Nieman Reports

July, 1955

The "Monopoly" Newspaper

by Paul Block, Jr.

Nieman Reports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Charlotte F. Robling, Darien, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Providence, R. I.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription $2 a year. Entered as second-class matter December 31, 1947, at the post office at Boston, Massachusetts, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. IX; NO. 3 JULY, 1955

Nieman Fellowships For 1955-56

The Nieman Foundation announces appointment of eleven United States and five foreign newspapermen to fellowships for a year of background study at Harvard University.

The five foreign newsmen are appointed as Associate Nieman Fellows. Three, from Canada, Australia and New Zealand, are sponsored and financed by the Carnegie Corporation, which has brought newspapermen from those countries to Harvard for the past four years under an agreement with the Harvard Corporation. The other two are the first associate fellows from India and Japan, and are sponsored by the Asia Foundation by a similar agreement with Harvard.

The eleven United States Fellows make the 18th group appointed to Nieman Fellowships at Harvard under the bequest of Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*. Mrs. Nieman's will in 1937 left Harvard funds "to promote and elevate standards of journalism and educate persons deemed especially qualified for journalism."

Two hundred twelve United States newspapermen have previously held Nieman Fellowships and pursued studies in a year of residence at Harvard to increase their background for news work.

The *Oregon Journal*, the Charleston (W. Va.) *Gazette*, the Buffalo *Evening News* and the Lindsay-Schaub papers of Decatur, Ill., are represented for the first time by the fellowship awards. Nine of the Fellows are from daily papers, one is from a wire service, one owns a small weekly.

Seven are reporters, one an editorial writer, two are copy editors and one a weekly publisher.

The Nieman Fellows for the 1955-56 academic year:

John L. Dougherty, 37, telegraph editor, Rochester *Times-Union*. He joined the *Times-Union* staff on graduation from Alfred University in 1939 as a reporter, and has served the paper since with a five year absence in war service that included counter-intelligence work in Germany after the war.

He plans to study the Far East and American foreign policy.

Julius C. Duscha, 30, editorial writer, Lindsay-Schaub newspapers, Decatur, Ill. Native of St. Paul, his first newspaper work was on the St. Paul *Pioneer-Press* while studying at the University of Minnesota. He completed his college work at American University, Washington, D. C. (1952) while working on the *Congressional Quarterly* and in the Department of Agriculture. He was associate editor of *The Machinist* for two years before joining the Lindsay-Schaub newspapers.

He plans to study the political and economic situation of Europe.

(Joseph) Edward Hale, Jr., 30, assistant night city editor, Buffalo *Evening News*. Graduate of Dartmouth and of Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, he plans to study local government and regional problems of a Great Lakes port.

Robert H. Hansen, 30, reporter on the Denver *Post*, has specialized on the public lands and water problems of the Rocky Mountain area and means to study these problems at Harvard. A graduate of the University of Arizona, he was a reporter on the Miami *Herald* 1948 to 1950, when he joined the Denver *Post*.

Richard L. Harwood, 30, reporter, Louisville *Times*. A graduate of Vanderbilt University, Harwood started newspaper work in Nashville on the *Tennessean* in 1947 and went to Louisville on the *Times* in 1952, where he has covered major stories as a general assignments reporter.

He plans to study American history, politics and "public opinion."

Robert L. Healy, 30, Boston *Globe* reporter, started as an office boy with that paper in 1941, at 17. A year later he was in the Air Corps, and flew bomber missions over Germany. Returning to the *Globe* in 1946, he has covered major news stories as a general assignments reporter.

He plans to study history, chiefly of the United States.

Richard E. Mooney, 28, United Press reporter in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Mooney joined the UP after graduation from Yale in 1948, working first in New York and since 1951 in the

(*Continued on last Page*)

Facing up to the 'Monopoly' Charge

by Paul Block, Jr.

In 90 per cent of American cities there is only one newspaper, or there are two under single ownership. It's high time the men who publish these newspapers acknowledged these facts, time they quit apologizing for them.

Newspaper publishers ought to be explaining why there has been a strong trend to consolidation. They should be showing the public how the trend actually has produced better newspapers. They should be exchanging knowledge and experience on how to deal with the special problems single ownership creates. If they don't do these things, critics of the press will have a free field in which to sell people the idea that American newpapers are vicious monopolies acting against the best interests of our free society.

What is needed most is forthright discussion of the trend toward single ownership. This kind of exchange can, I believe, help the public better understand the benefits single ownership offers readers. It can illustrate the fact that this trend is the best hope to improve the quality of journalism and reduce the abuses which flourish in all but the largest cities, where newspapers can compete for different groups of readers instead of trying to be all things to all people.

New approaches, new techniques must be developed by newspapers in single ownership cities. Their advancement would be more rapid if publishers, and editors, and the professional societies they belong to would discuss them freely.

Yet they never have been talked about by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, or the Associated Press Managing Editors. Why not?

One notion which has no substance is that the trend to newspaper consolidation results from efforts to accumulate wealth or power, say in the manner of the utility or railroad combines of the Era of the Moguls. Too much prestige in the community is involved in publishing a newspaper to permit a motive for sale of a prosperous one, in the way a prosperous plastics factory might be disposed of to turn a quick profit. If one does come on the market, an estate or an elderly widow usually is involved. Even unprofitable papers struggle on for years because there is more satisfaction in being a publisher poor in the world's goods than in the peace and comfort of retirement in Florida. When one of these finally is sold to its competitor, it must be clear that the causes of single ownership preceded its consummation by years.

Nor can the tendency toward concentration be wholly credited to "rising costs." It's true that technological advances haven't kept pace with demands by newspaper unions for higher standards of living. But to find the cause of the merger trend, one must add to the pressure of costs the effect of factors leading to the disappearance of the two-party press in this country.

The two-party system itself, the increasing similarity of the parties as the Civil War faded into the past (easily demonstrated by the similarity of their election-year platforms, the American people's lack of interest in political doctrine—here is where reasons are to be found why the press of this country could label itself "independent" so it could bid for mass readership, while the press in most other countries remained tied to the party system.

Large-scale advertising emerged in this same period and helped kill off the party press. Advertisers provided a larger share of newspaper revenue. The party-minded reader became less important. Then the advertiser found he got more customers from dollars spent in newspapers whose readers had high purchasing power, normally the more conservative newspapers. These prospered at the expense of others, finally swallowing them up. Strong party views were tempered to make them less offensive to the readers of the defunct paper, who were potential new subscribers. Meanwhile, retailers found that, with fewer newspapers, they could cover their market at lower cost.

Critics of the press have wasted few tears on the passing of the party pamphlet era of journalism. They agree it is a better informed reader who is exposed to opposing views than the one who is cheered on by repetition of ideas he already holds, even though the critics wouldn't admit that this process has gone far enough. What they don't realize is that once newspapers become more or less independent, competing newspapers acquired a strong resemblance to competing telephone companies.

The validity of this comparison will be protested, not unnaturally, by those students of the press who are steeped in journalistic principle and more or less familiar with how newspapers operate. The student is deeply interested

---

Paul Block, Jr., publisher of the Toledo *Blade* and the Toledo *Times,* presented this discussion to the Nieman Fellows at Harvard, January 20.

in all phases of newspaper content. He will recognize differences in treatment by different papers and will measure them against his own set of professional standards. But most readers have no such critical eye for all parts of their daily paper (although most readers have real and critical concern for some part which represents a field of their own intense interest). The avid sports fan will argue the virtues of one sports writer as compared with another; the average reader is largely satisfied to know who won the game, by what score. Some will appreciate the choice of interesting detail and the skill required to write a good obituary; most will be satisfied to learn who died. And most readers, confronted by two newspapers, neither of which is an out-and-out political organ, will find the news of national and world affairs looking pretty much the same in either paper.

So it has been that newspapers, as they have become more responsible and more independent, inevitably have come to resemble each other more and more. Where news is concerned, they tend to give the reader duplicating services. That's where the comparison with competing telephone companies comes in. Most people, needing to conserve time or money, will subscribe to only one. Which of several competing newspapers are they likely to choose? Normally, the one with the most pages, which usually is to say the one containing the most local retail advertising.

Men don't realize the part retail advertising plays in appeal to women readers. To the woman keeping house and raising a family, the offerings of the stores, the bargains available from day to day, make the most important news of all. I do not mean to suggest that retail advertising alone can make a newspaper. If it could, the shopping news formula would be much more successful than it is. Advertising is a form of news for the newspaper, but the newspaper lends some of its character and credibility to advertising. Thus, advertisers seek those newspapers which give their advertising greater prestige, as well as those with the most readers, and the trend toward consolidation feeds itself.

Having become more responsible, more independent, single ownership newspapers reflect advantages which are only possible because they have no competition. They are able to give the reader a better, a more dependable product.

For one thing, a newspaper which isn't competing against a rival can present news in better balance. There is no need to sensationalize. A headline doesn't have to say any more than the story warrants. The temptation to over-emphasize, or under-emphasize, has been removed. The sin of exaggeration is committed less often.

Competing newspapers live in fear of each other. They may be stampeded into excesses by their fear of losing circulation to a competitor less burdened with conscience, or even one who might this once be less conscientious than he usually has been. Underplaying news is another result of competition. An editor not uncommonly omits or plays down a story his opposition has uncovered and developed exclusively. Having been caught short, he may try to give his readers the impression it never was much of a story anyhow.

The unopposed newspaper can give its reader the benefit of another tremendous advantage—relief from the pressure of time. Deadlines no longer loom like avenging angels just this side of the next edition. Editor and reporter may be as anxious as ever to get the news fast, and get it right. But they will put more emphasis on getting it right. Where a few more hours broadening the background, or rounding out final details, can prevent inadequacy or inaccuracy, time is there for the taking. The need to make the next edition ceases to be the excuse for giving readers a half-developed story.

Pressure no longer promotes premature and hazardous publication of stories about business negotiations not yet closed, or governmental action not yet taken. The newspaper can print the record of what has occurred, without interfering unintentionally in the occurrence.

There's relief from a peculiar newspaper nuisance—the pyramiding story—in the lessening of time pressure, too. A big story is in progress. It has been carefully and understandably reported for the first edition. Along comes a new development—the latest, but not necessarily the most important. The mechanics of printing conspire with the tradition of vigorous competition to place that new development at the top of the story, ahead of all the detail, all the background, everything that helps the reader put the whole event in proper perspective. Any other course would require extensive rewriting and resetting of type, making it impossible to meet edition deadline. The newspaper without local competition need not pile bulletin on top of bulletin; it can postpone for the sake of balance and clarity. The newspaper bucking competitors usually equates latest with most important, obscuring the whole continuity of the story, the whole emphasis of the story, and frequently the whole meaning of the story.

But not all advantages of single ownership are in news treatment. There is more freedom from financial pressure on the business side. A single ownership newspaper can better afford to take an unpopular stand. It can better absorb the loss of money in support of a principle. For what other institution is called on to antagonize its customers, even as it solicits business from them?

Such a newspaper has more freedom to reject questionable advertising. It can better accept advertising from

out-of-town retailers who compete with local merchants. Scarcely six newspapers in the country had no rules against this type of business at last count.

There are objections to single ownership—some valid, some not. Surely the commonest of them is the highly emotional aversion to the word "monopoly." Americans instinctively oppose monopoly. The very word conjures up horrendous images and thoughts. Monopolists frequently are arbitrary, if not downright criminal. These antagonisms have largely been overcome by some utilities through intelligent public relations. Newspapers, trying to ignore the problem, haven't directed their public relations programs specifically to this point, contenting themselves to emphasize their public service, their features, or the magnitude of their circulation.

Yet clearly a single ownership newspaper isn't a monopoly in the same sense as an electric utility. It has competition from television, radio, out-of-town newspapers, neighborhood newspapers, weekly news periodicals, monthly interpretive periodicals—even, if you wish, comic books. And a shopping news in some cases, too.

The public hardly knows about one truly valid complaint against single ownership. It is the difficulty of keeping a newspaper's departments on their toes—editorial staff as well as solicitors of advertising and circulation. Solutions will be found, but they will not be so obvious or so direct as the constant race against an energetic competitor. Here an exchange of information and of practices between newspapers which share the problem surely would help.

There's an especially ominous ring to the complaint that single ownership provides the reader only one local editorial point of view. This does sound like monopoly. A critic of single control may grant that national and international news and opinion can be obtained from many sources, staking his case on the supposedly appalling situation of having only one voice in local affairs. And who will deny that in any controversial situation, the more "voices" expounding and opining, the better? Unfortunately for this complaint, competing newspapers don't always mean competing ideas and competing opinions. The very fact of competition may make it more difficult to espouse causes that are unpopular with community leaders. The art of playing off one competitor against another is as old in the newspaper business as in any other.

This line of reasoning finally falls, however, when actual cases are considered. No cities are known to the writer where competing newspapers consistently take opposing sides of controversial questions, giving readers a clear-cut choice. A rapid survey indicates that a sharp difference of opinion between two newspapers on a local matter doesn't occur as often as once a year on the average.

Here it is tempting to illustrate by use of specific examples. The writer is familiar with single ownership newspapers which are keenly aware of their public responsibility on all issues, and with others which acknowledge no interest but their own. Similar contrasts can be cited between newspapers which have real competition, and also between those with only nominal opposition. How better illustrate that this is not a problem confined to single ownership newspapers?

Yet I am going to forego this opportunity to take my place among the judges of American newspapers, who issue periodic lists of the best and worst, because I do not believe any one not actually a resident of the city in which a newspaper is published can pass judgment on it in this day and age when most national and world news comes by wire into the offices of all newspapers. What determines the merit of a newspaper today isn't the way it shovels this wire copy into its pages. It is the enterprise and skill it shows in handling those things closest to it, the fortitude it displays in standing up to local pressures.

No maker of lists, dropping into a city for a few days or reading its newspaper from afar off, can begin to assess this effectiveness. So the listmakers, who almost invariably are of liberal political persuasion, turn to newspapers with editorial pages of liberal inclination, which keep showing up there year after year. Such newspapers deserve commendation for editorial courage. They are not necessarily what the listmakers represent them to be. So some of the best newspapers in the country go unrecognized, while some of the "Best 10" are living on their reputations.

In every city except New York and probably Chicago, all daily newspapers try to appeal to all people. The effect of competition, then, is for all viewpoints to draw closer together.

Here newspapers have followed the trend already described with respect to political parties. Politicians now agree that the way to win elections is to be as much alike as possible, managing to lean just a little to one side or the other. Thus the extremists know which candidates they must vote for. It's middle-of-the-road voters who are confused.

The same philosophy prevails in the case of competing newspapers today, robbing one of the strongest arguments against single ownership of its punch.

One consistent complaint of critics of the press is that most newspapers follow the conservative, Big Business line. It isn't confined to single ownership situations. In this respect, competition of itself won't satisfy the querulous. But the charge is severe and grave. It hurts all the press if it can be said that a very high percentage of newspapers opposed Roosevelt, Truman and Stevenson. Even if you think opposition to those Democratic candidates was wise

and right, it looks suspicious to the public. If it looks bad, some people will argue it is bad and call for legislation against it.

The facts, unfortunately, tend to support them. In the 1952 presidential election, only 142 of 918 daily newspapers supported Adlai Stevenson's candidacy (of these, 105 were in single ownership cities).

But must newspapers lean forever toward conservatism? I do not think so. Some forces that have tended to make newspapers conservative are being reversed, or at least modified. For one thing, the tendency of incomes to level off means that the newspaper publisher no longer can afford—even if he wanted it that way—to be concerned only with readers in the upper income brackets. The very fact of single ownership, which makes so many newspapers the only one read by all groups of people in a particular city, becomes a strong influence on its policies and practices.

One last charge against single ownership—a classic one wherever real or alleged monopoly is concerned—deserves attention. It is that once a single newspaper controls its field, it inevitably puts the squeeze on its customers by raising advertising and subscription rates.

In this respect, single ownership newspapers simply defy nature, if it really is the nature of monopolies to increase prices without regard for cost factors. Or it may not be that what figures show in this respect offers additional proof that single ownership newspapers aren't really monopolies, since competition from other sources than another newspaper in the immediate field tends to hold prices down.

Comparisons of advertising and subscription rates in single ownership cities with those in competitive cities do reveal that they are higher in competitive fields, although the difference is slight. A comparison of advertising rates in the newspapers of 20 cities of comparable size is illustrative. Ten are single ownership cities—Kansas City, Minneapolis, Oakland, Jersey City, Atlanta, Louisville, Providence, Memphis, Rochester, and Toledo. Ten are competitive cities—Buffalo, Houston, New Orleans, Indianapolis, Denver, San Antonio, Miami, Portland, Ore., Columbus, and Fort Worth. The retail advertising rate per 10,000 copies in the 10 single ownership cities is $1.26, as against $1.27 in the competitive cities. The national rate per 10,000 copies where there is single ownership is $2.12; where there is competition $2.65.

Figures on circulation costs to subscribers tell much the same story. Increase of single copy prices involving major newspapers have been principally in competitive cities—Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and almost all Pacific Coast cities where a 10 cent high has been reached in some instances. The five cent rate has held in single ownership fields—Kansas City, Minneapolis, Louisville, Toledo, Dayton, Akron, Omaha, Des Moines, and so on down the line.

There is one more traditional complaint against monopolies in general that doesn't apply to single ownership newspaper fields. It is the charge that monopolies inevitably tend to grow bigger and bigger. Some single ownership newspapers are, in fact, very small. And all of them are limited by the size of the community in which they operate.

Not all differences between single ownership and competitive newspaper situations can be classified as advantages or disadvantages. Some are problems created by the trend toward consolidation which challenge the ingenuity of all newspapers which occupy the field by themselves.

An important psychological change takes place in the relationship between a newspaper and its readers in single ownership cities. The newspaper becomes the "voice" of the city and, by a kind of ventriloquist's technique, the "voice" of all its component parts.

Being the "voice" of a community can raise hob with traditional newspaper standards. Joseph Pulitzer once wrote: "An able, disinterested, public-spirited press with trained intelligence to know the right and courage to do it, can preserve that public virtue without which popular government is a sham and a mockery." Pulitzer was a wise man and a great journalist. He undoubtedly would have been one of the first to recognize that under single ownership the significance of "disinterested" is so intensified that it overshadows "public-spirited." How can you be both disinterested and public-spirited? To be public-spirited is by nature to be partial, to be a proselyter, to press for something; whereas the man who is wholly disinterested becomes an umpire. And this role is not compatible with partisanship and zeal required of the public-spirited citizen.

