Nieman Reports

July, 1956

The Press and the Campaign

J. Russell Wiggins, Charles E. Higbie
Nathan B. Blumberg, Alex S. Edelstein

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.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription $3 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. X; No. 3 JULY, 1956

Where They Are Now

Former Nieman Fellows: A Statistical Roundup.

When they returned to their papers in June, the 11 Nieman Fellows who had spent the college year at Harvard brought to 218 the total number of newsmen who have held these fellowships since their start in 1938.

A very generalized review shows that the 218 former Nieman Fellows came from 102 different newspapers or news organizations in 42 states, the District of Columbia and Hawaii.

Nieman Fellows are now working on 85 newspapers and news agencies in 32 states. Part of this area shrinkage is accounted for by the demise of eight of the newspapers; part of it by movement of the Fellows from some of the smaller papers to metropolitan papers and to Washington, and to a lesser extent onto magazines, into radio and television, into journalism schools, government offices and public relations.

The extent of movement of Fellows from the news offices from which they were appointed can be sketched statistically in a small space.

Of the total 218, ten have died and two of the five women, after marriage, gave up their professional work. That leaves a net of 206.

The largest statistic is the 94 who are still with the original papers or news organizations. The next largest figure is the 35 who are on other newspapers. One hundred twenty-nine are on the same newspaper or other newspapers.

The 94 on the same newspaper are not, in many cases, on the same job. For example, of the first group (1938-39) of Fellows: Irving Dilliard is now editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* editorial page where he was an ediorial writer; Edwin Lahey is now chief of the Washington bureau of the Chicago *Daily News* where he was a reporter; Edwin Paxton is now director of the radio station owned by the Paducah *Sun-Democrat,* where he was city editor. John Clark was publishing his own paper, the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle,* when he died.

The 35 who moved to other papers were, naturally, moving to better jobs. For example, George Chaplin is now editor of the New Orleans *Item;* William Dickinson is news editor of the Philadelphia *Bulletin;* William Townes is assistant managing editor of the Miami *Herald;* Ernest Linford is editor of the Salt Lake *Tribune;* John Strohmeyer is editor of the Bethlehem (Pa.) *Globe-Times;* Carroll Kilpatrick is an editorial writer on the Washington *Post;* Hoke Norris and Melvin Wax on the Chicago *Sun-Times;* Donald Zylstra on the Denver *Post* and Albert Kraus on the New York *Times,* are examples of reporters who have moved from smaller papers.

Twenty Fellows have gone from newspaper to magazine work. Twelve of these are still correspondents, as Robert Martin for *U. S. News and World Report;* Robert Fleming for *Newsweek;* Robert Glasgow and John Steele for *Time,* Inc; Christopher Rand and Robert Shaplen for *The New Yorker.* Eight others are magazine editors: Thomas Griffith and Robert Manning, senior editors on *Time,* Inc; Steven Spencer, associate editor, *Saturday Evening Post;* Leon Svirsky, managing editor, *Scientific American;* Vance Johnson, general manager, Crowell-Collier, Piers Anderton, on *Collier's;* David Batter, assistant managing editor, *Look,* and Simeon Booker, associate editor, *Jet.*

Radio and television have attracted four Fellows but this is the same number who have moved out of that industry into newspapering. John Day is news editor, CBS, and Alexander Kendrick is a CBS correspondent.

Eight Fellows have left news work to join the faculties of journalism schools at the University of Michigan, New York University, University of Massachusetts, University of Colorado, Ohio State University, University of Oregon, and the American Press Institute at Columbia University, where William Stucky is associate director.

Fourteen Fellows have gone into Government, including the State Department, the Housing Administration, the United States Information Service, the Federal Reserve Board, and two as executive assistants to senators.

Book authorship and publishing have claimed five, of whom A. B. Guthrie is the best known for his Pulitzer Prize novel, *The Way West,* and its companion, *The Big Sky,* begun at Harvard.

Public relations now involves 16 Fellows. Their employers range from the Federal Government to Harvard University and include the Committee for Economic Development, Henry Kaiser, Encyclopaedia Britannica, University of North Carolina, the American Heart Association and

(Continued to last page)

Crisis in Communication

By Marquis Childs

A distinguished psychiatrist not long ago sent an open letter to a group of commentators and editorial writers challenging them to demand nothing less than the highest integrity from all men in public life. He was asking in effect that those who mould opinion, or who attempt to do so, lay down a stern law of rebuke and rejection for anyone compromising with the great moral issues of our times. His letter was written out of something like despair at the attrition, the dangerous erosion, of values that has taken place at almost every level of our national life. It was written in the hope that opinion could be mobilized and brought to bear in both a negative and a positive fashion on the principal figures seeking to resolve the troubles that beset us at home and abroad.

There is here, it seems to me, a basic problem of communication; a problem which has a long historical precedent.

This problem of communication—the expression of the urgent demands of a time of crisis—responsibility, idealism, discipline, as opposed to the old habits of comfortable and self-centered isolation, is the heart of the matter. We have never before had such extraordinary means of communication. Yet at the same time I think our failure to communicate, to reach a common understanding about ideas and ideals, was perhaps never more tragically evident. I venture to say that as a nation we were much closer to a common communication when Benjamin Franklin, whose 250th anniversary we are observing this year, founded the American Philosophical Society and pushed the development of the postal system primarily because he believed in the exchange of ideas.

There are many reasons why with such vast means at our disposal we should nevertheless fall so far short of conveying the true nature of the crisis in which we find ourselves and the obligation that is ours in that crisis. As you undoubtedly know, one of the occupational diseases of the business of commenting and analyzing is an overweaning sense of omniscience. The commentator all too often comes to sound like a poor imitation of one of the prophets of old. Prophecies of doom can be picked off every bush, and I do not intend to deliver still another Jeremiad. But, I want to try to discuss frankly what I feel is a serious failure.

Let me say first of all that in the new media of mass communication, radio and television, the effort at meaningful and vital communication simply has not been made. It is said that television by its very nature must be a medium of entertainment. But merely saying this does not absolve those responsible for the programs coming over this new form of communication, which now reaches well over half the American people, from their responsibility for helping to inform opinion on the great issues of the day. One could as well have said that the newspaper is a medium of entertainment and have filled it with comic strips, sensational crime and sports, devoting only a few paragraphs to the real news of the day. Some newspapers seem unhappily to be trying to follow that course.

Just as the newspapers can be used for entertainment or for true communication on the level of ideas and ideals, so can television. We have had at least some proof of how resourcefully television can be used to make vivid and real the problems that have in cold print an all too abstract sound. In his television program "See It Now" Edward R. Murrow showed how with the use of a little imagination the reality of threatening war in the Middle East, the overflowing farm surpluses, the integration of the races can be brought to life on the TV screen to hold the interest of an audience of many millions.

The "See It Now" program represents one of the few efforts by a major network to use television for these ends. Another was the interesting but unhappily short-lived program "Background" on NBC. The production costs of "See It Now" were high. That was one reason the sponsor dropped the program. For the same expenditure on a program of "entertainment" it was hoped to reach a very much larger audience. Then, too, that faithful word "controversial" was applied to certain of the "See It Now" programs. One can only guess at what the Founding Fathers would say if they knew we scurried away from what was labeled "controversial." Controversy was the life blood of the times that tried men's souls and it was only the "Summer patriots" who ran away.

It is perhaps unfair in this instance to blame the sponsor since after all we were able to see this important experiment in the use of television in the news for two years. There is here a question of responsibility. News, the communication of ideas and ideals, cannot be left solely to the whim of the market place. That has been one of the serious weaknesses of commerical radio and television. So long as the market was bullish for news, as in World War II and its immediate aftermath, we had a great many news programs. But when commercial sponsors are no longer willing to pay for such programs, we find the news drying up.

This is a serious evasion of responsibility on the part of those with authority to determine program content. Let me

---

This is from **Marquis Childs'** address, dedicating a new Communication Building at the University of Washington in April.

add that I believe our system is best for us. The British Broadcasting Corporation, a government-owned corporation operating radio and most TV programs, is perhaps the best system for Great Britain. Such a system applied here would be subject I am afraid to grave abuses. But there is under our system a responsibility to serve the public. That responsibility is at the base of the franchise of the free press, free radio and television. If there be a default in this obligation to serve the public, then sooner or later the franchise will be weakened and even destroyed. Public service in television does not consist in supplying a constant diet of chocolate ice cream sodas.

In this connection I would like to mention the particular responsibility of a Presidential election year. We have heard a great deal in recent weeks about the abuses of campaign contributions. Those abuses are very real and the so-called clean elections law falls short of correcting them. If the cost of television time for political campaigning, both on the national and local level, is to continue to increase with the increased use of television, then those abuses will multiply. It would seem to be the part of wisdom not only for the networks but for local stations as well to come forward with an offer of substantial free time to the major parties and the principal candidates. Such an offer would contribute to a sense of justice and fairness in the right of both parties to put their case before the electorate although one of these parties happens at the moment to have very great financial resources coming from campaign contributions and the other party is faced with a deficit for a lack of such contributions. Those who own and control the facilities of radio and television ought to realize that a conviction of injustice, if it is allowed to grow and fester, will eventually bring political reprisals. Those reprisals could endanger the whole structure of our system of free radio and television. The political climate can change quickly and a privilege freely granted in one atmosphere can be abruptly withdrawn in another.

Now to look beyond the mechanics and the politics of communication. I should like to suggest what seem to me to be perhaps deeper and more underlying reasons for our deficiency in real and meaningful communication one to another. Those responsible for the content of radio and television are often heard to say, "But if there is no demand for serious treatment of the news and the issues of the day, and we do have very little demand, why should we feel an obligation to provide such treatment for what must be after all a small minority."

They have a point. We may well ask ourselves why there is not a greater and more insistent demand for programs of substance concerned with the great problems of the time. Why is there such a passive acceptance of whatever "they" choose to send us from New York or Hollywood?

The fashion today is to put the blame for all our failures and deficiencies on our system of education. This is manifestly unfair if only because of the intense competition for the mind of the young. There has grown up what might be called a distraction industry. It is pervasive and far reaching. It takes in comic books, motion pictures, television, each with a skillfully calculated claim on young minds.

It is time to ask ourselves how the roots of intellectual curiosity are to be formed and how they are to grow and be nurtured. Nor is this an idle, academic question. It may have a far more direct bearing on the struggle with communism than we realize. A keen American observer recently in Soviet Russia noted the seriousness of students at almost every educational level. He saw teen-agers in book stores eagerly poring over books on physics, chemistry and mathematics. It occurred to him to wonder whether one reason for their absorption in serious subjects was that they were free from most of the manifold distractions now part of the daily fare of our young people. He wondered if this did not help to explain the zeal with which students in the Soviet Union were preparing to be scientists and engineers. These are sobering reflections when we know that Russia is turning out half again as many technicians and engineers as the United States.

I scarcely need to add that science is only one field in which we have begun to be aware of our deficiencies. We are beginning to understand that representative self-government cannot operate on an automatic pilot while we all enjoy the ride as passengers.

Lastly I should like to speak about the failure of leadership in this matter of communication. Carved on one of the government buildings in Washington are the words, "Where there is no vision the people perish." That has a trite and commonplace sound. But it may be that we have too long taken those words for granted.

Mere expression of goodwill, mere good intentions, is not vision. Vision signifies the deep and searching examination of the condition of mankind and the communication in vital and meaningful form of what the heart and the mind have found. I think we have a right to ask whether we today have from any source that vision of the past and the future which is one of the attributes of true leadership.

Let me try to illustrate what I mean in connection with the gravest issue confronting this country today. It is the issue of the equality of each citizen irrespective of race, color or creed as raised anew in the decision of the Supreme Court declaring the segregation of the races in the public schools to be unconstitutional. This relates directly to the rule of law and the powers of the Federal government. And

this time the context is far larger than it was a hundred years ago. For our system is on trial before the world in competition with the system of communism. What happens in Alabama whether for good or evil will be reflected at once in the headlines of the press of India and Indonesia, in the farthest corners of the earth.

The gravity of the situation in the South can hardly be exaggerated. There is on every hand the material for a terrible conflagration. There are communities in the Deep South where an uneasy armed true between the two races may be broken at any moment.

It is imperative that ways be found to ease this intolerable tension. Communication between the two peoples has all but broken down. Here, it seems to me, is a responsibility that President Eisenhower must assume. He should call the leaders of the two races together in Washington before it is too late. He should encourage them to try to find a way out of the present impasse. He should communicate to them his own urgent conviction of the need for a reasonable compromise. He has spoken in favor of moderation, he has cautioned against extremism. But this is not enough. He must put the weight of his own great popularity, the far reaching authority of the office he holds, in the balance. Even that may not be sufficient. But to do less, to permit the present drift to continue, is to wait for what could be irretrievable disaster.

Certainly such a course involves risks. Those who argue always for caution and political expediency can be expected to oppose it. But to wait for something in that fine Micawberish phrase to turn up, is a far greater risk. One may argue the wisdom of the Supreme Court decision and particularly the wisdom of its timing. But it is today the law of the land and the responsibility of leadership is to communicate the meaning of this decision in the lives of each and every one of us. This had not been done.

As the educator is a whipping boy in this time of troubles so also is the American official who undertakes to tell the world the American story. The Voice of America has been investigated and reinvestigated, condemned and denounced time and time again. Almost any member of Congress however obscure but believes that he could do it far better.

The Voice of America is a rather weak voice. It has many imperfections. But in all fairness we should consider the difficulties under which it must operate. Is it fair to expect this government agency to speak to the world with a clear, resolute voice when we here at home find it difficult to speak to one another in any reasonable or meaningful way about the issues that divide us? This seems to me the question we must ask ourselves. If we have all but ceased to discuss in a civilized fashion the problem of equality between the races then it is manifestly unfair to belabor the Voice of America for fading and failing from time to time.

My impression in the course of fairly extensive travel overseas is that the Voice is more effective than we have any right to expect. It was not so long ago that many of the employees in our information service abroad, often overworked and underpaid, were treated as though they were criminal suspects. Only two years ago two irresponsible mischief makers flashed through Europe, presumably with the authority of a Senate committee, browbeating and intimidating anyone who challenged their dictates. We may have forgotten that sorry episode. Europe has not forgotten it nor have those Americans who were humiliated by the tactics of these two intolerable Katzenjammer kids. We should not be surprised to find that many able information specialists have resigned and that it is increasingly difficult to persuade qualified men and women to take remote and difficult assignments.

The threat that communism insidiously poses is that it will pervert our own free way of life. In resisting it we shall become like it. Our fears will become so obsessive that in the pursuit of evil we shall forget the good of a strong and free society. The fever that plagued us two years ago has happily subsided. But we are left with many of the restraints, the inhibitions, the timidities of the rash of McCarthyism and they operate still to some degree on press, radio and television.

