Nieman Reports

December 1971

1972-73 Nieman Selection Committee Appointed

Nieman Reports

VOL. XXV, No. 4 | Louis M. Lyons, Editor Emeritus | December 1971

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

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

When Music Sings the Praises of Freedom

By Walter Monfried

Mr. Monfried is the Theatre Editor of The Milwaukee Journal.

One of the most familiar anecdotes in music history concerns Beethoven's dedication of his third symphony to Napoleon Bonaparte. Beethoven sincerely believed that the leader of the French nation was a supporter of democratic rule and of human rights. Then, on May 18, 1804, Napoleon declared himself emperor. Beethoven, disillusioned and outraged, ripped the title page from the manuscript which he had just completed.

"Now he will be only another tyrant," Beethoven roared and cursed as only he could do when aroused. When the great composition was published, it was titled: "Heroic Symphony to the Memory of a Great Man." Hence the popular appellation, "Eroica."

Beethoven passionately upheld republican government, freedom from tyranny and the brotherhood of man, which is the theme of his ninth and last symphony, the "Choral." He is a supreme example of the fact that great composers can be staunch patriots and idealists.

His views did not prevail in his own day. His own adopted land of Austria was governed despotically. It was adept in the oppression of minorities and the suppression of a free press.

When Beethoven died, in 1827, a 14-year old boy in a northern Italian town was beginning a career that would make him an immortally great composer and patriot. Giuseppe Verdi was his name. Through his long life of 88 years he constantly strove for Italian freedom and parliamentary rule. In the early decades of his life northern Italy

(Continued on page 18)

Of Time and the Critics

By Herbert Kupferberg

Mr. Kupferberg, associate editor of Parade Magazine, is former Lively Arts Editor of the New York Herald Tribune. His new book, *The Mendelssohns,* will be published by Scribner's in the spring.

For people who read reviews of dance, drama and music in the New York Times, these have become suspenseful days. For to the ancient question of *what* the critics are going to say has been added the comparatively new one of *when* they are going to say it.

Last October 23, for example, the Times set what may be a new record for itself in delayed reviewing. It carried in its editions of that day, a Saturday, a critical appraisal of a dance event, the world premiere of Gerald Arpino's *Kettentanz,* which had occurred at the New York City Center the previous Wednesday. That's a three-day time-lag, which is a bit longer than is customarily the case. Usually, the Times has been running its dance, opera and concert reviews after two-day intervals, and sometimes, as at this year's Metropolitan Opera opening, it even gets them in the next day. Reviews of new plays, on the other hand, almost always appear on the next day, just as in former years.

Lest anyone conclude that the Times' drama critics write faster than its dance or music critics, it should be pointed out that when Clive Barnes, who leads a double life as the Times chief dance and drama critic, writes a play review it invariably appears the next day, whereas when he reviews a new ballet, the dance world must usually bate its breath an additional twenty-four hours before it receives his verdict.

The basic reason why the Times continues to print its drama reviews on the morning after the play's opening is, of course, competitive. The other New York papers also review plays, and their notices always run on the day after the opening. The local television channels actually review them the same night. But in the case of music and dance the opposition is less formidable. The Daily News only reviews these activities irregularly, and the New York Post operates on a much more limited scale than the Times. As for television, it hardly covers music and dance at all. In broad critical coverage of the performing arts field, the Times has had little serious competition since the demise of the New York Herald Tribune, and it is no accident that its policy of delayed reviewing dates from that calamitous event.

Considering the pressures and expense of putting out a massive daily newspaper, it is perhaps understandable that the Times should yield to the temptation of holding up reviews. For one thing, it ends the necessity of dropping reviews into the late city edition and re-running them the next day in the city edition, to the despair of make-up editors and sometimes the confusion of readers who pick up the wrong edition. For another, it breaks up the Monday morning critical glut—that formidable array of reviews of week-end cultural activities which, in New York at least, used to stagger even the most artistically oriented reader at the start of every week. And it must be admitted that the Times' policy of deferred reviews has not yet evoked any overt protest from the music and dance world; in the case of *Kettentanz,* for instance, dance aficionados seem to have

possessed their souls in patience, or at least resignation, for three days while awaiting the verdict of the reviewer, Miss Anna Kisselgoff. As it turned out, she didn't much care for it anyway.

One other fringe benefit of the delayed review ought possibly to be mentioned: the fact that it gives reviewers the opportunity to remain to the end of the performance they are covering. No more is a music critic compelled to sneak up the aisle, coat on his arm, between movements of Beethoven's Fifth, or to write, with a discreet suggestion of regret that deceives no one, a sentence like "Exigencies of time prevented me from hearing Mme. Glottis' final group." And this is as it should be: why should critics, any more than the rest of us, be excused from sitting through Rhadames' last gasp, or Marguerite's final screech?

Nevertheless, even with all these benefactions stemming from the deferred review, there are a number of us who still feel a pang of regret for the days when newspaper criticisms of opera and dance sprang as current and fresh to the eye as the latest basketball score or weather report.

There used to be a school of thought which held that all criticism should be put off for a day or two, possibly even a week, with the idea of giving the critic a longer time to reflect upon and prepare his review, thereupon producing a critique of greater perception and literary grace. In 1967, it may be remembered, the Times engaged a drama critic, Stanley Kauffman, who wrote most of his reviews on the basis of preview performances, thereby gaining additional time, although the other critics continued to attend the official openings and write their reviews the same night. No great superiority seemed to develop in the quality of the Times reviews, and when the Herald Tribune closed the same year, the Times replaced Mr. Kauffman with Walter Kerr, who had always been a same-night man.

Actually, most experienced critics, either through habit or desire, prefer to write their reviews immediately after seeing a show whether or not the notices appear the following day. In New York, theater producers traditionally advance the starting time of shows to 7 p.m. or so to give the critics time enough to write their reviews the same night. In practice, a critic will arrive back at his office at 10 or 10:15 and be expected to have his review completed by 11:30 or so. On the face of it, this may not seem like much time to evaluate a new work—which, after all, may have been years in the making—and write about it informatively and intelligently.

But in practice it seems to work out pretty well. Actually, time is not required to form a judgment so much as to express it intelligibly on paper. Nearly every one knows whether or not he has liked a play or enjoyed a concert immediately upon walking out of the hall; the difficulty is to explain why. Having attended plays both as a reviewer and as a member of the paying audience, I can attest that there is nothing like the knowledge that within an hour one will be called upon to put on paper one's reaction to heighten the perception and sharpen the senses. For a critic as for any other newspaperman, a deadline has a wonderful way of clearing the mind. Almost invariably, what a critic writes the same night is just about what he would have written a week later—which is one reason why a drama critic's Sunday round-up article usually is a rehashing of his daily reviews of the week before.

So deferred reviews don't ease the reviewer's lot and they don't enhance the quality of the finished product. And since they assist neither the writer nor the reader, the question remains whether they do any particular harm. What difference does it make, really, whether Arpino's *Kettentanz* is reviewed on Thursday or on Saturday, or whether Mme. Glottis and her public get the bad news the next day or the day after?

In the great sum of things, perhaps it makes little difference indeed. Yet, if only because we have been so long conditioned to immediacy from our daily papers in all matters, to be deprived of it in criticism seems more than a little disconcerting. A concert at Carnegie may be a small matter compared to a confrontation in Harlem or a conference in Washington, but without due attention to the minutiae—not so say compensations—of life, a newspaper isn't functioning fully. Somehow dance and music reviews, like many choice foods, lose their flavor when put on ice.

Every newspaper keeps on hand a supply of "filler" or "punk"—standby copy, all set neatly in type, which can be dropped in at any time there is a hole to be filled or a page to be closed. Criticism seems to be edging toward this category. It seems especially unfortunate that, at a time when cultural manifestations are proliferating so greatly in this country, some newspapers should be treating them as second-class news, to be covered only when convenient. That ancient gentleman who proclaimed that he didn't care who made a nation's laws as long as he could write its songs may have been absolutely right: the question is, when are they going to be reviewed?

The First Amendment Includes Television

By Reuven Frank

Criticism is what I have come to talk about, criticism of the way the news craft in this country does its work; criticism is what you are meeting to talk about this year. Not challenges of new fields or information opening up, or new ways of doing things, or of new things we ought to be talking about in new ways—but what is happening to us—what is about to happen—if anything.

I am not convinced that the significance of the criticism of the past few years has been equal to its noise. One criticism we often get is for allegedly paying too much attention to vociferous minorities, and providing them with platforms they might not otherwise have. This may be truer than we have admitted with respect to one minority no critic has mentioned . . . himself, the critic of current American journalism, the man in the high place in government, the law or the academy, who sees a social role for us we refuse to fulfill, who wants us to engineer for him the society he would prefer to this one. Public opinion sampling does not seem to support him to the extent this has been measured, the public seems to approve the way we do our work, and at least to my inference, the work we have set ourselves to do.

Nevertheless, that minority might occupy a critical enough position to work changes if it were so minded. And some people in it seem so minded. If the craft of American journalism lets any hint of any such attempt go by unchallenged it will deserve the result. That, if you like, is the suggestion I bring for what ought to be the stance of our public relations, the function we have been worst at. It is a paradox. American journalism, which is so skilled at judging the public relations activities of others, at using out of them only what it needs, has been inept at its own public relations. It hesitates to present its own case; when it does so, it does it unconvincingly.

I don't know why this is. It is astonishing to me that most Americans think as well of us as they do. I don't remember any of us trying skillfully to convince them to. We may be too reluctant to use the channels of communication which are our factory floor to make the case for what we are. Here, parenthetically, I should say I am not bothering to use time to catalogue criticism we all already know about, or the practices and premises of our craft which I merely assume we all agree on. But one of these premises needs statement in this context: of all those Americans interested in the news, and that is all Americans, only those who are professionals in the news craft are interested in the news alone.

Of course news is influential. Only fools pretend otherwise. But professional journalists alone do not seek to influence. Nor do they allow themselves to be edited by considerations of the influence they might have. I have said this too simply. I have left no room for valid and honorable publications of openly declared special interest. But this simpler statement is to me what traditional American journalism now represents, and is the too rarely spoken premise of American journalism at its best.