Trying to reconcile these opposing roles, the single ownership newspaper must make compromises from day to day. The "one voice" must support major community projects; must sometimes furnish much of the drive behind a public undertaking. In generating energy it sometimes must be less than the disinterested community umpire, but never to the point of forgetting that every project, no matter how worthwhile it may appear, conflicts with some interests who will expect and be entitled to a "voice."

Where it is the only voice, a newspaper must be independent of any civic faction, any social set, any economic interest, just as it must be independent of any political

party or philosophy. Fortuately, as has been pointed out, the same single ownership which demands such independence makes it economically feasible.

On the Toledo *Blade,* we have found it necessary to adjust our approach and some of our news techniques to this "one voice" psychology. One of the first of these adjustments has to do with the story that would ordinarily be rejected because it will interest too few readers—in other words, is not "newsworthy." Where there are competing newspapers, the rejection would be accepted as a matter of judgment. Where there is single ownership, rejection frequently brings the charge of discrimination. It's hard on the well-trained city editor at first, but standards of what is "newsworthy" have to change in cities with but one newspaper "voice."

Some techniques adopted under single ownership will seem to the newspaper in competition to be leaning over backwards to avoid even the most foolish accusation of unfairness. Good journalists would squirm at the way the Toledo *Blade* edits political news during election campaigns. It's done with a ruler—partly in deference to the political prejudices of readers, partly to protect the *Blade* from that type of post-election survey which implies that a newspaper was grossly unfair because the speeches of one party's candidate received more space than those of the other.

Then there's the matter of letters to the editor. Competitive newspapers as a rule carefully screen them, printing only the better ones. Where there is only one "voice," the newspaper can't be so fastidious. The *Blade* cheerfully prints letters that are merely illiterate or idiotic, drawing the line only at blasphemy, pornography, or sedition.

Another way single ownership newspapers may do things differently is in the use of syndicated columnists, who offer a chance to present conflicting political points of view. On the Toledo *Blade,* these columnists are used without regard for their popular appeal, solely in the belief that its politically variegated readers are entitled to every viewpoint that can be had, provided it is an honest one. Contrary to the practice of appraising each column on the basis of what it has to say and how well it says it, recognizing that no writer can be good every day, the *Blade* carries its hands-off policy to the point of refusing to edit or omit the copy of any of its regular columnists (however much forbearance it sometimes may require).

Single ownership newspapers can demonstrate their concern with the public interest in the most practical pecuniary way. Public appeal advertising and that of charities gets the lowest possible rate in the *Blade* (the same rate earned by those retail stores which do the largest amount of advertising in a year's time). The *Blade* also keeps its rate for political advertising low, in contrast with the rather general practice of charging a premium rate . In a single ownership field, it is more important to encourage the fullest expression of political opinion than to set a high price on it, even though political advertising—being irregular and uncertain—will not otherwise carry its share of the cost load.

These are only a few of the ways single ownership newspapers may use to vary their approach and change their techniques. More will be developed as publishers are willing to stand up for the journalistic advantages of single ownership. With the opportunity in their grasp to prove to readers that single ownership newspapers can be—usually are—better newspapers, why try to ignore or hide the fact that single ownership is the dominant form of American journalism?

Failure to acknowledge what is a fact, failure to act boldly, intelligently, and without apology on this knowledge, can only increase public misunderstanding and encourage agitation for government interference in the newspaper business. If the men who edit and publish American newspapers fail to counteract this misunderstanding and this agitation, if they let the government come into the news room, the editorial conference, and the business office through an opening created by unreasoning fear of monopoly, the First Amendment soon will be as meaningless as the Second, which actually declares that " . . . the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The American Press: A Canadian View

An Address by R. A. Farquharson to a group of Canadians in Washington April 12, 1955.

Fewer newspapers are selling more copies than ever before. Newspaper revenue has been soaring but because expenses have been going up faster than revenues the annual mortality has also increased. Twenty dailies in the United States died last year and early this year the Guild-struck Brooklyn *Eagle* collapsed.

I am going into the economic side rather fully because, as I hope to show later, it has a pronounced bearing on editorial trends, on the news the papers print and, perhaps what is more significant, the news the newspapers don't print.

There is a new trend—not yet noticed in Canada—and that is the steady disappearance of Saturday newspapers. There are now 156 newspapers that do not publish on Saturday. There are eighteen that do not publish Saturday or Monday. A quarter of the nation's daily press are now publishing five days a week or five days plus Sunday.

The abbreviated dailies are almost all in the under 12,000 circulation field. They have not large enough staffs to stagger crews and avoid overtime. Faced with the need of paying time and a half after five days they elected to drop the least profitable issue of the week. *Editor & Publisher* reports that the only advertisers to complain are the undertakers. Where both Saturday and Monday editions are dropped the staff get out the Sunday paper without overtime.

The week-end mortality is much higher in Oklahoma and California than in the east but it is spreading. Pennsylvania publishers meet in June to discuss the future of the Saturday paper. The five-day week has created a pattern which has revolutionized shopping habits, made advertisers demand middle of the week space and made the issue with the least advertising the most expensive to produce. A look at Saturday issues anywhere in this country shows how hard the blight has struck.

In earlier newspaper changes forced on publishers by economic necessity, the Canadian newsprint industry was the perpetual villain. The nine-column classified page, four point rule instead of six points, the super shrink mats which made the pages narrower, were the early economies. The advertising ratio changed. Fifty-fifty was a profitable ratio when I first laid out a paper. Then the objective became 60 advertising to 40 news. Now many U. S. newspapers shoot at 70 per cent advertising.

High newsprint costs are now an old story. Wages have been the added factor in recent cost increases. In the five years before 1950 composing room costs went up over 100 per cent; stereotyping and photo-engraving 90 per cent and press room 70 per cent. An editor reported that one of his pressmen at $16,000 was drawing down $2,000 more a year than the editor. Overtime costs had caught up with many papers.

The figures just quoted do not take into account editorial costs. Editorial unions came after the depression in the United States but the Guild is new in Canada and has only arrived in three Canadian centers. Reporters have been doing their best to catch up quickly with the older unions.

Unionization is changing employment practices. For instance office boys in many contracts are guaranteed the opportunity to become reporters. This means that in New York and other places university graduates are seeking office boy jobs. The old drift from the small paper to the larger paper is disappearing.

Because the major expenditures of a newspaper other than newsprint are made before the press starts turning, there has always been a tendency to offer extra readership without comparative extra cost as a bonus to advertisers. This bargain is clearly set forth in what is called the milline rate—the cost per line for every million papers sold. For instance in the United States last year the milline rate of all Sunday papers was $2.76 against $4.34 for evening papers and $3.01 for morning papers. This bargain is one of the reasons for the frightening weight of the newspaper left at your door every Sunday.

It is also only too true that the paper appealing to the masses has through the years been able to offer a better rate to advertisers than the more serious papers with smaller circulation. The box office is just as unrelenting in newspapers as in the theater though death comes faster in the theater.

Canadians have been unfair in their criticism of the U. S. press. With the exception of nine cities every single newspaper in Canada is a monopoly newspaper as far as local competition is concerned. The application of libel law and contempt of court are entirely different. From my own experience I would say that in both countries there is a tendency to go as far as the law allows.

Highly competitive conditions make for the same kind of papers in both countries. It should be remembered that

Robert A. Farquharson, former managing editor of the Toronto *Globe* and *Mail,* is Information Counsellor in the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

the Toronto *Star* has the greatest density of circulation on the continent and that the Toronto *Telegram* now often takes the initiative in the hottest circulation war in this hemisphere. They are both examples of efficient editing for mass appeal.

I have the authority of Erwin Canham, the great editor of the *Christian Science Monitor,* for the statement that the smaller dailies in the non-competitive fields are steadily improving in their responsible approach to the day's news. The teletype and now the teletype setter have made available to them a wide range of news to more than satisfy the average reader. They are not engaged in the circulation wars that bedevil the larger centers and are free to produce a newspaper rather than a daily magazine.

The same generalization could be made about a good many of the smaller papers in Canada. I try every day to run through the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* which a friendly publisher sends me. It is a good example of a non-screaming, responsibly edited paper which feels that it is in business to publish news. I single it out because no paper in Canada has a better feeling for typography.

When a paper is operating on a 30 per cent news ratio it just isn't possible to find space for the local news and the wire news and the magazine type features which have become so important to the ever-growing circulations. So in selecting what to keep the editor is often forced to think of the in-and-out reader who assumes an importance that the habitual reader never acquires. The in-and-outer is far more apt to be interested in sensation. World news only interests him at the peak of a crisis. The modern mass-circulation paper has assumed its present pattern to hold the inconstant affections of its readership fringe.

We are not conscious of this situation as we read the papers in Washington. Here we are particularly well served by the *Post* and the *Star.* Perhaps their excellence is partly due to the fact that they have a local audience unusually interested in national and international affairs. Then the New York *Times* arrives in time for breakfast. In the newspaper world the *Times* is in a class by itself, an outstanding example of how virtue can be made to pay.

The dominance of the *Times* has made it difficult for the *Herald Tribue,* a morning paper caught in the no man's land between the *Times* and the tabloids. It is now in the extremely difficult position of changing its personality, something just as hard for a newspaper to do successfully as it is for a grown-up human being. The *Herald Tribune* achieves, however, a pleasant gayness as well as responsibility.

The *Christian Science Monitor* is an institution that would not be possible without the backing of another great institution. I know of no other paper so little concerned with deadlines that it calmly sits on a story when there is any doubt about accuracy. The *Monitor* does not believe in being first with the news. It prefers to wait and be able to explain the news. Considering the size of its circulation I believe it to be the most influential newspaper in America.

The Chicago *Tribune* has never been popular in Canada. Discounting its lusty bias I could go along with its claim that it is the greatest paper in the world to the extent that I know of no more competent paper anywhere.

The Chicago *News* shows the influence of Christiansen, of the London *Express,* a newspaper genius whether or not you like his paper. The *News* was the first of the large American papers really to sweat the fat out of copy.

The Milwaukee *Journal* has two interesting firsts. It carries more advertising than any other newspaper in the United States, probably in the world. It is owned entirely by its own staff. The Nieman Fellowships at Harvard, which permit 12 U. S. newspapermen to spend a year studying what they wish, commemorate the man who built the *Journal.* His widow left her shares to Harvard and Harvard sold them back to the staff. Mr. Nieman could still be proud of his paper as well as the Fellowship which bears his name.

The Philadelphia *Bulletin,* known by so many people who never saw the paper because of the slogan, "In Philadelphia nearly everybody reads the *Bulletin,*" reflects the honesty of the cautionary word "nearly." It specializes in local coverage. I am looking forward to accepting Walter Lister's invitation to visit the paper.

Successful papers—and I mean successful in a much broader sense than the size of the net earnings—all have distinctive personalities and there are many successful papers in this country. I am looking forward to visiting old friends on the Nashville *Banner,* the Cleveland *Plain Dealer,* the Detroit *Free Press,* the New Orleans *Times-Picayune.* I want to know the editors of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* the Kansas City *Star,* the Dallas *News,* the Baltimore *Sun,* the Seattle *Times,* and many others. When you have heard of a paper for years and even recognize its format, there is a great joy in knowing the personalities that make the paper.

Now I would like to swing back to my job as Information Counsellor for Canada though it is hard at times to remember that I have jumped the fence after so many years in newspaper work.

In the United States Canada does not get a big press but it gets a good press, and that is what is really important. Comments about Canada are nearly always both friendly and generous.

There are, however, some changes I would like to see which, I think, would improve Canadian coverage in the press here.

For instance the AP report going to Canada is processed by Canadians in New York to provide a suggestion of Canadian accent. I feel that if the AP and UP reports on Canada were processed by Americans before export the result would be copy that would be more usable in the U. S. press than the copy now being provided. I am not complaining about Canadian reporting. I am only stating that news reporting should have a national accent to be appreciated. I would like to see an AP correspondent in Ottawa and AP editors in Toronto filing the Canadian Press wire to New York.

I do not believe that in getting the position of Canada understood we take advantage of the great concentration of correspondents in Washington. There are times when announcements that are made in Ottawa could also be made here. No Washington correspondent is in the business of writing stories with Ottawa datelines.

I have rambled around the subject in this discussion of the American press. I have not been here long enough really to know U. S. newspapers as only day-to-day reading gives an understanding affection—or dislike—of particular papers. But I have followed newspapers all my professional life and weighing the papers I admire against the papers I do not admire leaves me with the feeling that there are more kindred souls in the press of the United States than in any other country I have visited.

Science and Journalism

by August Heckscher

The Lasker awards in journalism have come to be coveted by the newspaper profession, and as one of its representatives I am glad to be able to say just one or two things about the problems with which science and journalism have a common preoccupation.

There was a famous book published in the nineteenth century with the title *The Warfare of Science and Religion.* I sometimes wonder whether our problem today might not be put briefly by saying that there is, in the nature of modern things, a warfare of science and journalism. There is a deep incongruity between the media of mass communication and the spirit of science—of medical science in particular. How could it be otherwise?

The spirit of science is tentative, experimental, skeptical. The spirit of journalism is decisive and optimistc. The man of science sees even the boldest actions as being a way of testing a hypothesis. The newspaperman sees the most moderate undertaking as one that will, quite possibly, make over the world.

In these last weeks, we have been confronted with the problems of the Salk vaccine; and I think that on both sides we have suffered from what I might call our occupational defects. The newspaperman (if I may confess to our own faults first) came very close to saying that polio had been conquered once and for all. But all the while, I suspect, the men who had been carrying forward this incalculably significant work supposed that they were simply extending on a wider scale and with a greater assurance of success the experiments of last summer. Neither had really thought his problems through.

And so the public was left with cases of the dread disease that seemed inexplicable and brutally irrational—like casualties that occur in battle after the armistice has been signed; or else the public was assailed by statements from the medical authorities that sounded hopelessly confused and inconclusive.

Partly for these reasons—the need for a clear source of evaluation—the *Herald Tribune* has been urging a national law and a clear national policy. The final word to the public, it has seemed to us, should come neither from the doctors nor the newspapers, but from a responsible layman of the highest capacity, able to appraise the work of experts and to make the kind of decisions in which the average citizen has an instinctive confidence.

Well, that is one aspect of the problem which I posed—and one solution. In the long run, I believe, there *can* be a reconciliation between the two races of man, the scientist and the journalist; just as the warfare between science and religion was ultimately mediated by a greater vision and awareness on the part of both.

The Lasker Foundation not only believes in such a reconciliation. It is doing something important to bring it about. The men who will receive the Lasker awards have shown by their example that it can be done.

It is not a small thing which the Lasker Foundation has encouraged and these men have attained. For on a mature understanding of scientific methods and developments by the people of our democracy may depend not only our health, and the health of our children, but our very survival.

August Heckscher, chief editorial writer of the New York *Herald Tribune,* spoke at the annual medical journalism awards luncheon of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation in New York, May 23.

Doctors and the Press

by J. Robert Moskin

Medicine today belongs to everyone, the sick and the well, the rich and the poor and the moderately well-off. But medicine cannot reach all these people—unless medicine and journalism work together at our joint responsibility of service.

Our joint responsibility of service gives us common problems of communication. Doctors and editors have to explain the story of medicine to all the people, if we want all these people both to support and to derive the maximum benefit from medicine today.

The problems of communication we have in common are three. These barriers are creatures of our time. They did not exist in our father's time.

The first problem is the inhumanity of medicine—the impersonalization of medicine today. I mean just that: the inhumanity of medicine today. This is our greatest trouble.

I went to a doctor a few weeks ago. He examined me, checked me over—thoroughly I'm sure—and then he sped me out of his office. He had two other patients undressed and waiting for him in other examining rooms.

The father of a friend of mine needed surgery recently. He and his family checked around. They heard from doctors they knew about several excellent surgeons. Of one man they were told: "Your father wouldn't like him too well. He operates superbly but he never sees the patient afterwards."

A man we know who moved into an adjoining town very recently called my wife to see if she knew of an obstetrician. His wife was pregnant and threatening to miscarry. He had called one of the best-known obstetricians in the country and had been told that the doctor doesn't make house calls.

I could go on. But my point is clear. Medicine is becoming dehumanized today. Doctors are interested in drugs and x-rays and stomachs. They have less time for patients.

I don't present this as a gripe. I present it here today as a problem. When I was medical editor of *Look*, people used to walk into my office and ask my advice, my diagnosis. When we on the *Woman's Home Companion* publish an article about cancer or mental illness, we are flooded with letters from readers pouring out their story, pouring out their hearts, and asking our help.

J. Robert Moskin is articles editor of the *Woman's Home Companion*. This is from a talk to the National Health Council.

If these people had a personal and lasting relationship with a doctor they trusted and knew as a friend and counselor, would they be turning to something as impersonal as a magazine or someone as medically unqualified as a magazine editor?

But the fact is they do turn to us. And this turning-to is a challenge. The avidness with which people, millions of people, read medical articles, listen to and watch medical programs is evidence of a great hunger in America. A hunger for help, for personalness, for human contact, for information and reassurance. This is the challenge: to bring to millions of people information and understanding. This is the great role of the mass media in medicine.

So communication problem number one is to work together—doctors and editors—to counteract the modern impersonalness of medicine and bring to masses of Americans the medical help they need, the knowledge of where to turn.

Problem number two follows: This is the multiplicity of medicine today. It stems from our vastly broadened spectrum of research and study. The division and subdivision of medicine.

This variety of medical specialties, medical research, leaves the layman floundering. He doesn't know where to start finding help. We spend a lot of time and space on the *Companion* telling people the simple, elementary—but otherwise confusing—facts of how to make the first move, how to get a heart examination, how to find out what facilities your community has.

Did you see in the paper recently that New York State now has 2,000 charitable organizations registered with it and planning to solicit funds from the public?

This multiplicity is self-defeating. It confuses the lay person. It infuriates him, overpowers him and leaves him impotent to act. Our local newspaper in Westchester ran an editorial pointing out to its readers that one cancer fund drive was not to be confused with another one being attempted simultaneously. I'd say this is getting a bit out of hand.

Again, this is not a gripe. It's a problem of communication.

The last problem of communication I'd like to mention briefly is this: Not only do we have a growing inhumanity and multiplicity of medicine today, but we have—on top of these—self-imposed, man-made barriers. These are the barriers of pride and self-interest, of vanity and infallibility.

These barriers are of two kinds: the professional curtains that doctors set up to keep their arm's distance from the lay public. And secondly the selfish barriers of falsehood and distortion that often as not are erected by some of the organizations raising funds from the public.

