist. Valences are as common as ambivalences once were. Resonance and rationale have become household words. Those things (actions, music, postures) that once were viable have today turned psychedelic. And whatever remains problematic has at least the good fortune to be blessed with parameters.

There's a Shaker song worth remembering when the analogies get too muddy to bear: " 'Tis the gift to be simple, 'tis the gift to be free, 'Tis the gift to come down where you ought to be . . ."

The Sporting Life

By Frederick C. Klein

Mr. Klein is a staff reporter for The Wall Street Journal. This article appeared in the October 6, 1967, issue.

Charles Parmiter writes about sports for Time magazine. He sometimes asks penetrating questions. Joe Namath is a quarterback for the New York Jets. He apparently doesn't like questions. According to court papers filed by Mr. Parmiter in preparation for a suit, the two men met at 3 a. m. in a bar here recently, and Mr. Namath assaulted Mr. Parmiter. The quarterback is said to have commented, "I don't need any of you $100-a-week creeps to go around writing about me."

The comment upsets Larry Merchant, a sportswriter for the New York Post. "We are not $100-a-week creeps," he says. "We are $200-a-week creeps."

Changes *are* occurring in the sportswriting business. A much larger number of writers are asking more than routine questions. They are not afraid to offend their subjects. They are quicker with the acerbic comment—and they are making more money. (It is understood Mr. Parmiter actually earns about $400 a week and Mr. Merchant says he makes $250 a week.)

Outstanding sportswriters are nothing new, of course. In the past, readers were entertained and enlightened by such figures as Grantland Rice and Stanley Woodward. Such long-time writers as Red Smith, the syndicated columnist, Shirley Povich of the Los Angeles Times continue to delight readers every morning.

The late Mr. Woodward, writing in the old New York Herald Tribune, had a biting sense of humor. After being rehired by the paper in 1959 (he was fired in 1948), he began his first column: "As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted 11 years ago. . . ." On another occasion, after Army's football team had been badly beaten by Michigan, Coach Earl Blaik said a study of the game films indicated that if the Army center had given the ball a quarter turn before snapping it, the outcome would have been different. Mr. Woodward told his readers: "That's like blaming the Johnstown flood on a leaky toilet in Altoona, Pa."

Not every sportswriter today is a Stanley Woodward—or a Larry Merchant—it should be noted. There are still many writers who have a high cliche-per-sentence ratio. They offer little insight or interpretation. They are hero-worshippers. They are often dull. But these writers are being made obsolete by television. Fans now can often see the game better from their living room than the sportswriter can from the pressbox. The fans know that Klutz hit a fast ball into the left-field bleachers; they want to know that his reading of How to Avoid Probate eliminated his estate-planning worries and made him relax at the plate.

The increasing number of sportswriters who supply this information often are known as chipmunks—perhaps because they burrow into athletes' psyches. Quick-witted men themselves, they are prone to write mainly about quick-witted, off-beat athletes—good or bad—who can see the light side of sports.

One chipmunk favorite, for instance, is Jim Bouton, a New York Yankee pitcher. Bouton is liked because he has a sense of humor. Claiming that the Chicago White Sox will put off canceling a rain-delayed game for hours in an effort to sell more hot dogs, he once said, "It takes longer to get a game called in Chicago than to play one." Double-talking Casey Stengel is another favorite, as is middleweight boxer Nino Benvenuti, who trains on spaghetti, does yoga exercises and has written a book that contains words like "masochism."

Chipmunks make a fetish of avoiding the usual locker-room questions —such as "How did it feel when you hit that homer, Klutz?" or "Well, coach, when did you know you had it won?" The classic chipmunk question is credited to Stan Isaacs of Newsday, an afternoon paper on New York's Long Island. Mr. Isaacs was in the Yankee locker room after the Yanks had won a World Series game in 1962. Winning pitcher Ralph Terry was being interviewed by a horde of writers when he was called to the telephone to talk to his wife, who had given birth a few weeks before.

"Who was it?" asked one writer.

"My wife," he answered.

"What was she doing?" asked another.

"Feeding the baby."

"Breast or bottle?" asked Mr. Isaacs.