We suffer today from the twin blight of complacency and conformism. If ours is to be a dynamic society providing by word and deed the leadership of the western world, then there is no room in it for complacency. It is almost literally true that nothing that we do can possibly measure up to the extraordinary demands that are put upon us as Americans in this extraordinary century in which we are living. We can only give the best that we have in the hope that it will not be too little.

Staff Memo: 1956 Elections

From J. R. Wiggins

***Executive Editor, Washington* Post**

The political campaigns of 1956 are almost upon us. We need to remind ourselves of the obligations for the fair and accurate reporting of public affairs. These obligations rest upon us at all times, but departures from them are always more noticeable and painful in a year of heightened political interest on the part of readers.

The news columns of the Washington *Post* and *Times Herald* must bring to readers fair and impartial accounts of public events and unbiased and objective interpretation of those events. The news columns are without political affiliation. Coverage should not be influenced by our editorial page or by our personal inclinations and wishes. "Those who profess inviolable fidelity to truth must write of no man with affection or with hatred."

People who are keenly interested in public affairs—and newspapermen ought to be—are likely to arrive at certain conclusions about them. Some of us will start the campaign with intellectual preferences. Others will develop preferences as the campaign proceeds. It is not reasonable to expect that this can be avoided. It is not necessary to avoid it. What we seek to avoid is the intrusion of these preferences into the professional tasks of news handling.

An old Minnesota editor expressed the sort of dedication to our own profession about which I am talking when he said:

> He who assumes the high responsibility of conducting a public journal misapprehends the province and privileges of the press if he thinks he may treat men and events in relation to himself personally. He who cannot in the management of a journal rise above considerations of friendship or enmity and regard men, women and events impartially in their public aspects and influence is unworthy of his position. The press, otherwise, is degraded and its powers perverted or abdicated.—Joseph A. Wheelock, Editor of the St. Paul *Press,* 1875-1906.

No matter how successfully we attain impartiality and objectivity, we will be charged with unfairness and partiality. Partisan persons never really desire objectivity. We cannot, therefore, avoid criticism of our campaign coverage by partisans of the two parties and of rival candidates. All we can hope to do is to handle the news so that we do not deserve criticism.

What is in the news columns will be most influential in this matter. However, what we do, as individuals, also will have an influence. We claim, informally, and by our attitudes, if not by formal assertion, the privileges of a Fourth Estate, apart from (if not above) the other estates. It is inconsistent with this role for any of us to make public statements or to exhibit in our private capacities and in our personal conduct, violent and decisive partisan attitudes toward men or measures, so strong as to preclude, in the mind of the ordinary listener, the possibility of unbiased reporting. Judges have found it wise to maintain, off the bench as well as on the bench, both the appearance and the reality of impartiality. We occupy a not unlike situation. If we become known as committed public partisans in private life, it will be more difficult to persuade those whose views we oppose that our news columns do not reflect our partisanship.

The real test, of course, is the handling of the news itself. We cannot divest ourselves of the lifetime accumulation of impulses and impressions that shape our minds. Our judgment of what is newsworthy, important, significant and relevant, is bound to be influenced by all we have seen, heard and been. Each of us has his own astigmatism. Each of us views the world through windows not quite as pure as optical glass. Fortunately, however, we are not all handicapped by exactly the same imperfections. We can help each other to achieve a collective impartiality more perfect than any of us could alone attain: the sum of our bents, biases and partiality will add up to something more purely objective than the view had by any one of us alone. We are going to fail to achieve our ideal of objectivity, from time to time. An ideal to which all of us invariably conformed probably would not be high enough. When we do fail, in the judgment of afterthought, we must be quick and whole-hearted in correcting acknowledged error or bias.

A lack of objectivity, of which a given writer or reporter is not aware, because of his own slant on affairs, can be forgiven and corrected. The deliberate effort to insinuate bias into the news is another matter. Those guilty of this offense usually leave a great many finger marks about. It does not take a very astute analyst to figure out that a partisan is at work when views that are the reporter's own are slyly attributed to "sentiment in the state," "prevailing opinion," "reliable sources," "competent observers," "diplomatic quarters," or other handy retreats into anonymity. Whenever you think "prevailing opinion" indicates a "Democratic" or "Republican" landslide, or like political phenomena, make sure that it prevails somewhere other than in your own mind.

Even in writing interpretively it is a good thing to avoid total judments on men or events, or parties. God has not abdicated, for the duration of the campaign, the prerogative of arriving at solemn final moral judgments on human beings. Such assistance to Diety as the individual reporter may provide would not be decisive in any case. It is a good policy to withhold it. Much is expected of individual re-

porters and editors. They are not expected, on the basis of each day's news, to give the reader the current total estimate of the relative merits of contending candidates or parties. It is better not to attempt it.

During political campaigns a conspicuous weakness of American reporting becomes especially noticeable. I am referring to our weaknesses in reporting public speeches. A published account of a speech—political or otherwise—ought to try to disclose to the reader the total view of the speaker, insofar as he exhibits it, and not just a fragment. This doctrine sometimes seems to be at war with our news techniques. We look for a lead—usually the most provocative, inflammatory, controversial thing the man says. From that lead we tail off into as much additional comment as we have room for. It is not possible to abandon the "lead" technique entirely. Let us exercise caution in trying to keep the controversial phrase in context. If the speaker hedges, let us say he hedged, at the expense of a sharp lead or good headline. We cannot always do the speech in the English manner—as a veritable abstract of an address, with the ideas in substantially the same sequence. We can achieve a better total balance than we have, sometimes, in the past.

It is our duty, of course, to report the utterances of candidates for office, whatever the merit of what they say, but the fact that a campaign is in progress does not suspend the laws of libel. The degree to which privilege extends to such matter varies with the incident but it is not wise to assume that any privilege exists. Whatever the law in the matter, we do not wish to work injustice on individual persons during a campaign or at any other time. When someone is charged with criminal acts great care must be taken in reporting. If we are satisfied that the matter is not libelous or is privileged (by reason of being uttered in the Senate or House or under other privilege) we should take care to see that accusation and answer are printed in the same editions of the newspaper, if possible.

In closing days of a campaign, we must be especially careful that we do not help float groundless accusations and libelous rumors to which the persons accused cannot answer before the election. The news columns are the proper forum for debate, but the debate there, as elsewhere, must be conducted with regard for the rules of fairness.

Election day editions ought to be confined to the real news of the election and should shun speeches and statements making last minute charges, the truth or falsity of which cannot be ascertained, or the answers to which cannot be simultaneously presented. If sensational developments occur, decision on whether to publish or withhold should be put up to the Managing Editor.

Apart from content of stories there is the matter of emphasis by display, by sheer length, and by position. How are we to be fair in these matters? An appearance of fairness might be achieved with a foot ruler and a compass. We could make sure that from now and on to next November, we gave to each major political party and candidate, exactly the same number of column inches of space, exactly the same number of eight column headlines, seven column headlines, six column headlines, etc.; exactly the same number of stories above the front page fold and below the front page fold; exactly the same number of stories in each position on each inside page and precisely the same number and same size photographs.

This would be doing violence to standards of news selection that would buy a cheap reputation for impartiality but, in fact, exhibit the most shocking bias. Let us put eight column headlines on the speeches of Presidential candidates because what they are and what they say deserve eight column headlines, and not just because we gave that display to the speech of an opponent last week. Let's display pictures of the candidates in action on the basis of news merit and not just to balance the books with a foot rule. If we are governed by news judgment, to be sure, the law of averages ought to produce a roughly equivalent display. As we proceed, the failure to achieve a roughly equivalent display ought to cause us to re-examine our news judgment. But we must not be terrified into some mechanical distribution of space, position or staff, in order to achieve an apparent impartiality that abandons sound news values.

As the campaign proceeds, some of us will think the fate of the nation, and the fate of mankind, turns upon the triumph of one candidate or another. We may think that impartiality in a fight between the angels of heaven and the demons of hell is an attitude of immorality. It is safe to predict (and that is about the only safe election prediction) that not all the angels or all the devils will be in one camp. And even if they are, nothing will do the angels more good and the devils more harm, than the fullest reporting of the contest.

It will be helpful, if throughout the campaign year, as in other years for that matter, every member of the staff regards himself as a part of the guard appointed to keep our conscience. If you see anything in the coverage of any event that strikes you as unfair, inaccurate or partisan, let the editors know about it. In respect to some particular story, you may be the one person on the staff with a perfectly impartial attitude or with the information that discloses our inaccuracy or bias. Our newspaper ought to be the product of our collective judgments and observations and as such, superior to the newspaper that any one of us could produce alone even if that were mechanically possible. See that you do your part.

Fortunately, the whole American people are not required to elect one newspaper and defeat all others. Let us so conduct ourselves that if this were the situation, the election of this newspaper as the most impartial and objective newspaper in the country would be a foregone conclusion.

The Press' Stake in Performance Studies

By Charles E. Higbie

In the upper castes of the American newspaper industry it is safe to say that the most pervasive topic of thought in the past few months has been how to gain acceptance from supporting groups for added publishing costs—newsprint prices again being on the rise and supply on the decline.

Probably only in an off-hand manner has the industry, even in its more informed areas, paid more than cursory attention to the proposal by a Sigma Delta Chi sponsored group to study the political performance of the U.S. press in this year's presidential campaign. In a off-hand way, on the basis of interviews and some polling by mail, a cross-section of the nation's publishers was adjudged to have turned the proposal down by a great enough margin to cause the waiting Ford Foundation to put a proposed $650,000 grant back into its coffers for more non-controversial purposes.

Yet it is more than likely that the ultimate answer to the publishers' more economically-based problem of newsprint supply and costs will be more than vaguely related to the way in which the press performs in the next few critical elections. Whether the solution to higher costs in the industry is more circulation income, added advertising revenue, or subsidies in some form or other; the success of whatever course is adopted will be largely determined by attitudes towards the press by a number of groups, including its readers.

With the "one party press" charges already launched in 1952, the reputation of American newspapers with politicians and public alike will probably be determined to a tremendous degree by how the press is believed to be functioning in comparison to radio and television in bringing the news and views of the election to the American people.

The industry itself has apparently decided to shy away from research and systematic examinations of how it is functioning in 1956. However it is certain that there will be a number of examinations of the press by various groups during the campaign. It will still be important how the top echelons of the publishing business, the so-called spokesmen of the industry, publicly accept these investigations.

There are special reasons, both historical and modern, why newspapermen especially are justified in being wary of anything that smacks of "investigation." Historically the constitutional guarantee of "freedom of the press" was always applied in a manner which permitted a good deal of the element of the right to be wrong, and even the right to be wrong-headed or perverse. This came to mean that even to investigate a newspaper's motives was construed as an attack on the freedom of the press. It must be said for this system that on the whole it proved to be a good pragmatic way in which to apply the guarantee of press freedom. For one thing in the era of personal journalism it was the least oppressive way to implement the guarantee, since to question the motives of a newspaper generally meant questioning the motives of a single individual, the publisher. Who in that heyday of the Fifth Amendment had the presumption to test an individual's personal motives by forcing him to waive his immunity against testifying against himself?

If the newspaperman has historical reasons for being skittish about investigations of "intent," he has modern ones also. Perhaps no institution in America today is more familiar with close relationship between "investigation" and "conviction" which the temper of the times has forced upon certain government employees and even government departments. The fact that public opinion, even coached somewhat by certain units of the press, acquiesced in the summary dismissal of employees because of the fear for national security, may further enhance the traditional attitude of some newspaper executives that even an inquiry is a direct attack.

Despite both the historical and contemporary reasons, there is little evidence to believe that the conscientious professional newspaperman at whatever level has anything serious to fear from research or systematic examinations of newspapers.

There are numerous reasons why this is so. First of all it should be stressed here that the purpose, intent, or bias which is being sought out or measured is not necessarily even reprehensible from a conventional moral point of view. It may be controversial and it may subject a newspaper or a group within our communications system to criticism, still it is not likely except in the most far-fetched case, to involve anything resembling an actual statutory crime.

Once the editor or publisher has grasped the truth that an investigation of his paper's handling of a controversial matter is a clinical study of the apparatus of publishing and not a fishing expedition into his personal morality, a much more realistic judgment will be possible on the merits of research.

Probably the most important fact is that the U.S. press is eminently capable of defending itself from a genuine and forthright attack on itself collectively or on its individual members. Judging by past sensitivity it will certainly do so. When the answer to a possible negative finding on a newspaper is merely better performance, it is difficult to see the danger of research into "purpose" and "intent."

Charles E. Higbie is assistant professor of Journalism at the University of Minnesota.

The greatest danger to the press will come if it loses in the long-run the ability to demonstrate its independence and good intent to the public. If this ability to convince public opinion that its intent is good is lost, so too will be lost the press' ability to influence public opinion in defense of press freedom.

Perhaps the quickest way in which mass communications agencies of the U.S. may lose public regard may be in seeming to resist examination of their performances and role in society. Secrecy by any institution or official at once attracts suspicions or distrust in America. This attitude to a large extent was planted and diligently nursed by the newspapers of the country. The newspapers themselves, however, may find themselves victims of this basic attitude which they have had an honorable part in instilling. This will certainly be so if newspapers in general continue to resist or deplore research efforts of either descriptive or purposive nature, especially in the face of such political charges as the "one party press."

So much for 1956. Perhaps it is not too early to put in a plug for future action—say in 1960. Failure on the part of many newspapers or newspaper associations to show curiosity about the newspaper industry so that the total research bill spent is estimated at less than one per cent of the industry's net income, is bad enough. What is worse from the point of view of maintaining a favorable public opinion on a long term basis is to leave research in the area of communications and public opinion completely in the hands of outsiders.

This negative attitude toward participation in research has at least three immediate effects.

1. It casts the Fourth Estate in a negative light as far as public opinion is concerned. The press itself finds itself denying the research findings of others with merely its own assertions.

2. It tends to deny to the researchers who are rightfully interested in the field of communications the valuable knowledge, know-how, and points of view of those professionally engaged in the very field being investigated.

3. It deprives the newspaper industry itself of the objective information on its own strengths and weaknesses which must be known before any industry, governed by a genuine professional class, may develop self-confidence and in turn continue to enjoy the public confidence so necessary with which to defend itself.

An affirmative attitude towards research would result in giving the profession itself much needed descriptions of itself and its practices in the form of validated dimensions. Secondly it would guarantee that all research in areas vitally affecting the communications industries would have the sharpness and reality that the presence of industry sponsored research would force upon it. Thirdly it would enable replies to be made to criticism, valid or invalid, without being in the slightly ludicrous position of having no self-examination activities of a major character underway at all.