Don't misunderstand me. I'm not talking about all or even most of the people doing these jobs. But a minority is roasting the truth. They are making the doctor's job and the editor's job harder. They are breaking down—as though they were using a sledge hammer—public confidence in the medical profession in all its aspects.

I am sorriest about the professional barriers. For example, we believe that to gain the reader's confidence the *Companion* should present as much medical information and understanding as possible directly from a reputable doctor. We want our article to carry medical authority and to say to the reader, this is authoritative, this is the best information we can bring you from the best doctor we can find.

But the red tape, the labyrinths we are required to go through to do this! The doctor has to get permission each time he wants to sign an article for us; he stands in danger of being condemned by a jealous fellow doctor. His copy has to be censored. In New York City we often can't publish his picture to add even that speck of personalness of communication between doctor-to-be-trusted and help-hungry reader. It is rather incredible.

Thank goodness in some communities this barrier of professional impersonalness is breaking down and in some places local medical groups are making a positive and unafraid effort to inform the public they seek to serve. We've even made progress here in New York. But it is slow, time-consuming and time-wasting.

These are our problems of communication today. These are some of the major questions that face doctors and editors when we attempt to work together. Let's examine *how* we can work together.

Working with people in the health fields, I have found them, almost without exception, dedicated and self-effacing. They want to serve. Medical and health articles are among the most eagerly read, the most widely discussed material in magazines today. This is so because in great part people in the magazine and health fields have worked together successfully.

But there are still a few places where the techniques of our working together need to be thought about and improved. There are five such raw spots, I think, and I will simply say a sentence about each one.

The first spot is integrity. This is confidence by the health people that a magazine is going to treat their story or their facts with honesty and the magazine writer's and editor's conviction that he will get from them honest facts and fair interpretation.

I'd rather have a public relations man come to me and say here is a story about new research; it is a valid story, a significant one. But of course I represent such and such a company or association; that's why I'm here. Let me tell you what our stake is in this story and you'll see that it is still a valid story.

So my first advice on working together is honesty. It does pay.

Candidness is related to honesty. You can be silent and still honest, but candidness requires more effort—and more risk—than that. Only by taking this risk can we in the long run achieve together our goals of service.

The doctor always works on the frontier of man's knowledge. He must decide between life and death with only a frontier-man's information. He can only see as far as the land of research has been cleared. Ahead of him is a dark tangled forest. He can't know what dangers or what eldorados the forest holds. He can only hack away at the trees in front of him, relentlessly and with prayer.

Unless he is candid about what he knows and what he does not know, the cheers and support of those behind him must die away. To succeed he must be candid with those through whom he can reach the public that wants to cheer him on and put to work the new fields he clears.

Doctors and researchers are only slowly overcoming their fear that unless they pretend to be oracles and sages, the public will not believe them and trust in them. This gaining of self-confidence based on the solid rock of candidness and integrity must be hastened before public faith is undermined. You and we can work together to help speed this process that is fundamental for the preservation of non-governmental medicine.

Closely connected to these problems of integrity, candidness and omnipotence is the delicate balance of fear and reassurance.

We editors are spending more and more time reassuring our readers about cancer, mental disease, polio and many, many others. We are supersensitive today to the problems of creating unwarranted fear.

The delicate balance that must be maintained between fear and reassurance means that medical information must not be withheld from the public because it will scare them and that medical news must not be pumped up and inflated so that it becomes a terrifying balloon ready to burst.

My last point about working together is purely a technical one but perhaps knowing how we are thinking these days will have some value to those of you who are seeking to work with magazines.

Today all of the mass media have one identical problem. We must all compete for the public's time and attention. Time is our common enemy. The fight gets tougher and tougher as our lives grow busier and busier. We have to compete for the public's time against the important and the trivial. We must compete against the news from

Moscow and the stock market reports, against Ed Sullivan and Dick Tracy, against the preparation of dinner and a canasta session. Our hoped-for reader has very little time for you or me.

A doctor in Maryland made this point recently, complaining about the pace of our modern lives. He said, "In the old days, if somebody missed a stage coach, he was willing to wait around a couple of days for the next one. Now, we swear if we miss a slot in a revolving door."

We on the mass circulation magazines believe that the way to compete for a reader's time and attention in this speeding world is by editing and writing for that reader. The nearer you can get to the reader, the better is your chance of entering his life. I liked the line in *The New Yorker* about what the child said when the librarian asked him what he liked best in the library. He said, "The little chairs and books about fierce things."

We magazine editors believe all of us must understand the dimensions of our reader's life. Let's sit him down in a chair that fits and tell him things that will interest him fiercely. And I must add that nothing interests him more fiercely than his own health and vitality.

When I was at college, we were amused by an anecdote repeated down through college generations about the late Robert Benchley and his student days. Benchley found many outside activities of interest. One January morning he faced his mid-year examination in American history completely unprepared.

The main essay question read as follows: "Discuss the significance of the treaty for the Newfoundland fisheries from the Canadian and American points of view."

He was as ready for that question as you or I would be today. Some fast footwork was in order. He thought a long moment and then began to write: "Although many would prefer to discuss the significance of the treaty for the Newfoundland fisheries from the Canadian and American points of view, I prefer to discuss its significance from the fish's point of view."

He won an "A" on the exam.

This may be purely Benchley legend, but it makes my point. We all must approach the reader from his own point of view. We must follow Bob Benchley's example and look at our subject from the fish's point of view, the point of view of the reader whom we are all, in the final analysis, fishing for. This is the only way we can gain the public's time and attention. I wish more people who bring us what they feel sure are magazine stories were aware of this concept. It would make our job easier.

Watching the medical and health world from my editorial desks over these post-war years, I think we are approaching a crossroads.

We are, I fear, on the road to losing public faith in the medical profession today. The inhumanity of medicine, the multiplicity and expensiveness of medicine and the barriers that medicine continues to erect between itself and the public are all making the course downhill, swifter and swifter. And the crossroad ahead offers government supervised medicine or responsible free enterprise medicine. If the public, whizzing up to this crossroad, is to choose to stay on our historic course—if the American public is going to choose differently from the British people or the Scandinavian and others—the practitioners, the researchers, the spokesmen and the media of medical communication must build public faith.

We in magazines can only help. We can't do the job alone. All we can do is report, make sure people know when good is being done them.

Public support of appeals for money for medical research is in danger today. We are bombarded with hand-wringing, tear-jerking, fear-arousing pleas for money. No one can possibly support them all. How does the layman choose? He can't choose rationally.

Public attitudes toward medical practice are growing just as confused. The public is learning that doctors can be shrewd businessmen, that they can run a powerful lobby in Washington and spend millions to support or fight legislative programs. The public has seen organized medicine *fight* voluntary health insurance, group practice, acknowledged fee scales and has seen medicine have to back down on each point. The public must wonder how noble and virtuous is the doctor's fight.

When that wonder turns into conviction, then look out. Then we will have nationalized medicine. Unless the profession changes its attitude about inhumanity, multiplicity, economics and barriers of communication, I predict that we will in our life-time be socialized in this field of research and service. Today the public knows it has a stake in medicine and will get its due one way or the other.

But the picture I want to paint is not black. These things don't have to come about. Here in the second half of the twentieth century we are at a point of tremendous advance in the health sciences. We fight effectively against infectious diseases. Our knowledge of nutrition, metabolic and mental disturbances is far greater than it was just a generation ago. We are on the threshold of a great era in the health of mankind. Medicine never had so much to offer mankind before.

Our prime job—both editors and health people—is to inform the public. The job immediately ahead of us is a job of communication. We are making the advances in tools and techniques—now we must talk to the people. Now, in our lifetime, we must tell the people about these great discoveries and show them how they can be used.

The Press And Robert M. Hutchins

Remarks to the
American Society of Newspaper Editors
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1955

Twenty-five years ago, almost to the day, I last had the honor of addressing this society. The quarter of a century between has been the longest in history. That was a different world, before the depression, before the New Deal, before the Newspaper Guild, before the suburbs, before they charged for newsprint, before the atom, before television. It was a world in which you were powerful and numerous. You are powerful still; but some 800 papers that were alive then are gone now. Twenty-five years hence, when I am 81, where will you be?

When I was here last, I said, "The greatest aggregation of educational foundations is the press itself . . . . Indeed I notice that in spite of the frightful lies you have printed about me I still believe everything you print about other people . . . . If the American press does not need or cannot get the leadership of some endowed newspapers, we must fall back on the long process of education through educational institutions, hoping that in the long run we may produce a generation that will demand better things of you. This process will be tedious and difficult, because of the power of the press itself over the minds and habits of those whom the educational institutions produce."

You paid no attention. Well, I would merely remind you that a great many men who paid no attention then are not here now.

I joined in another effort in your behalf in 1947, when the Report of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press appeared. The Commission felt a little sad. It said, "The outstanding fact about the communications industry today is that the number of its units has declined." It expressed a high opinion of your role in life, for it said, "Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are moral rights which the state must not infringe." And again, "We must recognize that the agencies of mass communication are an educational instrument, perhaps the most powerful there is."

You were furious. Your president issued a statement in six paragraphs, in three of which he said that the members of the Commission were "left-wing," and in all of which he stated his conviction that, since most of the members of the Commission were professors without experience in the newspaper business, nothing they said could be of any importance, although it might be dangerous. At the meeting of this society in 1947, to which I had expected to be invited to receive your congratulations, the only thing that saved me from condemnation was the expressed unwillingness of your committee to "dignify" me by such action.

All over the country you attacked the Report. I hope you will read it sometime. But for fear you won't, I shall quote a passage from it that will give you the main idea: "If modern society requires great agencies of mass communication, if these concentrations become so powerful that they are a threat to democracy, if democracy cannot solve the problem simply by breaking them up—then those agencies must control themselves or be controlled by government. If they are controlled by government, we lose our chief safeguard against totalitarianism—and at the same time take a long step toward it."

A kind of neurotic sensitivity is characteristic of the press throughout the English-speaking world. The British papers were outraged by the report of the Royal Commission on the Press, which was almost as mild as ours. I don't know what makes you feel this way. After all, in this country you have a special amendment to the Constitution, and the first one at that, protecting you. Perhaps it is this special dignity that sometimes leads you to confuse your private interests with those of the public. One of the most celebrated managing editors in the country told our Commission that the only threat to the freedom of the press was the Newspaper Guild and that all we had to do was to adopt a resolution denouncing the Guild and go home. Most papers saw Marshall Field's suit against the AP as the end of freedom of the press. All he wanted to do to the AP was to join it. About once a week you break out in exasperation against anybody who tries to keep anything from you, for reasons of state or for any reason at all. You are the only uncriticized institution in the country. You will not criticize one another, and any suggestion that anybody else might do so sets you to muttering about the First Amendment.

I know that lately life has been hard for you. And it may get even worse; for it may turn out that reading is an anachronism. When I was a boy, reading was the only established and available path to knowledge, information, or even entertainment. But the other day in Hollywood I met a man who was putting the Great Books on records. Everything else has already been put on records or films. One glance at the children making for the television set on their return from school is enough to show that this is a different world. The habit of reading, which my genera-

tion fell into because there was not much else to do, may now not be formed at all; it may have too much competition.

The competition may win. Gresham's Law of Culture is that easy stuff drives out hard. It is harder to read, even after Dr. Flesch has finished with the printed page, than it is to look and listen. I do not believe that newspapers can do what comic books, picture magazines, motion pictures, and television can do in glorious technicolor. Since they can do this kind of thing better, why should you do it at all?

You may say it is the only way to survive. John Cowles suggests it may be a way to die. In his Sigma Delta Chi speech he said newspapers have realized that complete and fair coverage builds circulation. With few exceptions, he said, those newspapers which "have had the heaviest circulation losses are not papers that regard full and fair news presentation as their primary function and reason for existence." If so good a businessman as Mr. Cowles can think there is *any* chance that sensationalism and entertainment are not good for business, a layman may perhaps be forgiven for being impressed.

Emboldened by his example, I will say that newspapers should do as well as they can the things that they can do best, and they should leave to others the responsibility of entertaining the public. If you are worried about who is going to discharge that responsibility, read the March 21 issue of *Newsweek*, which says that television is abandoning "Johns Hopkins Science Review," "Princeton, '55," and "The Search." These programs have won many honors and audiences that look large to people who do not work in advertising agencies.

A couple of years ago Henry Luce was discussing the monopoly newspaper. He said the argument against it was that it deprived the community of differing presentations of news and opinions. He went on, "Like so many high-brow discussions about newspapers (I notice that journalists invariably use the word "high-brow" when referring to criticisms of the press, even when, as in this case, the truth of the criticism is self-evident to the merest moron) this one is fine, except that it ignores the actual nature of a newspaper. Does any one feel strongly that a city ought to have several newspapers in order to offer the community a greater variety of comic strips, breakfast menus, and cheesecake?" If this is the actual nature of a newspaper, the fewer papers the better. Certainly the special constitutional protection thrown about them seems no more warranted than such protection would be for acrobats, chefs, beauty parlor operators, and astrologers.

What the framers of the First Amendment had in mind was debate, a great continuing debate, with the people hearing all sides and getting all the facts. If government could be kept from interfering with this debate, nothing could interfere with it; for a man who differed with the existing papers could start one of his own. The Founding Fathers did not foresee that 94 per cent of American cities and eighteen American states would be without competing papers. In the overwhelming majority of communities there can now be no debate among rival editors. The editor in a one-paper town has the only voice there is, and the only one there is likely to be. The debate has become a soliloquy.

Talk about the virtues of monopoly is the flimsiest rationalization, as is shown by the poor quality of the papers in many monopoly towns. Monopoly cannot be a good thing. At its best it can be like a benevolent despotism, good while the benevolence lasts, but an accident in any case. Monopoly may in the present state of affairs be a necessary evil, but let us not pretend that it is not an evil.

Rising costs have put the publisher in the driver's seat, where he has no business to be. The First Amendment was not instituted to give a preferred position to people who were making money out of papers as against those who were making money out of other articles of commerce. The Amendment was to protect the content of the press, not the cash return from it. The reason the publisher is in the driver's seat is that it costs so much money to own and operate a newspaper, and more all the time. If the soliloquy is that of one of the richest men in town, it is more than likely that it will sound the same political note as other soliloquies in other towns, rendered by other rich men. This is the basis of the phrase, "a one-party press."

Of course we have a one-party press in this country, and we shall have one as long as the press is big business, and as long as people with money continue to feel safer on the Republican side. For sheer psalm-singing sanctimoniousness no statement in recent years has surpassed that of Charles F. McCahill, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, when he was asked to comment on Adlai Stevenson's polite remarks on a one-party press. Mr. McCahill said, and I quote him: "It is the responsibility of the individual editor and publisher to decide what is printed in a particular newspaper. Fortunately, there is no power in this country to standardize the editorial views of any editor or publisher." Here in two sentences Mr. McCahill managed (1) to say what everybody knew already; (2) to be completely irrelevant; and (3) to prove Mr. Stevenson's point for him by making the partisan insinuation that Mr. Stevenson wanted the power to standardize editorial opinion. How you get along with these publishers is more than I can understand.

Lord Beaverbrook, when he was asked by the Royal Commission on the Press what his purpose in life was, replied under oath: "I run the paper purely for the purpose of making propaganda, and with no other motive." (There is apparently less cant among publishers in England than

we are accustomed to here.) Lord Beaverbrook's propaganda collides wherever it goes with the counter-propaganda of numerous local and national voices. The popular press in Britain is the most sensational in the world, but an Englishman who doesn't want a sensational newspaper does not have to take the *Mirror*. Because of the geography of England he can get anywhere, inexpensively, and usually with his breakfast, a presentation of the news as fair as an editor can make it and as full as the restrictions on newsprint will allow, together with serious commentary upon it.

In the absence of some new technological revolution the number of papers per community in this country seems unlikely to increase. Nothing suggests that costs will fall. Television and suburbanization are driving ahead as fast as they can go. As monopoly continues to spread, the ancient check of competition can of course no longer be relied on.

This should lead to the burial of that consoling reference to Jefferson's Second Inaugural, an ever-present refuge in time of criticism, which made its last formal appearance here in the report of the committee reporting on the Report of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. Jefferson said, in effect, that the people would make their views of a newspaper felt by refusing to read, believe, or buy it. The theory that the daily test of the marketplace is an expression of public criticism, and all that is needed, is reduced to absurdity when the public has no option, when it has to buy the newspaper that is offered or go without.

If we cannot look to competition to keep publishers from getting out of hand, what can we do to save their freedom from the consequences of their irresponsibility? My youthful suggestion of some endowed newspapers was designed to execute some publishers *pour encourager les autres*. The object was to set some standards that publishers of unendowed newspapers might be held to. I take this proposal less seriously than I did twenty-five years ago. The *Christian Science Monitor* undoubtedly has a good influence on the press of this country, but the conditions under which it operates, with its foundations in heaven rather than on earth, are so different from the ordinary that any publisher has an adequate excuse for not following the *Monitor's* example. So I fear it would be with an endowed newspaper.

A trust such as that which controls the future of the Washington *Post* regulates the selection of stockholders, but gives the editor no explicit protection. The British trusts usually have the same object, that of preventing the ownership from falling into unsuitable hands. Although the British trusts reflect an attitude that an editor would find reassuring, no trust covering a daily newspaper leaves him formally any better off than he would be if there were no trust. The most that the Royal Commission was willing to say was, "A trust does not necessarily convert a newspaper from a commercial to a non-commercial concern or give it quality which it did not possess . . . . A trust can be, however, a valuable means of preserving quality where quality already exists. We accordingly welcome the action of public-spirited proprietors who have taken such steps as lie in their power to safeguard the character and independence of their papers; and we hope that the number of papers so protected will grow."

A publisher's willingness to establish a trust shows that he could be trusted without it; still it is a way of extending the benevolence of the benevolent despot beyond the limits of his own life. When you have a newspaper worth protecting, a trust will help you protect it; but a trust does not guarantee you a newspaper worth protecting.

The purpose of a newspaper, and the justification for the privileges of the press, is the enlightenment of the people about their current affairs. No other medium of communication can compete with the newspaper in the performance of this task. A newspaper that is doing this job well is a good newspaper, no matter how deficient it may be in astrology, menus, comics, cheesecake, crime, and Republican propaganda. A newspaper that is doing this job deserves protection against government, and it will certainly need it.