When I say we need to "tell our story" better, or even that we must tell it ourselves and consciously, am I violating this principle? Not necessarily. I think what needs doing can be done well within our rules, as indeed it must be. I suggest also that the public is more interested than we may think. Myself, I find news about news very dull, as a

shoemaker would be bored by hearing how shoes are made. I don't know that the public thinks the same.

But much more than simple exposition, I mean by better public relations the willingness to charge into the lists at every challenge, to pick spokesmen and lawyers, to answer, and to defend, and to lobby, and to appeal. To be that common scold. I am beginning to wander into a field where I have no demonstrated aptitude, no developed skill, and where I pretend to no competence, so I had best get out of it while I can. But I feel a lack and I hope some of you do, too. Let me, before I leave the subject, bring forward one consideration more specific than most which have gone before. We have from time to time been faced with proposals that American journalism be reviewed by some outside body, either generally or when there are specific complaints; or that American newsmen be licensed, "like doctors and lawyers," we are told. We are people of words. We know how to use them. We know better than most when words make no sense. How often and how loud have we said publicly that these propositions make no sense?

Licensed by whom and to do what? Is there to be a Stamp Act on publications or is anyone to obtain a license before writing or speaking? Newsmen do not set up to practice news. The parallel with medicine or the law does not exist. Who of us has said so—loud? The First Amendment does not preclude shouting "Nonsense!" in a crowded legislature. The proposals for boards of review are merely less obviously nonsensical. That may be why they are much more frequently—perhaps more seriously—made than proposals to license. Here there is some experience. Only police states now license journalists, but there are free countries where boards review news. I do not know of one which has helped solve any problem anybody thought he could define. But answering these proposals is not the best way to challenge them. Their proponents must be made to state them specifically, Who? What? Why? How would it help? Give me an example. These are not confrontations we need run from. We know they make no sense, but it is not up to us to prove that. It is up to those who propose to prove they do make sense and I tell you that as they try it will become apparent to all that the words are wind and the ideas are not ideas at all. Forcing the discussion will expose the error, and that, if you will, should be a part of our public relations.

We need better public relations as a shield as we continue to do what we do the way we do it, to reinforce in the American public what is apparently its instinctive regard for us, because we must not and may not claim immunity from criticism. And we ourselves must continue to report that criticism, if it is judged by us to be news. Even the silliest proposal to work change on us must be evaluated with the other news of the day. Cowering defensively behind the First Amendment may not be enough.

We stand here today at the threshold of another American quadrennial election, to the despair of our foreign friends, to the joy of our millions momentarily relieved of a sense of passivity in the face of great events, to the patronizing scorn of the scholarly, and to the raucous contempt of the disaffected. Americans who elect to take part will choose their governors by methods which will again seem to the supercilious to be irrelevant, outmoded and frivolous, insulting the sensibilities of every bluenose and pecksniff on the face of the globe, including some candidates.

It will once more be a year in which candidates by the hundreds will demand more attention for what interests them and less for what interests the voters about them. "Get that hot and uncomfortable spotlight out of my opponent's eyes," they will say to us. "You are demeaning the democratic process."

There will be thousands of candidates kneeing and gouging each other for a share of attention—more than a dozen now identifiable for the office of President alone—each claiming unique dedication to continuing unharmed the integrity of our Constitution and the intentions of our Founding Fathers. And afterwards, the losers will say they lost because we cheated them out of the attention they deserved, and the winners will say they won despite our twisted reporting, our inattention to what they really meant.

But you and I will wait in vain for a candidate to speak out for the First Amendment. If it is mentioned at all, it will be in ignorant or intentional disregard of almost two centuries of Constitutional history. Of course the free press, we will be told, but a free press means a responsible press, a constructive press, a patriotic press, an even-handed press, a restrained press—all the noble words used to describe the press in the official utterances and even the constitutions of every dictatorship in the world, of right or left. A free press, they will tell us, is a press which deserves to be free. That is what President Nyerere said when he fired the editor of the Dar es Salaam Standard; that is what Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew said when he shut down the Singapore Herald. But two hundred years ago Americans knew that it was not that the press deserved to be free, but that the people could not be free unless the press were free. There have been few votes in that proposition over the years. There may be none in 1972.

If there is anyone who succumbed to temptation on a slow day and tried to please the folks by taking a shot at the Fifth Amendment, (that's the one which forbids the Government from forcing the defendant to prosecute himself), he might wonder how much he has helped an atmosphere where analogous things are being said these days

about the First. And if there is anyone who still believes that the First Amendment is the cosy private property of the printed word I say to you that if the First Amendment does not apply to broadcasting it no longer exists.

Senator Erwin said it better. Here is what he said:

"While the Founding Fathers did not contemplate the media of radio and television when they wrote the First Amendment, their reasons for protecting the printed press from government control apply equally to the broadcast media. . . . If First Amendment principles are held not to apply to the broadcast media, it may well be that the Constitution's guarantee of a free press is on its death bed. . .

"Whatever the dangers to freedom of expression that result from concentrated ownership of the broadcast media, it is nowhere as dangerous as leaving to a few government officials the power to decide what can be discussed and what cannot: and even when ultimate truth has been discovered and what it is. . .

"With broadcasting, just as with printed press, government power to protect the public from excess and foolishness is governmental power to censor. . ."

I do not know how it happens that so many people miss the simple logic and historical need of including broadcast news, and especially television news, within the meaning of the First Amendment. If the First Amendment does not apply to television news, of what use is it today? It was written not to protect the press but to protect Americans. What does it protect them against if the evils which may not be practiced on written news are allowable if the news is broadcast? I repeat, if television news may be censored without violating the First Amendment, there is no First Amendment. It would be the first Constitutional provision repealed by technological advance, by a machine.

Once more and with feeling: the First Amendment does not protect newspapers against government supervision. It protects the American people from having their news supervised by government. If, in 1972, it does not protect the American people against having their television news supervised by government, why bother?

Perhaps the notion that there is a difference between the protection of news in print and other kinds comes from an unfortunate figure of speech which seemed useful enough at the time, a metaphor which came to be taken literally. It is the one about the air waves belonging to all the people. And, once again, we practitioners and experts in words have not insisted that words be used right.

What is an air wave? Is it a highway built with the taxpayer's money? Is it a right of way procured by eminent domain, a ribbon of steel which enhanced one crossroads and ignored another? An air wave is none of these things. If I gave each of you an air wave you would be no richer than before.

It is true I may not own an air wave. The company I work for may not own an air wave. Private commercial broadcasting may not own the air waves. An air wave is a wiggle. Different air waves are different rates of wiggle. Air waves cannot belong to some of the people or all of the people, any more than sunbeams can.

The metaphor was born when it became obvious that unless the government said who might move messages along each rate of wiggle, a chaos would result at the receiving end. This is the function of traffic police, and no sensible man denies the necessity. Traffic police may say who is to go and who is to stop and who is to turn and when. They may not say what is to be in the back of the truck. They may enforce the speed limit on the man delivering newspapers, but that gives them no voice in what the newspapers may say. The idea of an air wave as something which can be owned by anyone, even by everyone, makes no sense. We should say so. There is nothing in broadcasting technology which separates it from the written word so far as its Constitutional position is concerned. Even the short term limitations on the number of people or groups who may broadcast or telecast at the same time, for people at home to choose among them, is being shattered right now by such developments as the transmission of television messages by wire and by cassette. But criticism of the message itself, unacceptable by law and tradition when directed at the printed word is too often considered supportable if the message moves from here to there by another method.

Behind the slogan that the air waves belong to the people, therefore, critics will insist on television's duty to make life in America better as each critic sees the better life. It is beside the point that no two critics agree on what is to be that better America or even on how television can be made to work such influence.

There are other special rules for broadcasting which should have been challenged earlier. It is time somebody said that the Fairness Doctrine is unfair; not to us, because that doesn't matter, but to the public. Extended to its fullest, the Fairness Doctrine is monumentally boring, this legislated need for the full spectrum if opinions on any one one topic. Boring the public is cruel, and should be made unusual. Fairness, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder.

People in political office seeking re-election consider it unfair when their opponents receive any attention at all, and my experience tells me no criticism we receive next year will exceed this one in volume. True fairness is increasingly being served as public television dons the motley of protest groups. If few or more listen, this is not the fault of broadcasting. It is through all history the usual lot of dissenters. Access, which the Fairness Doctrine was once proclaimed to ensure, is to the home screen, not to any given channel

or program. To create a bludgeon against independent judgment in the name of higher freedom than the First Amendment is not folly but malice, and should be labelled malice.

People seeking attention for even the noblest purposes want a large audience delivered captive to them. They are not sure they can capture their own. Entertainment television can and has. Professing little respect for entertainment television they claim the right to slide in on its audience, all in the name of the "marketplace of ideas." First of all, they forget that little dial. More important they are not entitled to an audience, but only to the opportunity to fight for it, for access to the tube. That they have, and they have more of it every day. If they cannot show they are denied any access, how can they claim the legislated right of intervention in a specific news program if that program falls within the concern of the First Amendment?

As for criticism of what we judge worth reporting, and now I am back to all news without regard to the way it is transmitted, a society which cannot stand its own news is about to have survival problems. If I am over-optimistic about the public view of news as contrasted with vociferous critics, the news of these survival problems will be increasingly resented.

The function of news must in this situation be to inform the society about these problems, not to solve them. The society must solve them, and it can only solve them if informed about them—which it may resent. But I see no upright way of trying to avoid such criticism and attack. On the bright side, if the work we do needs public attention to be justified, apparently we have it. Otherwise we should not be worth attacking.

In another speech this year I closed by quoting what John Adams said 24 years before he became the first Vice President of the United States. Addressing the editors of the Boston Gazette, who had been criticized by British officials and Tories for their reporting of the Boston Massacre, he said:

"Be not intimidated, therefore, by any terrors, from publishing with the utmost freedom, whatever can be warranted by the laws of your country; nor suffer yourselves to be wheedled out of your liberty by any pretences of politeness, delicacy, or decency. These, as they are often used, are but three different names for hypocrisy, chicanery, and cowardice."

That is what John Adams said in 1765.

Mr. Frank is president of NBC News. The above talk was the keynote address at the annual meeting of Sigma Delta Chi, held in Washington.

The White House Press Conference

By Winston H. Taylor

"This hurts—let's do it more often."

That about sums up one of the most prevalent viewpoints apparent today among Washington news correspondents about the White House press conferences.