If for no other reasons than to defend themselves, all forms of communication—newspapers, radio stations, and TV networks—must be able in the future to prove with more conclusive evidence each election just how vital their role is in a modern democracy.

With the successful defense of his role in America based on modern descriptive research, the editor will find himself better able to bring home to those concerned the special nature of his economic problems. He will be able also more easily to demonstrate the need for higher standards to his staff and also to request cooperation of the necessary sort from the many individuals and groups in society from whom he must demand cooperation.

The definition of realistic standards for his profession has been the need of newspapermen at all levels for years. The intangible nature of newspaper work, which made it extremely hard to demonstrate conclusively many of the relationships, has held up the formulation of standards within the profession. With careful definition of criteria and modern methods of statistical tabulation the most intricate description of relationships now may be made for the first time in a practical manner. It is this type of research carried out on a non-partisan basis in the realm of newspapers and politics which will enable the profession for the first time to demonstrate on a mass basis the true values of an independent communication system and how they must be preserved.

Meanwhile in 1956 a new "open season" on the Press approaches with the new election year. My election predictions for 1956 are easy to make right now.

1. Newspapers will run "scared" early in the campaign hoping that no one will bring up the subject of surveys of press performance.

2. Mid-way in the campaign someone *will* bring up the subject. From this point on, the number of descriptive surveys misconstrued as proving special intent or purpose on the part of some press unit will be exceeded only by the number of "purposive" surveys which are interpreted as being typical of the conduct of the entire American Press. Newspapers themselves on numerous occasions will contribute to this confusion. The press will continue to run "scared."

3. The loser in 1956?—The Press of the U.S.

My hope is only that it will be a gracious loser for on the whole I think it is a good press. It may be maligned but I hope it retains its poise for I expect to be engaged in helping defend it from many quarters with whatever ammunition is available.

A Basis For Fair Campaign Coverage

By Nathan B. Blumberg

A long, hard look at the performance of many American newspapers in the 1952 presidential campaign and subsequently during the 1954 campaign shows clearly that there are ways in which newspapers can improve their reporting of political campaigns. This, of course, is only part of the total obligation of seeking methods to improve press coverage at all times. There should be little argument on the thesis that it is particularly important for newspapers to perform especially well in that period of approximately two months when voters biennially prepare to cast ballots.

The press has come a long way in the past 30 years. One needs only to look at coverage of the 1924 presidential campaign to see how far newspapers have progressed in the art of news reporting, but it appears likely that there will be even greater advancement in the next 30 years. It seems inevitable that the whole approach to reporting of political news is destined for a major overhauling. It is not just a matter of television and faster means of transportation and communication but, more important, it is an awakening by a majority of American newspapermen to the realization that what has been good enough for us, and what may have been good enough in the past, simply won't do for the future.

News coverage in the 1956 presidential campaign will present many problems. It now appears likely that persons other than the candidates of the two major parties will have great news value. In 1952 the participation of the president of the United States in the Democratic campaign created special difficulties for news desks. "It is fairly easy to keep news even between Adlai and Ike," James C. Pope of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* told the American Society of Newspaper Editors during the 1952 campaign, "but Truman throws things off balance." The problem in 1956 probably will not be any easier to solve than it was in 1952, and there is always the possibility of unforseen developments, such as a third party candidate, to add to the woes of news editors. Nevertheless, coverage of the 1956 campaign in all likelihood will be fairer and more temperate than was coverage of the last presidential race.

The basis for this sanguine prediction is that newspapermen have become increasingly conscious of the fact that they are being watched, and sometimes closely watched, by their readers and by their critics, both hostile and friendly. In the past three years there has been an effort at introspection on the part of newspapermen which perhaps is unparalleled in the history of American journalism. Political campaign coverage was discussed at length at the meetings this year of the ASNE and the American Newspaper Publishers Association, two organizations which in the past have shown considerable unwillingness to consider the subject. The Associated Press has a special committee studying campaign reporting, and hardly a week goes by without some reference to the problem in the *AP Weekly Log*. The United Press has initiated a series of secret "election memorandums" by its superintendent of bureaus aimed at improving UP reporting.

One of the more important results of recent studies of press performance during political campaigns has been the general recognition of the elementary fact that some methods of news presentation are fairer, more impartial than other methods. As a result, it is possible, admittedly at the risk of being dogmatic, to draw up a set of principles which would serve as a guide for impartial coverage of political campaign news. This set of five basic principles could not, of course, apply to all of the 1760 daily newspapers in the United States. Local conditions peculiar to some newspapers would make it either unnecessary or unwise to apply some of the suggestions which follow. But here, for what they may be worth, are some ideas on the art and science of news coverage during a political camapign:

1. Editorial preferences of the newspaper should have no influence on news columns. Obviously this is a prerequisite. Opinions expressed on the editorial page of a newspaper should have nothing whatsoever to do with the determination of news coverage and news display. A special reminder to this effect from the editor has been employed on several newspapers to make more certain the impartiality of the news pages. This philosophy is so manifestly necessary for fair presentation of political news that it is somewhat surprising that there are publishers—only a few, we can be thankful—who do not agree with this principle, and who

---

Nathan B. Blumberg, associate professor of journalism at Michigan State University, is the author of *One-Party Press?* a study of newspaper performance in the 1952 presidential campaign.

regard those publishers who employ this policy as naive or —worse—as fools.

The point was completely missed, for instance, by a New Jersey editor who, irritated by President Truman's remarks about a "one-party press" during the 1952 presidential campaign, omitted all news of Stevenson's campaign for one day to show "what a one-party press would really be." He made his announcement in a front-page editorial the same day, explaining that his newspaper would resume "equitable" treatment of both parties in the next issue. This jejune approach fails to recognize that responsible critics of press performance are not dismayed by black-and-white cases as much as they are disturbed by the shades of gray which creep into news columns. It is a rare newspaper indeed which virtually excludes the news of political activities of the party with which it disagrees, but there are newspapers, unfortunately, which stack the cards so that one party always draws a straight flush while the opposite must settle for an occasional pair of deuces.

2. *Space should be made available for views on important issues by representatives of both political parties.* Many newspapers already are doing this; more power to them. The American press long ago emerged from the era in which newspapers served as partisan political organs. Those papers which have failed for one reason or another—perhaps space limitations—to give a few column-inches to a well-defined political debate have been missing a good bet.

The suggestion by Democratic Chairman Paul Butler that newspapers provide a "battle page" may have been offered more to embarrass than to aid, but there is some merit in his proposal. Most newspapermen, however, prefer to think of the "battle page" in the sense that it was used by W. W. Waymack, onetime editor of the Des Moines *Register* and *Tribune*. He regarded the "battle page" as a "deliberate effort . . . to make sure that the principal opposing points of view with respect to major issues will regularly be laid before our readers by competent arguers." He was referring primarily to columnists, but during election campaigns the idea expressed by Waymack could well be extended to include any "competent arguer."

There are weaknesses and dangers in the "battle pages" which should be recognized. Although there have been several examples of newspaper "battle pages" which made interesting and informative reading, an improperly-handled series of this kind can be deathly dull or, in the words of one editor, a "playground for publicity men." The idea also may be distorted as it was during the 1952 campaign when one metropolitan newspaper in a large midwestern city attempted to show its "impartiality" by offering space on its front page to spokesmen of the political party it opposed. This ludicrous episode merely served to emphasize the fact that this particular newspaper was making no attempt to present a balanced report in its news columns.

3. *Omission of significant news items and emphasis on the trivial are two serious kinds of distortion.* No amount of statistical analysis can reveal the influence of silence and/or vehemence in regard to some stories during the 1952 and 1954 campaigns. Believe it or not, there were some newspapers which did not even carry Stevenson's 1952 speech explaining his role in the Alger Hiss case. And even more difficult to fathom is the fact that some papers did not carry Eisenhower's Detroit speech in which he announced he would go to Korea. Many other stories, perhaps not quite as newsworthy but nonetheless important for an understanding of political issues, were not published in some newspapers. It is possible that there were extenuating circumstances, such as deadline pressures or stories breaking on opposite time, but there are some events which remain important even when they are warmed over. No editor can afford the luxury of a policy based on the idea that his readers will be "filled in" by his newspaper competitors or by radio or television.

Equally unfair are the "manufactured" news items which reach a peak of production during political campaigns. It is tempting, with an election a short time away, for newspapers to "uncover" unsavory information about candidates of the opposite political faith. But a crusade has mud on its guidons if stories are dug up simply to embarrass and, hopefully, to defeat certain candidates. There should be no trace of editorial threat running through news stories, nor should there be a deliberate attempt to hold back until the opportune moment information with political overtones. Similarly, interpretive articles and "think pieces" have a deserved place in modern news reporting, but occasionally these devices are employed with motives so ulterior that readers would have to be dolts to accept the stories at face value. There are other kinds of synthetic news. For example, editors might well examine the record of public opinion polls to decide whether they are a "new kind of news," as one syndicate promotional piece contended recently, or a commercialized stunt with about as much scientific validity as a ouija board.

4. *Special "campaign desks" could improve news coverage.* Special appraisal and treatment of news is particularly important during political campaigns. A desk which had as its primary function the handling of all political news is more likely than the traditional copy desk to keep campaign reporting in balance. If one wire story reports that candidate A was met in city X by "50,000 rabidly enthusiastic, confetti-throwing citizens," and another wire story reports that candidate B was met in city Y by "a large crowd"—which may

have numbered 100,000—a man handling political news on a "campaign desk" would be able to spot the inequity quickly.

Robert W. Lucas, editor of the Denver *Post* editorial page, has been a strong advocate of the "campaign desk" approach to news handling. "The objective," he told Michigan State University journalism students recently, "is to edit news of politics, to minimize duplication and repetition of speeches and quotes, to single out for more extensive background support developments of a more complex or controversial nature. This way it is hoped that the public will receive a simpler, clearer and more precise chronicle of the campaign's progress." Under the Lucas plan, staff members who sit at the special desk would consult with the managing editor, who would make the final decision on news play. The editor and the editorial page editor, Lucas added, also would have the "campaign desk" men available for consulting and planning. The Denver *Post* plans to experiment with this special desk in the 1956 campaign, Lucas said. The plan makes so much sense that other newspapers might want to try the idea without waiting for another election to pass.

5. Editing, headlining and display of news stories and photographs require regular appraisal. On the basis of a study of thousands of front and inside pages, it is safe to conclude that those newspapers which employ the makeup device of grouping stories under a shared headline, or making a special effort to demonstrate that news stories concerning both political parties are receiving a fair share of the space allotment and display, are the newspapers which deserve fewest complaints from their readers. In other words, the hit-or-miss method of news presentation—"seat-of-the-pants" newspapering—does not allow both parties to get their respective positions on issues across to the voter—which, after all, is what a political campaign is all about.

Because special care is required to make certain that both parties get impartial news treatment, it does not follow that newspapers should employ a little man with a ruler whose job is to measure news stories and photographs in every edition. What it does mean is that there should be an effort made every day, both before and after publication, to assess the newspaper's contents. J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington *Post and Times Herald,* has taken a long step in this direction by inviting every member of the staff to regard himself "as part of the guard" of the newspaper's conscience during the campaign. "If you see anything in the coverage of any event that strikes you as unfair, inaccurate or partisan," Wiggins informed his staff, "let the editors know about it." More newspapers might well engage in self-evaluation of this kind during the stress of political campaigns when partisan emotions are most easily aroused.

It would be ridiculous to contend that there should be equal allotment of space and equal display emphasis every day. There are days on which the news involving one political party is of supreme importance or interest. It is difficult, however, to follow the logic of an editor at the 1952 convention of the ASNE who announced that he was preparing to adopt the "cowardly device" of giving both parties equal news space in an effort to "allay criticism." Certainly it is likely that in the course of a campaign there will be days when candidates of one party will be making speeches of greater news value than the representatives of the other party, but only the most partisan of editors would maintain that this would be the case consistently throughout a campaign. Human beings being what they are and human nature being what it is, the element of news value usually will favor each major party many times throughout a give-and-take campaign. But even when the news of one party merits special display it should be kept in mind that what the other party is doing should not be excluded.

There is also the point that some newspapers use a banner headline every day as part of their standard makeup. When this is the case, it would appear to be particularly necessary for these newspapers not to make the mistake of thinking that only one political party has a monopoly on big news.

News desk handling of the content and structure of news stories obviously presents more difficulties than the more simple decisions of headline play or page and space allocation. Content analysis is not really as mysterious or "scientific" a pursuit as some of the researchers with post-graduate degrees in sociology and statistics would like to have us believe. Most news editors are equipped to rely on their experience and judgment to gauge the fairness of news presentation. It does not take a persistent pursuer of content analysis techniques, for instance, to detect the fundamental unfairness of these headlines over stories which have no quantitative inequality:

STEVENSON ADDS	HOW IKE STANDS
TO PROMISE OF	ON VITAL ISSUES
NEW DEAL TYPE	FACING AMERICA

Obviously, these headlines, which appear in a large metropolitan newspaper the day before the 1952 election, could be altered to achieve the following: Eisenhower Adds/ To Promise of/ Hoover Type, and How Adlai Stands/ On Vital Issues/Facing America.

The same newspaper also utilized its news columns to inform readers to "Pull the Republican Party Lever *Only,*" and employed a series of photographs to show how to accomplish this feat.

Furthermore, it is unquestionably true that some newspapers which succeed in presenting a fair and balanced diet of news of the activities of candidates at the national level fall down miserably in their coverage of congressional campaigns. This is sometimes an interesting phenomenon—a kind of inverse news desk "Afghanistanism" in which all

is well with people and places far away, but terrible passions break loose at the local level. Readers also tend to be more sensitive about news stories—or the lack of them—concerning candidates for the congress or for state offices, and there is considerable evidence that charges of partiality in the news columns frequently can be more easily substantiated in treatment accorded candidates for these positions than in the coverage of national campaigns.

Closely allied to the problem of space display and content is the matter of photo coverage. There have been occasions when newspapers have employed large and dramatic photographs to emphasize the attractive qualities of one candidate at the expense of another. No one in his right mind would suggest that any newspaper fail to use a photograph simply because it means that one party might be given more space in the paper that particular day, but it does seem logical that there should be no monopoly of photo coverage for one candidate. Good photographs of men in both parties are available. They can be used in such a way that over the period of the campaign there would be no reason for readers to complain that a newspaper could find room for pictorial coverage of only one party.

Above all else, the fact remains that newspapers, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion. If some newspapers are to be above suspicion there will have to be some changes made.

The Jury Does Not Wish To Be Judged

By Alex S. Edelstein

An editorial early this year in *Editor & Publisher* (Jan. 28), commenting upon the decision of Sigma Delta Chi to drop its study of newspaper objectivity in the 1956 presidential campaign, contained a triumphant note that might well have been omitted. More appropriate would have been a word of warning.