A newspaper that is doing this job will have to bring before its readers points of view with which it disagrees and facts that it deplores. Otherwise in monopoly towns the people cannot expect to be enlightened; for television and radio are unlikely to be in the same class with a well-run newspaper in telling what is happening and what it means. Television and radio are, moreover, controlled by a governmental agency, and one that does not inspire much confidence today.

A good many newspapers take seriously their responsibility to enlighen the people about current affairs. It is generally agreed that the best American papers are as good as any in the world and that the average is high. Our question is how to maintain the good newspapers in the faith and how to convert the others.

I think you should reconsider your opposition to the principal recommendation of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. That was that a new agency be established to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press. The Commission said, "It seems to us clear that some agency which reflects the ambitions of the American people for its press should exist for the purpose of comparing the accomplishments of the press with the aspirations which the people have for it. Such an agency would also educate the people as to the aspirations which they ought to have for the press." The Commission suggested that this agency be independent of government and of the press; that it be created by gifts; and that it be given a ten-year

trial, at the end of which an audit of its achievement could determine anew the institutional form best adapted to its purposes. The fact that the British Commission independently reached an identical recommendation seems to me highly significant.

Such an agency should contain representatives of the press; it should also contain laymen. My guess is that the weakness of the Press Council in Sweden results from the fact that it is composed entirely of representatives of the newspapers. I believe that the British Council will go the same way because the press rejected the recommendation of the Royal Commission that the Council should have lay members and a lay chairman. If its first report is suggestive of its future, this group is likely to manifest its fearless and high-principled character by speaking sternly to newspapers on trivial subjects.

The *Nieman Reports,* the Press Institute statements, A. J. Liebling's "Wayward Press," Bob Lasch in the *Progressive,* occasional studies by schools of journalism, these are all we have in this country. They are too casual and limited, and, since most of them are directed at the press, they do not perform one function that the Commission on the Freedom of the Press regarded as essential: they do not "educate the people as to the aspirations which they ought to have for the press."

Your own efforts to act as a critical agency have come to nothing. You appointed a committee in 1949 "to examine the desirability of sponsoring an appraisal of the self-improvement possibilities of American newspapers." The Committee reported in 1950 as follows: "Our Committee recognizes and reiterates that the American Society of Newspaper Editors is, itself, and must be, a continuing committee of the whole on self-examination and self-improvement. But, in addition, we urge the Society to call upon its Board of Directors to take whatever action may be necessary from time to time to clarify understanding of American newspapers by the public, and to keep editors alert to their responsibilities in fulfilling the public's right to an adequate, independent newspaper press."

That sounds as though it was written by a public relations man. In these sonorous sentences we hear the cadence of the psalms.

The great issues of our time are peace and freedom. A new critical agency might appraise the performance of the newspapers in correcting, or contributing to, our vast confusion on these subjects. We know that the peoples of the earth are now equipped to turn one another into radioactive cinders. Can you say that you have given Americans the material they need to reach a conclusion on the course they should follow, on the choice between co-existence and no existence, the choice between seeking peace through purchase and intimidation and seeking it through total, enforceable disarmament, the choice between competing nationalisms and world law?

And what of freedom in the garrison state? Since most of you take the official line, that the only important fact of life is our imminent danger from the international conspiracy, most of you have watched the erosion of freedom without a twinge. When the official line permitted, you have sallied forth, as when you gallantly led the troops from the rear in a belated attack on Senator McCarthy. You have filled the air with warnings of the sinister figures on the Left, but have printed almost nothing about the fat cats on the Right. You have allowed things to get to such a pass that some government departments now have guidance clinics in which the employee is taught how not to look like a security risk. Look at the Passport Division, interfering with the travel of Americans on their lawful occasions; at the Attorney-General's list, ruining the lives of thousands on the basis of hearsay; at the Post Office Department, saving us from *Pravda* and Aristophanes; at the State Department, adding the name of Corsi to those of Davies and Service and countless others. See the blacklist spreading in industry, merging with proposals that American Communists should be starved to death. Listen to the wiretapping, to the cry of Fifth Amendment Communist, to the kept witnesses roaming the land. The most distressing part of it is not that these things happen, but that the free press of this country appears to regard them as matters of routine.

You are educators, whether you like it or not. You make the views that people have of public affairs. No competition can shake you from that position. You will lose it only if you neglect or abandon it. As the number of papers per community declines, the responsibility of each one that remains increases. This is a responsibility that is discharged by being a newspaper, by giving the news. The editorial function is to make sure that it is given in such a way that it can be understood. The people must see the alternatives before them; otherwise they cannot be enlightened.

Enlightenment means telling the people where they are in time and space. It means engaging in systematic criticism. The criticism of current affairs has to be made in the light of some standard. This must be something more than a set of partisan slogans. The standard by which the American press must judge current events is derived from an understanding of and sympathy with the deepest aspirations of the American people, those for peace and freedom. A press that serves its country in this way need have no concern about the future.

The Hofer Factory Revisited

Seven years ago the editor of *Nieman Reports* published what seemed to him an extraordinary exhibit of an identical editorial appearing in 59 newspapers, without identification of its source. Its source was the *Industrial News Review,* a clip sheet of E. Hofer & Sons of Portland, Ore., distributed in the interests of private power companies and similar interests and financed by them.

Recently Denny Lowery examined the use of the Hofer releases in Colorado newspapers, for a report in a journalism course at the University of Colorado.

His report and illuminating correspondence about it were submitted to *Nieman Reports* by the dean of the college of journalism at Boulder, in the following letter:

To the Editor:

I thought that you would like to read and perhaps to make some use in *Nieman Reports* of Lowery's article, of Hofer's letter, and of Lowery's letter.

E & P would not use, or only in a short form, nor would *The Quill,* nor *Journalism Quarterly.* Nor, NEA's monthly. This kind of data should get about.

A. Gayle Waldrop,
Dean, College of Journalism,
University of Colorado

Prefabricated Public Opinion

The Industrial News Review In Colorado

by Denny Lowery

The Industrial News Review, published each week in Portland, Oregon, reaches 179 Colorado newspapers, according to the *Review's* own figures.

Almost 70 of the editors of those papers, in answering a recent questionnaire, stated very definite ideas about this free editorial service. When all of the opinions were in, the editors against INR seemed to have four bones to pick with the service, while those favoring the publication had four points to praise.

Maurice Leckenby, editor of the *Steamboat Pilot,* led off the long parade of those against INR. He stated, "I consider the *Industrial News Review* to be dynamite and propaganda that is not in the public good." However, Lyle Lindsmith's Englewood *Press* came back with "We are glad to know there are those who care about the free enterprise, captalistic system. We need more of its kind."

Otis Bourn's *Routt County Republican* expressed disfavor concerning E. Hofer & Sons' publication by saying "You will find a favorite expression of small newspapermen to be that such junk mail is filed in the wastebasket and replies sent to the effect that since no advertising was forthcoming, they should 'Board where they room.'"

However, the Aspen *Times,* edited by V. E. Ringle, noted: "The *Industrial News Review* is good. While it is pointed towards business, it gives lots of facts about problems most people never know."

Jack Wellenkotter, editor of the Alamosa *Courier* made still another charge against INR. He said "The *Industrial News Review* is very carefully and very thoroughly Republican in everything it contains. The *Review* openly calls Democrats 'power-hungry bureaucrats.' And I am a Democrat!"

But still on the political standpoint, James Dement of the Antonito *Ledger-News* said "Another 20 years of Roosevelt and Truman and we might as well join with the Reds and scrap our Constitution and Declaration Of Independence," and in addition, he stated "I like INR's treatment of the Socialistic trend and the warning of approaching Communism if we don't get back to a sound philosophy of government."

The Walsenburg *World-Independent* felt that INR is too biased to be of any value in conscientious public service, while the Buena Vista *Republican* said INR is "Good with relation to domineering, selfish labor activities."

The total result of the opinions went against INR. Fifty-two per cent of the answering editors felt the copy of INR had no value in the column of a newspaper. They cited various reasons including "harmful propaganda" and "unpaid advertising."

Naturally, not all of the 48 per cent who wrote in favor of INR (or at least did not denounce it) actually use its copy.

Marge Mundell Hale, assistant editor of the Denver *Record Stockman,* for instance, stated, "The *Industrial News Review* might be quite valuable editorial material," but "it does not apply as such for the *Record Stockman* for our newspaper is devoted entirely to the livestock industry and what affects it."

And Roscoe Bullard's Wray *Gazette* noted "Most of the time, (INR) isn't localized enough to be of special interest to a farming community such as we operate in."

Although Dale Cooley of the Limon *Leader* didn't favor the *Industrial News Review,* he did state very clearly one of the causes many editors cited for not using such copy. He said "There is a long chance that in not regularly pursuing this release, we are sometimes overlooking something which would be of actual news value, but the search for the wheat among the chaff requires so much time that the average country editor simply has more important things to do."

Fred Pottorf of the Holly *Chieftain* seconded this by saying "...I (as a one-man force) don't have the time to ferret out such copy."

Some of the other reasons given for not using the copy were lack of space in the paper, and lack of interest in such material among the subscribers.

Out of the 96 editors who returned the questionnaires, 32 said they did use INR copy, at least occasionally, and several stated they use 100 to 200 items a year.

Fifteen of the editors said they wrote many of their own editorials on ideas received from the *Review's* copy. Wallace Foster, of the Gunnison *News-Champion* said he merely lifted out INR figures which he could fit into his own editorials.

Several papers, such as Mary Morgan's Georgetown *Courier,* said they used the copy only for filler material.

Although less than one-third of the papers actually reprint the material regularly, over 60 per cent of the editors stated they did read the weekly releases.

According to the results of the questionnaire, most editors preferred to change the material before reprinting it. For every one editor who printed the copy just as he received it, four either rewrote it, changed the heading or made some other change.

If the percentage of the 32 papers using INR copy applied to all Colorado weekly papers, the *Review's* reprinted editorials would reach almost 100,000 Colorado subscribers a week.

In an attempt to get more material on INR's use in Colorado papers, the November 1954 issues of 87 Colorado papers were surveyed.

Out of the 87, only nine were found to use INR copy during that month. Only one daily paper was among the nine.

Most of the nine papers used the copy sparingly. Only one used it almost exclusively.

The presentation in the nine papers was slightly different from that of the original copy. The most frequent change was in the headings. None of the papers gave credit to INR for the material.

The *Industrial News Review* was established in 1913 in Portland, Oregon, by its present publishers, E. Hofer & Sons. At that time the Hofers were the publishers of the Portland *Daily Capitol Journal,* and INR was an outgrowth of the paper's editorial policy.

The service began slowly, being sent to a few weekly papers in the Portland area. Then local industry began to support it financially. The service was gradually enlarged throughout the Western states as more financial support from industry was secured. Finally in 1923, the service became national in scope. It is now sent to approximately 11,300 newspapers across the country.

The service consists of a monthly magazine and a five-page weekly selection of editorials and other features. It is sent to almost every type of newspaper published with the exception of metropolitan papers.

The weekly releases are made up of about 15 editorials and a section called "Grass Roots Opinions," which includes four or five short editorial excerpts from small daily and weekly papers around the country.

An editor may use as much of the copy as he wishes. He can change the copy in any way and is not required to give credit for it in his publication.

The purpose of the service is stated in the "To the Editor" section of each week's release as follows:

"The aim of the *Industrial News Review* is to advocate and encourage policies which it believes essential to the well-being of Our Country, the development of industry, the sound investment of savings, and the steady employment of American workers. Its editors express their personal convictions in discussing industrial and economic questions that affect business stability and social progress ..."

Also in the same section of the releases, the Hofers state their financial sources: "INR's weekly distribution," they say, "is supported financially by industry, business and professions, including public utilities, retailers, railroads, mines, manufacturers, food processors, petroleum, financial institutions, and others who believe that community prosperity and growth, sound government and reasonable taxation, must accompany individual and corporate prosperity."

Subjects for the INR editorials vary from dams to double-taxation and from roosters to railroads. But the main emphasis of the INR writers is placed on utilities, stock-ownership, retail distribution, Socialism, Communism, and the major industries such as oil, meat-packing, steel and coal.

The editorials run from about 100 words up to 500. They quote recognized sources, deal with problems often uppermost in the American mind, and naturally, they present the side of the subject-situation which favors industry.

Although the editorials range among a great many subjects, the writing style of the material is about the same in all. The INR writers appear to use a time-worn but sucessful gimmick—that of the "question" or "thought-provoking" lead, with fact and figures sandwiched in the middle of the editorial and the necessary conclusions to close it up.

The wording of the editorials, however, is very well done. The adjectives, verbs, and adverbs are the words that appear to carry the weight of the writer's thoughts. These words are strong and forceful—often so strong as to cause the reader to wonder at their use in the editorial.

For instance, INR stated the following about Socialism: "Human being are not like ants, they are individualistic in nature, and must have freedom to do their best. That is why Socialism and ant-like regimentation are not the answer to man's problem. To progress and gain contentment and profit from his work and at the same time preserve his individualism, is all important to him. He can't do this under ant-like Socialism."

And then, in another release, "Socialism depletes everybody's pockets, just as it undermines everybody's freedom and opportunity."

Words such as "ant-like" and "undermines" might derive no special notice when their source is known, but when reprinted in the nation's weekly press, their meanings and significance are greatly magnified.

INR advocates private, rather than government ownership of electric power systems. This subject is dwelt upon more than any other single aspect of industry by INR. Almost anything concerning the subject makes its way into the lines of INR copy, and the latest issue, and one of the most loudly proclaimed in the nation, is the Dixon- Yates Contract.

The *Industrial News Review* has not commented on the contract any more vehemently than many newspapers around the country. But the wording of some of the NIR editorials has no doubt carried great weight among many of their readers.

"In short," INR says, "the Democratic attack on the contract has been an ideological one, made by those who want socialized government power monopolies."

Jack Wellenkotter, the Democrat, quickly picked on that statement with the sarcastic phrase "As if the Dixon-Yates affair could ever be described 'in short.' "

Concerning taxes in one recent release, INR gave detailed statistics on individual tax costs now over individual taxes twenty years ago, but it failed to mention one word about the rise in government costs in those twenty years.

And commenting on labor, INR quoted a passage from the Versailles, Ky., *Woodford Sun*. "As we read on and on about union demands for 'fringe benefits,' paid vacations, shorter work weeks, guaranteed annual wages—in short, more and more for less and less—it is downright refreshing to be reassured now and then that the rank and file of American workers are truly interested in their jobs."

Several things came to mind concerning that passage. First, is not almost every "rank and file" American worker interested in "fringe benefits," "paid vacations," "shorter work weeks," and "annual wages?" And secondly, just who are the unions? Are they not made up of the "rank and file" of American workers?

The critics of INR range from the "lukewarm" editors who feel the service is a bit too one-sided to be editorially fair, to the "hot" editors who attack INR on the basis of "outright propaganda."

Louis M. Lyons, editor of *Nieman Reports,* explored the use of INR releases in the July 1948 issue of *Nieman Reports,* in an article entitled, "Editorial Writing Made Easy." He asked the question "What would be the reader's judgment of an editor who farmed out his editorials to some one else without letting them know? Suppose this some one else was an anonymous person not resident in their community or within a thousand miles of it—someone not working for the interest of their community or even the intrest of their newspaper—but working for some special interest with an axe to grind of which the readers are not told."

Lyons went on to berate newspapers using INR and similar copy without identifying its source, then named fifty-nine newspapers which had used a certain Hofer editorial concerning a speech by the president of Harvard University.

In concluding his article, Lyons stated "The medical profession has a procedure for malpractice. So do the lawyers. There is an American Newspaper Publishers Association and an American Society of Newspaper Editors, and there are ethical codes for journalism sponsored by these and by state press associations. This exhibit (the article) is offered to any who accept any responsibility in these matters."

Another critic of the *Review,* with a slightly different slant, is the editor of the Pleasant Hill (Mo.) *Times.* In an editorial reprinted in the Jan. 8, 1955, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* he said "Since 1913, the Hofers have been blanketing the rural press with essays on behalf of 'the essential well being of Our Country,' as they demurely phrase it." Then, "It just so happens that the essential well being of Our Country always coincides with the special interests of those industries—notably oil, power, railroads, shipping, and stock exchanges—which pay the tab for the Hofers."

And commenting on who receives the most benefits from INR he stated, "It is not the ink-stained chump who permits someone else to sell and collect for the space in his

newspaper; not Uncle Sam, who must rule this a legitimate, tax-deductable business expense; not even the clients, who really ought to know the influence bought from a newspaper that would go for canned editorials isn't worth postage. The winner, by a T.K.O. of everybody in the ring, is E. Hofer & Sons."

But, although INR seems to be attacked from every angle, it evidently has many, many editors who think highly of it and use its copy. The *Review* claims a reproduction of 1,894,318 inches of its copy in 1953, and of that total, 14,332 inches reprinted in Colorado. These figures suggest that not all editors follow the policy in regard to INR suggested by a Colorado editor who neglected to sign his name or indicate his paper: "An editor must think for himself."

Mr. Gayle Waldrop
Director, College of Journalism
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado
Dear Mr. Waldrop:

Thanks for sending us Denny Lowery's report in reply to our request. We have made two copies of it for our files, and are returning it to you.

We had expected the report to be of a more academic nature based on the actual facts as supplied by the newspapers and by us. Any judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, as to the merit of the work should have been stated clearly after a full presentation of the subject. As so many of us do, I'm afraid Mr. Lowery allowed his prejudices to greatly influence the factual content of the report.

We deal with economics, one of the social sciences, which branch of learning is unfortunately neither fish nor fowl. I took economics as my major in college and everywhere found an attempt being made to lend the subject an exactitude possible only with the physical sciences. This can not be done because, after all, any social science deals with the inter-relationship between people, who are influenced not so much by exact mathematics, as they are by feelings, customs, and personal judgments.

Mr. Lowery fell into the trap of allowing his personal economic convictions, based on a nebulous mistrust of private business and our free enterprise system, slop over to an alarming degree into what should have been a factual study of the *Industrial News Review*. I don't want to get into an ideological discussion. We are convinced that we can have political freedom and a representative form of government only by keeping the economic activity of the country in the hands of private citizens rather than government bodies. This has been proven often by the experiences of countless civilized societies through thousands of years of recorded history.

We feel strongly the importance of getting this idea before people generally in every part of the country. That's the only reason we're in this business. Any one of us could make as much or more money running a feed and seed store, or a grocery store, or selling automobiles, or any of a number of things that are purely commercial. I believe some of the economics books call it "psychic income." A person likes to be connected with an activity which he feels has some meaning or importance. That's probably why you are in the field of education.