Mr. Isaacs and his colleagues generally have favorite teams as well as favorite players. The box-office success of the New York Mets has been largely attributed to the fact that New York sportswriters chose to consider the team zany and lovable instead of just plain bad. Mr. Isaacs himself has a favorite college football team: Glassboro (N.J.) State, (whose campus was the site of the Johnson-Kosygin summit). Though it's not considered within Newsday's circulation area, Glassboro State has been covered by Mr. Isaacs. The team has been a loser, with a three-year record of two wins, 22 losses and one tie, and Mr. Isaacs likes losers. "They're more interesting than winners," he says. "They tend to see sports in better perspective."

The chipmunks, most of whom are young writers with big-city dailies, "are dedicated to the proposition that sports is fun and entertainment, not life and death," says Maury Allen, a sportswriter for the New York Post.

Most sportswriters, including some who are considered the best, aren't chipmunks. Those that are aren't universally admired by their colleagues. Lester J. Biederman, long a baseball writer for the Pittsburgh Press, says, "They sit around during the game playing quiz games, then go down to the locker room and ask a lot of personal questions. I've always thought an athlete's personal life is his own business unless it really affects his team's performance."

Red Smith, a syndicated sports columnist who is acknowledged as one of the best writers in the business says, " I admire some of those fellows as good craftsmen, but I've always thought that if you probe psychologically you ought to have some scientific qualifications."

The 780-member Baseball Writers Association of America has banned one writer—presumably a chipmunk—from voting in its annual elections for each major league's most valuable player, rookie of the year and best pitcher. In 1960, the writer, whose identity has never been disclosed, voted for the Pittsburg Pirates' groundskeeper as the most valuable player in the National League. His reasoning: A Pirate ground ball that struck a pebble started the rally that gave the Pirates the victory in the final game of the World Series that year.

Many sportswriters don't have the time (even if they have the ability) to be clever, biting or cute. There are 1,750 daily newspapers in the U.S., and some 75% of them have circulations of 25,000 or less; a typical sports "staff" on these small papers consists of one or two men.

On the Shelbyville, Ind., News, for instance, 30-year-old Jim McKinney puts out the three or four sports pages each day all by himself. He writes a daily column for the 9,500 readers, churns out three or four other full columns of local stories, edits the newswire stories, writes all the headlines and decides where all the stories will be placed.

His beat consists mainly of seven high schools in the area, assorted Little Leagues and teen-age leagues and softball and bowling tournaments. During basketball season—when Indiana nearly goes berserk—he is especially busy. "Sixty-hour weeks aren't uncommon," says Mr. McKinney.

Sportswriters on metropolitan dailies have some complaints, too. "Traveling was fun when teams played mostly in the daytime and went by train," says Dick Young of the New York Daily News. "Now, you play a night game on the coast, whip out a story for deadline and then rush to catch the plane back East. When you get there you fight the traffic to your hotel and try to catch a few hours sleep before a day game. The guy who makes up the baseball schedule is a sadist."

The strain of travel, especially in baseball "has sent a lot of the older writers back to the office," says the Post's Mr. Allen, who is 35. "You don't see so many white-haired guys in the pressbox nowadays."

If the work is such a drag, why do so many men want to be sportswriters? "As a kid, I was a sports nut," says Arthur Daley, who has written a sports column for the New York Times for many years. "And the appeal has never dwindled."

Part of the appeal is the knowledge that you are read religiously by the throngs of sport fans. "Circulation managers say that about 30% of the people who buy their papers do it primarily for the sports news," says Malcolm Mallette, an associate director of the American Press Institute, an organization that holds seminars for newspapermen. Newspaper managements are aware that sports sells papers, so they are paying more and more for good writers. A sportswriter in a big city now earns $11,000 to $18,000 or more a year.

Sportswriters also have fewer small, routine stories to write than do general-assignment reporters. They also have more freedom to inject opinion, and they gain public recognition more quickly than their counterparts on other sections of the paper.

The sportswriter is also influential. Furman Bisher, sports editor of the Atlanta Journal, arranged the initial meeting between Atlanta officials and executives of the Milwaukee Braves; the meeting led to the Braves' move to Atlanta. Braves officials have said the press in Milwaukee was influential, too—but in a different way. One reason given for the team's leaving Milwaukee was an "unfriendly" press.