The warning: That some group other than a professional journalism society may take on the job of studying press performance without bothering to ask the support of newspaper publishers and editors.

When *E & P* implied that some of the publishers, editors and educators who supported the proposed study were doing so "out of a desire to prove some preconceived notions about the press" it did none of us any good. And in describing the majority of editors and publishers who saw little value in the study *regardless of its conclusions* as "responsible," the implication was present that publishers who saw potential value in the study might well be "irresponsible."

The fact of the matter is that press performance has been studied, is being studied, and always will be studied. The SDX proposal merely suggested going beyond the ruler stage, applying to editorial research tested techniques that have been utilized profitably in market research by newspapers as well as by competing media.

Just to cite one case, the Minneapolis *Star* & *Tribune* has for many years devoted important manpower and budget to editorial research. In describing recent changes in the *Star,* Research Director Sidney Goldish told *E & P* (Feb. 18, 1956) that many of the changes were the direct result of editorial research.

As for the decision of the "jury" itself, it may very well be that the 35 publishers who expressed doubt that the study would establish anything "conclusive" are quite correct. But nothing conclusive really was claimed.

The most extensive "claims" are contained in the memorandum sent to the publisher-jury by Norman E. Isaacs, managing editor, Louisville *Times,* on Dec. 22, 1955.

Mr. Isaacs, chairman of the SDX committee on ethics and news judgment, said that when all the study returns were in the conclusions would be issued, "not as the final word on newspapering in America," but as a responsible index to the performance of the newspapers studied in a 10 week period of a national political campaign.

Mr. Isaacs said the researchers were striving to determine:

a. What kind of information the citizen received from his principal sources of news;
b. If it generally was sufficient to give him adequate knowledge to make up his mind about the issues presented;
c. If the issues were presented in a generally fair manner;
d. Some analyses of news play and effect.

With some of the well advised objections to the study we have no wish to dissent. For example, several publishers asked if pilot studies would not first be advisable. Others suggested other media of mass comunication and relevant newspaper content such as editorials and columns be included. (SDX proposed only three news magazines and two picture magazines be included. Television was to be studied by the University of Michigan in the same manner as in 1952.)

Some doubted if the system of checking with editors on the utilization and play of stories would be productive or practical. Numerous questions were raised on the size of the proposed budget, about $650,000, a problem which is related closely to the suggestions for pilot studies.

But some of the other areas of disagreement seem to call for vigorous discussion.

Most significant were the numerous expressions of dis-

agreement with the principle of examination and self-criticism.

These range from the statements of J. R. Knowland (Oakland *Tribune*) that " . . . we are frankly belittling ourselves in this movement," and of James M. Cox, Jr. (Cox Newspapers) that " . . . a further study would be a propaganda sounding board . . . (for various left wing spokesmen) . . . " to the caution expressed by Erwin D. Canham (*Christian Science Monitor*) that . . . "no apparatus which can be converted into a means to bring illegitimate pressure on newspapers should ever be supported by newspapers."

But Canham added:

> "I am inclined to think this study will prevent worse evils from coming upon us . . . "

Allen Raymond, in a recent pamplet discussing the struggle for more information from goverment, cites as one of the handicaps:

> " . . . so great a distrust of the ownership and management of American daily newspapers . . . as to limit greatly the power of the press to work in that freedom conceded to it constitutionally *for the benefit of the people.*" [1]

Raymond says a great many people outside newspaperdom are far more concerned with the way in which newspapers handle the information about government they get now than about the need for the newspapers to get more. He adds:

> "Although many newspaper editors have written influentially about public affairs, they seem to have either neglected or failed to convince the reading public that freedom of the press is so vital to the freedom of the citizen that *popular uprisings ought to ensue when the freedom of the press is threatened.*" [2]

As for the usefulness of the study, it is pertinent to quote Carl R. Kesler, editor of *The Quill.* He stated his confidence that the study would have demonstrated the great majority of American newspapers are objective in their news columns and adds:

> "If the *public* had a better understanding of the essential nature of a free press, much of the criticism that led to the proposed survey would never have been made." [3]

And *publishers?* It is apparent that many of them are being critically slow to awaken to the effect upon the public, and in turn, upon the press itself, of deviant cases of press performance.

The SDX committee itself felt that by studying the development of political campaign news at the source, the pattern of transmittal to newspapers, its editing and display in newspaper offices, and the expectations and reactions of its readers, a great contribution to an understanding of news handling might be afforded and stated:

> "It would enlighten non-professional readers, especially as to the actual role of a newspaper in a political campaign." p. 30

A discouraging aspect of some of the replies lay in the irresponsible terms in which the opposition was expressed.

The Chicago *Tribune,* for one, could not wait to receive its letter from SDX before it answered editorially, in part:

> *"We think the proposal is remarkable chiefly for its silliness.* The best judges of whether a newspaper is fair are its readers. They will not continue to read a newspaper that they believe to be unfair. By and large, therefore, unfair newspapers fail, though it does not follow from this that all newspapers which fail are unfair." (Reprinted in Publisher's Auxiliary, Dec. 3, 1955) [1]

Let *us* not now be silly. Who among us believe that circulation in itself is a measure of a newspaper's service?

Each reader is *not* his own best judge. Each man who desires it should be able to find information in the press adequate to assist him to make intelligent judgments about issues important to himself and the society. This does not deny his own responsibility to seek out the truth, of course, but one man can no more educate himself today than he can print his own newspaper. In most cases, he has little choice in the purchase of a local newspaper.

But even if the only test of responsibility were the "reader test"—the five to 10 cents represented by the sale of each copy of a newspaper—some of those who scoffed at the study might better have called for research than a show of coins.

The "World Greatest Newspaper," for example, dropped from a morning circulation of 1,076,000 in 1947 to 892,000 in 1954. This loss was recouped partially in 1955 to 926,000. But this is in a period when total daily newspaper circulation increased 10,000,000—about 22 per cent.

[1] Nov. 16, 1955.

The *Tribune* had this, as well, to say of the SDX study:

> "The work would be intrusted to *something known as* the council for communication research, an affiliate of the Association for Education in Journalism, an organization composed of members of journalism school faculties.
>
> "That is to say, the proposal for this inquiry comes from *men who can't decide whether their occupation is an honorable one, are inclined to think it isn't, and cannot trust themselves to inquire into the question on their own account and with their own money.*"

One would guess from those innuendoes that the *Tribune* has a justified distrust of researchers, research techniques

[1] The People's Right to Know, A Report on Government News Suppression, (Prepared for ACLU) New York, December, 1955, Page 39.
[2] Ibid, Page 40.
[3] "One Man's Opinion, "Vol. XLIV, No. 3, March, 1956, Page 3.

and journalism schools. But the Jan. 28, 1956 issue of *E & P* reports the *Tribune* spends upward of $400,000 annually for market research and social studies.

These social studies, the *Tribune* study director reports, have focussed on the relationships between newspapers and society, the function of the newspaper, what people expect from newspapers, and if social changes are creating new reading tastes.

These matters should be studied, and, it is apparent, are not far removed from SDX study proposals. As for the journalism schools, they are not the ones who will supply the answers. It will be the editors and the readers. Why, then, such indignation?

Perhaps it is as one of the publishers, Eleanor McClatchy (McClatchy Newspapers) says:

> "It would take more than a $650,000 study to convince a newspaper of the propriety of ethical and objective news writing if such is not already a basic principle of its existence."

This is so, of course, but the examination must not be thought of as the cure. The examination may be a success but the patient may die. On the other hand, an examination may suggest there is nothing wrong with the patient that cannot be corrected, or the patient may be found to be in the best possible condition, taking into consideration his age and his occupation. That is to say, there are advantages that would accrue to the press and the public merely in a *report* of press performance.

The notion that the press is above study, evaluation or criticism cannot be accepted by the public, by scholars, newspapermen or by publishers. Arrogance in a monopoly is an occupational disease. It can happen to any man who does not guard against it.

If we are to be honest with ourselves we also must concede that the SDX study proposal was not inspired nor was it to be financed by Robert Hutchins, as the hue and cry asserted. It was not intended to appease those who assert that we have a "One Party Press." It grew, rather, out of a desire to provide a more reliable inventory of press performance than fragmentary studies have been able to give us, and as such, to serve to refute charges made by the axe grinders. Some results might not be flattering, but if we are being fair in our news handling on the whole, as most of us believe, that documentation would not be without value.

Speaking of Hutchins, and the inability of some publishers to look at criticism through anything but a bloodshot eye, one is reminded of the furor raised by the Hutchins Commission report, *A Free And Responsible Press.*

Certainly we would agree, as the saying goes, with the right of any man to differ with another, or even with a commission, but the shouting and the fuming exceeded all bounds. But oddly enough, the press has found itself agreeing with many of the Commission's findings. In our own professional literature we find extensive agreement on the need for providing news that is meaningful, accurate and comprehensive.

Returning to the SDX jury, several editors and publishers insisted on the need for self-criticism and evaluation, points stressed by the Commission. They said the public interest would be served by the study, that the public "had a right to know" how their press was performing. Others expressed a keen interest in what public attitudes are toward the press. About a half-dozen agreed with the researchers that some workable standards for press performance might emerge from such a study. There were more pro-research statements by the jury than critical comments.

One of the most significant suggestions made by the Commission was that a public agency be established to conduct research in the mass media. The Commission felt this agency should be free of both government and press control. The reason given, of course, is that only in an independent agency is there implicit assurance that the results will be the product of objective study. The public will not be satisfied with self-appraisals by publishers.

Instead, the publishers look askance at the SDX proposal, which would have combined independence in judgment with experience and understanding in the media. Had the publishers chosen the path of cooperation with SDX it would not have meant that all other investigation and study would cease. Quite likely, it would have tended to spur it on. But it would have promised more enlightened scholarship. Certainly studies by specialists in schools of journalism are to be preferred to those conducted by specialists from other fields—or by Senatorial inquisitors.

If we have little to be ashamed of in the total picture —as this writer would expect—we would do well to undergo examination.

Let us not lose our freedom because we feared to ask ourselves if we are meeting the test.

* It might be argued that SDX cancelled the study, rather than that it was voted down by the publisher jury. SDX made the decision, based on a priori conditions, to cancel the study unless it met with substantial publisher support. Actually, however, with the exception of inquiries of editors, reporters, et. al., about the handling and display of political news, the study could be conducted independent of arrangements with newspapers. But this would have destroyed the validity of the study design. Other studies have not employed the personal interview device with those who handle the news.

Prof. Edelstein, former California newspaperman, is at the School of Communications, University of Washington.

Three Jobs for the Editorial Page

By John Hulteng

Nearly any practicing critic of the press will be glad to point out to you in detail how sadly the editorial page has declined in influence from the days of Greeley and Bennett, when the individualistic thunder of a single editor was enough to dictate the course of wars or elections.

The critics cite statistics showing the press commonly on the losing side in presidential races. They can relate and document numerous instances in which the readers of a given newspaper went solidly against the editors' earnest advice in the matter of a bond issue or a local controversy. And they can reel off the results of readership surveys which show the editorial page far behind the front page, the comics, the sports section, and even the crossword puzzle, in terms of consistent following.

But when they are all through, what have these critics proved? That the days of gaudy personal journalism are pretty largely over? I'll go along with that, and shed no tears at the passing.

Have they proved that the editorial pages cannot marshal their readers into line—one, two, three—to follow dictated judgments? I'll agree to that, too, and say a hearty amen in the bargain. No editor should try to, or be able to, dragoon his readers in that fashion.

Have the critics proved that the editorial page no longer attracts the interest of readers as it once did? Perhaps they have, if the poll figures can be accepted as reliable.

But have they therefore proved that the editorial page is obsolete? Have they proved that the editorial page is an atrophied limb of the journalistic operation that ought to be chopped off as deadwood?

They certainly have not, for my money.

If the editorial page has lost readership and declined in influence, the cause does not lie with some inexorable process of obsolescence, accelerated by the rise of newsmagazines, columnists and television. The cause lies with editors and publishers who have failed to perceive and to accept a responsibility that still attaches to their roles in the national community.

There is still an urgent job for the editorial page to do —whether that page is being published in the New York *Times,* the Portland *Oregonian* or the Sutherlin *Sun.* But in too many newspaper shops that job just isn't being done, and it is there that the health of the editorial page is being undermined.

Exactly what is the job that still needs doing?

It is threefold, as I see it. And the first part of the three has to do with a word—"interpretation"—that has become worn almost as smooth and meaningless by misuse as have such other once-significant tags as "liberal" and "conservative."

You don't need me to tell you that the flow of news today is far too complex to be understandable to the newspaper reader on the basis of spot news fact alone. The skeletal, factual outline of the news as it develops from day to day must be fleshed out with supplementary facts, and with the observations of qualified analysts, if it is to make sense at all to the reader who sits down with the paper each evening, feet up on the hassock, and prepares to devote 10, 15 or perhaps even an extravagant 20 minutes to posting himself on the way the world wags.

The job of filling out the full dimensions of the news is done in large part by the so-called interpretative reporter. The cult of interpretative reporting has been spreading at a headlong, perhaps even a disastrous pace in recent years. (I say "disastrous" because this potentially dangerous tool is being put more and more frequently into unskilled hands, with results that can only be unhappy in the long run for both the press and the reader.) But even at best, only so much can be done through interpretative reporting—if the editor wants to retain his integrity as a newspaperman.

Interpretation inevitably tends to shade over into opinion. When the reporter begins to speculate about the motivation in a news development, or its future consequences, or its impact for good or evil, he is no longer dealing in news. That sort of interpretation does not belong, unlabeled, in the news columns.

When your wife shops for your dinner at the butcher's, she quite properly expects to find the cuts of meat clearly and explicitly graded. She would object, and violently, if there were not grade labels, and if she were expected to judge for herself on the basis of color, texture and odor which cuts were choice, which good and which prime.

Your customer, the reader of your newspaper, is entitled to similar consideration. He should not be obliged to analyze each item for himself to determine whether it is indeed news, or whether it is predigested fare, already transformed by the intellectual gastric acids generated by some reporter's biases. He expects to find news in your news columns, or

---

Until he joined the faculty of the University of Oregon School of Journalism last year, **John Hulteng** was chief editorial writer on the Providence *Journal.* He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950. This is from a talk to the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association.

interpretative reporting which stays within the bounds of news. And he looks for interpretative opinion where it belongs, on the editorial page.

The first part of the threefold function of the modern editorial page, then, is one of interpretation. It is the editor's job to help the reader to an understanding of the full significance of the news. And the interpretative or expository editorial is one of the most effective instruments he can employ in that task.