There is one thing that we would like Mr. Lowery to understand, and that is that the material which we sent him, and which he should have made some effort to understand, gave as true a statement of our intentions and picture of our business as it was possible to give. Our editorial policy is not decided by the size of anybody's check. We discuss subjects which we believe are of importance to the country, and our editorial support cannot be bought like a half page advertisement any more than can editorial space in the newspapers with which we work. We turn down a great many subjects which simply do not fit our policy. Industries provide the support for our work, but industry does not tell us what to write. You or Mr. Lowery, or any editor in the country are more than welcome to come into our office any time and learn about any aspect of our publication in which you are interested. We have no secrets.

We do not like to have the integrity of the *Industrial News Review* questioned even by an uninformed person, but we never quarrel with anyone for disagreeing with our views. A divergence of opinion is a good thing. After all, a good rousing disagreement is what got this country started in the first place. I would suggest to Mr. Lowery, however, that he give the benefit of the doubt to any person whose intentions and basic integrity he sets out to judge. If he ever runs a newspaper he will soon find there would be no free press without private enterprise to support it—government in business furnishes no business for newspapers.

We have removed your name from our mailing list as requested.

Very truly yours,
L. V. Hofer

May 16, 1955

Mr. L. V. Hofer, Industrial News Review
1405 S. W. Harbor Drive
Portland 1, Oregon.

This morning, with great interest, I read your letter to Mr. A. Gayle Waldrop concerning my report on the *Industrial News Review* in Colorado.

To begin with, I agree with you on one point. The report was not as good is it should have been. When I first

began the study, I pictured the end-result as being a polished, smartly-written piece reflecting tremendous effort and a great amount of cautious analyzing, balancing, and the presentation of the facts. Although quite a bit of effort did actually go into the report, the facts would not allow themselves to be balanced, and the report came out saying two things: 1) A majority of Colorado editors do not appreciate the *Industrial News Review,* and 2) Through careful study of your releases, neither do I.

Now, on to the next point. One of the basic elements of any new concept or undertaking is constructive criticism. I appreciated your criticism of the report, although I did not consider it to be too constructive. Now, in the same vein, I would like to criticize your criticism.

1. In your letter, you stated the report was influenced by my "personal convictions, based on a nebulous mistrust of private business and our free enterprise system." Am I to assume then, that I am a misty, but budding Socialist?

My only answer to this point is that I have a faith in private business, and an admiration for free enterprise just as strong as you, or any other person in these United States.

If my report was prejudiced, or influenced to any degree, it probably stemmed from the reading of your releases, the research I did into your service, and the replies from the editors of Colorado newspapers—a very sincere and sensible lot, for the most part.

2. As to the factual content of the paper, you will find it quite valid. If there is any prejudice in the report, it is in the 38 lines (of a ten page report) where I commented on the wording and structure of your editorials.

3. In your paragraph concerning your editorial policy and finances, I might point to one sentence which was a very nice understatement. Industry might not tell you what to write, Mr. Hofer, but I'm sure you won't, and never have, "bitten the hand that feeds you" by criticizing some phase of industry. And I'm sure that you, as an economics major, will admit there are many phases of industry that need criticism.

4. This fourth point is not a criticism, but a question: When the study was first proposed, just what DID you expect the results to be?

I hope this letter will clear up a few misconceptions you have evidently drawn from the report. I will readily admit that I greatly lack experience in the field of gathering and preparing such reports, but as you say, Mr. Hofer, I expect "the benefit of the doubt" when my "intentions and basic integrity" are judged.

Denny Lowery
1112 Belford Ave.
Grand Junction, Colo.

"Nobody in His Right Mind —"

by Fred Brady

I know you want me to get to the lead on this piece. It's a simple one—newspaper is a barren and a bitter business.

I came here today to say to you: sell sports cars, be an evangelist, go out and do something electronic. Or at the worst, marry well if it will keep you out of newspaper.

Why would you want to go into it?

Perhaps you think it will let you spend your life among good, mad fellows. Well, that's possible.

Long before your time there was in New York a sports writer of note. But he had one twist. He was much given to the sauce. To be quite honest, he lived on Scotch and bananas. In Manhattan he had no trouble. But whenever he went out of town on a story he did. You know yourself how hard it is sometimes to find bananas.

But for years the good mad fellows he knew had always taken care of him. One of the crowd was always deputized to do a story for him. Inevitably came one night when they all forgot. I think it was in Newport at the start of the Bermuda race.

In any case everybody filed his own piece and forgot our friend. That night they were scattered all over town in different pubs and, inevitably, they all remembered our friend at once.

About 2 a.m. our friend wandered into the hotel with a message from his city desk. It said: "Fifth lead best one yet. Keep them coming."

Or perhaps you think newspaper will help you with your writing. Well, that's possible.

It is my own opinion that you'll never have to worry about the great stories. They write themselves. But to me, at least, the real test of writing is writing the commonplace.

Once a friend of mine who was a country reporter—and a country reporter is a good thing to remain wherever you go, if you can—went out on one of the most commonplace of stories: a small boy killed by a car.

In those days it was a country reporter's job to get a picture. My friend waited for the boy's parents to return from the hospital. He explained what he wanted. The father gave him a picture and he left.

But my friend had only stepped into the hall when he overheard a line. The man turned to his wife and said:

"The house is empty."

So, perhaps you can help your writing once you learn to listen.

As for the great stories, the one I remember was done by Henry McLemore who was then a sports writer for the UP. There was once a town in Texas, population millionaires exclusively or nearly so. In any event everyone who lived there was tremendously wealthy.

One day the school blew up and killed hundreds of the children.

Of course all the big name writers were flown there. The UP sent McLemore. The big name boys covered it like a blanket. As you would expect their pieces were highly creditable. But I found them a little purple, a little reaching.

McLemore in those days was a man who didn't write fast. Most of the big name boys were long since finished and he was still struggling with a lead. But he got it.

McLemore wrote: "The richest town in the world tonight is the poorest."

Perhaps you think, being young, that newspaper can help you strike a blow for freedom. Well, that's possible.

One of my good friends is Peter Carroll, the Associated Press photographer who made all the famous first pictures of D-Day on Omaha Beach. You remember, one of them was used for a stamp, the one showing troops marching under the Arc de Triomphe. Peter got kissed by the President of France and awarded the Legion of Honor for those pictures.

Last year I happened to be in Normandy for the 10th anniversary of D-Day. And I ran into an old colonel who'd been the G-2, the intelligence officer for Pete's sector of the beach.

The colonel and I were talking about Peter and I said something about how amazing those first pictures were.

The colonel said: "Well, it's true they were the first pictures. But they weren't really the first Pete could have made. He didn't make any for a while. He was too busy helping carry back the wounded. When we first hit the beach Pete was one of the best corpsmen we had."

Well, that's newspaper.. Nobody in his right mind would go into it. But, as I've tried to suggest, I've known men to go into it because they were in their right heart.

At its worst newspaper is a factory bench like any other, if you see it that way. At its best it's a fellowship of uneducated men—at least they're uneducated in the ways of getting on, the little paths to success, the door to the divine buck or the bootlicking.

Newspaper is one of the poorest trades in the world, but it has a minimum of bowing.

Fred Brady is on the Boston *Herald*. These lines are from a talk he made to the Boston University journalism class conducted by his colleague, Wellington Wales.

News Is a Problem for Religious Education

by James W. Carty, Jr.

One of the most serious deficiencies in theological education today is the absence, under-emphasis, or misteaching of courses in communications.

Seminaries largely are failing to teach ministerial and religious education majors how to write and speak effectively. The schools are not helping the students to arrive at a mature philosophy of church public relations.

These curricular lacks are seen in the undeveloped sermons preached weekly and in the amateurish use of radio and television. The failings are reflected, moreover, in the inferior quality of parish papers, church bulletins, press releases, posters, letters, advertisements, church histories, scrap books and arrangements of outdoor bulletin boards. The style of most religious books is so belabored and unreadable that laymen find it difficult to understand the writings, and the religiously illiterate masses are not reached.

Ministers and religious education directors increasingly are aware of the need for training and continued reading in the field of mass communications. This hunger for more knowledge about a special area expresses itself in various ways.

Approximately 425 church leaders and students from Nashville and Middle Tennessee have attended the two annual religious journalism seminars sponsored by the Nashville *Tennessean,* in 1954 and 1955. Other papers also are setting up seminars, partly because the editors realize that seminaries are failing to set up summer workshops with short-term courses for ministers already graduated without the benefit of needed courses in communications. The Methodist Information Commission has sponsored valuable regional workshops in public relations.

A growing number of universities and seminaries are offering courses in religious journalism. At Syracuse University, Dr. Roland Wolsely has been a pioneer. Scarritt College for Christian Workers at Nashville offered courses under Webb Garrison, of the Methodist board of education, during the current year, and plans to continue them under this writer during 1955-56.

Increasingly more church news is being printed. Many newspapers carry the weekly interpretative article and other special features of George Cornell of the Associated Press. The Chicago *Daily News,* Louisville *Courier-Journal,* Nashville *Tennessean* and other newspapers have the weekly article on the general theme of "A Reporter Goes To Church." The annual pre-Easter laymen's series originated by the *Tennessean* five years ago on the general theme, "What My Religion Means To Me" is widely used now by many newspapers.

Despite the growing cooperation of leaders of churches and newspapers, there is still hazy thinking of church leaders about the relation of pulpit and press. The unprofession-

al attitude of some ministers toward communication agencies is discouraging.

It irritates newspapermen for news chairmen, from religious institutions, to enter the office and say, "Here is some publicity," as if they thought the press should be promoting them. Newspapers strive to print news and not "publicity." The sooner leaders of all organizations, including churches, drop the use of "publicity," the better their relationships will become with editorial staff employes.

An underlying factor of the use of publicity is the fact the user does not know what constitutes news. Some church leaders conceive of sermon titles as being the news to fill a church page. They think editors are back in the period three decades ago when the only church news consisted of a fight or church controversy, a crusading evangelist, or a Sunday school teacher turned robber.

Religious journalism on newspapers has moved ahead to more comprehensive treatment of church events. Trends, growth of congregations, new building programs, election of officers, employment of new personnel, conventions, and interviews of authorities and world travelers are among the many types of church stories being used.

Church leaders must not fail to seize upon this opportunity to take advantage of the hunger of readers for religious news and the responsiveness of editors to this growing reader appeal. *Every seminary should require that all students take a course or series of courses in communications.*

The communications work would cover both the theory of communications and public relations and laboratory experience in the preparation of press releases, sermons and radio-television talks, church histories, scrap books, congregation bulletins, parish papers, and other audio-visuals. A writing course in journalism school requires thousands of words of writing of high quality. Seminary instructors in preaching and journalism courses need to require this same intensive and rigorous program if students are going to acquire a discipline that will have a chance of continuing in later life.

The student of the theory of communications will realize the people's right to know about the congregation's activities.

Every church has public relations whether it thinks it does or not. The relations may be conscious or unconscious, systematic or unsystematic, planned or unplanned, effective or ineffective in regard to advancing the Kingdom of God on earth. Refusal to acknowledge the need for a planned program of interpretation will mean that developments will be haphazard. By declining to cooperate in an interpretative program, the church leaders in effect say they do not care whether the opinions of people about them are true or fair or complete.

The most effective public relations work consists of a vital, dynamic religious program. Such a program will speak for itself as to whether or not it is worthy of interpretation and development. It will use all ethical devices in interpreting itself.

Church men should be accurate and complete in their preparation of sermons and news releases. Sometimes, newspapermen, working under great pressures of time, will be accused of inaccuracy. I find many press releases contain inaccurate information.

The laboratory course would call for students to visit newspapers, radio and television stations, and see the operations. Many church leaders have no conception of pro-operations. Many church leaders have no conception of one seasonal holiday, the *Tennessean* sent out forms asking for information for our roundup of special services. The form carried a deadline. The day after the roundup appeared and on the eve of the holiday, one minister came into the office and wanted a separate story on his own church done apart from the general story. Told that only one edition was being printed and that the presses had been rolling for five minutes, he asked if we couldn't stop them long enough to insert his story.

Perhaps theological schools have held back from more course offerings in communications, because they think religious journalism is practical and no practical course can be of lasting value. I think it is an extremely sad commentary on religious education that I learned a tremendous amount about the workings of social, welfare, health and recreation agencies and ways of cooperating with them while attending a journalism school and not while going to a divinity school.

Schools tend to assume that if people have knowledge they will communicate effectively. They are aware of the dangers of the sophists who learned communication techniques but lack knowledge. However, general knowledge about church history, theology and Bible does not guarantee the possessor will speak and write effectively.

Perhaps one reason schools hold back is the lack of specialists who are teachers. Most communities have full-time editors or radio and television men who would teach part time.

On my church beat I find some of the best preaching that is available anywhere—and some not quite so good. I also find a growing consciousness of religious journalism and an increase of knowledge and use about it by church leaders. Seminaries in regular course and in summer workshops and other institutes, and church-related colleges, should help this trend, by moving forward more rapidly into this area of mass communications.

James W. Carty, Jr., is religious editor of the Nashville *Tennessean*. He is also teaching religious journalism at Scarritt College this summer.

The Seven Deadly Virtues

By Wallace Carroll

The times demand drastic changes in our ways of doing things, and the time factor makes it imperative that we move swiftly—much more swiftly than we are moving today.

For generations we Americans were a race of spectators. We sat in the grandstand and watched the game from a safe and sanitary distance, and we were amused or vexed, excited or bored, as the circumstances might suggest, but always serene in the awareness that for us it was only a game. This was largely true whether the game was being played in our own home town or on the playing fields of Europe.

That's not the way it is today—is it? Today we are out of the stands and down on the field, and our nose is being rubbed in mud on every play. We have learned that we can't go very far with the muscles and brains we developed in grandstand sitting.

So revolutionary a change in the role of the American citizen was bound to have its effect on American newspapers. For many years we newspapermen had given the American reader the kind of newspaper he wanted—a newspaper for the spectator. That kind of paper is no longer good enough. Today we must produce a newspaper for the citizen. We must produce a newspaper which will help the reader work out his answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?"

The American press has many fine qualities, and if any layman should take what I am saying out of context, I will give him those qualities between the eyes.

But as a newspaperman who believes that the men and women who gather and edit the news will have much to do with the survival of our society, I fear that the transition to the newspaper of the future is being made too slowly, much too slowly.

Every branch of news gathering and dissemination is still the prisoner of our spectator past. Both the ink and the vacuum tube branches are the victims of taboos and fetishes which they themselves have created. And some of the very virtues of American journalism have, I am afraid, become deadly virtues—almost as deadly as sin itself.

Deadly Virtue No. 1—"Objectivity"

What is "objectivity?" It is a discipline which reporters, editors and publishers impose upon themselves to keep their own feelings from affecting the presentation of the news. Objectivity is therefore a fine ideal.

For more than 100 years American newspapers have been progressing toward this ideal. If you would examine the intensely partisan and sometimes venal newspapers of a century ago, you would see how far our newspapers have come. And if you went across the country and talked to newspapermen everywhere and analyzed their writings, you would find very few who were not striving to live up to the ideal of objectivity as they understand it.

Then what is my objection to "objectivity?"

I have no objection to the ideal itself but only to our rigid and almost doctrinaire interpretation of objectivity. It seems to me that this narrow concept of objectivity sometimes brings us pretty close to the borders of irresponsibility. Too often our objectivity is simply the objectivity of the half-truth.

Among the American newspapermen who have been debating this subject there seem to be two divisions. The first might be called the fundamentalists, or the apostles of the literal word; the second, the liberal interpreters.

The fundamentalists believe that bias is inseparable from human nature and that reporters are at least as human as the rest of men. So reporters, they say, should simply get the facts and present them with as much detachment as they can, but should not try to fill in the background, interpret or analyze, especially when they are handling an explosive subject. The reader can be left to figure out the meaning of the facts for himself, or the editorial writers can help him out in a day or two.

The liberal interpreters believe that this strict interpretation of objectivity leads to serious abuses. They argue that, especially in times like these, a newspaper is not doing its job if it merely gives the reader "one or two dimensional reporting;" it must add a third dimension—*meaning*. Consequently, newspapers should encourage reporters to dig down through the surface facts and fill in the background, interpret and analyze.

To the liberal interpreters it seems that the fundamentalists would permit the reporter to report the spiel of the gold brick salesman but not to point out that the clay is showing through a crack in the gilt.

Why, they ask, should newspapermen refrain from putting a twist on the ball and then permit some one else to pitch the reader a curve?

Eric Sevareid put it this way:

"Our rigid formulae of so-called objectivity, beginning with the wire agency bulletins and reports—the warp and woof of what the papers print and the broadcasters voice—our flat, one-dimensional handling of the news, have given the lie the same prominence and impact that truth is given; they have elevated the influence of fools to that of wise men; the ignorant to the level of the learned; the evil to the level of the good."

These comments of Mr. Sevareid, like much of the recent debate on objectivity, were inspired in part by the tactics of Senator McCarthy. The debate, as you might expect, has been heated and confused.

But now that McCarthyism, as some one has said, has ceased to be an *ism* and become a *wasm,* we may be able to make more progress.

I am sure that if a scholarly study were made of the part played by American newspapers in the rise of Senator McCarthy, it would show that the Senator understood the deadly virtues of the American press much more clearly than we do ourselves. Such a study would show, I am sure, that Senator McCarthy was able to exploit our rigid "objectivity" (and another deadly virtue which I shall mention in a minute) in such a way as to make the newspapers his accomplices.

That is why I say that objectivity interpreted too literally can approach the borders of irresponsibility.

But we may be able to comprehend this problem of journalism a little more clearly if we keep it away from McCarthyism. Let me take an example of misguided objectivity—an imperfect example but one which came within my recent experience.

Several months ago our county held a referendum to decide whether voting machines should be acquired and used in future elections. On the day before the referendum and shortly before the deadline for our afternoon paper, two of the county commissioners released a statement that if the vote went in favor of voting machines the county tax rate would have to be raised. We printed the story in the afternoon paper under a headline about the possible increase in the tax rate.

In the referendum the next day, voting machines were rejected by a margin of about 100 votes. The people who had favored the machines said that our story had swung the election. I think they were right.

Now what was wrong with that? We had merely reported the statement of the commissioners and we had reported it "objectively."

The trouble was that the commissioners had raised a new issue on the very eve of the election, and as you know, not even atom bombs will scare voters so thoroughly as an increase in the county tax rate.