(Oliver Kuechle, sports editor of the Milwaukee Journal, denies the charge. "We gave the Braves so much space I'd get letters asking if there wasn't any other sports news around," he says. He says he became unfriendly only "when I was satisfied the team was lying" about its intention to stay in Milwaukee.)

Another advantage of being a sportswriter is that sportswriters get a lot of free gifts and food and tickets. The

practice is declining, but it is still widespread. The Chicago White Sox gave stereophonic tape recorders to some writers last Christmas; the Chicago Cubs gave luggage. A few papers still allow professional sports teams to pay for their writers' travel, food and lodging on road trips, a practice that was widespread until about 20 years ago. A free lunch or dinner at the ballpark is still standard. At the Astrodome in Houston, the working press has the free run of a bar and can choose a meal from among four entrees.

The New York Times, which has a 54-man sports staff, says it still will let its staffmen accept free tickets—but nothing else. "We like to pass the tickets around to deskmen who otherwise might not go to many sports events," says Times sports editor Jim Roach. "If a copy desk man gets to the races once in a while, he's less likely to write a stupid headline on a racing story."

Gifts aside, many sportswriters say they have a greater problem than other reporters in maintaining objectivity and independence from sources. They usually travel with the teams they cover and often develop close relationships with players, managers and team executives.

"It's hard for us to be as brusque and forward as, say, a crime reporter who interviews a guy once and then never sees him again," says Mr. Young of the New York Daily News. "We see the people we write about every day, so we have to look at things differently. Every once in a while a story comes up that if I write it as bluntly as I might I'll lose a news source. If I think the story is worth it, I'll write it. If not, I'll tone it down."

Adding to the difficulty is the fact that athletes and coaches are a notoriously sensitive lot who resent being criticized or second-guessed. Also, athletes are usually bigger and tougher than the writers, which can be bad for the writer. The Jets' Joe Namath, for instance, is 6 feet, 2 inches, and weighs 200 pounds; Times's Charles Parmiter is 5-9½ and weighs 160. When Cincinnati Post & Times-Star sportswriter Earl Lawson suggested a couple of seasons ago that Vada Pinson should try to bunt more often, the Reds' outfielder—6 feet and 190 pounds—hauled off and slugged the 5-8, 170-pound reporter.

Despite such occupational hazards, though, most sportswriters love their work. Says Red Smith, who apparently has never been slugged: "Sportswriting is the most pleasant way of making a living that man has yet devised."

Charles Morton

(Continued from page 15)

things kept him from displaying in the office. He wore his favorite clothes on his own time. I remember a yellow and black checkered vest, shirt and tie of hues appropriate to the vest, socks that invited attention to a prized pair of alligator shoes, and a sports jacket of pronounced pattern. And over all, weather permitting, a great green English ulster that reached to his heels and reeked of race track. This was appropriate, for the peak of Charlie's interest in sports was the 500-mile Indianapolis automobile race. He would sometimes wangle an assignment to cover this classic for some obscure trade magazine that he held in special reference for just this purpose.

If one of his favorite people were speaking at a Nieman dinner, Charlie's chuckling, head-weaving, hand-rubbing admiration was satisfying to watch. But if some Fellows were so insensitive as to badger the guest with irrelevant questions, Charles would squirm in visible discomfort and made grimaces at me, all but inviting the moderator to intervene to halt such stupidity. If the guest, not of his choice, failed to attain a sufficient level of interest, Charlie would get up and go by nine o'clock. If my eye followed him to the door, he would give me a flat downward cut of his hand, signifying, "You can have him."

This makes effective criticism.

If one could chart all of Charlie's crotchets and prejudices, his distastes and disdains, it would constitute a fence, a barbed-wire fence, around a high plateau of the quality of living that Charlie guarded with militant tenacity.

This added up to a positive force for standards, for integrity, for competence and horse sense.

It is hard to think of another who so consistently and emphatically maintained, in all his attitudes, so insistent a demand for sanity, sincerity and simple honesty in performance and profession.

Charlie Morton was indeed one of a kind.

Nieman Notes

1939

Edwin A. Lahey, chief correspondent of Knight Newspapers, gave the Lovejoy Lecture at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, on November ninth. Lahey also received an honorary Doctorate of Law.