The degree of responsibility is relative, of course. No one expects the country weekly editor to interpret for his readers the full flow of news, from the Bulganin-Eisenhower notes to the complexities of rival farm policy proposals in a campaign year. He hasn't the staff to allow for the thorough background reading that necessarily must underlie any such broad range of interpretation.

But the weekly editor is uniquely grounded in one area: community affairs. His grasp of the meaning of events in the community he serves is more complete than any other citizen's, or ought to be. If he can't spare the time to interpret the world's trends for his readers, he can and should help them to an understanding of the news of local origin.

The newsmagazines can't do that for your readers, nor can the syndicated columnists. Only the editor and his editorial page can interpret local news in all dimensions for the public in your community.

Robert M. Hutchins has said some pointed and constructive things to editors from time to time. Most recently, speaking to the American Society of Newspaper Editors at Washington, he said this:

"You are the 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 alternative before them; otherwise they cannot be enlightened."

The second part of the threefold function of today's editorial page is the provision of honest opinion.

Interpretation and explanations are essential to the reader's understanding of the news. Vigorous, well-reasoned opinion on the editorial page is essential to the reader's exercise of his critical and intellectual resources.

The opinion editorial serves the readers in one of two ways. It may provide a crystallization of his own convictions on a subject, if the editorial's point of view and his own happen to mesh; or it may provide him with a yardstick by which to measure his own opposing views, if his ideas and those of the editorial clash. In either case, his thinking processes will be stimulated. And that is a thoroughly worthy goal. It is altogether wrong to measure the success of editorials solely by the degree to which they force public opinion to conform to the paper's view. If they prod readers into thinking for themselves, they have done a job worth doing.

And who but you can provide your readers with the necessary intellectual stimulus in the field of local affairs? Certainly the newsmagazines and the columnists can't. If you don't do it, no one will.

The third part of the job to be done by the present-day editorial page is, of course, the maintenance of an open forum. The letters to the editor section of the local paper provide the newspaper reader with his only chance to set his views before the public on a plane with those of the editor. Only your editorial page can maintain such a forum in the community.

So the job is there to do. All three jobs are there to do. If they aren't being done, the editors and publishers are the ones who are to blame—not some internal, inevitable decay taking place in the editorial page as an organ of the press.

If the jobs are done, the editorial page will no longer be sick. It will no longer lack readership or respect, in big town or small.

There are vigorous editorial pages around the country, and in Oregon, fully alive to their obligations and living up to them every day; fighting to make a community's milk supply safer; battling to reassert the public's right to know how the public business is being conducted; prodding unwilling readers to face the facts of life in an atomic age.

I have no intention of joining in premature funeral services for the editorial page while I know of such papers and such performances.

And the job is by no means the responsibility only of the big city editor. It rests with every editor, with every one in this room. A British observer, the Washington correspondent for the Manchester *Guardian,* sees the opportunity perhaps more clearly than can we, who are in the midst of it:

"If I were privileged," he writes, "to be an editorial writer in this country, I would try to make my parish in the Republic speak with its own brave voice on the imperious issues of national policy. In an age of echoes I would try to resist the tyranny of slogans and the easy success which comes from conforming to other people's opinions."

If the editorial page is sick today, it is because editors are too busy or too lazy to resist the "easy success" which rewards conformity. It is because editors and publishers do not, or will not, see their responsibilities in the round.

And it is NOT because there is nothing left for the editorial page to do.

Reporting The Findings of Economics

Economic research is booming but newspaper coverage of the results is in a depression. Foundations are spending millions of dollars to study such problems as farm price supports, downtown traffic, installment buying and the shortage of scientists. Yet the American people know little or nothing about this research.

This problem of communications was recognized this spring by both the foundations and the press when more than 20 reasonably busy men took two days off to attend a conference on communicating the results of economic research. The setting was the Amos Tuck School of Business Administration at Dartmouth College in Hanover, N. H. With the conference room windows open to Hanover's hesitant spring, these men sat down during the last weekend in April to discuss their problems.

Almost immediately common ground was found between the research agencies and the press. The Ph.D.'s relaxed and insisted on using first names, but the newspapermen didn't take off their coats or roll up their sleeves—in deference to the academic atmosphere.

The press was represented by staff members from United Press, Buffalo *Evening News,* Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers of Illinois, *Times, Harvard Business Review, Business Week,* Washington *Post* and *Times Herald, Challenge* Magazine, National Broadcasting Co., New York *Times* and *Scientific American.*

Representing the research side were men from Stanford Food Research Institute, Council on Foreign Relations, Twentieth Century Fund, National Planning Association, Ford Foundation, National Bureau of Economic Research, Brookings Institution and Chicago Federal Reserve Bank.

The group agreed that communicating the results of economic research is only one aspect of the problem. Before such results are ready for publication, it was pointed out, the foundations can develop interest in their work by discussing what they are doing with as many newspapermen as possible. Most of the foundations are located either in New York or Washington, cities where it is easy to assemble groups of interested reporters. The New York and Washington newspapermen and research representatives agreed to try to set up background sessions in both cities.

* * * * * *

Newspapers and wire services want as much *news* about important economic research as they can get.

The wire services are the key to the distribution of national news, whether it be the results of economic research or Marilyn Monroe's new look.

Both the specialist and the general reader are at its wire tips. When the specialist sees a story in his local newspaper, he knows where to go for additional information. He can turn to specialized publications or else to the research agencies for details. The general reader usually will be satisfied with the necessarily sketchy wire service story.

To get news on the wire, the research agencies must provide clear and simple reports. Although some research people maintain that simplification means the distortion of their work by leaving out essential details, most seem to feel that with additional time, effort and expense they can produce more understandable reports without sacrificing accuracy. The newspapermen also impressed upon the research people that the easiest way to reach the widest audience is to tell the tale in terms of people. One of the economists warned his colleagues against trying for more attention than the results of their work justify. He also cautioned against research for the sake of research. There was some disagreement here though.

* * * * * *

While the wire services are important, the research agencies cannot ignore the provincial press. That's where most of the 56 million newspaper readers are. But these are the newspapers most likely to be slighted by the research agencies—given nothing more than a handout now and again.

Personal contact between the newspapermen and the research people is the ideal solution to this problem. A provincial newspaperman who is interested in economic news should get acquainted with the men doing the research. This would include local and state colleges and universities as well as national and regional research foundations. Then, when a study of particular interest to a region is under way, a tip from the research agency to the reporter will get the newspaper in at the beginning.

Contacts between regional newspapers and the national foundations can be established easily. Most of the larger newspapers have Washington bureaus. Men from these bureaus could attend the get-acquainted sessions which some of the research agencies want to set up. The foundations, like many other groups, fail to realize that perhaps two-thirds of the Washington press corps is made up of men representing regional newspapers.

The provincial press wants more than the leavings of the large magazines and Washington and New York newspapers. The research institutions, if they want to get along with the provincial papers, must give them exclusive stories, too. The stories would have to be significant and have some regional impact. No newspaper will devote a lot of expensive newsprint to a story that was kissed off

the day before in a brief wire service dispatch printed in a local opposition paper.

The wire services cannot notify every interested newspaper of every upcoming report. It is up to the papers and the research agencies to establish communications.

Large metroplitan newspapers are oriented around a city news staff. This serves as a manpower pool for local, regional, national and even international stories. There are experts here who can deal with scholars. It is foolhardy, of course, for a newspaper to send a police beat man on an economics story.

Economics reporters in the provinces should ship back to the research agencies clips of their stories. Then the research people can see how reliable and competent a reporter is.

If personal contact between the institutions and the reporters is impossible, the inadequate press release can be an opening wedge. When a reporter sees a handout, he knows something is available and can ask for more information or the complete report. Such queries from reporters will be answered with courtesy and, probably, a large amount of surprise by the research people.

The research agencies have a lot to do toward solving the problems of working with the provincial press. But the newspapers themselves have a large share of the responsibility, too. It's time regional papers realized that economics is wrapped up with all other problems of American life. It's more than death and taxes. Economics is one of the few branches of the social sciences that has been accepted by the government in its planning process. The 56 million readers of America's 1,700 daily newspapers are entitled to know what's going on in economics. Yet all too few papers have economics reporters. Most editors of business pages spend their time writing puffs for local industry. Maybe it's time for an economics beat under the general news category.

Another aspect is comment. That is where the editorial page comes in.

Editorial pages are a prime market for the dissemination and discussion of economic research. All editorial pages should be interested in new ideas, and many of them are. Those editorial writers whose minds are open to persuasion are always looking for new ideas—especially in the social sciences and particularly in economics. The editorial writer wants a short news release which reflects the main line of the research and its conclusions. He also wants a copy of the report or, if that is not possible, enough in the way of excerpts from the report so that an intelligent and thoughtful editorial can be written from the information. He also wants to know exactly what the foundation is, where it gets its money, who paid for the particular research under consideration, and the qualifications of the persons who did the research. (Reporters want this information, too, of course.)

If research agencies would get more information about their activities to editorial writers, more of the story of research would get to the American people. Editorial pages do not reach the mass of the people who read little but the comics or the sports pages. But editorial pages are read by the leaders of communities, the people who influence those who read only the funnies.

The break-down in communications is not solely the fault of the research agencies. Editorial writers are also at fault. All too many editorial pages still are not interested in controversy, and there is some controversy in most economic research. Many editorial pages are still manned by men who have little understanding of economics. (Will someone give us a summary of Keynes in 50 words, please?)

* * * * * *

The three Nieman Fellows who attended the Dartmouth conference agreed that the larger newspapers and the national magazines are trying to report and discuss news of economic research in an intelligent manner, but that most of the provincial press—which has the great bulk of the 56 million newspapers readers—is doing a poor job. Many research agencies are not getting the proper kind of information to newspapers. Many newspapers, either because of lack of staff or inertia, are not making use of the information which they do get. If research agencies want to get more information to the public they must consider communication as a part of their entire program, not as something to be concerned with only after the research is completed.

Both sides are to blame for the barriers between economic research and the people who should know about the research. Such barriers are not unique to economic research; they exist in most other social sciences and in some of the natural sciences. They can be broken down, if both research foundations and the newspapers want to demolish them.

Incidentally, the conference on communicating the results of economic research done by foundations was sponsored by a foundation engaged in economic research—the Sloan Foundation.

Julius Duscha
J. Edward Hale
Richard E. Mooney

(The authors were Nieman Fellows the past year and members of the conference at Dartmouth.)

Decisive Role of the Science Reporter

By Dr. Leona Baumgartner

In my book medical and science reporters are mighty important people.

To a tremendous extent, you control the flow of ideas between the scientists and the public and between the public and the scientists. That you inform the public of what is going on, what has been achieved and what is being studied in the field of medicine is obvious.

I wonder if there is wide enough recognition of the effect you have on public health workers whose job it is to put these medical and scientific discoveries into wide-spread use.

It is my observation that in the process of reporting and writing about medicine, you also stimulate the thinking of the people on whose work you report.

One of the ways I have, for example, of finding how the public feels and thinks is through talking to and picking the brains of newspapermen, magazine writers, radio and television people with whom I come in contact. I know that other health workers do the same thing.

You are particularly helpful in teaching us how to state problems to the public, in helping us tell in simple, direct, understandable terms what we are doing, what we achieve and what we hope to achieve.

In short, you are immensely helpful when you force us to talk in a language other than medical terminology and administrative jargon.

Dr. Alan Gregg, that godfather of medical research, and the Rockefeller Foundation, has a story about a professor. This professor was asked to give his idea of heaven. He replied: "For me, heaven is a place where I will get a clear view of the significance of what I am doing." Medical and science reporters certainly help public health workers to get a clearer view of the significance of what they are doing and to the extent that they do that, help them toward heaven.

In public health we have often tried to find out what makes people do things about health. Our health educators have worked out theories and hypotheses and analyses of what things make people click. They tell us that only a minority of the public are really concerned about general matters of health. Their studies suggest that an individual is not likely to be urgently concerned about the general subject of health, but he is likely to be concerned about a particular aspect of health if he is ill, or if someone close to him is ill, or about how to pay for his medical or dental bills.

These analysts report that there is little interest in long-range health problems, or in goals that can only be achieved over a considerable period and then with hard work. They also say it is hard to arouse and sustain interest in such problems.

Certainly, it seems harder today, for example, to arouse public interest and maintain that interest in the problem of tuberculosis than it was 40 years ago when tuberculosis was far more widespread. When tuberculosis was more prevalent it was an immediate threat to a great many more people. Today, the threat appears remote. Is it because it seems remote, that the possibility of arousing intense interest in the problem is so difficult? Or haven't you and we found the right way to interest people in tuberculosis? And with the possibilities of control apparently so near at hand, isn't it high time we found out how to help people accept and carry out those measures which will at last eradicate this ancient scourge?

I am sometimes told that we in public health all too often try to teach people to become concerned about what *we* as specialists believe to be important. Perhaps we would be more successful if we tried to find out what people considered to be important and concerned ourselves with those things. I agree thoroughly it is important to begin where people are. But isn't part of the job of the specialist to tell people what he considers to be significant and meaningful? At times isn't it an inescapable part of his duty to wave a red flag even if people have expressed no interest in danger? Certainly I think it the duty of a public health officer to tell what is wrong, what problems are important, and what can be done to solve them.

To me, one of the most admirable things about Winston Churchill is that he did not shirk the role of Cassandra when so many others in British public life chose to play Pollyanna.

You medical and science reporters have played, and are playing, a decisive role, in helping to show the public what has been done scientifically. You often contribute by pointing out unsolved problems.

But if the measures that can save lives and promote health and happiness are to be successful you must do more. You have already convinced the public of the value of research. It is now up to you to help convince the public to use the fruits of that research.

In doing so I see two problems. One is associated with changes that may need to be made in the day to day behavior of individuals and the other is in the problem of overcoming, dispelling apathy.

Science and its application have added years to our lives. With this increased span of life, many of us face a future of living with a chronic disease, a physical, mental, emotional disability. To add life and happiness to these years is a new challenge and one that must be undertaken individually. These health problems can't be solved by chlorinating

water, pasteurizing milk, or spraying DDT, or going to your doctor. These problems will be helped only as individuals *do* something for themselves. You can and must help interpret what can be done.

The other problem has to do with apathy and even resistance toward adopting new measures proven valuable by the best of scientific endeavor.

There is a need to find the underlying causes of apathy, of resistance. Are people apathetic because there is no immediate threat? Or because the personal value, the benefit of the action to be taken isn't clear? Or is it just a simple case of not knowing, of ignorance?

Believe it or not, we still find parents who don't know about the Salk vaccine!

Or has the story been told so long ago that the present generation doesn't know it?

Among the few residual cases of diphtheria, for example, we always find some in which the necessity for immunization was not understood even though the parents themselves had been immunized when they were children.

Are the words we use simple enough? Or are there other blocks to action about which we do not know?