President Andrew Johnson a century ago probably got as many complaints about the first presidential "press conference" as President Nixon does today. The complaints have continued, but may be getting more attention now than ever before—or is that only because we're here to hear them?

Why the complaints? Reporters give several answers, and there may be more. One big reason cited is the long dry spells between Richard Nixon's conferences. Another is the accusation of "news management" or the dry spells between answers, the lack of real information. Television enters into almost every criticism, but not always for the same reason. And the press is perturbed about some of its own obvious inadequacies.

The proposed solutions are as many and varied as are the complaints.

Most people in Washington, press and government as well as the historians, agree that the President's press conference belongs to the President, that he must make the basic decisions about changes.

But there is considerable, and perhaps growing concern that the press conference no longer serves a major, if not the major, historic function—informing the public about the Administration's policies, intentions and practices.

Then there is a real question whether the issue is one which the Washington correspondents have blown out of proportion, or whether the public really does "give a damn" about the frequency, format and fulminations of the President's appearances via media.

The press is quick to point out Nixon's statement during the 1968 campaign:

"The free flow of information is the function of a free society. Only an informed electorate can make informed decisions. The business of government is the people's business, and the public has a right to know how their business is being conducted."

In spite of some of Nixon's past performances with the press, especially his infamous 1962 encounter after losing the California gubernatorial race, this led the press to hope for improvements in the process—even if it was said in the heat of a campaign.

The hope, of course, was in the belief that the press is the public's main channel of information about the government. Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News, president of the White House Correspondents Association, makes a major issue of Nixon's tendency to "separate the press from the public interest."

Nixon's press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, has stated that the President wants to serve not only his own interest, but also the press' and the public's interests.

Says Lisagor, "We represent the public interest or we have no case. Why else should he deal with the press?" Stressing the principle of accountability, he adds, "We must insist we are qualified to represent the public and to hold officials accountable through questions."

Lisagor admits that "we waste a lot of energy discussing the problem but we do it because of an obligation, if self-imposed, to pursue the function as it has been known. The

public gets what it knows out of the press, so it does give a damn." To emphasize the point, Lisagor reminded that, when the public is surprised with some new scandal or problem, it immediately asks, "Where has the press been?"

Going along with this, but only part way, is J. F. terHorst, Washington bureau chief for the Detroit News. He says "the press is the public's man in town." But he goes on to admit that Michigan readers are more interested in the latest school bond issue than they ever could be in Washington events—so he returns to Michigan every year to get in touch with reality.

In the same vein, Robert Boyd, bureau chief for Knight Newspapers, calls the capital city "not a real world."

Some variation in the public's concern or lack of it is indicated in a survey made of two groups in the Washington area. Though not scientifically selected, they do provide a rough approximation of opposites in residence, class, education and color. One is predominantly inner-city, lower middle class, with high school education or less, and black. The other is predominantly suburban, upper middle class, with college education or more, and white.

Of the inner-city residents, ony 38 out of 183 watch the President's press conferences, compared to 61 of 72 suburbanites. Part of the explanation may come from their response to "Do you view the President's answers as generally valid and true?" The inner-city group responded 41 yes to 83 no, while the suburban group was 43 yes to 4 no. Both had a number of undecideds.

Only 28 of the city group thought the President keeps in close enough touch with the public, and 103 not, compared with 30 yes and 24 no in the suburbs.

Many of the suburban respondents had suggestions as to the President's "best method" of maintaining public contact, such as: "read more and varied newspapers and magazines and have more meetings with congressmen"; use only "pre-submitted questions"; allow time for more questions; "get rid of his advertising-public relations oriented news managers"; "speak to groups . . . representing contrasting viewpoints"; public question-answer meetings; "listen to the people and stay where the action is." Several stressed the need for more television appearances.

Specifically, what are the gripes with the press conference, what are their sources and how do they stand up? There is apparently no dichotomy within the press corps on the concept that the conference needs improvement. Nor is there much agreement on the solutions.

Lack of answers: "Nixon is excellent—he doesn't answer the questions that are put to him." This is the quick response from Laurence T. O'Rourke, bureau chief for the Philadelphia Bulletin, who recalls his question of some months ago: "What kinds of federal leverage would be used for achieving integration in housing, particularly in the suburbs?" The response was: "I am against forced integration." At the next conference O'Rourke got much the same reply, though many persons were still asking just what the President had meant the first time.

O'Rourke adds that the conferences enable the President to convince viewers that he is handling the questions spontaneously, "which of course he isn't." Nixon is so well-briefed, says O'Rourke, that "he listens to questions for certain key words and automatically rattles off an answer whether it actually addresses itself to the particular question."

Frank Cormier, senior White House correspondent for Associated Press, auguments this with, "Spout the key words, and the President's off and running."

Columnist Carl Rowan says the President has given evasive answers and then turned quickly "to the other side of the room as if beseeching some newsman to change the subject."

Similar comments come from Boyd, that Johnson's press conference was "grandstand, with non-answers," while Nixon's is just "non-answers," and from Neil McNeil, director of Medill News Bureau in Washington for Northwestern University, that "I can't think of much real news from one in several years."

However, terHorst avers, "You can get information out of the President at press conferences which can't be obtained from any other source."

The question of the answers' validity also got a couple of sharp retorts from the suburban survey group—"but he does select and gloss over to suit his overriding political purposes" and "most answers are vague and general."

Television's effects: the advent of television coverage, film under Eisenhower and live under Kennedy, led to many complaints, such as interference, showmanship, shortened time.

In the early days, when reporters identified themselves as they asked questions, there was an overwhelming temptation to get one's name and paper out there for all to see. This need for visibility is diminishing, terHorst believes, but he thinks TV has made it impossible to cover up "the press' own stupid questions and the President's own stupid answers."

One reason for the lessening of this temptation, according to Ray E. Hiebert, head of the University of Maryland's journalism department, is that a reporter who needs to be shown at work or who needs identification by raising a question probably is not the kind who would be helped by today's system. He would not be sufficiently well-known to the President to be called on by name, as some are.

Hiebert holds that live TV had made the conference a "staged event." Samuel J. Archibald, Washington consultant for the University of Missouri Freedom of Information Center, says that televising the conference has "made actors out of reporters." Boyd adds the word "showmanship." Even more outspoken is McNeil, who thinks the present conference format just allows "a few loud-mouth reporters to get their pictures on the idiot-box."

To which O'Rourke adds: "They should get those damned TV cameras out of there." With the cameras present, correspondents won't challenge Nixon, there isn't enough time for in-depth and follow-up questioning and so "the TV people hoard the question-asking." He feels the only good thing about TV is that the public gets a chance to see how the President reacts under pressure, even if it is pressure he's well prepared for.

An outsider, Britain's pundit Malcolm Muggeridge, in an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said the television camera had helped to create a "world of fantasy" and has changed the press conference so much by its intrusion that he doubts "any reporter nowadays would think it worthwhile to risk breaking a leg in his eagerness to get to the telephone first with a story that the whole population will be gooping at before the day is over."

Infrequency: "rarity" is the fundamental complaint the corps has about the press conference, according to Boyd.

Lisagor agrees with the plea for "frequency and regularity" on the basis that, though the President is accountable ultimately to the voters, "we're too close to the brink to wait four years" for the answers.

By February, 1971, according to an Associated Press report, Nixon had had 13 general press conferences in two years, for an average of one-half per month. This compares to 2.1 per month for Johnson, 1.9 for Kennedy, 2.0 for Eisenhower and 2.9 for Truman. During his first 20 months, Nixon had the fewest press conferences of any executive since Hoover, who is remembered for his poor press relations.

A member of the chief executive's staff, DeVan Shumway, deputy director for communications, also voiced hope for more press conferences.

Questioning difficulties: the frequent admission that the press is too often inept in its questioning is a counterpart to the first problem, lack of answers. Most of the correspondents mix their words about this with their complaints about some of the obstacles set in their way.

For instance, terHorst says, "Press conferences have gotten so damned big that it's no longer possible to follow through on your own questions without stealing time from your own colleagues." Archibald holds that "under the format he's set up, you can't ask good questions," while Boyd declares, "the questioning is inadequate."

Lisagor says: "There's no coherence. Questions range the gamut from a new river dam to moon flights. The press conference is anarchic, incoherent and disorganized by nature." He recalled that one press corps yarn has it that, even if the President were to announce the world was going to end tomorrow, the next question would be: "Where will you be next week, Mr. President?"

"It's the senior reporters who get his eye," says Calvin Rolark, editor and publisher of the Washington Informer. "He's usually briefed as to the reporters who are probably for his policy, so he can make it look good. If a reporter asks him the wrong question, he may be blackballed and never recognized again."

Jules Witcover of the Los Angeles Times News Service also refers to instances of planted questions, an accusation as damaging to the press as to the President, and to the lack of diligent preparation by the correspondent for their opportunity to ask questions.

Rowan points to an "inexcusably lax" press, "letting the Presidents use them to soft-soap the public."

Basic to the questioning problem is the lack of "follow-up" inquiries, which also gets blamed on both parties. It may be due to the President's desire to avoid added questions on a subject, to the severely limited time span or to the number of correspondents seeking to make inquiries. The follow-up question gets more attention from critics than almost any other—and less agreement as to solution.

The problem is involved with other issues such as in-depth questioning and the lack of thorough exposition of any subject. Time certainly is not the least of the problems, when the half-hour segment has included as many as 28 questions and answers. How can there be any hope of getting substantive and significant information from such a head-long rush of words?

Closely related to all this is the fact that the White House press conference has acquired a "glamor" or prestige image, attracting reporters who would otherwise never darken the door of the Executive Mansion, from papers which rely almost entirely on the wire services for news coverage. In other words, some reporters like to attend whether or not it produces information; once there, too many may try to get in on the questioning and the "show," regardless of whether they have anything to contribute.

As indicated earlier, almost every President has had his troubles with the press, but the types of problems have changed drastically over the nation's 180 years. The press conference, in anything like its present form, is barely a half-century old.

A hurried review of history reveals a few generalities:

—Most Presidents have been insensitive to the needs of the press of their day and unaware of how to use the press, for either their own or the public's benefit.

—A little bit of newspapering has been in the background of most Presidents, but not enough to be helpful. Even editors-become-Presidents seem to forget their journalistic principles and practices, something of which Warren Harding was a prime example.