1941

Boyd Simmons, metropolitan editor of the Detroit News, has been named assistant managing editor.

1943

Thomas Griffith, senior staff editor of all Time, Incorporated, publications since 1964, has been named editor of Life magazine. Time editor in chief, Hedley Donovan, announced that Griffith, who received his Nieman Fellowship when he was on the Seattle Times, will replace Edward K. Thompson on January first. Mr. Thompson is retiring.

1948

George Weller, Mid-East correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, spoke at the Second Homecoming Forum at the Overseas Press Club in New York City. He explained how it was possible to predict the exact date of the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli War six days before it happened last June.

1952

John Harrison has been promoted to full professor of journalism at Pennsylvania State University.

1953

John Strohmeyer, editor of the Bethlehem Globe-Times, was among the press committee members appointed to the newly created Bench-Bar-Press Committee. The committee has been formed to promote better understanding of mutual problems between the bench, bar, and press of Pennsylvania.

1956

Desmond Stone has become chief editorial writer for the Rochester Democrat-Chronicle. He succeeds Clifford Carpenter, who has become a columnist. Stone was a Nieman Fellow from Invercargill, New Zealand.

1959

Norman A. Cherniss, editor of the editorial pages of the Riverside Press and Daily Enterprise (California) has been named associate editor.

1962

John Hughes, a Pulitzer Prize-winning Far East correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, was the guest speaker at the first Homecoming Forum of the Overseas Press Club in New York. He spoke of the long-term stake the United States has in Asia in addition to its commitment to South Vietnam.

Gene Roberts goes to Vietnam as the New York Times Bureau Chief in Vietnam, January first. He has been The Times' southern correspondent based in Atlanta. Before joining The Times in 1965, Mr. Roberts was a Fellow from the Raleigh News and Observer.

1964

David Mazie, South American correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, was jailed for two hours November fifteenth in the Brazilian city of Caxias do Sul after attending a public labor meeting at which government policies were criticized.

1966

Robert Giles, city editor of the Akron Beacon Journal, has been named metropolitan editor.

1967

Louis Louw has been appointed London Editor of Nasionale Koerante's group of newspapers (Die Burger, Die Volksblad, Die Oosterlig, and Die Beeld).

Walter W. Meek, reporter for the Arizona Republic, was charged with contempt of court on October eleventh after refusing to leave a preliminary hearing ordered closed by Justice C. Stanley Kimball. The contempt charge resulted from the newspaper's decision to test the constitutionality of Rule 27 of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, which is often used to exclude press and public from criminal proceedings determining whether a defendant will be brought to trial.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code) Date of filing: October 1, 1967. Nieman Reports is published quarterly from 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Mass., 02138, by the Nieman Alumni Council. Editor: Dwight E. Sargent. Owner: Society of Nieman Fellows. There are no bondholders, mortgages or other security holders.

	Avg. copies each issue preced. 12 mos.	single issue nearest to filing date
A. Total number copies Printed (Net Press Run)	1,800	1,500
B. Paid circulation		
1. Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors and Counter Sales	none	none
2. Mail Subscriptions	1,325	1,175
C. Total Paid Circulation	1,325	1,175
D. Free Distribution (including samples) By Mail, Carrier, or other means	10	195
E. Total Distribution	1,675	1,370
F. Office Use, Left-Over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing	125	130
G. Total	1,800	1,500

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

Nieman Selection Committee 1968-69

Harvard University has appointed its Selection Committee for Nieman Fellowships for 1968-69. They are the following:

Frank Batten, publisher of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot and the Ledger-Dispatch;
William F. McIlwain, Jr., editor of Newsday;
Newbold Noyes, editor of the Washington Star;
Fred L. Glimp, dean of Harvard College;
William M. Pinkerton, news officer of Harvard University;
Dwight E. Sargent, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Applications from newsmen for the Fellowships will be received until April first. The committee will award about twelve Fellowships for the academic year opening in September.

The Nieman Fellowships provide for one year of residence and background study for newsmen on leave from their jobs. Applicants must have at least three years of news experience and be under forty.

This will be the thirty-first annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard. The Fellowships were established in 1938 under a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee Journal.