And what of the problem of resistance? Do we understand enough of what is behind it? One aspect at least which seems to be identifiable is a certain distrust of the expert, of the technologist, a kind of anti-intellectualism. In many fields such distrust may be justified—but is it justified when careful and objective research has pointed clearly to the human benefits which will accrue from action? This problem is not a new one. We have only to remember the difficulties Copernicus, Jenner or Pasteur faced in having their evidence accepted. But today with the ever-increasing tempo of technological change we must do better with our greater potentialities in the communications field.

There are times when all of us have to commit acts of faith. Scientists commit acts of faith. The specialist in one field has to accept the word of a specialist in another field, otherwise science would not progress And in some matters, not all, the public too must accept the word of the specialist. I am not proposing that the world is to be divided into two camps, the expert and the non-expert, and that the "non-expert" must accept the word of the "expert." I merely believe that in some matters we must learn to trust each other.

And there is another basic problem here which we have not faced—the problem of having so many persons who do not truly understand the principles upon which modern science is based. Many persons are ignorant of how scientific evidence is obtained, how it is evaluated. Surely we will always deal with emotions, and fortunate we are that we have them. But is it unreasonable to assume that in a scientific age we can slowly but surely educate the public about the scientific method?

And furthermore, is there not a real challenge in investigating the nature of this distrust of the expert, of the scientist? Do we know what kinds of people lead the opposition to scientific progress and its application? Do we know what makes them do so? Is this not in itself a matter for scientific investigation?

In conclusion, may I point out that though you are experts yourselves, you are also middlemen. You understand the substance of the sciences. You understand the exigencies of mass and other special media of communication. You know that communication is a necessary component of living together. You know it is a necessity in our time.

It is for this reason that those of us in public health whose essential job it is to get the bottle off the laboratory shelf into the hands of everyone who needs it, come to you, depend on you. For this reason I salute you.

Scholar, physician, administrator, **Dr. Baumgartner** is a leader in public health education in America.

Government and the Citizen in Medical Research

By J. Percy Priest

My subject is one on which I have had repeated occasion to reflect during my fourteen years as a newspaperman and an equal number of years as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the last two years I have been chairman of that committee.

I want to discuss a few specific examples which illustrate I believe some aspects of the relationship between the Federal government and citizen in relation to medical research.

The committee has just reported legislation designed to provide Federal grants-in-aid to assist non-profit and public institutions in the construction of additional health research facilities.

The philosophy underlying this legislation is that it is the proper role of the Federal Government to encourage the making available of additional funds for the construction of medical research facilities, but that under no circumstances should the Federal Government replace the principal responsibility of private citizens and voluntary organizations in this area.

This philosophy was successfully tested in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Experience with that law has demonstrated that citizens and private groups will not only meet the minimum matching requirements established by the law with regard to the cost of construction, but going beyond the Federal program, they will provide funds in ever increasing amount for the construction of health facilities completely independent of Federal grant-in-aid.

It is my hope that the Health Research Facilities Act will become law shortly, and that the experience under that law will repeat the pattern found to exist with regard to the construction of hospitals and numerous other grant-in-aid programs. In other words, it is our hope that the bill if it becomes law, will not only stimulate the contribution of matching funds required by the bill, but that under the impetus of this program additional health research facilities will be constructed and financed 100 percent with the contribution of private citizens and voluntary organizations.

One of the principles written into the Health Research Facilities bill is that of Federal non-interference with the administration of research institutions which would receive grants under that law. It is provided in the bill that unless the law specifically so provide, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States is authorized to exercise and direction, supervision, or control over the research conducted by such institution or the personnel which is conducting the research.

I believe that the strict observance of this provision of non-interference in an absolute necessity. In the absence of such observance, medical research throughout our Nation stands to lose more on account of centralized Federal direction than it stands to gain because of the availability of Federal grant-in-aid.

The great progress which we have made in the last decade in the field of medical research, to the extent that such research has been financed in whole or part by the Federal Government, is due in no small extent to the admirable self-restraint shown by the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, and other sponsoring agencies in disbursing Federal funds without simultaneously placing the dead-hand of centralized control on the shoulders of our Nation's medical research workers.

Closely related to the principle of non-interference is the principle of assuring the right of dissent. The Health Research Facilities Act contemplates a specific provision to the effect that the annual reports of the Surgeon General and the appraisal of the research facilities construction program contemplated by this Act shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of the members of the Advisory Council which would be established under this Act. I believe that this provision requiring the publication of minority views is of fundamental importance to the citizens of our country because it confirms their right to be fully informed, and full information includes both majority and minority views.

Our Committee wrote a similar provision assuring publicity for minority views into the law which created the National Science Foundation and since then it has written similar provisions into other laws wherever full and complete information, including information with regard to dissents, appears of vital importance to our citizens and their elected representatives.

The principle of guaranteeing citizens access to scientific controversies and the reasons and arguments advanced in the course of such controversies is important at all times but it becomes particularly important when Government enters into medical research either directly, in its own laboratories, or make financial contributions to such research facilities.

Mr. Priest is chairman of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce. This was a talk at the Lasker Journalism Award, May 23.

In this connection, my thoughts go back to the situation which existed a little more than a year ago with regard to the question of the safety and potency of the Salk vaccine. A very vocal scientific controversy raged at that time with regard to killed virus vaccine versus live vaccine, and with regard to safety standards which would produce a safe yet potent killed virus vaccine. At that time, many responsible persons felt that the implications of this controversy should be discussed among scientists but that certainly John Q. Public should be spared the ordeal of coming face to face with the existence of a serious scientific controversy which might lead him to doubt the "Sacredness of science."

I happen to believe that it would be a serious mistake for any Government to hide the truth from its citizens whether it be with regard to a scientific controversy or with regard to other conflicts which affect the happiness and lives of our citizens.

At the time of the Salk controversy, our Committee held open hearings in the course of which a panel of the most outstanding scientists in the field openly discussed their views and their disagreements. In the course of these hearings, the majority of the scientists declared themselves in favor of a continuation of the Salk vaccine program under new and more rigid standards on the ground that the benefits of such program would outweigh the risk of harm that might come to some individuals.

I believe the decision to hold open hearings at that time and to have the conflict and the risk brought into the open contributed a great deal to the public understanding of the scientific problems involved and increased rather than decreased the public's respect for science and scientific methods.

Let me summarise what I have been trying to say by reciting these few examples:

(1) In the field of medical research, our Government should at all times strive adequately to inform citizens and based on that information it should seek to encourage our citizens to make greater contributions. On the other hand, our Government should never attempt to pamper our citizens by hiding from them scientific controversies or true but uncomfortable scientific facts.

(2) With regard to financial support of medical research, our Government should always encourage such support on the part of our citizens but never seek to substitute governmental financial support for private support.

(3) Finally, in cases where government-financed support of research is needed, great caution ought to be exercised by our Government lest the harm flowing from possible centralized Federal direction or interference might outweight the benefits which are derived from such financial support.

Twenty New Fellowships

All Mass Media Included in Awards to Start Next Year

For the past 18 years the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard have afforded a unique opportunity for news men to strengthen their background for journalism by study in a university. For the past several years the Council on Foreign Relations has offered similar opportunity for two foreign correspondents each year. For several years also the Reid Foundation has awarded about five fellowships a year to newspapermen to travel or study abroad.

Such fellowship opportunities for news workers are now to be substantially increased. About 20 such awards a year will now be offered by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, established by the Ford Foundation.

These will be available not only to newspapermen, but equally to writers, editors, producers and directors in radio and television, magazines and educational films, and to teachers of journalism and communications.

Applications must be made by October 31; awards will be announced next April 1 for a period of study to begin after June 1, 1957.

The Fund announced on June 15 the opening of the 1957 "leadership Training Awards Program in the Mass Media."

Pres. G. Scott Fletcher stated:

"Our purpose is to broaden and better the contribution of the media to liberal adult education. The objective of the awards is to enable a small number of individuals, selected for their work and their promise, to engage in study or training of their own choosing—study and training likely to improve the quality and effectiveness of their output."

The Fund is offering also grants to adult educators, both professionals and volunteers. These two types of grants compose a single program of Leadership Training Awards. It will be possible to apply either for an adult educator's award or for a mass media award until October 31, 1956.

Robert J. Blakely is Director of the Fund's grant programs. Inquiries and requests for announcements and application forms should be addressed to Ronald Shilen, Executive Secretary, Leadership Training Awards Program, 320 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Are You Going To The Melbourne Games?

Australia Prepares for Olympics Reporters

By Fred Flowers

Take 800 newspapermen and a sprinkling of hardboiled female newshounds, about 150 press and magazine photographers, at least the same number of movie, radio and television commentators, plus an army of technicians. Bring them from more than 70 different countries encumbered with their equipment, language barriers, phobias and habits, concentrate them in one tight group in a strange city thousands of miles off the beaten track—and let 'em loose on the one BIG STORY.

What have you got? One big happy family, or chaos?

Even the Kansas City Milkman could not answer that one. Certainly Melbourne's 1956 Olympic Games Organizing Committee won't know the answer until *after* the Games which will run from November 22 to December 8. But officials are expending as much effort on preparations for this record influx of newspapermen as they are on preparations for the athletes.

There will be an average of one visiting newsman to every four athletes. Numerically the Games will be the best covered, the most intensely written about, in history.

Keeping all these highly individualistic people happy is the Herculean task of the Press and Publicity Committee, and its sub-committee, whose members are mostly newspapermen with long overseas and local experience in arranging the coverage of major events.

Thurber once wrote that in his time he had met many disgruntled reporters, but never a gruntled one. It is Melbourne's aim to send back home hundreds of gruntled reporters who could be Australia's best ambassadors ever.

Australians are deeply conscious of the need for a good, friendly press overseas. They are anxious to attract migrants and overseas capital and they hope to use the Games as a publicity vehicle to achieve this purpose—of course as a natural by-product to efficient promotion of the Games.

They recognize that even one disgruntled reporter of note could shatter their plans by cabling back home a string of abusive articles.

So—the red carpet will be laid for visiting newspapermen who will be in danger of becoming the most pampered in Games history.

Accredited journalists and photographers will live in downtown hotels not much more than a mile from the main olympic stadia. Their hotels won't *all* be up to Statler standard, but what they lack in tinsel will be made up for by extra, friendly service.

Tough, wise, old soldier, Lieutenant-General Bill Bridgeford—the Games Chief Executive Officer—has personally padded the sidewalks of Melbourne to point out to hotelkeepers (and when Bill points out it's practically an order!) why it is necessary to keep newspapermen happy. And, he tells me, he will send his staff round again to yarn with hotel managers before the first press contingent arrives.

"They might have to share a bloody bathroom in some instances," says General Bridgeford, "but we'll see they get good meals whenever they want them, that they have at call the quickest possible means of clearing their stories by cable, phone or radio."

Top-class working conditions will be assured for 800 accredited journalists, 125 accredited still photographers and 100 accredited film and television correspondents. Seating and working rooms have been reserved for them at 19 different olympic venues.

Accreditation quotas were allotted to each of 87 member countries of the International Olympic Committee, and at least 70 nations have taken up all or part of their quotas. The USA, Britain and Russia have each been allotted 50 seats for the main olympic stadium, the Melbourne Cricket Ground, one of the world's greatest sports arenas with accommodation in modern stands for 110,000 spectators.

The USA and Russia are certain to use their full quotas. Extra paid seats will be available for unaccredited press representatives at the main stadium.

An accredited reporter will be entitled to free accommodation in the olympic stadia that concern him. Seating arrangements for the press, TV, and radio representatives are as follows:

Athletics, soccer and hockey finals (main stadium), 500 seats with desks, and 300 other seats;

Swimming, 215 seats with desks and 131 other seats;

Hockey preliminaries, 20 seats with desks and 30 other seats;

Soccer preliminaries, 50 seats with desks, and 50 other seats;

Track cycling, 80 seats with desks, and 120 other seats;

Road cycling, 63 seats with desks and 65 other seats;

Boxing, 100 seats with desks, and 170 other seats;

Rowing and canoeing, 50 seats with desks, and 50 other seats;

Fred Flowers of the Melbourne *Herald* was an associate Nieman Fellow at Harvard 1955-56.

Water polo, 25 seats;

Fencing, 30 seats;

Basketball and gymnastics, 35 seats with desks, and 65 other seats;

Wrestling and weightlifting, 30 seats with desk and 48 other seats;

Yachting, 30 seats on official craft;

Rifle shooting, 20 seats;

Clay Pigeon shooting, 6 seats;

Modern Pentathlon; riding, 10 seats; fencing, 18 seats; cross-country run, 10 seats.

Most olympic venues will have fully furnished press rooms.

The main stadium will have a special press dining room and refreshment bar and a modern working center open to 2 A.M. daily. World news agencies will have their own work rooms. AP, UP, and INS each will send a team of 25 men to the Games and will recruit extra casual staff in Melbourne. Reuter, Tass, and other big world agencies will also send strong teams. The international agencies will pool their resources to promote a world syndication service of results direct from the main stadium. This service will be managed by AP sports editor, Harold J. ("Spike") Claassen, who will have with him two men from each agency. The service will be linked direct to New York and London by teleprinter. Results from outlying stadia will be flashed to the main stadium and distributed immediately after each event.

The press will follow the Marathon and 50 Kilometer Walk by bus—of course, anybody who wishes to walk can!

Accredited film and television men will live at the residential colleges of Melbourne University, about two miles from the main stadium. Broadcasters will live at the university's Women's College. The women will be on leave!

Special taxi services will be provided for correspondents, also exclusive parking areas will be reserved at the gates of all olympic venues.

More than 40 countries from Burma to Brazil, from Portugal to Peru, are sending radio commentators. Fifty sound proof studios are being built in the new stand at the main stadium. These studios will be fitted with tape-recorders and microphones. Each country will have at least one commentator in the press stand who will broadcast from his actual viewing seat. Wherever necessary viewing seats will be fitted with telephones.

The main stadium is being fitted with 800 separate telephone lines to carry the vast traffic. During the Games at least four Radio Australia transmitters will be broadcasting continuously to Europe and North America from 6 p.m. to 3 a.m. (Melbourne time) daily. This is the only period during which it is possible to broadcast from Australia to Europe. Each nation's commentators will be allotted 30 minutes of broadcast time daily.

Olympic broadcasting arrangements are under the control of the Australian Broadcasting Commission whose general manager, Charles Moses, Sydney, will be pleased to provide further details.

A pressroom will be established outside the six-million-dollar Olympic Village and pressmen will have free access to the Village for interviewing.

Where space limitations make it impossible to accommodate all reporters a ticket system will operate.