So I think there were two things we might have done if we had wanted to be truly objective. The first would have been to get together as quickly as possible some information on the other side of the case; this could have been used in a balanced story under a balanced headline. If time did not permit this, we might have held the story for the morning paper and presented a balanced roundup of the arguments on both sides, including the tax-rate issue together with what people on the other side would have said about it. Actually, we did print such a story in the morning paper, but the afternoon story did the damage.

Now this, as I said, is not a perfect example of misguided objectivity, but it does show you that not only Senator McCarthy but much less sinister people can use the press for their purposes if we apply our rules without a sense of responsibility.

And surely fundamentalists and liberals ought to be able to agree on this one point of principle: that any practice or any part of our code which permits newspapers to be "used" should be carefully reconsidered.

Now, let's look at one more example of "objective reporting"—this time a story by a master reporter who has done more than any other newspaperman to free us from some of our archaic practices.

In the 1948 presidential campaign, Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate, made a speech in which he claimed that he was the author of the bi-partisan foreign policy.

James B. Reston of the New York *Times* covered the speech and reported Mr. Dewey's claim. But Reston went further. He dug into the memoirs of Cordell Hull and reported in a side-bar story what Mr. Hull had said about the origins of the bi-partisan foreign policy. From Mr. Hull's account it appeared that Mr. Dewey had been guilty of some highly slanted reporting.

Mr. Reston's story must have shocked some of the fundamentalists. In their book, he was probably guilty of "editorializing." But when a reporter has solid evidence that a statement is misleading, should he merely report the statement or should he give the reader the benefit of his additional knowlege?

The times are serious enough and American newspapermen are mature enough for us to apply to ourselves a stricter discipline than that required for the old objectivity.

And as we make the transition, let us lay down certain safeguards. First, we must resolve that in bringing a third dimension to reporting, we shall subject every one—Republican or Democrat, industrialist or labor leader, legislator, businessman or football coach— to the same treatment. Secondly, we must find, train and pay the kind of reporters who can do three dimensional reporting. Thirdly, we must back them up, not with the routine editing of the copy desk, but with the best editing skill of which we are capable.

Deadly Virtue No. 2—Speed

The speed with which we work in the news business is still something of a marvel. A key is pressed on a transmitter in London, Paris or Frankfort and simultaneously news starts to arrive in the New York office of a press association. Readers of the American newspapers often know about events in other countries even before the people of those countries are aware of what has happened.

The speed with which news is gathered, transmitted and turned into print is, of course, a very important element in our business. News is a perishable commodity, and news

sells newspapers. Every newspaper in the country is in competition for people's news interest, if not with other newspapers, then with radio and television. No American newspaper or press association can put spot news in the deep freeze and hope to prosper.

But speed has unfortunate consequences. Speed leads to many of the inaccuracies for which people criticize newspapers. And speed is at the basis of much of the shallow reporting which I am convinced we must overcome if we are to strengthen our hold on the reading public.

The reporter who runs to the telephone with the latest "peace offer" from the Kremlin or the latest denunciation before a Congressional committee must, of necessity, be rigidly "objective." He has only enough time and breath to give the bare facts, however misleading or meaningless they may be. Thus speed is one of the factors that have put us in the straitjacket of objectivity.

We can, and often do, deliver a fact so speedily that the meaning never catches up. We have also seen how ruinous accusations against a man in public life can get such a running start that the rebuttal never quite overtakes them.

This is especially true, as some of my colleagues have pointed out, when the rebuttal is complex. An accusation of treason is a hard, brutal fact which makes an effective headline. But the answer—in which the victim tries to explain the circumstances in which he made certain statements, the reason he was seen with certain people at certain times, and the climate of opinion when these things occurred—may not make an equally arresting headline or a story for the hit-and-run reader.

Thoughtful editors and reporters have been concerned for a long time with the imperfections caused by speed in our news report. Some of their concern has been reflected in the work of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.

In the Army-McCarthy hearings, for example, a number of editors pointed out that the press association stories from Washington reflected a little too faithfully the confusion in the committee room. Here was a chance, they argued, for newspapers to do what television was not doing—we could take some of the confusion out of the hearings. The management of the Associated Press welcomed their suggestions, and as a result, the AP began to relate the testimony and maneuvers to the basic charges and issues. Very little, if any, speed was lost in doing this, and the news stories gained in clarity and meaning.

I remember a discussion I once had on this problem of meaning with one of America's finest foreign correspondents, the late John T. Whitaker.

"After all," he said, "there's only one real difference between a newspaperman and a stenographer: a newspaperman makes the *point* of the story."

If all we want is the speedy delivery of facts, we can hire stenographers to do the job for us. But that is not the kind of job that needs to be done.

In the past we have usually thought of two broad areas of news coverage—spot news and features. In the future we shall have to give more and more time and effort to a third category—news in depth, three-dimensional news, or news with meaning. If we fail to do this, a large and influential part of our audience will turn to television, the news magazines and the weekly and monthly publications for the satisfaction of its widening interests.

The perfection of our techniques in this broadening area is one of the challenges that face your generation of newspapermen.

Deadly Virtue No. 3—Super-abundance

The American newspaper truly prints all the news that fits. And this is an awe-inspiring quantity of news.

Take the newspapers which I edit in a town of 90,000 people. On a weekly morning we publish about 90 columns of news and feature material. That is roughly 90,000 words, the wordage of a fair-sized novel. An issue of the Sunday paper will contain about 220 columns of news and features, or roughly 220,000 words. The big metropolitan newspapers, of course, carry two or three times this quantity of news.

And look at the kinds of news we print. We have community news, state news, national news and world news. We have the weather, the stock markets, the public records. We have the news of sports and society, the births, deaths, marriages and engagements. And we have the news of radio, television, movies and the theater.

It is an admirable accomplishment to turn out this volume of information every day of the week. And the fact that newspaper circulations continue to rise is a sign that people want it and like it.

But the very volume of news is bound to bewilder. The more leisure our technology brings us, the less time we have to think. The conscientious citizen—and there are many conscientious citizens— picks up his paper and finds interesting and entertaining facts from all parts of the world. But how much does this volume of news help him with his heavy responsibilities as a citizen? How much does the news about his city, county and state governments, about Congress and the Administration, about the United Nations and the world outside, help him with his question, "What must I do to be saved?"

That very great newspaper—the *Times* of London—meets this problem in a remarkable way. You open up the *Times* in the middle, and there on the right is the editorial page and on the left the main news page. You turn over the main news page and you find the second news

page. In these three pages the reader may gather all the information he needs to make him a well-informed subject of her Majesty the Queen.

But the *Times* is a unique institution which has developed under conditions peculiar to Britain.

We do, however, have some good things in this country, too.

Do you read the Review of the Week in the Sunday New York *Times*? It is a wonderful piece of journalism and a great service to the citizen. Here in two tightly edited pages you can catch up with the essential facts of the week plus the background and the meaning.

I wish that every paper in the country could serve its readers as well as this.

Perhaps we shall be able to do that in time. And perhaps each paper in its own fashion will find ways to deal with this problem of all the news that fits—the abundance that bewilders.

The means to that end has already been indicated by our examination of the related problems of objectivity and speed. We need more men and women of high calibre than we have been getting—men and women with talent and imagination. We must make these men and women see the challenge in today's journalism and we must find the resources to make their jobs attractive to them. And we must train them to stand above the torrent of facts and figures and tell the reader the vital and exciting things that are the real news.

In the coming years the job of the editor more than ever before will be to rise above the daily battle and help the reader and the citizen understand what it is all about.

Deadly Virtue No. 4—Prefabricated Prose

From coast to coast, the writing in American newspapers is about as juicy as a tootsie roll.

What do you find in a news story when you dissect it? ... A lead sentence with the back end forward; adverbs stuck in awkward positions ("today" and "tomorrow" are always with us and always ahead of the verb); bits of identification strewn about at random (the defendant swore that he did not murder Bertha Blagg, 36); nouns used as verbs (nobody ever talks to a man when he can *contact* him); clumsy and standardized synonyms used to avoid repetition (it takes a heap o' somethin' to make a house a *structure*—or a flood an *inundation*); archaic words (slay) and tired words from tabloids (probe)—and the whole thing held together with a liberal cement of bromides and cliches.

All this would be bad enough if it were only the aberration of individuals. But this mishmash is a "style" sanctified by the sweat of the copy desk ever since Greeley stayed East and therefore as little subject to improvement as the language of the Psalms.

I have been a newspaperman for more than a quarter of a century, but I find it hard to read many news stories on relatively simple subjects and still harder to retain what is in them.

Why do we do this to our readers and ourselves?

Why is it that every reporter talks a better story than he writes? You can go into any court house or any state capitol or into the lobbies in Washington and hear reporters talk shrewdly and entertainingly about what is happening on their beat. The stuff of their conversation is the raw material of exciting journalism and much of it is publishable.

Why, then, don't they write it? The answer is that it just doesn't seem to fit into those standardized little paragraphs that make up a "news story."

This situation is not funny. It is dangerous.

The newspaper of the future must not be a solid newspaper—it must be exciting and entertaining and therefore *readable*. Newspapers are locked in fierce competition with other media for people's time, money and esteem. As television does a better and better job of news coverage, as the news magazines and the picture magazines dig into significant events, newspapers will look more and more shoddy unless they take more pride than they have ever taken before in their writing.

But there is another danger in prefabricated prose. The kind of writing that we accept today is not adequate to the times. The sweeping and subtle events that are going on around us simply will not fit into the existing formula. Today we must be able to describe trends and moods which have no handy "today angle." Only if we free ourselves from tyranny of our own news "styles" will we be able to do the job.

"Take care of the sense," said the Duchess to Alice, "and the sounds will take care of themselves."

That is good practical advice, even though it comes from Wonderland.

Deadly Virtue No. 5—The Nickel Crusade

When I was in college I had a professor of journalism who used to tell us stories of the great crusading newspapers. How I wanted to work for one of those papers! I believed that a newspaper which did not fight for the right in every edition was hardly worthy to exist.

Now that I'm older I have grown skeptical of "crusading." Today, I must confess, my heart no longer leaps up when I behold an editor or publisher take off like a jet-propelled Peter the Hermit to fire the conscience of Christendom, or, at least, of the circulation area. Too many crusades, I suspect, have their origin in problems of circulation, in the pet irritation of a publisher or in a rush of self-righteousness to the head of some one or other.

Several years ago I served on a committee which screened

the candidates for one of the national honors conferred on newspapermen. One of the candidates was a breezy police reporter who based his application on a "crusade" he had conducted for his paper—an exposure of graft and inefficiency in one of the departments of the state government.

After we had read his written entry, another member of the committee and I questioned him.

"As you went along on this story," I said, "did you change some of the opinions you had at the beginning?"

He looked at me for a few moments as if wondering how much he ought to tell me. Then he said:

"My answer is going to surprise you. You know, there wasn't anything really wrong with that department. Oh, there was a guy up in the northern part of the state who'd been appointed by another governor and he was putting away a few bucks. But the guy at the head of the department was okay. He was doing a swell job."

At this point my colleague couldn't help breaking in: "Did your newspaper ever say anything like that in its news or editorial columns?" he asked.

"Oh, no," said the reporter. "Our managing editor is a very realistic guy. He wasn't going to back down for anybody."

I wonder how many crusades have been like that. Reporters are an honest breed, but how many of them can keep their heads when their editor or publisher is urging them on to glory?

Should a newspaper, then, remain indifferent to corruption in government, inefficiency in the public service and injustice in society?

By no means. Let me read you what William King Hoyt, the publisher of the Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel,* recently said on this subject:

"The newspaper crusade is a phenomenon that may have outlived its usefulness. To some newspaper people that might sound like something akin to heresy. There is a greater-than-ever need for careful, intelligent digging behind the scenes for acts and happenings that are not apparent on the surface or to the naked eye. There is plenty of room for thorough, unbiased, non-partisan investigation by skilled reporters. This kind of investigative reporting takes time, enthusiasm, hard work, patience and skill. But it should be done in the spirit of fact-finding and research rather than in the crusading, emotional approach of the partisan."

"Careful, intelligent digging . . . in the spirit of fact-finding and research"—that is what we need.

I believe that every newspaper which can afford it should have at least one reporter who specializes in investigation. Such a reporter should never be assigned to "get" somebody or expose something. He should be sent out to get the facts and present them in as fair and balanced a way as he is able. In this work he should have the close collaboration of his editor—the editor making sure that controversial angles are re-checked, that every one involved has been given a chance to tell his story and that the final product is as fair and honest as human being can make it.

This kind of investigative reporting, I can tell you, will win a newspaper more genuine respect and prestige than any amount of spread-eagle crusading.

Let me add a footnote about a dream that Mr. Hoyt and I have often talked about. We would like to see a number of good newspapers pool their investigators on stories of national importance which call for thorough, impartial investigation. We talked about this idea, for example, during the last presidential campaign when we read about the personal funds set up for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Stevenson by their friends.

Suppose that a number of newspapers of different political views would assign their investigators to make a combined effort on a story of this kind. Wouldn't the result be a real service to the American citizen—and exciting journalism as well?

Deadly Virtue No. 6—Purity Beyond Price

Humbert Wolfe, the British poet who was also a newspaperman, once wrote some lines that went about like this:

> You cannot hope to bribe or twist—
> Thank God!—the British journalist;
> But seeing what the man unbribed will do
> There's no occasion to!

The integrity of American newspapers is now so clearly established that we newspapermen have no need to carry a chip on our shoulders.

I know that reporters, editors and publishers are still subjected to threats, blandishments, social pressures and boycotts. And I know that reporters, editors and publishers take these pressures in their stride and do an honest job of presenting the news. If a man's name appears on a police blotter, it does not matter whether he is a big advertiser, an occasional bridge partner or a bum—he will get the news treatment that his offense calls for.

Now, being so secure in our own incorruptibility, shouldn't we begin to give a little more thought to the social consequences of what we do? Shouldn't we be thinking a bit about stories which we would never suppress under pressure but which may hurt the innocent or scandalize the community? Shouldn't we be a little less assertive about our legal rights and give a little more weight to our moral responsibilities?

I must confess that I do not have an answer to these questions, and I am afraid that I never shall reach a satisfactory answer.

I am thinking of suicide cases in which uninhibited reporting is sure to increase the grief and shame of the

family . . . of cases in which the head of a family is arrested or killed under shameful circumstances . . . of court testimony (such as we faced in the Jelke case) which may have little bearing on the question of guilt or innocence but which may needlessly damage reputations and bring shame to innocent people.

I have talked to editors—and I respect them—who maintain that they will not monkey with the public records. It is their practice to print everything of record which they consider legitimate news.

I have heard of other editors who have taken the liberty of withholding news or toning down stories which they felt might wound the innocent. I respect them, too, though I feel that if only the people who can get to the editor will benefit from his compassion, an injustice of another kind is done to others in similar circumstances.

What I am leading up to in this painful way is this: We know too little about the effects on society of the publication of certain kinds of news. Perhaps in the years ahead, social scientists, jurists or researchers will find evidence that some of our present news practices are harmful. If that should happen, I hope that newspapermen will not take a self-righteous stand upon legality. I hope that they will study the evidence and give fresh thought to their moral obligations to society.

This point is important not only for society but for the newspapers, because the personality that a newspaper presents to its readers is important. The newspaper of the future must not only be incorruptible. It must have a heart and soul. As you progress in your profession I hope future editors will find a way of being honest without being cruel.

Deadly Virtue No. 7—? ? ?

Now what is my seventh deadly virtue?

At this point I shall turn to Father William in slight paraphrase:

"I have answered six questions, and that is enough,"
Said his father: "Don't give yourself airs!
Do you think I can listen all day to such stuff?
Be off, or I'll kick you down stairs!"

This is a democratic country and I think anyone is entitled to nominate one candidate in seven.

In fact, anyone who will read the newspapers a little more carefully than usual during the next few weeks may want to revise my list considerably and make up his own version of the seven deadly virtues of American news journalism.

The American newspaper of today is better than the newspaper of 10 or 20 years ago. The newspaper of 1965 will be far better than the newspaper we know today. If I may retreat a little from what I said at the beginning, the elders of the press still have a powerful kick, and many of them are working and planning to give the American reader the kind of newspaper he needs to satisfy his broadening tastes and meet his obligations in this new world.

The newspaper of the future will be a newspaper with a mass appeal. It will have all the news that fits and contain something for everybody. But it will make a special appeal to the conscientious citizen—and there are more conscientious citizens than we sometimes think and still more who would like to be conscientious if we would help them a little.

I was talking the other day with a brilliant young pathologist who is on the board of admissions of a first-class medical school.

"We still have boys applying for admission," he said, "who say they want to be a doctor because they want to serve humanity. It embarrasses me when they say that. I think the greatest opportunity to serve humanity today is in the field of journalism. If you really consider the job of political education that needs to be done, the health of this country and of the world is in the hands of American newspapermen."

You might want to think about that.

Wallace Carroll is executive editor of the Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel*.

WGBH-TV (Channel 2) and FM Boston, May 16

James Morgan

Dec. 18, 1861 — May 12, 1955

Friday I was away when the passing of James Morgan and Michael Hennessy of the *Globe* was in the news. As the news runs, that is now time past. Also the memoirs by their colleagues that the *Globe* published Friday and Sunday leave little for a late comer to say. I too was a colleague for 25 years and simply wish to be recorded.

James Morgan was 93, Mike Hennessy 88. They died the same day. Recently A. J. Philpott of the *Globe* died at past 90. Frank P. Sibley, who was the star reporter when I was a cub, had gone only a little before.

Their names and their lives through these many years gave continuity and stability and character to the paper, and a newspaper is an institution that lives by these qualities. A very human institution.

James Morgan over these many, many years had imparted to the *Globe* all that was best and richest in its character. His great humaneness, his wisdom, his immense knowledge and his limitless range of interests were incomparable. He educated all of us—the most educational force in my life. Others would say the same. The key editors and writers on the paper, now, were brought up by James Morgan—L. L. Winship, the managing editor, Willard DeLue, their roving reporter, Lucien Price and Jim Powers, their key editorial writers, and many more.

The best talk anyone could encounter anywhere was in the *Globe* office, because James Morgan was there. Just to sit in on editorial conferences with him was a liberal education. A memo from him on a story suggestion was as good as a college lecture. Luncheon with James was always a delightful seminar, and he came in to lunch with some of us once a week through his seventies and eighties, even after he had ceased regular work days at the paper. He had been everywhere, seen everything, known everybody, and never lost his zest.