—In general, Democrats seem to have been able to make better use of the media than have Republicans.

Despite the Founding Fathers' concern for press freedom, the early Presidents were more concerned with keeping out of print than with being publicized. That is, unless it could be just as they wished, which many managed by helping to establish friendly publications in the capital city.

James E. Pollard in *The Presidents and the Press* credits Andrew Jackson with "the most effective employment of the press for partisan purposes in the long history of the Presidency." Other milestones in President-press relationships include Van Buren's granting the "first independent interview" to a journalist, James Gordon Bennett, in 1839; the first Washington bureau for an out-of-town newspaper during Tyler's days; the end of the "official organ" under Buchanan; Lincoln's ability to deal with the press, his understanding of its needs and the importance of the press as a link to the public.

The earlier-mentioned Andrew Johnson press conference was probably one of the dozen interviews he gave during a stormy six months of 1868. Grant had little direct contact with the press, and they in turn harassed him. Cleveland saw individuals or groups of reporters at times but had an "intense dislike of papers."

There is argument as to whether Theodore Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson called the first White House press conference, but it is certain that TR established the first press quarters inside the executive mansion and that he was "conspicuous for the trust he placed in correspondents." His successor, Taft, had talked with reporters almost daily when he was Secretary of War, but as President became largely mute.

Wilson, who expressed firm belief in "pitiless publicity" for public business, inaugurated the first formal and regular White House press conference, twice weekly. He reportedly started the practice voluntarily because he felt a responsibility to keep the public informed and thought he could do this best through the press. Wilson is remembered also for having the first secretary "who really had a flair for public relations," James Tumulty.

Harding made the conference a permanent event, but his often inept candor led him to revert to the requirement of written questions. Coolidge was called inaccessible and "flat and meatless" by the press.

After several incidents in which he had exhibited a warm relationship with the press, Hoover as President became aloof, and sensitive to criticism. Although he asked for suggestions to improve his press affairs, he apparently ignored them. In late 1931, correspondents drew up a list of requests which are reminiscent of today's controversy.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal meant that for the press also, as his conferences totaled 337 in his first term, 374 the second, 299 the third and 8 in the truncated fourth. He ended the requirement for written questions, used visuals to illustrate points and was candid. His conferences had a reputation for producing news. Roosevelt is remembered also as the first President to make extensive use of radio, because he knew it would reach the people.

Harry Truman continued Roosevelt's openness, although without the same aptitude. His outspokenness made it necessary to retain the general ban on direct quotation of the President.

Television came into its own with the Eisenhower years, but with the provision that the conferences be filmed, rather than live, so they could be edited before broadcast.

The latest major change in the conference was in 1961, when President Kennedy put his on live television. This had several results, which are factors in much of today's debate—the intrusion of cameras, lights, crews, cables, the immediate availability of answers, and even embarrassing or dangerous bloopers.

When this occurred, Lawrence Laurent, Washington broadcast critic, reported some of its advantages and hazards. He pointed out that live TV coverage "practically assures extensive coverage in the daily press" and that Pierre Salinger had reported growing public interest in government problems as indicated by incoming mail. At the same time, he remarked that "the President is always in control" and the reporter "is not assured of a responsive reply and there is no opportunity for a follow-up question."

Lyndon Johnson, who soon found he was not at his most effective on television, added another problem to the press' responsibility of accurate reporting by his folksy, often-interrupted walks around the White House grounds while talking with several reporters. One said he could go on and off the record "like a yo-yo."

Although Johnson did have full-blown conferences on occasion, he sought to avoid the open kind and much preferred the highly informal type, out on the grounds, on his Texas ranch or even in his office. There the regular corps of correspondents asked "occasional questions to further the rambling flow of Johnson's conversation."

Cormier says the press corps "misses the intimate contact"

that members had with Johnson, but he notes that there's not much difference in the amount of information available.

Archibald cites the importance of the historical evolution of U.S. government information functions. The press conference created by Nixon and his communications director, Herbert Klein, is the same system that Kennedy tried to evolve, says Archibald. Part of the system is the realization that "constant feeding of the White House press corps was not as important as making sure that executive agencies kept grinding out as much information as possible."

This agency information, and Klein's program of providing information to editors across the country is seen by Archibald as important because the White House press corps "is by and large unable to digest and correctly interpret the kinds of information that is given to them by the President."

Some of the criticisms of early press conferences sound like today's. In Coolidge's day, a Scripps-Howard correspondent wrote that the meetings "are a vicious institution in American life and should be abolished. . . . Correspondents have to submit in order to protect themselves."

At a gathering about 1930, Henry Suydam of the Brooklyn Eagle called the press conference "an arrangement which is more to the advantage of the President than of the press." He added that the Administration's criticism of dispatches in the press that had been inspired by high officials had broken down readers' confidence in the papers.

What are today's solutions, and whose is the responsibility?

Most press representatives admit their trade must share the blame for ignoring or glossing over important topics in order to make little speeches or to be obsequious or toss "softies."

It seems inevitable, however, that there always will be a certain amount of tension between press and President, because, as indicated by history, the press conference is grounded primarily in the President's desire—and need—for a way to reach the public, both informatively and persuasively. Laurence Stern of the Washington Post says it was "conceived and is dedicated to one purpose, the reinforcement of presidential power."

A former adviser to three presidents from two parties, Daniel P. Moynihan, draws from that experience the view that "in most essential encounters between the President and the press, the advantage is with the former. The President has a near limitless capacity to 'make' news which must be reported, if only by reason of competition."

Muriel Dobbin of the Baltimore Sun says the press corps is part of the presidency's "awesome responsibility," but she goes on to say that "the President is hardly at the mercy of the press," because most chief executives try to use the media to reflect a "favorable public image."

Of course, Presidents have another control too, whether to have press conferences.

The former New York Times bureau chief, Arthur Krock, once observed that the only law requiring them is the "political law of self-preservation." Two more executive controls were pointed out by Salinger, that the President also decides when and where to hold press conferences.

President Nixon apparently doesn't go all the way with those ideas, for in December, 1970, he took note of the press corps' expressed desire for more news conferences by saying he was open to suggestions for changes, but "you make the vote; I won't select it."

That particular session, almost six months from his last previous news meeting, was notable for Nixon's views as to the purpose of the press conference.

He mentioned his belief that he has "a responsibility to members of the press . . . to help you do your job." But he stressed that his primary responsibility, "to do my job," includes "informing the American people" and one of the ways to do that is through the press conference. He added as "useful" possibilities his reports to the nation, interviews and other types of meetings with reporters.

Although "I think the American people are entitled to see the President and to hear his views directly and not to see him only through the press," Mr. Nixon then indicated his willingness to limit the televised press conferences.

Much could be made of the fact that the President speaks not only in that capacity but also as head of his party. To counteract that factor, Rolark urges that the party out of office be given equal time to present its views. Although Nixon has made several admittedly political statements in press conferences, in one of his latest he surprised many observers by asserting he would not use the occasion for political purposes.

What, then, are the possibilities for changes?

Frequency: one thing most correspondents seem agreed on is that more frequent and regular conferences would help both press and President. Lisagor feels that the problems of credibility and lack of information would not be so severe with greater frequency. McNeil also thinks there would be "less problem of credibility if the conferences were more frequent." O'Rourke urges sessions on a once-a-week basis, on-the-record, with or without television.

Rolark agrees, in a way, that "if the public knew there would be regular, monthly press conferences, it would help tremendously in the communications gap." Currently, most of the sessions are "crisis-oriented, to put out a fire," he asserted, but if information were given out regularly, "people would be aware" and not shocked by revelations.

Type: on behalf of the White House Correspondents

Association, Lisagor recently wrote President Nixon to propose some possible variations, with the suggestions that the President experiment with a variety. Several reporters comment, most favorably, that Nixon seemed to be doing just that in recent weeks.

The types, in addition to the full-scale television conference, might include:

One-on-one, such as the interview with C. L. Sulzberger of The New York Times or with Howard K. Smith of ABC-TV; small group, perhaps with special interests, as with women reporters recently, economic editors, etc.; in-office, such as Johnson favored and Nixon has used; on-the-record backgrounders.

Without urging the small-group approach, Lisagor points out that there are plenty of specialist reporters available and willing for such meetings.

Another variation advanced by Rolark is "taking the White House" and the conference to other regions of the country. This would give a wider segment of the press a chance to ask questions and would give the President "a chance to feel the pulse."

Edmund Lambeth, director of the University of Missouri's Washington Reporting Service, also suggests the idea of trying out specific formats, such as an occasional print-media-only, and specific subjects, like urban affairs. Such a limitation, he holds, would decrease the size of the press contingent and increase the chance of follow-up questions, as well as forcing reporters to prepare better in advance.

McNeil feels that the in-office conferences are more effective, but he does not go along with one often-voiced reason —the opportunity to send in subject specialists. "If a press man is worth his salt, he should be able to ask good questions."

Television's influence: one point that almost everybody makes is that at least some of the press sessions should be without live television. This would help to answer some of the problems, for instance the perils of "live quotation." Some correspondents feel, however, that Nixon likes the television exposure so much that he would not go far down this line.

Questioning difficulties: several correspondents suggest that the problem of the President's coming up against a delicate question, which he can't avoid answering somehow on television, could be solved by on-the-record backgrounders, where he could fend off some inquiries. "There's nothing wrong for a public figure to say he has no comment," according to O'Rourke.

Boyd figures that the difficulty of follow-up questions might be handled by single-subject conferences or by a selected pool of reporters who could "bore in." He believes that "the President should speak for quotation."

Lisagor reacts to the pool proposal by asking who would choose its members. As president of the correspondents, "I would refuse to play the role." He thought little more of a lottery or of the Sigma Delta Chi suggestion that the pool be chosen jointly by the President and the correspondents' group.

Others have proposed that reporters get together and be prepared with a series of questions which would provide the desired follow-up. Lisagor thinks "you couldn't get five reporters here to agree to a set of questions."

One proposal that is sure to bring anguished expressions is that of written questions. That would mean a return to the old-but-not-missed days of Herbert Hoover.

A warning comes from Hiebert that too frequent changes of form may prevent any solidarity among the press. This could make the press conference even more the President's controlled vehicle. And there is now some solidarity—at least there's not a "generation gap" between older and younger correspondents, or between veterans and the new breed, so far as the need for improvement is concerned.