A co-operative known as The Olympic Photo Association has been formed to pool still photographic work. The co-operative is divided into three sections:

The Australian and New Zealand sections, excluding magazines;

The global section representing the overseas press, excluding magazines;

The magazine section representing Australian and overseas magazines.

Each section will bear its own costs. Its members will meet daily at least once to assign tasks, to allot all restricted positions, to iron out difficulties.

Processing of negatives taken by the Australian and global sections will be done at the main stadium and prints distributed on an equal priority basis.

The global section will consist of AP Photos, International News Photos and UP Photos, and any other agency which desires to enter the section and carry its fair share of the costs. They will exchange photographs.

The magazine section consists of Australian magazines, *Life,* and *Sports Illustrated*. Its members won't exchange photographs unless the number of magazine positions available is less than three.

A special meteorological information bureau will be established at the main stadium and will issue detailed weather information to the press, such as forecasts of weather temperatures, wind direction and velocity, humidity and other weather variations.

When this was written in May the Olympic Games Organizing Committee had not decided the basis on which it would allow television services to cover the Games. Earlier the Committee had indicated it expected the TV agencies to tender and pay cash for these rights. The agencies were holding out for the same tariff-free rights accorded the press and radio.

If any newspaperman, radio or TV commentator, or newsreel reporter has any question concerning the Games he should direct them to E. A. Doyle, chairman of the Press and Publicity Sub-Committee, Olympic Games Organizing Committee, Melbourne.

Visiting pressmen will need Olympic constitutions to keep up with the work, and the social events planned for them during their few weeks in Melbourne.

I'll be seeing you!

The Opportunity of Journalism

By Malcolm Bauer

Present day journalism students are to be envied. For they are embarking on the practice of a profession that—whatever its shortcomings, and there are many—has been singled out by society as the steward of the foundations of all liberty.

Freedom of the press is a phrase that comes easily to our lips. For it is a principle that is associated intimately with newspapers and with the courses you pursue in this school.

But just how much do we understand about the true nature of this freedom, which many learned men, including justices of the Supreme Court, have proclaimed as the "first freedom," the basic freedom on which all other freedoms depend?

I am afraid that all too often we who have revealed our partiality for the press by selecting it for a career tend to think of the freedom of the press as our own private property. We think of it as a passport that makes possible our entry into interesting quarters denied lesser mortals or as a glittering banner to be hoisted when we mount our editorial charges in assault on the other estates. We think of it as a press pass through the fire lines, as an amulet with which to charm away the devil's spirit in would-be-censors.

To use a specific example of this misinterpretation of the first freedom, let me cite the record of a substantial portion of the press on the issue of child labor. To the indelible shame of the profession, some editors and publishers—not all of them by any means—actually used the principle of press freedom to argue that newspapers should be permitted to employ boys and girls on terms that are denied to other employers.

Actually, freedom of the press and all that it implies are not at all properties of the press. We newspapermen are merely stewards, caretakers for the whole of our society. It is our privilege to be entrusted with the preservation of this most vital of all our freedoms. If we either neglect it or convert it to our own selfish uses, we fail that trust.

There are many and varied criticisms of the general conduct of the press. Some of them scarcely warrant recognition. But some others should have our careful attention.

Among these is the complaint that the press is becoming or has become a monopoly in many communities, and that, in consequence, it has become an arrogant overlord rather than a servant of the people.

Statistics on this point are pretty clear. The number of newspapers, daily and weekly, in the United States reached a peak in 1909. Never since have there been as many, although today's population of the country is almost twice what it was in 1909.

While the number of individual units in almost every other field of enterprise—except perhaps the blacksmith shop—has been increasing rapidly, the number of newspapers has been on the decline.

There is a bright spot in the picture, and it shouldn't be overlooked. Actually, during the decade from 1945 to 1955, there was a net increase in the total number of U.S. dailies—an increase of 25. This contrasts with a net decrease of 200 from 1930 to 1945.

But in 1955 the trend was downward again. Twelve new daily newspapers began publication, but 26 others suspended, were gobbled up in mergers with other papers or changed to less frequent publication. That is a net loss for the year of 14.

Of course, all this time total newspaper circulation has been climbing steadily, although not quite as fast as the population. But this has, in a way, compounded the problem of increased newspaper costs by requiring greater and greater expenditure of that precious commodity newsprint.

But I will not speculate on causes of this shrinkage in the range of the public's selection of its newspapers. The cost of newsprint is perhaps the chief villain; the reader's demand for a variety and quantity of expensive features another.

But for our purposes it is sufficient that we acknowledge the trend and recognize that it will probably continue. And moreover, that we understand the additional measures of responsibility that consolidation of the press places on the practitioners of the profession—on you and me.

This is how John M. McClelland Jr., editor of the Longview (Wash.) *Daily News*—a monopoly paper in a town of more than 20,000—views his responsibility:

"Perhaps one newspaper will not be as good as two," he says, "but it can come pretty close. It can come extremely close if the men who edit and write for the one newspaper in a town have a professional attitude toward their jobs. A town which has two doctors or two dentists or two lawyers may unquestionably be better off than the town which has only one of a kind among these professions. But

---

Malcolm Bauer is an editorial writer on the Portland *Oregonian*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950. This is from an address to the University of Oregon School of Journalism.

the one of a kind, if he is a real professional, will work all the harder because he is alone and because his responsibilities weigh more heavily on one than they would on two members of his profession . . . So it can be with newspapers.

"The newspaper which has a truly professional attitude will strive all the harder, because it is alone, to serve the public. . . . It has a responsibility to gather, write, edit and disseminate the news accurately, fairly *and above all intelligently and understandably.*"

The University of Oregon School of Journalism has been making it increasingly possible for its students to obtain the widest possible intellectual experience outside the specific realms of the School of Journalism itself. There has been a mounting emphasis on producing educated men and women, not just men and women armed with a journalism degree and a knowledge of the traditions and techniques of the press.

It is just such broad educational experience, combined of course with a sound education in the professional requirements of journalism, that is necessary to fit students to perform newspaper tasks (in Mr. McClelland's words) "intelligently and understandably" and to rise to the heights of responsibility commensurate with the importance of their trust.

These are pretty high heights indeed.

This brings us to another recurrent charge against the press—that its tastes, standards and sense of justice in some instances are pretty low.

Just one example—Cleveland's Sheppard murder case in 1954—covers all these points.

I am sure that most students of journalism remember much—maybe too much—of the sorry press performance in the Sheppard case. So I will not labor the details. There was scarcely a newspaper or a press association that was not in some degree responsible for the lurid coloring superimposed on what was essentially a routine police story.

"If the newspapers of America," said Editor Sevellon Brown of the Providence (R. I.) *Journal* and *Bulletin,* "had set out deliberately to prove the proposition that abuse of press freedom can wreck the impartial administration of justice, they could not have done a better job than in their reporting of the Sheppard trial."

I am happy to say that a good many editors came to the belated conclusion of Mr. Brown and have deplored the coverage of the Sheppard trial as many had earlier deplored both the conduct and the coverage of the Lindbergh kidnapping trial years ago.

It would be beneficial if the press—the Great Critic—would criticize itself more often.

Does this mean that newspapers should treat all subjects with a superrefined delicacy and abject impartiality? Far from it.

Editor Charles Sprague of the *Oregon Statesman* has written that today's editor has no higher responsibility than that of "fielding the hot ones." Houstoun Waring, publisher of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent,* recently put it a bit differently: "To print the significant news and to provide readers with editorials that lead to intelligent understanding and social action, an editor must have more than a fighting heart. *Broad knowledge, kept up to date, is equally essential.*"

Here's how one editor fielded a hot one, as told in a book published this month: *How to Get Better Schools,* by David B. Dreiman.

Mr. Dreiman recites the events that put Houston public schools on the front pages of the nation, time after time, a few years ago.

First, the Houston School Board arbitrarily banned the American government textbook authored by the late esteemed Frank Magruder, a member of the faculty of Oregon State College.

A member didn't like the conservative Mr. Magruder's reference to the postal system, public power projects and progressive taxation as examples of socialism and free public education and old age assistance as examples of communism in American life.

Next the board abruptly cancelled a scheduled speech by Dr. Willard Goslin, newly-dismissed superintendent of schools in Pasadena, California, for the curious reason that Mr. Goslin was "a controversial figure."

Not long afterward, the board demonstrated again its acute sensitivity to controversy by precipitously discharging from his post an assistant superintendent of Houston schools, Dr. George Ebey, who had gone to Houston from Portland, Oregon, with a fine administrative record. Mr. Ebey, it developed, had at one time participated in a Portland Forum co-sponsored by the Urban League. This, in the Houston board's mind, made him a "pro-Red," "intercultural" and "controversial." Out he went.

The Houston school board by this time had become a bit controversial itself. Reasonable Houstonians were beginning to ask: "What is going on in our schools?"

For the point is not whether one agreed with Dr. Magruder, Dr. Goslin or Dr. Ebey, but that secrecy and arbitrary action appeared to be fixed policies of the board.

Since early in the 1920's the board had been composed chiefly of persons with a single point of view. They had not solicited others.

"School board meetings," Mr. Dreiman writes, "were held in a school cafeteria over lunch or in a small office at one in the afternoon. Because of the time and place, board members were usually spared the distraction of outside observers."—including, need I add, reporters.

And I might also interpolate here—such practice is by no means exclusive to Houston.

But the board's clannish policy proved its downfall. Its own controversial actions, reported in the press of the nation, stirred public concern in Houston as well as elsewhere. And the Houston *Post* determined to get to the bottom of the school board's troubles.

The result was a series of articles which revealed that the manipulation of public school policy had been largely the concern of a small clique, prominent in which were members of an organization called the Minute Women. The Minute Women's creed was simple: Everything they disagreed with was, per se, socialistic or communistic.

Writes Mr. Dreiman: "They functioned secretly behind the scenes to drive out anyone whose views differed from their own."

After publication of this series of articles, the city editor of the Houston *Post* told Mr. Dreiman: "The atmosphere has just changed overnight. People in the schools and universities who have been demoralized can now see the light of the day coming when they can get up and talk about things without fear of some old biddy standing back there with an axe in her hand."

Thus, the Houston *Post* and the citizens it inspired lifted the grip of bigotry from the Houston schools. The *Post* is to be congratulated, and I have used it as a handy example of what a newspaper can do to help move the world. I have used it as an example also, because, if the Houston paper had been doing its job all along, the Houston schools would never have gotten into such a fix in the first place.

But journalism students will need to prepare themselves. They will need to sharpen what Denver newspaperman Mort Stern, writing in *Nieman Reports,* calls "that greatest tool of the real journalist—the inquiring intellect."

They will need to develop integrity and courage, too. And all these things make for what can be called intellectual backbone—a term I prefer to intestinal fortitude, or guts; because I believe that it cannot be denied that what it takes is a quality rooted, not in the abdomen, but in the brain.

I have said little or nothing about the better qualities of the press. Also I have made only passing reference to possible cures for the faults of the press.

Journalism students are familiar with many things of which the press can be proud; else they wouldn't be optimistic enough to be enrolled in a School of Journalism.

There is nothing wrong with the press that a supply of fresh brains cannot set aright. It's up to journalism students to see that they make the most of their chance to provide those brains.

"The Future," says the cover title on the current *Saturday Review,* "Belongs to the Educated Man." That is particularly true of the future in journalism.

The Press of New Zealand

By Desmond Stone

Let me paint in a little of the background of New Zealand, because I think it's difficult to understand overseas papers without understanding something of the country they're produced in. New Zealand would fit fairly neatly inside Colorado state or New England. There are two main islands and from the tip of the North Island to the toe of the South Island is a distance of about 1200 miles. But no part of the country is more than 80 miles from the sea.

Our nearest neighbor, Australia, is 1200 miles away and it hurts us like hell to meet people who think, understandbly enough, that Sydney bridge begins in Sydney and ends in New Zealnd. We've always had to struggle to keep our identity—not always successfully. I keep thinking of the New Zealander who came to America and was asked how long it had taken him to motor across. I think it would shock most New Zealanders if they knew that virtually the only time we make the news over here is when a tuatara arrives for the New York zoo, but I also think it would do them good.

You can see then we're a very small country with a very small population of only two million people. We could and should have more people. We have at the moment a state not only of full employment but of overfull employment, so that we're not making the most of our opportunities. Yet the country isn't as underpopulated as you may think.

New Zealand has a grassland economy and lives by her exports of food to Britain. If population were allowed to grow unchecked, the time would come when we would be eating our food instead of exporting it. There are in New Zealand some 130,000 Maoris who live pretty much on equal terms with pakehas. Of the country's European population some 93 per cent are of British extraction. It has been said in fact that while there are no serpents in New Zealand there are lots of Scotchmen.

The State pervades almost every corner of New Zealand life—it runs the railway, the radio, the marketing organizations, pays our medicines, doctors' bills and hospital expenses, subsidizes the farmers, regulates food prices, maintains many of the highways and so on. And yet because it's a small country where the government is close at hand, state control has rarely seemed oppressive.

Our socialism has not often been of a doctrinaire nature, but rather has grown a little like Topsy. What Andre Siegfried said of the New Zealand worker in 1904—that "he was

---

Desmond Stone was an Associate Nieman Fellow from the *Southland Times,* Invercargill, New Zealand, this year. This is from a talk to his colleagues about the New Zealand press.

hardly conscious of any class hatred, was not revolutionary and only vaguely socialistic"—has remained largely true. The dominion, like Australia, is independent within the Commonwealth. It is firmly committed to two-party government—the Nationalists or Conservatives in power now—but it has only a single chamber legislature. The Upper House was abolished several years ago because it was serving only as a repository for political appointees.

To sum up then, New Zealanders are a small, insular, very proud, very sensitive people, inclined to be undemonstrative and unemotional, as you may have gathered, not very hospitable to intellectual adventure, supremely practical, and essentially sane and friendly; and the country itself is very beautiful scenically, a place of unhurried and sometimes unimaginative living, where there are no extremes of climate, wealth or standards, and where there is no graft in government but plenty of mediocrity.

The New Zealand newspapers reflect most of these conditions. There are, to begin with, 43 dailies. I should say, incidentally, that it's significant of the provincial character of life that there is no one city overshadowing all the rest. The four biggest cities are called the four main centers, and as you might assume from this there is no one national daily, although the largest, the *New Zealand Herald* in Auckland, extends fairly deeply into the North Island. Each of the four main cities has one morning and one evening, and indeed nowhere are there two morning or two evening papers in the same town. The Labor Party did attempt to start a Labor morning in Wellington, but it failed after several years.

In all the centers there seems to be room for two papers but no more. The result, I think, is that there's enough competition to keep reporters on their toes but not so much that the papers feel obliged to hit their readers over the head with the news. I should have explained that most dailies are controlled by companies or individuals independent of one another and that there's no monopoly in any one town. This has two good results: 1) the papers can always provide a public forum for debate in their editorials; and 2) they are not forced to adopt the more sensational forms of news presentation and typography. Banners, for example, are used sparingly.