Twice in his late years I had him out to talk to the Nieman Fellows. Each was a memorable experience for all of us. Once he told us the story of the convention that nominated Bryan. He had reported it. Once he told us about the opening of Oklahoma Territory. He had covered that too.

He had reported every national political convention from Cleveland to Truman. An inveterate traveller, he took to the airplane at 90 and that same year began to use a typewriter.

His utter simplicity molded his style. He had an old-fashioned charm and complete courtesy that I associated with his Kentucky origin. He had begun as a telegrapher when the telegrapher's key had the magic, to a boy, of today's space ship. He was, of course, self educated; so he never lost his sense of practicality.

He had a canny sense of the shape of things. It was this in 1918 that led the *Globe* to wait when all the other papers elected Hughes—but the *Globe* said the election was in doubt, as it was for two days. My last election night with him was 1944, and his bump of caution then, when to the rest of us the tide seemed set, was to say, "Let's wait for Minnesota, it ought to be along soon." It was and he was satisfied then to let her go with the headline of a Democratic sweep.

It was incredible that the quality of his mind was as keen in his nineties as earlier, and as Lucien Price wrote in yesterday's *Globe,* his writing quality even improved in his final years.

Only last month he contributed to the *Globe* an article that I believe was prophetic. Its title: Are People Tiring of the Cold War? He created the Uncle Dudley editorial column in the *Globe* and its characteristic informed philosophical kind of discussion reflected James Morgan.

It is hard to account for so deep and pervasive an influence in so mild a man. One factor was his very mildness, his calm in a business that is so often frenetic. When he closed the door for the conference the clack and jangle of the news shop was shut out. Then he infused all with a sense of history. Nothing was so new that it did not piece on to a pattern. He never had an office that would hold more than three chairs. Some of us would sit on the desk. He shared a desk with the Sunday editor. All he needed were the papers and a place to talk things over.

He remained from choice a writer all his life. He had held every editorial post on the paper, but he avoided executive work. He preferred to train younger men to be the editors. He cared nothing for power or notoriety. This freed him to use his mind and his pen and to travel and know his times. But it limited the force he might have been to shape the paper that occupied so much of his life. His contribution was his influence on the men who held the key places, and it was a determining influence. I believe he was the most civilizing influence it has been my lot to encounter.

Louis M. Lyons

The Dangers of Secrecy

by Carroll Binder

How to keep secret the military information which could seriously harm us if it should fall into hostile hands while giving citizens the information they require to exercise wisely their civic responsibilities and conduct their affairs is one of the most difficult problems of this republic.

It is a particularly difficult problem in this critical era when our country is engaged in a struggle with Soviet totalitarianism which seems likely to continue for decades.

The purpose of these remarks is to call attention to the danger of thinking that secrecy will provide security. A little secrecy, like small doses of certain potent medicines, is expedient in certain situtions. But large doses of secrecy, like large doses of such medicines, may destroy the body we are trying to save—our free institutions.

The determination of what it is in the national interest to keep secret and what it is in the national interest to make known is one of the most delicate responsibilities of a free society.

I wish I could say that that responsibility is being exercised with maximum wisdom from the standpoint of the long-term national interest. I am sorry to have to say that, in my opinion and in the opinion of many newspapermen and scientists who have some knowledge of the situation, neither the present national administration nor its predecessor has devised a system for successfully coping with the problem of what to withhold and what to make known in this time of peril.

Newspapermen and scientists have found fault with both the Truman administration's and the Eisenhower administration's handling of information about a wide variety of matters, including what may properly be regarded as secret projects. Both national administrations have found fault with the media of information—which include scientific and technical publications read by specialists as well as newspapers and magazines, radio and TV.

President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson complain that information of value to a potential enemy is being published. President Truman made the same complaint. Both administrations blamed United States government sources for releasing such information and both want the press to assume a larger responsibility for withholding from publication what has been released by government sources.

Mr. Eisenhower did not say what technical secrets he had in mind but has long been concerned about the amount of information being published about the new Nike guided missile anti-aircraft system.

Mr. Wilson is particularly troubled about publication of information concerning how high, how fast and how far the Nike missiles are capable of traveling. Some of the information about performance of the Nike missiles became known through publication of contractor advertising, required by law. Other information seeps out through the fact that Nike battery sites were built within plain public view around cities such as Baltimore.

It is generally assumed that the newspapers are the chief divulgers of information which those who seek security through secrecy think should be withheld from publication. Some information potentially damaging to our military security undoubtedly finds its way into columns of newspapers.

In some instances neither the reporter nor the editor has any idea of how potentially damaging such information may be.

A certain amount of such unwitting disclosure is inevitable even when there is wartime censorship. In peacetime, when there is no censorship, some information which is of great value to a potential enemy and which is not of vital importance to technical progress or the making of sound political decisions is bound to find its way into print despite rigorous restrictions on the release of that sort of information.

Such things happen in a free society. They also happen at times in totalitarian societies. For the most rigorous censorship in the most rigorous police state is bound to overlook information which tells an astute reader in another country things the secrecy-minded police states wish to withhold. Our intelligence learned vital Nazi and Japanese secrets through careful combing of their publications during World War II and our intelligence is less good than it should be if it is not constantly gleaning valuable information from Soviet publications despite all that the Soviet apparatus can do to prevent such information from finding its way into print.

The most significant disclosures of this sort are found, however, in scientific and technical publications rather than in newspapers or popular magazines. Russia bought $200,000 worth of books and periodicals published in this country last year for the obvious purpose of trying to penetrate our secrets along with keeping posted on the general state of our knowledge.

The President and Secretary Wilson think we make it too easy for Russia and other potential enemies to learn our secrets by too extensive publication. This view is shared by other officials and many citizens. Some people with less understanding of such matters than the President has, thanks to his wide experience, have come to identify se-

---

Carroll Binder is editorial director of the Minneapolis *Tribune*. This is part of a talk to the Associated Harvard Clubs meeting in Cincinnati, May 14.

crecy with national security. Persons of that turn of mind have grown so secrecy-minded that they object to the publication of just about everything except obituaries, scores of major league baseball teams and the name of the winner of the Kentucky Derby.

These are the people who object to publication of anything that would be of value to a potential enemy. If one attempted to act on that principle there would be no publication of weekly carloading reports, daily treasury statements, petroleum production reports. A potential enemy can learn something of value from reports of what day the cherry blossoms bloom in the national capital, our long-range weather forecasts, the day the ice breaks in the Great Lakes, unemployment statistics and a number of other things that probably wouldn't occur to most people as possible matters for withholding from publication.

The functioning of our productive apparatus would be seriously impaired by witholding publication of such information. We prefer to take the risk of its being put to harmful use by a potential enemy in order to enjoy the benefits of its availability to our own people.

The President is not objecting to publication of such types of information. He wants technical military information that could be of help to a potential enemy to be withheld.

Secretary Wilson shares the President's view but hasn't been consistent in his efforts to carry out that view. Wilson and R. Karl Honaman, newly-appointed deputy assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, are trying to bottle up information that does not make a "constructive contribution to the primary mission of the defense department." They are trying to get newspapers and technical journals to withhold from publication much of the material which now finds its way into print in connection with letting of contracts, publication of papers read at scientific meetings and reports or addresses made by members of Congress or the armed forces.

Honaman also has the curious idea that compilations of published information should be suppressed. He gave as an example, recently, the case of an engineer without intelligence experience who undertook to see what he could learn about our guided missile program while waiting for security clearance to go to work for a defense contractor.

This man, Honaman said, went to a public library and read the daily newspapers, technical magazines and government publications on its shelves for three months. He then wrote a 45-page report "including 15 pages of charts which gave very accurate information on the characteristics of our weapons. He included detailed information which gave for each its name, model designation, manufacturer, guidance system, method of propulsion, length, diameter, range and altitude. He also included certain reasonable deductions concerning the high level plans and policies of our whole guided missile program."

The report was so accurate and complete, Honaman said, that "it was necesary to classify it." Honaman saw no absurdity in classifying this complication though he admitted that "all of the information that went into it was gathered from information readily available from the newspaper stand and magazine counter."

Some of the information Honaman's engineer culled from publications on the library shelf should presumably have been classified by those who controlled it and thus kept from publication. That, as Honaman admits, is hard to do when a model goes into production and practically impossible to do when the weapon is made available for service. The manufacturer needs hundreds of drawings to produce the weapon. The service people need hundreds of manuals at widely-scattered places to operate the equipment.

But what is gained by classifying the compilation of published material? Surely any foreign intelligence agent is capable of making the same compilation an intelligent American engineer can make. The most that such a compilation can do is save the foreign intelligence agent several months' work. But how much delay may its classification cost our own defense effort by perhaps requiring many Americans to make their own time-consuming compilation?

Honaman's is not an isolated example. During the war when extraordinary efforts were made to prevent publication of anything about radar and public use of the word was frowned upon, the editors of a national publication compiled a detailed account of what made radar possible and how radar operated, out of textbooks to be found on the shelves of every good library.

Lloyd Berkner, president of the Associated Universities, thinks that technological delays resulting from secrecy deprived us of many of the benefits we should have had from the discovery of radar which was made about 1930. Berkner thinks that had we made known our radar protection of Pearl Harbor, it is doubtful if the Japanese would have attempted a surprise.

Secretiveness about radar permitted dilatoriness in development of airborne-radar applications. Thus at the beginning of World War II we had no anti-submarine radar, no night fighters, no means for extensive sea search.

Berkner thinks that "had radar been developed and advertised openly, the consequent great progress in these developments might have so weakened the German confidence in the submarine supremacy, or in their capabilities for strategic air attack, that the war might have been prevented altogether."

He also thinks that technological secrecy about poison gas and the tank prevented sufficient training and tactical development of those two weapons and consequently pre-

vented exploitation of their potentialities during the first World War. Until last month similar considerations prevented the training of our allies in the tactical use of atomic weapons.

The only way we can get full good out of technological advances, according to Dr. Malcolm Henderson of Catholic University, who was one of the designers of the long-range detection system that warns of Soviet atomic tests, is to have them widely known. "Suppression of classified material, while necessary, is bad enough but the suppression of non-classified material—strategic information as we call it now—is much worse.

"What will happen is that suppression in the newspapers must of course be accompanied by suppression in all media, and in particular in the technical journals, trade papers, house organs, proceedings of learned societies and everywhere that technical material of general interest is published.

"Now, when the technical journal is censored for unclassified material as well as classified, the technician, engineer and scientist will really have blinders and earmuffs put upon him. It is just this sort of information that keeps him active, interested and productive, and it is to the wide dissemination of such information that American technology owes a large measure of its success."

In these days all the important areas of science have military implications and, if those who seek security through secrecy have their way, must inevitably fall under the cloak of military secrecy.

The stultifying effect of secrecy upon scientific progress was brilliantly stated by Berkner at Ann Arbor last June.

"The really significant new concepts of science are often if not always the result of association of widely diverse facts and ideas that may not hitherto have seemed remotely connected. Such ideas as the laws of mechanics and the concepts of space and time derived from astronomy, together with the work of Planck on high-temperature radiation, led Einstein to postulate the equivalence of mass and energy through his concept of relativity.

"On this concept is based the discovery of nuclear energy. Yet today, any intelligent military organization, operating under the present rules and concepts, would certainly classify the equivalent of Planck's work so that it would be denied to a potential Einstein."

Berkner asked whether scientists could not demonstrate that "in suppressing seemingly isolated scientific bits of information of direct military value, we at the same time prevent the germination of scientific ideas of much greater scientific, social and military significance? Can we not show that such really great concepts, injected into our industrial complex, can provide far greater security through technological supremacy than we could ever hope to achieve through the secrecy of technological information?"

The testimony of Dean McGeorge Bundy of Harvard before a Senate subcommittee last March should not be overlooked in any consideration of this problem: "It is widely supposed that the only important science is secret, and that somehow it speeds our progress if we lock things up. The truth is almost the opposite. The real scientific strength of the country is in free minds, trained by free teachers, and the national defense of the future rests on the depth and strength of open inquiry in many fields. Nuclear physics cannot be advanced under cover. The secrets that deserve protection are relatively very few, and important as they are, they are trivial compared to the secrets still locked in nature. The free university is committed to a steady assault upon nature's secrets, with all the weapons of the free mind. This is its basic mission and its proper service to the state."

That is why Harvard has wisely avoided undertaking secret work for the government and kept its scholars and resources free for their proper task of basic research.

The trouble with secrecy, Robert Oppenheimer told Edward R. Murrow, is that it denies to the government itself the wisdom and resources of the whole community. The only way the government can have the benefit of collective wisdom and experience is to let almost anyone say what he thinks. There must be encouragement to try to "give the best synopses, the best popularizations, the best mediations of technical things that you can. To let men deny what they think is false you have to have a free and uncorrupted communication."

There are undeniable weaknesses in the democratic process, including freedom of information and discussion. These weaknesses, real and apparent, are particularly conspicuous at the present time when the free societies are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Communist police states—the antithesis of freedom.

But there are even greater weaknesses in totalitarian regimes which tend to be overlooked by those who are familiar only with the shortcomings of freedom.

I have seen at first hand nearly all contemporary forms of totalitarianism except Communist China. I have been a reporter in Fascist Italy, Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, militarist Japan, Peronist Argentina and in various adaptations of those types of police states.

These observations over a period of nearly 30 years give me a strong conviction that there are greater dangers in the sort of secrecy practiced in those regimes—and upon which some of our officials, less well acquainted with their actual operations, look with envy—than in the freedom of information practiced here.

Efficiency For What?

by Irving Dilliard

The term "best" is elusive and none of us want to define it precisely. Yet we are inevitably impressed when we know that the University of Oregon Alumni Association named Eric Allen one of "the six best teachers" in all the years since teachers and students first began to come together here in Eugene. Under Eric Allen's administration the first Journalism Building was constructed in 1923 and now this striking building, opened only last September, is to keep his memory green through countless generations of students to come.

In another year the Eric Allen lectureship will pass its tenth annual milestone. This suggests the appropriateness of a roll call of the speakers who have preceded me in the enjoyment of this honor.

First, in 1947, came James Stuart Russell, outstanding agricultural journalist of the Des Moines *Register and Tribune*. Next, in 1948, you heard the late Charles Gratke, long the able overseas editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. In 1949, you brought former Nieman Fellow, Houstoun Waring, who is making the *Daily Independent* an influence in the life of Littleton, Colorado, much as the *Gazette* was in Emporia, Kansas, under William Allen White.

Marquis Childs, the distinguished syndicated columnist, whose comments appear in the Eugene *Register-Guard,* was the lecturer in 1950; and Thomas H. Keene of the Elkhart (Ind.) *Truth* in 1951. In 1952 there came James S. Pope, one of the company of outstanding editors assembled by Barry Bingham in Louisville at the *Courier-Journal* and *Times,* to demonstrate that a monopoly news paper situation can serve its community with a high sense of mission and responsibility.

The 1953 and 1954 lecturers presented a striking contrast. In the former year you heard Henry R. Luce, head of the vast *Time-Life-Fortune-Sports* magazine publishing empire whose periodicals are known around the globe. Last year you quite properly invited to this rostrum an editor from a small city in your neighbor state of Idaho—William F. Johnston of the Lewiston *Morning Tribune,* whose plain-spoken, vigorous editorial page is a credit to the profession. I hardly need to add that these Allen lecturers make up a company I am grateful to join.

As I look over the remarkable physical properties of this handsome building my mind goes back to a historic ceremony I witnessed in Washington, Dec. 15, 1952. The place was the national Archives Building. The occasion was the unveiling and dedication of the new shrine for the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

On that day, for the first time, these three great charters of our independence, our basic liberties and our system of government were brought together in permanent and carefully designed display cases.

In all the history of the United States, no President ever spoke truer words than Harry S. Truman did in his dedicatory address. Because his message has its bearing for this occasion let me quote from what he said:

"We are engaged here today in a symbolic act. We are enshrining these documents for future ages. But unless we keep alive in our hearts the true meaning of these documents, what we are doing here could prove to be of little value.

"The Constitution and the Declaration can live only as long as they are enshrined in our hearts and minds. If they are not so enshrined, they would be no better than mummies in their glass cases, and they could in time become idols whose worship would be a grim mockery of the true faith. Only as these documents are reflected in the thoughts and acts of Americans can they remain symbols of a power that can move the world."

So it is with Eric W. Allen Hall.

There can be no doubt of its capacity to produce young journalists who can write satisfactory news stories with all the "who, what, where, when and how" questions answered. There can be no doubt about the quality of its training in copyreading and headline writing, in lay-out and make-up.

The same approval undoubtedly can be expressed for the laboratory work in advertising and circulation, in newspaper management, in radio and television broadcasting, in photography and typography and the other graphic arts.

But Eric W. Allen Hall could do all these things superlatively well and still be a mausoleum. It could do all these things and still not contribute to the preservation of freedom of the press. It could do all these things and in the end Oregon and our country could be the worse, not the better, for it.

Efficiency in newspaper production is a proper means but it is not a proper end. Among the most efficient of operations were the death mills in the Nazi concentration camps run by the Hitler regime. When the pros and cons of Mussolini's fascist rule in Italy are listed, Il Duce always is credited with getting the trains to run on time. Efficiency again.

In Communist Russia the emphasis is on efficiency in operation, in efficiency and still more efficiency—in indus-

trial production, in agriculture, in transportation, in selective distribution. Malenkov is out, so he himself said, because he was a failure in bringing up agricultural production, not successful enough, if you please, in efficiency.

Whether newspaper efficiency is good or bad depends entirely on what we do with it. If it enables needed but financially hard-pressed newspapers to survive, then efficiency is a blessing. If it merely makes for greater uniformity, if it contributes to the decline in newspaper personality, independence and vigor, then it is a blight on not only the press but the entire nation. For, as Joseph Pulitzer said a half century ago: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

I know how Eric Allen Hall is going to make a student from Coos Bay into a skilled news photographer. I can see the photographic laboratory room in which this transformation will take place.

But where and how is Eric Allen Hall going to take a student from Pendleton and develop him into a fearless editor who will stand fast for the truth as he knows it to be no matter what the pressure?

I know how Eric Allen Hall is going to produce a pleasing, confident news broadcaster from the freshman who comes from down at Grants Pass. I can visit the broadcasting and television laboratory and see this in progress.

But where and how is Eric Allen Hall going to take another freshman from LaGrande and give him the courage he will need if he is not to be submerged in the sea of journalistic conformity?