An aura of both resignation and hope appears in Lisagor's comment that "the press conference has worked reasonably well" and it will pass to another President to handle as he sees best. While that correspondent "laments" its decline, he believes the President "has other means at his disposal that he hasn't yet begun to use."

Since in the name of the game "White House" precedes "press," perhaps the reporters should recognize the Chief Executive always will have the upper hand in this confrontation. Within that understanding, and with hope that Presidents also will be open to suggestions, they can still raise their own level of performance enough to bring the press conference back to an experience in communication, not perfect, but at least more significant and informative to the news-seeking public.

Mr. Taylor, director of the Washington office of United Methodist Information, is on sabbatical. As a graduate assistant, he is teaching at the School of Journalism, University of Maryland.

Thomas More Storke 1876-1971

The following remarks were made by Stuart S. Taylor, Editor and Publisher of the Santa Barbara News-Press, at the memorial service of T. M. Storke. The ceremony was held in the Old Mission in Santa Barbara on Saturday, October 16th.

Several years ago at a newspaper meeting, I sat in on a discussion about editors and newspapers, old and new. Two of those present—the late Barney Kilgore, then editor of the Wall Street Journal, and James (Scotty) Reston, prominent columnist and writer for the New York Times, were deploring the lack of journalistic titans on present-day newspapers.

"Where are the thunderers?," Kilgore asked. "I miss them." Reston agreed, and they ticked off the names of several old "thunderers," including the name of T. M. Storke. Yes, T.M. as his staff called him, was a thunderer, in the sense that he was a crusading, hard-hitting editor who welcomed a fight, if he was convinced he was right, and always spoke through his newspaper in a voice that rang out loud and clear.

Thunderers are more apt to grow and flourish in rather small, developing communities, like the Santa Barbara of T.M.'s younger days, than in established urban centers. Such developing communities are more volatile and more changing, their leaders are more free-wheeling and their problems call for charting more new courses. From them came the old thunderers such as T. M. Storke and William Allen White, of Emporia, Kansas, and others. Because of their tremendous impact on their communities, and their states, their influence was way out of proportion to the small size of their towns and newspapers. They were national figures.

T. M. was seldom in doubt about what was good for his community, and when his mind was made up, he put the resources of his newspaper right on the line. He had a wide and intimate acquantainceship with government greats and near-greats on the local, state and national level, and when he decided that Santa Barbara needed something, T.M. knew just whom to ring up, as he was wont to say, to get some action. He was determined, he was persistent, and he was a very difficult man to say "No" to.

T.M. was a well-known and widely-respected newspaper figure on the national scene for many years, and his paper was greatly admired by publishers of far larger newspapers, both for its news coverage and for its trenchant editorials. It was at Associated Press meetings that he first became acquainted with Robert McLean, to whom he sold his paper in 1964. T.M.'s greatest journalistic achievements were probably in helping to make Santa Barbara the unique community it is today, through his own unflagging efforts and those of the News-Press. But his greatest journalistic honor did not come until he was a vigorous 85 years old. This was in 1962 when he won a Pulitzer Prize and other national awards for his famous exposé of the under-cover activities of the John Birch Society and the character-smearing tactics of its founder, Robert Welch. Even this national issue had a local emphasis for T.M., who was alarmed by what was happening in his own community, as well as infuriated by Bircher attacks on his good friend, Earl Warren.

T.M. was not a man of violence, nor an advocate of violence, but he inherited from frontier days a passion for fair dealing and a temper equal to the passion. He had sympathetic feelings for the early vigilante committees that sprang up in California to fight hoodlum gangs hired by corrupt bosses, in a day when law and order were subverted by selfish and greedy interests. A favorite saying of his was "you can't kill a rat with a feather duster." This may sound harsh on modern ears. But to T.M. it meant "you can't compromise with evil," a sentiment that seems in keeping with this occasion.

The old thunderer is gone, but the echo of T.M.'s wise and strong voice remains, to inspire us as we try to cope with the manifold problems that beset Santa Barbara, the state and the nation.

(Editor's Note: the following account of Mr. Storke's death appeared in the Santa Barbara News-Press, October 12, 1971.)

"Mr. Santa Barbara" is dead.

Thomas More Storke, 94, a crusading editor and publisher who lived to achieve the highest honors of the Fourth Estate, including the Pulitzer Prize, died on October 12 at his home in Santa Barbara.

"T.M.," as he was known to close friends and associates, was born Nov. 21, 1876, at 1740 Grand Ave., the only wagon road then existing on the Riviera, to Charles Albert and Martha More Storke.

T. M. Storke was destined to spend his entire life in Santa Barbara.

However, his outlook never was to become parochial or provincial, and he made the vigor of his ideas felt throughout the country during the 63 years he published a daily newspaper here.

Starting in 1901 with the purchase of a moribund sheet, the Independent, Storke built what evolved into the Santa Barbara News-Press and radio station KTMS. He sold them to Robert McLean, publisher of the Philadelphia Bulletin, in 1964.

After that time, as editor and publisher emeritus, Mr. Storke maintained an office in the News-Press tower, keeping regular work hours five days a week and coming in to check his mail Saturday mornings.

Among Mr. Storke's important activities outside the newspaper field were a term as Santa Barbara postmaster, a short term as a U.S. senator from California, a regent of the University of California, a member of the California Crime Commission, and directorships on numerous civic organizations, including museums, historical societies and libraries.

Mr. Storke's maternal great-great-great-great grandfather, Capt. Jose Francisco de Ortega, blazed the trail from San Diego to San Francisco for Gaspar de Portola's Expedition in 1769. Thirteen years later Ortega was a founder and the first commander of the Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara.

Mr. Storke was also related to the Carrillo family, notable in California, Spanish, Mexican, and American history.

His maternal grandmother was Susana Hill, daughter of one of the first Yankee settlers in Santa Barbara, Daniel Hill, and his Spanish-California wife Rafaela Ortega. His maternal grandfather, T. Wallace More, came to California in the Gold Rush days of 1849, became a large landholder in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, and was murdered on the Sespe Ranch while defending his property rights against squatters 28 years later.

Mr. Storke's father joined the Union Army in Madison, Wis., at the age of 16. Taken prisoner in the Battle of the Wilderness, he spent 11 months in Southern prisons including the notorious Andersonville Prison, and was one of 12 survivors of his regiment.

After the Civil War, he enrolled in the then new Cornell University, and worked his way through by parttime labor as printer's devil, printer, and proofreader.

Brought to Santa Barbara in 1872 to teach Latin and mathematics at the shortlived Santa Barbara College, Storke soon gave up teaching to turn first to newspaper work, and later to law and politics. He established the Los Angeles Herald in 1873, but there was a severe depression and his paper lasted less than a year. Back in Santa Barbara, he studied law, which he practiced for 50 years, during which time he served his community as district attorney, mayor and state legislator.

T. M. Storke inherited from his father his love of printer's ink; insight into both the skulduggery and idealism of politics, and a crusader's zeal to oppose destructive forces and to help constructive ones in his town and his country.

In the First World War years and early Twenties, the elder Storke, who signed himself "The Old Man," served as the vigorous, lambasting editorial writer for his son's newspaper, the Daily News, with which the earlier Independent had been combined. He died in 1936.

T. M. Storke received his formal education in local schools and at the young Stanford University from which he was graduated with the class of 1898, where he made friends with an upperclassman, Herbert Hoover.

Returning home, he tried his hand at tutoring, and at sheep ranching on Santa Rosa Island. But he was drawn into the newspaper business, first as a cub reporter on the Daily News, and later as night city editor of the Morning Press.

At 24, young T. M. Storke developed a strong urge to have his own newspaper, and to run it according to his own ideals and service to the people, rather than to the utility, banking and railroad interests that dominated his little town of 6,500—and much of California.

Unsuccessful in an attempt to buy the Morning Press, he borrowed $2,000 from a personal friend, and with another young newspaperman, A. S. Petterson, bought the tottering Independent from the widow of its owner. It had a battered press and plant, an honorable reputation, and a "courtesy" circulation of 200.

A grim struggle for survival followed, and Petterson soon tired of it and left. But Tom Storke could not quit—he had his obligation to his creditor, and to the public which was beginning to pay attention to his crusading.

For 10 years it was touch and go, the young publisher working day and night, doing everything that needed doing, and often hiring a horse and buggy and delivering papers to subscribers after a full day's work.

The Independent became a force to be reckoned with, as Storke fought for lower utility rates, and won the enmity of

powerful monopolies. He helped induce Milo M. Potter to build one of the fabulous millionaire resort hotels of the 1900s, the Potter Hotel, on the beautiful beach front. After a few years, he bought the Daily News, which had dropped to third place in the stiff newspaper competition, and his merged papers soon matched, and passed the Morning Press.

In 1932, he acquired the Morning Press. For several years he maintained the two papers as separate morning and evening publications, one with a Republican and the other a Democratic editorial policy, for he felt strongly that a community needed competing media in order to get both sides of news and viewpoints on public questions.

By 1937, however, business and mechanical requirements dictated a change, and the present evening and Sunday News-Press merger came into being.

Mr. Storke not only built a strong and influential newspaper, but he also was called on to serve in many positions of honor and public trust.

He was appointed postmaster of Santa Barbara by President Woodrow Wilson, serving from May 19, 1914, to April 15, 1922.

He played a part in Democratic national politics, as a moving force in the California delegation to the national convention that nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932.

Republican Governor Merriam appointed Storke to fill the U.S. Senate seat left vacant by William Gibbs McAdoo who resigned in 1938.

He was named to the State Crime Commission by Republican Governor Earl Warren, and to the Board of Regents of the University of California by Republican Governor Goodwin C. Knight.

He used his influence in high political places, especially his intimate friendship with Sen. McAdoo, who resided here, to bring millions of dollars of federal money to Santa Barbara during the WPA days of the depression.

Mr. Storke was instrumental in getting federal funds to create the municipal airport. He was also a major figure in the fight to get a branch of the University of California located here, and in winning federal support for the Cachuma dam project.

His favorite weekend retreat during the last quarter century of his life was his TMS Ranch, "Pasatiempo," located near Lake Cachuma, where he entertained many visiting celebrities over the years. Among his intimate friends were Warren, who became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court; Gov. Knight, Will Rogers, Leo Carillo, Irvin S. Cobb, Amelia Earhart, Capt. Charles A. Lindbergh, Gov. Edmund G. Brown and Adlai Stevenson. He was a charter member of Los Rancheros Visitadores.

He contributed a $250,000 publications building to his alma mater, Stanford University, and a $600,000 publications building, surmounted by the regents' $600,000 Storke Tower and carrillon, at UCSB.

Called by the New York Times "the dean of American publishers," Mr. Storke turned out a highly-successful book of memoirs, "California Editor," in 1958, in collaboration with local writer and historian, Walker A. Tompkins. The work attracted international attention as the combined autobiography of a veteran newspaperman and a personalized record of local and state history, with glimpses into national political affairs, from the 1870s to the 1950s.

Mr. Storke was an early crusader for civil rights, from the first decade of the 20th Century when the Southern Pacific machine ruled the state through two world wars, depressions, and even after he had turned over his newspaper to the command of others.

As a recipient of the four highest honors in the newspaper world, the veteran editor whom Time magazine called "a benevolent lion," came into international prominence, as did his Santa Barbara News-Press.

In early 1961, at 84, he exposed and condemned the undercover tactics of the John Birch Society and the character-assassination activities of its founder, Robert Welch.

This won for him, in November of that year, the Lauterbach Award "for outstanding work in defense of civil liberties," presented by the Nieman Foundation of Harvard University.

On May 7, 1962, Columbia University announced that the Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing had been awarded to Mr. Storke for his editorials condemning the John Birch Society.

On Aug. 20, 1962, Colby College in Waterville, Maine, announced that its 11th annual award of the Elijah Lovejoy Fellowship, "for courageous journalism," would go to Mr. Storke for his editorial stand on the Birch Society.

The University of Missouri Gold Medal Journalism Award was presented to Mr. Storke on May 6, 1966, the year he turned 90, "for distinguished service in journalism."

Mr. Storke traveled to Columbia, Mo., to accept the honor, which also had been awarded to Winston Churchill and addressed a gathering from all over the world.

Mr. Storke described the campaign against the Birch Society in a book, "I Write for Freedom." Adlai Stevenson wrote the foreword.

Priding himself on keeping an ever young outlook and an up-to-the-minute grasp of affairs, Mr. Storke was predicting rocket shots bearing men to the moon 20 years before his seemingly wild ideas came true.

Associates found him able and eager to discuss the student riots at UCSB and Isla Vista, which he deplored; the thoroughbred racing at Santa Anita, which he frequently attended; the latest television offerings, new trends in movies, the war in Vietnam and Cambodia, and the 1972 elections.

When Music Sings the Praises of Freedom

(Continued from page 2)

was under Austrian domination, which Verdi bitterly resented. One of his early operatic successes, "Nabucco," based on an Old Testament theme, has an irresistibly beautiful chorus of Hebrew slaves. It is actually an expression of Italian longing for freedom and has become a beloved national anthem. Verdi regarded George Washington as the greatest man who ever lived because he fought successfully for his country's independence. Verdi's aspirations in southern Europe were to have, in later generations, a counterpart in northern Europe.

Edvard Grieg, Norway's greatest composer, was passionately devoted to his homeland and to truth and justice. In the 1890s France was wracked by the Dreyfus scandal, in which an innocent army officer was condemned by mass bigotry and hysteria. Grieg was so outraged that he refused to conduct in Paris, or to have his music performed in France.

The great Finnish composer, Jean Sibelius, esteemed by all the world, was an ardent patriot and champion of the rights of people. His best known work, the tone poem "Finlandia," is a document that upholds freedom of the press. This is literally true, as the International Press Institute was recently informed at its convention in Helsinki.

"Finlandia" was produced "in direct protest against the censorship of the press and the banning of newspapers." The institute learned this in a monograph, "Sibelius' 'Finlandia'—A Symbol of Press Freedom." The author is a Finnish musicologist and Sibelius authority, Prof. Erik Tawaststjerna.

Sibelius lived from 1865 to 1957—even longer than Verdi—and like Verdi he grew up in a land under foreign domination. Back in the Napoleonic era, in 1809, Russians under Czar Alexander I invaded Finland, wrested it from Swedish control and made it a Grand Duchy of Russia. Through most of the 19th century Finland enjoyed a considerable degree of self-rule, with its own constitution, parliament, laws, army and money.

But as the 20th century approached—when Sibelius was a rising young genius—the Finnish people were developing more and more of a nationalist spirit, like other small ethnic regions of the continent. The Russia of Nicholas II, who ascended the throne in 1894 and was to become the last of the czars (executed with his family in 1918), grew increasingly intolerant. It, too, was caught up in a nationalist fervor, the Pan-Slavic movement.

In February, 1899, the czar issued a famed and forbidding Manifesto, which deprived the Finnish Parliament of its powers in all major affairs. The decree was intended to make Finland a powerless satellite. To enforce this drastic policy the czar's regime sent to Helsinki a new governor general, a harsh army man, Gen. Bobrikov.

The Finns, proud of their powers of self-government, resisted the stiff-necked soldier.

Sibelius became a figure in this resistance movement. Ten years previously, when he was a student at the Helsinki Institute of Music, he had become active in the city's liberal circles of artists, musicians and writers. In the 1890s the Jarnefelt brothers, whose sister he later married, founded a liberal newspaper which is now called Helsingin Sanomat.

In 1891 a Helsinki concert, promoted for charity by the paper's editorial staff, included some of Silbelius' ballet and vocal pieces. He was pleased to be included in the printed "Fellowship" of the newspaper and its supporters.

"The main thing is that the people saw I was with them," the composer later recalled.

The people continued to see that he was increasingly with them. In 1896 he wrote the musical setting for a Finnish poem, "In the Morning Mist," that was unquestionably critical of Russian interference.

Three years later the February Manifesto brought another strong reaction from the composer. He wrote "Song of the Athenians," which glorifies the struggle of the Greeks against the superior forces of Gothic invaders. When the "Song of the Athenians" was sung in public concert, it drew from the Finns the same enthusiastic response that Verdi had drawn from the Italians a half century earlier with his chorus of the Hebrew slaves.

About this time Arvid Jarnefelt, one of the founders of the liberal newspaper, went to Moscow to ask advice from his teacher and master, the great, aging author, Count Tolstoy. Tolstoy said that the Finns' passive resistance and defense of their rights were morally justified for the sake of all mankind. Jarnefelt repeated these words to his brother-in-law, Sibelius.

In the fall of 1899, several months after the February Manifesto was published, he wrote another protest work for male chorus, orchestra and narrator, "Thaw on the Oulu River." It suggested the traits of the later "Finlandia."

By that time, the Russians were censoring and punishing the Finnish press brutally. One newspaper after another was ordered to close shop. In those that survived, blank columns gave vivid evidence of the stories that displeased the overseers. Gen. Bobrikov forced the resignation of Eero Erkko, editor-in-chief of the newpaper, which had reported on Sibelius' "Song of the Athenians," then ordered him deported. The Jarnefelts' newspaper, now Helsingin Sanomat, was "banned in perpetuity" but the ban could not stick.

The Finnish public rose to the support of their journalists. A three day event, called "Press Days," Nov. 3–5, was

arranged, ostensibly to help the journalists' pension fund but actually to demand freedom of the press.

For the Nov. 4 program at the Swedish Theater in Helsinki, Sibelius wrote eight short works to be used with a series of historical scenes. The music for the last tableau was called "Finland Awakes," which was shortly revised and was eventually called "Finlandia."

How it acquired that title is itself an unusual tale.

In 1900, the year following the February Manifesto, the Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra toured Europe and appeared at the World Exposition in Paris. While the tour was being planned, Sibelius received a letter from an admirer he did not know. This correspondent told him:

"Eleven years ago, for a Paris Exhibition, Anton Rubinstein wrote a fantasia on Russian themes which he called 'Rossiya.' You should do something equally impressive and call it 'Finlandia.'"

Instead of writing a work on Finnish folk airs, Sibelius reworked his "Finland Awakes" into "Finlandia." With its roars of defiance, interspersed with tuneful descriptions of Finland's natural beauties, "Finlandia" is often supposed to be based on folk music. But it is not—it is a completely original masterpiece by the man who is the best known Finn to the rest of the world.

In the 30 years after "Finlandia" was created, Sibelius wrote many other fine works—for orchestra, chorus, chamber groups, soloists of violin, piano and voice. But none is so stirring and widely known as the poem extolling freedom of the press.

(Reprinted from The Milwaukee Journal)

The freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments.

George Mason,
Virginia Bill of Rights, art. 1
June 12, 1776

Book Reviews

NEWSPAPER STORY: ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF THE BOSTON GLOBE, by Louis M. Lyons. Harvard University Press, 482 pp., $9.95.

The centennial portrait of The Globe will delight readers with its vivid evocation of the reporting on Boston and the nation from the era of Reconstruction and President Grant to the Vietnam War and President Nixon. It sets forth a pastiche of headlines, quotations, and old front-pages ranging from the Henry Ward Beecher scandal and the trial of Lizzie Borden to a 1970 feature headlined, "Can Nixon halt inflation?" Here, too, are sketches of scores of Globe personalities, a shrewd audit of editorial and business policies, and the history of features from "Confidential Chat" to Szep cartoons.

All this is entertaining reading, but it is more than a Disney-like excursion in nostalgia. It is also the account of the running (and occasionally the misrunning) of a newspaper, covering candidly even subjects as touchy as the relationship between advertisers and news policies. In total it is first-rate history by one of the most distinguished alumni of The Globe staff, Louis Lyons. The Globe commissioned the portrait, warts and all, and the finished picture reflects credit upon both Lyons and the subject.

The evolution of the Globe was rapid. A group of Bostonians of substantial means founded it in 1872 as a sort of genteel counterpart to the Transcript. Since there were scarcely enough Brahmins to support the Transcript, The Globe floundered close to bankruptcy before 27-year-old Charles H. Taylor, founder of the dynasty which still controls The Globe, took over. Taylor by shifting its direction toward the potential readers other papers scarcely recognized—women, young people, and the immigrant third of Boston's populace, for a half-century kept The Globe in the forefront of New England newspapers. There followed a third of a century according to Lyons when The Globe drifted in editorial doldrums only managing to keep afloat against acute competition. Yet it was the era which Lyons calls The Globe's dimmest period, from World War I through World War II, about which he writes from personal memory with the greatest verve and insight. In the most recent 15 years of The Globe century, the management has renewed innovation, emphasized youth, and led civic crusades.