In what room and under which faculty member is Eric Allen Hall going to teach elemental fairness so steadfastly that it will become an inseparable part of every student who comes here?

Where and how is each student going to learn that the reporter and editorial writer owe far more to the reader than to any editor or publisher who after all merely relays the newspaper man's salary from the reader without whose patronage and support there would be no newspaper?

Where and how is each student to learn that in a democracy few things are so important as for the citizen to know how his elected representatives vote on the issues that come before his City Council, Legislature and his Congress?

Where and how is the student going to learn so that he will never forget that his press fails the citizen when it reports so poorly the voting record of its elected officials, a Senator for example, that the voters do not know that Senator's record, though he represented them for more than 10 years, until an energetic candidate takes the stump and carries the facts about that record to the people by word of mouth?

Where and how, in Eric Allen Hall, is each student going to learn so it will last his lifetime that a man's religion or his race or special background is neither a disqualification nor a qualification for public office, and that those who apply such tests do a profound disservice to our democracy?

Where and how is each student going to learn that as a newspaperman or a radio commentator or a teacher of journalism he must never be afraid to express the contrary view if he believes prevailing opinion is in error?

Where and how is he going to have impressed on him imperishably that Washington and Tom Paine, that Jefferson and Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt all were dissenters who were denounced in their own day and would be dismissed as radicals by many today?

Where and how is each student to be taught to realize what it means for a great American business corporation, such as Socony-Vacuum Oil Company to apply an insidious pressure for conformity among young Americans? Where and how will the student learn to share the indignation of Norman Thomas when he reads these words from Socony's employment pamphlet as circulated by its personnel department:

"Personal views can cause a lot of trouble. Remember, then, to keep them always conservative. The 'isms' are out. Business being what it is it naturally looks with disfavor on the wild-eyed radical or even the moderate pink. On the other hand I think you will find very few business organizations who will attempt to dictate the political party of their employees."

Where and how is the student going to acquire a sense of conscience that will not allow him to suppress or be a party to the suppression of a letter from any reader whose critical opinion is an honest one that deserves to be printed?

Where and how is the student going to develop an effective resistance to the trivial and the tawdry, to the cheap and the self-serving promotions that flood into newspaper offices?

Where and how is he going to form an unbreakable attachment for that which is constructive and elevating and progressive even though he must search for it himself as he would hunt for grains of wheat in a pile of chaff?

Where and how is the student going to learn, firmly, so it will stay with him throughout a lifetime—that the news columns are to print the news, fairly and as fully as possible, and that in the daily fulfillment of this no political preference or publisher's prejudice ought ever stand in the way?

Where and how is the student going to learn that on the editorial page he must not compromise with dishonesty; that he must not turn his eyes away from unpleasant subjects and odious people when they need exposure; that he must not delay and temporize when the times cry out for him to be swift and sure?

Above all else, where and how is the student going to learn to care, to care what happens to his newspaper, to his profession, to his community, to his state and his nation, to care so intensely that caring becomes the mainspring of his life as a newspaperman?

These are not idle questions I assure you. They are not bits of rhetoric. And I suspect as well as hope that Dean Sabine and his faculty have some partial answers at least. But these questions are the very heart of our common problem.

Many of you know that the circulation figures for 1954 came out just a few weeks ago. *Editor & Publisher* led its Feb. 5 issue with the three column headline "Circulation of U.S. Dailies Soars Above 55 Million." This was an increase of 600,000 daily over last year—1.1 per cent.

If you read down into the smaller type you found that at the time circulation was growing by more than a half million daily, 10 morning papers had disappeared and 10 afternoon had ceased publication. This total decrease of 20 dailies in one year was the largest decrease in a year since 1943 when World War II created special problems of production and supply.

Thus the big newspapers are getting bigger and fewer. This means there are fewer individual newspaper outlets for presenting the news in print, for expression and comment, and presumably there will be even fewer for the journalist of the future. This means also that whereas there was one daily newspaper for every 35,000 persons in 1909 there is now only one for every 100,000 population. It is this present fact and this prospect that compel me to place my emphasis on newspaper morals as infinitely more important than newspaper techniques. For the fewer newspapers there are the fairer, the braver, the truer each one must be.

And from where are these better values going to come? They are going to come from the people in our country who care. From Palmer Hoyt's John Peter Zenger address at the University of Arizona which closed with these memorable lines:

"In this era of moral turmoil, it is increasingly obvious that the Constitution must be protected, if freedom of the press is to be guaranteed. It is equally obvious that American newspapers must form the bulwark of that defense. God grant them the wit to see and the strength to strike."

This is from an address by **Irving Dilliard,** editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* editorial page, to the Oregon Press Conference, Feb. 18, at the dedication of Eric W. Allen Hall, School of Journalism, University of Oregon, Mr. Dilliard was in the first group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard, 1938-39.

Letters

Tomorrow's TV Journalism

To the Editor:

Reading articles like Robert Drew's "See It Then: Tomorrow's TV Journalism" in the April *Nieman Reports* makes me realize more than ever that if journalism is to be responsible for news and information as disseminated over this medium, the profession must in turn ensure that it produces a new breed of newsmen to handle that responsibility. I like to think that Ralph Nafziger has given me that trust here; we certainly attempt to turn loose each June some grasp of what the medium requires in the way of specialized journalistic professionalism.

I heartily agree with Drew that "The question of the character of TV is largely a journalistic question, and it will be answered to a great extent by what TV does with its journalistic arm." On the other hand, it is my feeling that TV journalism at the *network* level, while important, is only part of the problem. For TV journalism to become a worthy counterpart of the other media (and I am sure it can never be much more than that) I submit that the handful of us who teach TV journalism should concentrate our effort on the youngsters who are to be the newsmen on the *local* TV stations. I don't think we should attempt to produce TV journalists who could, on graduation, step into the network newsrooms; rather, I think we should produce people who can give the viewers of the local stations the best possible news presentation at that level. Perhaps *Nieman Reports* could explore this thesis sometime.

It is just one year from the date we got under way here on WHA-TV, the State of Wisconsin's ETV station (operated on the University of Wisconsin campus, largely by University faculty and students).

Since the day WHA-TV went on the air (May 1954), I have been doing a five-night-a-week, 15-minute "newscast- cum-backgrounding" on the station. This program is a joint venture of our School of Journalism, our University Extension Division Dept. of Journalism, and the State Radio Council (the administrative unit responsible for WHA-TV). During the second semester of the academic year, this newscast is dovetailed with the course I teach in Television News (we are one of the very few journalism schools presently offering a separate course in TV news).

Robert Lindsay
Lecturer in Journalism
News Editor, WHA-TV
University of Wisconsin

Paul J. Hughes

1893-1955

Paul J. Hughes died in Lousiville, May 27. He was 62. He had been a newspaperman for 38 years, 28 of them in Louisville, first on the *Times* and in his last ten years on the *Courier-Journal*. These had been years of intense activity until his final year which was slowed down by the heart condition that led to his last illness.

He was a first-rate newspaperman and a grand human being who leaves a great gap among his colleagues in the Louisville papers, in the Nieman Fellowship and among a much larger acquaintance who admired his rare combination of qualities. He was a fine craftsman as reporter and writer. He had such standards and conscientiousness as make integrity seem too commonplace a word. And he had such gifts for friendship and for warm human relations as marked him out even among Kentucky journalists.

Paul Hughes was the first Nieman Fellow (1943-44) from Louisville and the first of a strong group from that center of distinguished newspapering.

This was great luck for the Nieman Foundation. For Paul Hughes was thereafter a leader in all Nieman activities. Indeed he established a Kentucky-Cambridge axis that was influential at both ends. It was no accident that the first Negro newspaperman awarded a Nieman Fellowship was Paul's Louisville friend, Fletcher Martin. Paul's neighborliness to Fletcher spread out into a fruitful development of race relations in Kentucky.

When the Society of Nieman Fellows was formed, Paul Hughes was chairman of the organizing committee. When Nieman reunions were held, Paul's Kentucky contingent were first on the ground, prepared with beaten buscuit and mint leaves and their own brand of bourbon for the mint juleps to go with a Kentucky Derby Party. These Kentucky parties were memorable events at Harvard. He carried the pattern of Nieman seminars back to Louisville and organized a series of such professional sessions there, some of them regional, whose invitation list extended from Ohio to Mississippi. His zest for one of his own assignments in county reform in Kentucky led to his organizing a full day of a Nieman Institute at Cambridge on problems of county government. A key to Paul Hughes' life was expressed in his application for a Nieman Fellowship in 1943:

"After 26 years of newspaper work, I still suffer from undiminished fascination and enthusiasm."

Born in Adair County, Kentucky, he went to Center College. Years later, his first trip to Cambridge was to cover the first dramatic football game between the "Praying Colonels" of Center and Harvard.

His first newspaper job was what he could get, selling classified advertising in St. Louis, in 1916. But he hankered for reporting and as the University of Missouri had a brand new School of Journalism, he entered it, firing furnaces to pay his way.

Then he took over a little weekly in Booneville, Mo., and made it over until a year later a staff job opened on the St. Louis *Times*. A year after that a job with the United Press took him to Chicago and later New York, for four years of the variety show of big city wire service news.

At 29 he went looking for a small paper to buy, found it in Ashland, Kentucky, and ran it for four years. Then a city editorship beckoned him to Huntington, West Virginia, and a year later he was invited to join the Louisville *Times* where Tom Wallace carried on the Watterson tradition. He did everything in the news line there, to become city editor, and on the side to teach journalism at the University of Louisville.

After his Nieman Fellowship he moved over to the ampler columns of the *Courier-Journal* in the same shop and for his last decade was a top writer on politics and the regional issues of his home State. He had the kind of assignments that turned up whole page Sunday articles on the problems and developments of the region. He worked closely with the Committee for Kentucky and week by week explored the issues that underlay the structure of the community life.

A wheelhorse for work, he personified the remarkable loyalty and team work that Barry Bingham and Mark Ethridge inspire in their staffs. But beyond that he was Paul Hughes and his byline was a mark of distinction on any assignment. He was a great reporter and an extraordinary ambassador for his newspaper.

His big old comfortable red brick house retained the charm of an earlier century. There his wife, Jessie Hughes, presided over a happy family life and a warm circle of friendship. Their three children, Betty, Edward and Paul, Jr., were a source of pride as they went off to college, married, went abroad, entered successful careers.

When Paul went off on a war assignment to Japan, Edward was starting a globe-trotting assignment that brought him distinction as a foreign correspondent, Paul Jr. was editor of a community weekly paper, and Betty was starting an art career in New York. Edward was chief foreign correspondent of the *Wall Street Journal* when Paul took his wife on a Summer tour of Europe two years ago, as she recuperated from an illness.

A letter in his illness describes one of his last campaigns:

"Mary Bingham, a local merchant and I carried on direction of a State-wide campaign to get 100 bookmobiles to add to the 10 we already had, to give complete State rural library coverage. We raised $300,000 for the mobile libraries (each full of books), got $319,000 from the Legislature and are just now winding up the job of local support by which the counties guarantee to operate the system—an estimated outlay of another $300,000. When we finish we will have more bookmobiles in a unified operation than we know of anywhere else. In the process we garnered some 600,000 books to augment the new ones we will buy with the State's appropriation. The whole business becomes State property when we formally turn it over about July 1."

The last line of that letter stated happily: "We will be grandpa and ma again this summer, says Betty."

Nieman Notes

1939

Ensign John Wesley Fuller, son of **Wesley Fuller** of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, was married June 7th to Anne Crawford Clowes in Bristol, R. I.

Edwin A. Lahey of the Chicago *Daily News* went to Argentina to cover Peron's war with the Catholic Church.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York *Times,* received an honorary degree at Harvard Commencement. His escort in the procession was **Louis M. Lyons,** curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

1943

Back from Yugoslavia this Spring, **Fred Warner Neal** did a series of lectures at the Harvard Business School on a round of university lecturing for the American Universities field service. Then he returned to his professorship in the department of political science at the University of Colorado.

1944

The Sunday night radio broadcasts of Town Meeting of the Air the past season included a debate between Cong. Vorys of Ohio and **Lawrence A. Fernsworth,** Washington correspondent of the Concord (N. H.) *Monitor,* on the topic: "Is Spain a Dependable Ally?"

The death of **Paul J. Hughes,** veteran staff writer of the Louisville *Courier-Journal,* is more fully reported elsewhere in this issue.

1946

Ernest H. Linford, editor of the editorial page of the Salt Lake *Tribune,* addressed The Mountain Admen Association in Denver, April 17, on "An Editor Looks at Advertising" and the Nebraska University Journalism Day gathering at Lincoln, Nebraska, April 30, on "Propaganda and You."

1948

Lester H. Grant, former science writer on the New York *Herald Tribune,* completed his studies at Harvard Medical School to graduate as an M. D. in June. He is going to interne in medicine next year at Grace New Haven Hospital, teaching hospital for Yale Medical School. His home address: 209 Franklin Road, Hamden, Conn.

1949

Christopher Rand was at the Bandung Conference for *The New Yorker* and reported on it in the issue of June 11.

"Carl Larsen, A Study in Perpetual Motion" is the headline on an article about the energetic career of **Carl Larsen** of the Chicago *Sun-Times,* published in the paper's house organ.

1950

Hays Gorey of the editorial page of the Salt Lake *Tribune* and Mrs. Gorey visited Harvard on a vacation in May.

Melvin Wax joined the staff of the Chicago *Sun-Times* in May. He had been managing editor of the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle* for four years and earlier was a reporter on the Rutland (Vt.) *Herald.*

1951

The Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger* won a Pulitzer prize for its campaign to clean up neighboring Phoenix City, Alabama. **Robert W. Brown** is editor of the *Ledger.* The city editor in this campaign was (and is) **Carlton Johnson,** who was on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard when the Pulitzer award was announced.

Chancellor Conrad Adenauer's visit to this country and his conference with President Eisenhower made an assignment for **Dana A. Schmidt** of the New York *Times* Washington bureau. He began his newspaper work in Berlin for the United Press.

Dwight E. Sargent, chief editorial writer for the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald,* has been named editorial page director for all three Guy Gannett newspapers in Portland.

1952-53

Robert P. Martin, Far East correspondent for *U. S. News and World Report,* and **Keyes Beech,** correspondent in Tokyo of the Chicago *Daily News,* assisted the Asia Foundation in organizing committees that selected the first Associate Nieman Fellows from India and Japan, announced in this issue.

1953

Donald D. Janson moved in May from the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* to the New York *Times.*

1955

Piers Anderton, formerly of the San Francisco *Chronicle,* has joined the editorial staff of *Collier's.*

Thomas G. Karsell, former managing editor of the Greenville (Miss.) *Delta Democrat-Times,* has joined the editorial staff of the Jackson (Miss.) *Daily News* as assistant to the editor.

Henry Tanner, foreign analyst for the Houston *Post,* has been transferred to its Washington Bureau.

NIEMAN FELLOWSHIPS

(*Continued from Page 2*)

Washington bureau, where he covers Treasury and other financial, tax and commerce news.

He plans to study economics.

Harry N. Press, 35, San Francisco *News* reporter. He started newspaper work on graduation from Stanford University in 1939, first as a copy boy on the San Francisco *Chronicle*. He has been with the *News* since 1941, with a four and a half year absence in war service with the Army, ending as a captain. He has covered a wide range of news assignments.

He plans to study problems of metropolitan and suburban development.

Don Seagle, 27, Charleston (W. Va.) *Gazette* reporter. A graduate of the University of West Virginia in 1950, he has since worked on West Virginia newspapers and has served the *Gazette* since 1952, on general assignments.

He plans to study labor-management relations and regional problems of his area.

Edgar F. Seney, Jr., 34, is editor-publisher of the weekly *Florida Keys Keynoter,* published at Marathon, Florida, between Miami and Key West. His first newspaper work was in the Army, where he became managing editor of the Germany edition of *Stars and Stripes.*

He covered police beats for a year on the Chicago *City News Bureau* and studied at the University of Chicago. Then he had four years of general reporting on the Hammond (Ind.) *Times.* In 1951 he bought a small weekly in North Adams, Mich., sold it after two years and established a weekly in a community that had no newspaper on the Keys of Florida. His crusading against local political corruption won him the award of the Florida State Press Association for the best weekly paper editorial in 1953.

He plans to study law and government.

Donald J. Sterling, Jr., 27, *Oregon Journal* reporter, in Portland, Ore. Graduate of Andover Academy and Princeton, he had four years reporting on the Denver *Post* before joining the *Oregon Journal* in 1952, as general staff reporter.

He plans to study regional economic problems of the Northwest.

Associate Nieman Fellows

Supported by the Carnegie Corporation:

Ronald Plater, 34, a senior sub-editor on the Brisbane *Courier-Mail.* A graduate of Sidney University, he was an officer in the Australian Army during the second world war, was wounded in the New Guinea campaign, later covered Japanese war crimes trials for the Australian AP. He began news work as a cadet with the Sidney *Sun,* reported for them six years before joining the *Courier-Mail,* where he serves now as cable editor.

He plans to study the Far East and American foreign policy.

Desmond Stone, 34, editorial writer and literary editor of the *Southland Times,* Invercargill, N. Z. He has had fifteen years in journalism in New Zealand.

He plans to study American foreign policy and mass media.

John P. Whealen, 30, reporter, Windsor *Daily Star.* Graduate of the University of Western Ontario, he has worked on the Windsor *Star* since 1948, covering general assignments and recently the parliamentary press gallery.

He plans to study writing and American-Canadian relations—economic and political.

Supported by the Asia Foundation:

Hisashi Maeda, 37, staff member, *Asahi Shimbun,* Tokyo. He specialized in English at Osaka College for foreign languages, graduated in 1939. He served three years in the Japanese army, has been on the *Asahi Shimbun* since 1943, now in its foreign news section. His earliest newspaper work was as a reporter of the Okinawa landings and then of the American occupation and national political news.

He plans to study international relations.

Sharada Prasad, 31, news editor, *Indian Express,* Bombay. He was graduated in English literature at Mysore University in 1945. The *Express* is an English language daily. He has been news editor five years. As a student he was twice jailed by the British during the "Quit India" movement of 1942. He is a frequent broadcaster on the All-India radio, and writes short stories.

The Nieman Fellowship selecting committee were Jonathan Daniels, editor, Raleigh *News and Observer,* John B. Oakes, editorial board, New York *Times,* Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, Harvard Law School, William M. Pinkerton, director, Harvard News Office, and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.