From the beginnings to the present, it is a good story. The rise began when Taylor made The Globe a staunchly Democratic newspaper, the defender of the underdog. Also he hired women writers and introduced household features, and employed more Harvard graduates and printed more "readable Harvard news" than any other paper. Within 20 years The Globe led New England papers in circulation and advertising.

Scoops and sensations were the great circulation builders. One of these, in 1892, involving the Lizzie Borden case, could have brought The Globe ruinous damage suits. The popular rhyme goes:

> "Lizzie Borden took an axe
> And gave her mother forty whacks
> When she saw what she had done
> She gave her father forty-one."

This was not how the jury saw it; their verdict was acquittal.

It is shocking therefore that long before the trial, The Globe erred by printing an account of the murders, complete with affidavits that its reporter had been duped into buying. This sensation in full fictitious detail blamed the murders upon Lizzie. Amazingly The Globe by printing a full apology at once managed to avoid lawsuits. Indeed, the net result of the Borden sensation was profit, since during the trial circulation once more soared.

So, too, circulation soared again and again as The Globe effectively reported trials and disasters, national sensations like the Spanish-American War and the assassination of President McKinley. In that era before radio and television, it scored what was considered an important scoop in reporting the death of the English poet Tennyson.

One of the greatest and most significant of The Globe scoops came just after the election of 1940 when Lyons obtained a long interview with isolationist Ambassador

Joseph P. Kennedy. After its publication there was no question whether or not Kennedy would return to his post in London, he was through as ambassador.

In his Boston hotel room, Kennedy had pungently aired his views to Lyons:

"I'm willing to spend all I've got to keep us out of the war. There's no sense in our getting in. We'd only be holding the bag. . . . The war would drain us. It would turn our government into national socialism. Democracy is finished in England. It may be here, because it comes to a question of feeding people. . . ." And so on, including derogatory remarks about Latin American nations.

Lyons reported Kennedy's emphatic words in a full three columns of the Sunday Globe. The day the interview appeared, Kennedy made no objection to The Globe cabling it to London, but when a furore ensued, Kennedy claimed the entire interview had been off the record and demanded retraction. The Globe refused, standing strongly behind Lyons, who now reports:

"The Globe's refusal to retract anything on the interview cost them many thousands of dollars in advertising for the Scotch whiskies controlled by Kennedy, which was kept out of The Globe for years. It was wholly characteristic of The Globe management under W. O. Taylor that I never heard of this penalty until I came to write The Globe history."

This episode, which has often been told from Ambassador Kennedy's viewpoint, has never before been related from that of Lyons and The Globe. In retrospect Lyons writes:

"I left out what he'd told me to and some other things such as kicking the Latins in the teeth. If I'd had enough more diplomatic caution to leave out a few other things, it would have saved both of us a lot of trouble.

"But the dynamite in it that blew him out of his ambassadorship, if it did, was his not mine."

Joseph Kennedy never forgave or forgot, but the bad feelings did not extend to the next generation. John F. Kennedy, throughout his political career, was friendly to Lyons.

When the Globe began planning its centennial history, Laurence Winship asked Lyons to write his account of the Kennedy interview, and sought suggestions for the history. Lyons key suggestion was that "most institutional histories were a bore and The Globe's hundred years was entitled to something better." Winship agreed, and persuaded Lyons to write that history. The Globe indeed has received something better.

Frank Freidel

Mr. Freidel is professor of American history at Harvard University.

The following is the text of a weekly letter written by Roger Tatarian, Vice President and Editor of United Press International.

One of the joys of flying long distances is that you finally get around to the book that has so long been demanding to be read. If there is an occasional in-flight distraction, it is a pleasant one: Steak or chicken Kiev? White wine or red? More pleasant distractions, certainly, than the insistent ring of the telephone or the imperious, five-bell summons from the teleprinter bespeaking crisis or calamity. All of that is now 39,000 feet below and thousands of miles away.

But it is precisely this isolation that proves frustrating when the book you are reading is Edith Efron's "THE NEWS TWISTERS" (Nash, $7.95). For on almost every page there is an assertion so damning to network news broadcasts that no trained newsman could possibly accept them without an independent check.

So the best you can do while traveling is to promise yourself that nothing will get a higher priority on your return home than a personal examination of the basis on which Miss Efron presents her charges of rampant political, racial and cultural bias in the news programs of the three major networks. Although her target is network news, her book will doubtless give encouragement to those who regard all news media with suspicion and mistrust. It is thus of equal interest to all of us.

Miss Efron has been on the staff of TV Guide for about 10 years. She is not necessarily accountable for the summary of her book that appears on the dust jacket; that overheated prose is presumably the work of her publisher's publicity department. Still, even discounting its tone, it does serve as a fair précis of what is inside. Here are two sample paragraphs:

"THE NEWS TWISTERS, as its distinguished readers say on the back cover of this book, is a 'bomshell' and a 'blockbuster.' Its initials—TNT—are not a coincidence. A powerfully documented exposé of bias in network news, it explodes the myth of network fairness and reduces the networks' claim of political neutrality to rubble. . . .

"TNT slashes through the conventional political line-ups on the network bias issue—uniting all of them in one scholarly yet suspenseful analysis. It confirms Republican charges of a calculated assault on Richard Nixon. It confirms the multiparty 'Silent Majority' charges of left-liberal bias. It confirms black-minority charges of insidious racism. And it confirms New Left charges of distortion and 'censorship.'"

Those are grave charges, and Miss Efron thus makes her work one that simply cannot be overlooked by anyone

interested in responsible journalism. So you begin to look carefully at her evidence.

Her study was based on the prime time broadcasts of ABC, CBS and NBC during seven weeks of the 1968 presidential campaign. These were generally the news programs aired between 7:00 and 7:30 p.m. Miss Efron picked them because "they are known to be the major source of political information for the whole country."

Miss Efron had all of these broadcasts recorded and then analyzed them to determine which positions they took on the candidates and on major issues of the day like the Vietnam war and campus violence.

The early part of the book is devoted to a series of graphs showing the number of words for and against the candidates. On ABC, she found 869 words for Nixon and 7493 against; on CBS, 320 for Nixon and 5300 against; and on NBC, 431 for and 4234 against.

When it came to Hubert Humphrey, Miss Efron's count showed: ABC, 4218 for, 3569 against; CBS, 2388 for, 2083 against; and NBC, 1852 for and 2655 against.

The nagging question that arises very early is precisely how Miss Efron defines a word "for" for "against" a candidate and whether she uses standards that would be generally accepted. Alas, you cannot answer that at 39,000 feet; Miss Efron does not present the actual texts on which she bases her analyses and this, in fact, is the fatal flaw in her case.

This omission strikes you repeatedly as you read Miss Efron's evaluation of various items from the three networks.

For example, on page 281, she writes that on Sept. 25, 1968, a CBS reporter "says Nixon has a rancorous streak; says Nixon is overconfident; suggests he is a liar."

If this is what the CBS reporter said, Miss Efron's charge of bias is proved. But when you get the actual text from CBS, you find that what the reporter said was: "This week's tour, all in friendly territory, is to reassure the faithful, and to boost local GOP candidates. Nixon says he is warning his staff against overconfidence, but he himself hardly looks worried."

Again, on page 312, Miss Efron lists a CBS broadcast of Sept. 25, 1968, in which, in her words, "Reporter attacks white middle class as racist." According to CBS, the precise words which Miss Efron interpreted in this manner were: "From Pennsylvania, Muskie flew to Michigan and there in Taylor, a white, middle class suburb of Detroit, was heckled by supporters of George Wallace. Correspondent Herman reports he handled them with as much aplomb as he handled college hecklers."

On page 285, she portrays an NBC broadcast of Sept. 20, 1968, in these words: "Reporter suppresses intensity of Nixon's triumph in Democratic Philadelphia as reported by two other networks, and devotes whole story to 'proving' that it was not a success at all, that the crowds were not for Nixon."

When you get the full text from NBC, this is what you find:

Chet Huntley is off tonight. I'm David Brinkley, NBC News.

When a candidate campaigns downtown in a big city . . . it is wise to arrive during the lunch hour . . . to catch the maximum number of people on the streets . . . whether they came out to see him or not.

Vice President Humphrey rode through Philadelphia at mid-day two weeks ago . . . and Richard Nixon was there at mid-day today.

The city generally is Democratic . . . but those who saw both candidates there say—for whatever it may prove—that Nixon's crowd was bigger.

In any case . . . Nixon's turnout was large . . . and here's a report from NBC News Correspondent Herbert Kaplow.

Kaplow:

Nixon came here knowing that his opponent didn't get much of a reception here a week or so ago—Nixon was determined to do better, and apparently has—So, this is more fuel for Nixon's fast start.

His campaign is diverse, as we saw during this past week—not only did he move into an urban center such as Philadelphia—there were visits to smaller, and different type communities—Salt Lake City / Fresno, California / Springfield, Missouri / and Peoria, Illinois.

It was the kind of political situation Nixon likes—technically, he was in the enemy camp—but it was a weak enemy—and so he rode through downtown Philadelphia looking more like the hero, than the man who technically should've been the hero, Hubert Humphrey.

Far too often, when Miss Efron's characterization of a broadcast is weighed against the text, it is revealed to reflect only her own very subjective evaluation of a series of words that can and do convey something quite different to others.

The great pity about Miss Efron's book is that it is going to be seized upon and cited by critics of the media in general as proof of everything they have always said about the press. They, like Miss Efron herself, forget that communication is a two-way process, and that it is not always the sender who twists facts; the receiver can do it quite as easily. Miss Efron proves that she herself excels at it.

Returned to Life

By Vermont Royster

The ancient Hebrew lawgivers—wise men, they—decreed that every seventh year the land should lie fallow; that is, be left uncultivated so that it could renew itself.

This caused the Roman historian, Tacitus, to complain later that the Jews devoted every seventh year to idleness. Not being true, that was a canard, but a misplaced one. Instead, the lamentation should have been that this wisdom of agronomy was not incorporated in those commandments handed down on Mount Sinai. After all, what's good for the vineyard ought to be good for the laborer therein.

Sometime in the Middle Ages the Christian fathers tried to correct the imbalance by inventing the sabbatical, at least for those who lived off the tithepayers and spent their time in teaching and meditation. The rationale was that if the good Lord had decreed rest on every seventh day, there was no harm in going Him one better and laying off completely every seventh year.

Different times, different customs. College professors still dream of getting a sabbatical, all charged to either tax funds or endowments, but they are more apt to dream than see one. As for corporate managers, especially newspaper publishers, the thought is heresy, and even George Meany hasn't yet brought it up around the bargaining table. It would probably be illegal anyway, under Phase I, II or III.

All the same, I commend it, even when you pay for it yourself. If it was rewarding for a medieval friar to escape the hurly-burly of the Middle Ages, it is equally so for anyone—especially a journalist—who has to wake up every morning face-to-face with modern civilization. With all our progress, life is no more placid than in the days of the Hebrew prophets.

The chief reward is that for a space you don't have to face the world every day. If you flee to a mountain top, or get aboard a small boat, time itself will have a stop.

On a small boat there is no newspaper delivery, and Congress has yet passed no law abridging your right to turn off the TV or the radio. There will, of course, still be floods, earthquakes, plane hijackings, political oratory, wars, monetary crises and all the rest. But unless that hurricane is in your vicinity it might as well not exist, just as a falling tree makes no noise if you aren't there to hear it.

The balm to the spirit is immense. You can sample it on any vacation, but a week or two is hardly enough to get over the withdrawal pains. When you stretch it to months, as I have done, it is like passing through a decompression chamber. Soon you wake up savoring the morning instead of wondering what disaster—or foolishness—has happened overnight.

It also alters your perspective. You begin to understand why the young, if they lack the spur of necessity, prefer not to face the world, and why the welfare rolls grow daily longer, for the same reason. You even come to appreciate the wonderful, marvelous, absolutely splendiferous income tax; its steeply rising rates provide a cushion for a steeply falling income. It's marvelous how our governors have arranged things to tempt us to work less.

And when you return to life—as, alas, you do—you find life little altered. The things you start thinking over are pretty much the same things you thought about before.

To be sure, you find people talking about the thing called Phase I, as if there were no phases before last August, and worrying about Phase II, as if it is going to be greatly different. At first when you pick up the newspaper you find that you don't understand it, but then you find nobody else does either, so you aren't any worse off for having been away and missed all those daily bulletins.

Anyway, you soon realize that you've been there before. I gather they now call it the Cost of Living Council, whereas

before it was the Office of Price Administration and long before that the Edicts of Diocletian. But it's still price control by whatever name, which brings a sigh. You have a haunting feeling that it is going to work this time just about as well as it did before.

There seems to be also, judging from the papers, some kind of flap about the Supreme Court. Last time I remember Mr. Nixon was being accused of playing a dirty trick on everybody by nominating the likes of Haynsworth and Carswell, and now he is being accused of a dirty trick by not appointing some nonentities who a lot of Senators thought were incompentent, and instead appointing a Mr. Powell and a Mr. Rehnquist, who most of the same Senators say are quite competent. Pretty tricky, indeed.

That, too, has a familiar—and ironic—ring. There was quite a flap when President Roosevelt, for his first Supreme Court nominee, picked a former police court judge from Alabama, and an ex-Ku Klux Klanner, just because being a Senator he would be hard for the Senate to reject. Mr. Roosevelt was also accused of "packing" the Court with a friendly nonentity, but the irony was that this first choice turned out to be Mr. Justice Hugo Black, eulogized on his death as one of the great judges of modern times. Hard to tell sometimes whether it's trick or treat.

So what else is making headline news? Well, there's the China question, the Irish question, inflation, unemployment, Vietnam, pollution, school busing, war clouds over the Suez, and whether any other Democrat can stop Ed Muskie.

But if all these give you the feeling you never left home, it's still true that escaping them for awhile lets you see everything with a different eye and face the world in a different mood. What is exhausting while you are caught up in it is the dailiness of it all; every day's flap comes to seem a terrible crisis the like of which men never knew before and the like of which men may not survive. The mind may know better, the weary spirit despairs.

For the human spirit, as for a cornfield, to lie fallow is not the same thing as to lie idle. The field has been ploughed, all the furrows are still there awaiting another season. What is changed is that the spirit, like the earth, grows different things and so has a chance to refresh itself.

Bernard Shaw was probably right when he said a perpetual holiday was a good working definition of hell, which is something the young ought to learn and the old know very well. But you are a lucky man—and count me such—if you can flee awhile. Smart fellows, those ancient prophets.

(Reprinted with permission of The Wall Street Journal)

The newspaperman is, more than most men, a double personality; and his person feels best satisfied in its double instincts when writing in one sense and thinking in another.

Henry Brooks Adams
The Education of Henry Adams, 1907

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, Ferris Professor in the Humanities Council at Princeton University, gave the first of the Edward L. Bernays Foundation Lecture Series at Boston University, School of Public Communication. His title was "Freedom of Expression: Foundation of American Liberties."

Frank S. Hopkins, coordinator for chapter services of the World Future Society, addressed a meeting of editors and managing editors serviced by United Press International in Pennsylvania. His subject was "Report on the Future," and covered today's major trends which futurists are studying. The World Future Society numbers almost 10,000 members.

1948

Carl W. Larsen has been appointed Director of the Smithsonian Institution, Office of Public Affairs. He succeeded Frederic M. Philips, who had served as Director since 1967, when the office was established.

1949

Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News Washington bureau chief, was part of a panel discussion of "Covering Washington" during the recent national convention of Sigma Delta Chi in that city.

1955

Arch Parsons, formerly public affairs specialist and assistant director for editorial services, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has been appointed associate director of The Washington Journalism Center.

1957

Robert F. Campbell, executive director of the Race Relations Information Center in Nashville, has resigned his position to become editor of The Daily Times in Gainesville, Georgia.

1962

David Kraslow, Los Angeles Times Washington bureau chief, moderated a panel discussion on "Image Makers '72" at the recent national convention of Sigma Delta Chi in Washington.

Ian Menzies, associate editor of The Boston Globe, has been elected to membership in the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

1965

John Corry has returned to The New York Times after three years of writing for Harper's.

Ray Jenkins, editorial page editor of the Alabama Journal in Montgomery, served on the faculty of a seminar conducted by the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association.

1967

Philip Meyer of the Washington bureau of Knight Newspapers also served on the faculty of the above seminar.

1968

Eduardo Lachica, formerly reporter for the Philippines Herald in Manila, has joined the Asian News Service as correspondent in Tokyo.

1970

William Montalbano, chief Latin American correspondent of the Miami Herald, was given an award by the Inter American Press Association for his contribution to Inter-American understanding. Mr. Montalbano was cited for his coverage of events in Chile during the presidential campaign and following the election of Salvador Allende. He received his prize at the annual IAPA meeting in Chicago.

Wallace H. Terry, former Vietnam war correspondent for Time magazine, has been named a Fellow in Journalism and Public Policy by the Metropolitan Applied Research Center of New York City. Dr. Kenneth Clark is the director of that institution.

1971

Josephine Thomas, formerly with the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, has joined the Detroit Free Press as behavioral science reporter, and writes a biweekly column.

Jack Schwartz of Newsday, in Garden City, Long Island, was one of eleven journalists selected as Fellows in Columbia University's Advanced International Reporting Program for 1971–72. Schwartz is the cultural editor of his newspaper.

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

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

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

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

Three More Associate Nieman Fellows

Three more Associate Nieman Fellows have been appointed by the President and Fellows of Harvard College for the 1971–72 academic year. The appointments were made after those of the Fellows listed in the September issue.

The additional Nieman Fellows are:

Benjamin G. Defensor, 42, Managing Editor of The Manila Chronicle. He was graduated from Far Eastern University, and plans to study econometrics, urban ecology and American literature.

Syed Mozammel Huq, 35, senior staff correspondent for the Associated Press of Pakistan. Mr. Huq has degrees from Carmichael College and Dacca University, and at Harvard plans to study international relations and politics.

Dong-ik Kim, 38, political editor of Joong-ang Ilbo in Seoul. Mr. Kim has his degree from the Law College, Seoul National University. He will concentrate on American history, foreign policy, contemporary culture and Asian regional economics.

1972-73 Nieman Selection Committee

Three newspapermen and three officers of Harvard University will serve on the Nieman Selection Committee for the next academic year. The President and Fellows of Harvard College have appointed the following to select the 1972–73 Nieman Fellows:

John Hughes, Editor of The Christian Science Monitor in Boston. Mr. Hughes is an alumnus of Stationers Company School in London. He received the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting in Djarkarta in 1967, and was a Nieman Fellow in 1961–62.

Richard Hart Leonard, Editor of The Milwaukee Journal, and director and vice president of the Journal Company. Mr. Leonard was graduated from the Universty of Wisconsin, and is a member of the National Board of Directors of Sigma Delta Chi, a national society of journalists.

George Cabot Lodge, Associate Professor of Business Administration at Harvard University. Mr. Lodge is a graduate of Harvard University. He was formerly a reporter for the Boston Herald, and was Assistant Secretary of Labor.

William Moss Pinkerton, Harvard University News Officer. Mr. Pinkerton was graduated from the University of Wisconsin, and was a Nieman Fellow in 1940–41. He is a former correspondent for the Associated Press.

Robert Mitchell White II, Editor and Publisher of the Mexico (Missouri) Evening Ledger. Mr. White is a graduate of Washington and Lee University. He is a past president and editor of The New York Herald Tribune, and president of Sigma Delta Chi.

Dwight Emerson Sargent, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships. Mr. Sargent was graduated from Colby College and was a Nieman Fellow in 1950–51. He was Editorial Page Editor of The New York Herald Tribune.

Newsmen wishing to spend the academic year in background studies at Harvard University must apply by March 15, 1972. Applicants, who are required to return to their employers, must have had at least three years of news experience and must be under 40.

About 12 Fellowships will be awarded for 1972–73. Each grant provides for a year of university residence and study for newsmen on leave from their jobs.

The current class includes 12 Fellows from the United States and four Associate Fellows from foreign countries.

The 1972–73 class will be the 35th annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. The Fellowships were established in 1938 under a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee Journal.