As seems to be the case here in the States, it's a one-party press and in the 1935 election campaign only one small daily placed itself on the side of the Labor Party. But the fact that the Labor Party swept into power with one of the biggest majorities in Parliamentary history suggests that we sometimes exaggerate the influence of the press. I think much the same thing happened in Mr. Truman's re-election in 1948.

Compared with American newspapers, the New Zealand press is much more conservative, both in form and in content. Almost half of the main dailies still put their news inside. The front pages of these papers, such as mine, carry births, deaths and marriages and classified advertisements, and not even the death throes of civilization could effect a change.

I recollect the night when word came through on our paper that King George VI had died, which is just about the biggest news event that can happen in a Commonwealth country. One of the things we had to wrestle with that night was whether to upset the front page tradition—not, of course, to the extent of putting the news on the front page —never that— but to the point perhaps of running a black border round the advertisements. In the end we decided against it, and that perhaps tells you something of our conservatism. They say that changes are coming and maybe by the end of the century we'll be in the swim with the front page. In the meantime, papers such as ours say our readers are creatures of habit and that our circulation would never survive the shock of a new appearance.

But by no means all papers are as far behind the times as this. News is on the front and back pages of most of the evening dailies, and as a rule it's mixed in accordance with importance—a local lead one day, an international event another. We, on the other hand, keep our news much more in compartments. As far as layout is concerned, I think we have a lot to learn from the American press, particularly in horizontal makeup. We could sell our news better than we do.

As you can judge for yourselves, our conservatism doesn't stop short at news presentation. It runs right through the news itself. In other words, there are areas of daily life we scarcely touch upon, and it might be of interest here to quote this criticism of a year ago by an American Fulbright scholar: "Due to ridiculous libel laws," he said, "the truth cannot be presented. The newspaper thus becomes a hindrance rather than a help to the finding of truth. American newspapers," he went on, "are admittedly often crude. But they reflect the news so that a person knows what has happened—they do not furnish him with a guessing game."

In part, I'd probably have to agree with him. We don't cut as close to some of the news as the American press, and one of the things that impresses me here is the cooperation the press gets at all levels of life. You get more respect than we do and that's possibly because you've stood more often on your rights. We get too many "no comment" and "off-the-record" statements. Even allowing for the antiquated libel laws and the fact that it's not our habit to conduct crusades, we do tend at times to flinch from baring the truth. It's significant, I think, that the only weekly journal of a sensational nature in the country is in fact named *The Truth*.

It's true that there are some issues we don't face squarely enough and to this extent I'd have to agree with the Ful-

bright critic. But it's not entirely a question of evasion. We feel also that there are some truths better not told, and which simply don't come within the category of news that's fit to print. We can take this attitude for two reasons: 1) because we don't have to face too much competition; and 2) because it harmonizes with our own way of life. If it's true that Americans are people of few reticences, then I think it's also true that New Zealanders are people of many reticences, and that accounts for many of the differences in the press of the two countries.

After its conservatism, the biggest distinguishing factor about the press of New Zealand is its almost exclusive attention to straight news. The papers are a source of information and opinion first, and of entertainment a long way after. Few of the dailies carry more than one comic strip; few of them pull out the stops for the lighter side of life. As a result, the papers are inclined to be dull, duller than they need be, but here perhaps they only reflect the national character. On the other hand, the papers do have a high content of solid and worthwhile news. Papers feel this is the way it should be and they can keep it this way because they don't have much competition either from other papers or from the radio. And, of course, we have no television. What we do have to admit readily is that we carry much too high a proportion of sporting news, particularly horse racing and rugby football, the only two religions the people have.

Admittedly, the papers are doing no more than reflecting national life. New Zealanders are almost unhealthily preoccupied with horse racing and with having a flutter on the tote. So the papers do have the justification of national interest when racing news takes up, as it constantly does, two full pages of a sixteen-page paper. But it's always seemed to me that the press's function doesn't begin and end with mirroring the life of a country. It must also seek to influence it for the better. It may be a mere delusion to think that it can, but that doesn't make it any less urgent or less important to keep on trying.

And here, if I may, I'd like to get in one or two plugs about editorials, which are my particular interest. I think I can safely say that while standards vary a good deal, readers of the best dailies have been trained to read the editorials with reasonable regularity—only because editors consider them supremely important. If a newspaper has a soul at all, then it's to be found in the editorial column. And if it hasn't got a soul, then it isn't a newspaper.

If there's any one reason more than another why the greatest American newspapers are the greatest, then perhaps it's the quality of their editorials. That seems to me to be certainly true of the New York *Times* and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* and the Washington *Post,* for example. I thinks it's possibly because of the emphasis the New Zealand press places on editorials that the syndicated columnist doesn't exist. There is a feeling that he tends to usurp the functions of the editorial writer, and to give the editors an excuse for not taking sides on controversial issues.

I think it all comes back to the point I made earlier—that the newspaper should do more than merely reflect the life of the community around it—that it should try to raise standards where it can. Since a columnist can't possibly speak for the thousand and one communities that make a nation, it seems to me that the job can best be done in the editorial columns, and that it can only be done successfully if the paper is prepared to dissent as well as to agree, to guide and suggest as well as to inform, and to interpret as well as to reflect. People have a right to be given a lead on issues of the day, and it's the paper that gives this lead quickly, without waiting for all the critics of the land to express their opinion and then to make a choice of these opinions—it's this paper that is best fulfilling its task. I think it's as important for the editorials to be up to the minute with the issues of the day as it is for the paper to be up with the news of these issues.

As for the standard of reporting, I think it's fairly good, being both reasonably accurate and balanced. The writing isn't as lively or the prose as lean as it is in the best American papers. Sentences tend to be fuller, paragraphs bigger. Because we haven't too much competition we haven't had to make too many concessions to popular taste and the day of the one-sentence paragraph hasn't yet arrived, I'm pleased to say. It's noticeable too, I think, that reporters in New Zealand don't have by-lines. And the feeling here is that it's the newspaper and not its staff members that matters most, that news should be presented impersonally, and that reporters should have neither opinions nor identity in the reader's mind. Here again, if competition were fierce, we might be forced to change.

There are incidentally four grades of reporters—cadets, juniors, generals and seniors, and occasionally a fifth flight of super seniors. There is no general or uniform system of staff training. We have no schools of journalism and only one university where a diploma in journalism can be gained. And even that is in some danger of being dropped. Generally speaking, editors feel that there's only one place to train a journalist and that's on the job itself. The provincial papers such as ours tend to serve as a recruiting ground for the metropolitan dailies. Our own procedure is to put a lad first into the proof reading room for six months to a year, and then to transfer him to the copy desk. After a year or so of subbing, he usually goes onto the reporting staff, and in this way he gets all-round training. I certainly don't think that reporters and copy desk men are interchangeable—a good sub, for example, is born with a blue pencil in his mouth—but it's been our experience that a knowledge of one department is indispensable to work in another.

The South and the N.A.A.C.P.

By Richard L. Harwood

As a Southerner, I devoutly wish I could give simple directions to lead us out of our American dilemma. But I cannot. Neither can I presume to speak for "The South" or suggest that many or few of the thirty-five millions in that region would agree with what I have to say. In that respect I am in the position of Senator Eastland. He does not speak for the region, either.

These are difficult times and cotton is not our only surplus. We also have a surplus of problems in the South. Sometimes I think we have more than we can handle. But you in the North have problems, too. Prof. Seymour Harris complains that we are stealing your textile plants. Probably we are. If you will steal the Citizens' Councils we will consider it a fair trade.

The South is still an underdeveloped land, a land of relative economic and social poverty. A committee of Congress heard testimony on our situation not long ago. As witness after witness recited statistical information, Senator Flanders was moved at last to comment:

"I cannot believe this. This is a census of graveyards."

In truth, things are not quite that bad. Great change is under way. Life is getting better, for Negroes as well as whites. Segregation, for example, is diminishing in many aspects of our life.

For this, the N.A.A.C.P. can claim much credit. It has been a successful advocate in the struggle to obtain for all citizens equal privileges under the common law.

The break-through has come in the past 15 years. Change has occurred much faster than any of us thought possible.

In the war years, the N.A.A.C.P. had no immediate hope of breaching the segregation in education. Yet, as soon as the war had ended, Negroes began to enter state universities and colleges throughout the South—in Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Missouri. Inter-racial groups arose by the score. Medical, academic, legal and other professional societies accepted Negro members. Churches opened their eyes to the implications of Christian democracy in the 20th Century. Negroes began to take part in the general civic life of the urban South. They were elected to various public offices including the Board of Education of Atlanta. In the past few months a Negro alderman temporarily served as Mayor of Louisville. In general, opportunities for public employment widened.

Richard L. Harwood, staff reporter on the Louisville *Times,* has just completed a Nieman Fellowship. He was asked to share a platform before a Havard audience with Roy Wilkins of the N.A.A.C.P. This was his talk.

At the same time, vast economic changes were in process. A great human exodus from the South was underway. Between 1940 and 1950, two million Negroes left the region forever, relieving the terrible population pressure on our land resources. Industries sprang up in cotton fields. Factory workers in Atlanta and Birmingham and Baton Rouge won higher wages than are paid in Boston. Job discrimination was wiped out in the International Harvester plant in Memphis and in other factories. Very, very slowly, but perceptibly, Negroes began moving into white collar jobs in the general business community. Farmers began to diversify their crops and to build fine herds of livestock. In the Delta, cotton choppers were getting $8 to $10 a day.

Charles S. Johnson, America's most distinguished Negro sociologist, remarked in 1951 that "a greater distance has been traversed in the South in the past ten years in the implementation of the democratic thesis, than in any other area of the nation."

This was change and, in the face of it, Southern journalists would seem to have been on solid ground when they wrote about a "New South."

But today, the view of our situation is cloudy indeed. Is this really a New South or is it just the Old South in an Arrow shirt?

Claghorn politicians are once more trumpeting the discredited doctrine of "interposition." Autherine Lucy becomes the most famous female in Dixie. Alabama wants to put people in jail for refusing to ride on busses.

What are we to think of all this and what should the N.A.A.C.P. do about it?

I am in no way qualified to prescribe for the N.A.A.C.P. It has been successful in the past. American Negroes have become one of our most powerful minority groups. The N.A.A.C.P. symbolizes this new power.

The question confronting it, it seems to me, is not how to gain *more* power at once, but rather how to use the power it has.

I think it has not always used its power wisely in the past. Some of its mistakes have been errors in judgment, as Thurgood Marshall conceded with reference to collusion charges filed against officials of the University of Alabama. No individual and no organization is immune to mistakes of this kind. They are not especially important in the long run except as antidotes to smugness and the delusion of infallibility.

A more serious criticism of N.A.A.C.P. can fairly be made, I believe. It has become institutionalized. It is a *professional pressure* group. In itself, this is no condemnation. That is the way things work in America these days.

The economic concept of countervailing power seems to be applicable to politics, too.

Unhappily, in the process of becoming an institution, a professional advocate, it has taken on some of the unpleasant characteristics of such groups in our society.

I do not suppose it has often been compared with the American Legion or the D.A.R. But crude similarities exist. Like them, it has become a common scold. No issue is too large or too small for its attention. No aspect of life is beyond reach of its judgment.

It informs the Hallmark Company that it dislikes some of their greeting cards and wrings from them a promise to mend their ways. It raises a fuss over labels on tin cans and bread wrappers. It objects to radio programs and movies that offend its sense of racial pride. Its publication, *The Crisis,* hints that it should investigate textbooks and teachers in the public schools to insure that the history of minority groups is taught in the way it wants it taught. It scolds the U.S. Naval Academy, not for discrimination in admissions or treatment, but because the Academy publishes too few pictures of Negroes in its pamphlets. It scolds the Defense Department for anchoring a ship in a South African port where apartheid exists. It scolds the Veterans Administration claiming that some nurses fail to address Negro patients as "Mister."

Like the Legion, it seems to accept the conspiracy theory of history.

It is not news that institutions find their own excuse for being. The American Legion was organized to perpetuate the memories of the Great War and to aid destitute comrades. Since then, the Legion's task has grown until today this organization is no less than the exclusive guardian of the American way of life, the U.S. Treasury and the Christian religion.

When William Walling, Oswald Garrison Villard and their associates founded the N.A.A.C.P. in 1909, I wonder if they anticipated that one day they would be in the business of censoring greeting cards or telling the U.S. Navy where to park its ships? I rather doubt it. W. E. B. DuBois said of the N.A.A.C.P. some years ago, "It was not, never had been, and never could be an organization that took an absolute stand against race segregation of any sort under all circumstances. This would be a stupid stand in the face of incontrovertible facts."

Professional pressure groups have another characteristic. They look for the *easiest* formula of success and once they have found it they are reluctant to experiment with alternative techniques. They equate success with wisdom and righteousness. It has found a formula. In essence it is the formula of force. Its forms are political pressure and the legal bludgeon. It has experimented with economic pressure, too, and I do *not* refer to the Montgomery bus boycott.

No thinking person could deny that in the context of racial segregation in America compulsion is often necessary. Many people do question, however, the validity of its almost exclusive reliance on force. Force is the extreme resort of democracy and in that sense they are extremists.

Adlai Stevenson expressed this doubt in connection with the reluctant South and the N.A.A.C.P. condemned him for it. In its vocabulary, "moderation" is a dirty word. But it did not, I think, answer effectively his question: Is there anything more important than getting white and Negro children in the same school building by Monday morning, no matter if heaven itself shall fall? I think there is.

On questions of this nature, these have been divided counsels from within the Negro community. Indeed, the whole history of the Negro struggle for the good life in America has been a record of violent disagreement. It has had a school of "accommodating leadership," exemplified by Booker T. Washington. It has had racial chauvinists, such as Marcus Garvey, who was the only Negro leader in the 20th Century to win a mass following; it has had militant leaders such as DuBois and Walter White, but even they could not agree.

I presume that Lillian Smith is on no list of racists. For that reason, I should like to quote at some length from a review she wrote of Walter White's last book, *How Far The Promised Land?* She said:

> Throughout his book, he blandly ignored organizations that have worked as hard as has the N.A.A.C.P. on the problem of human rights but that approach it from a different angle or a different level of action . . . Why did he fail to give credit to others? There are two reasons. Mr. White was a super salesman. He was selling to the American public a package called the 'Negro group;' he wanted to make big sales for his product and he wanted. . .the N.A.A.C.P. to get credit for the sales. Any organization that sold the 'Negro group' wrapped up in a slightly different package hurt his form's sales and was a competitor. . . .
>
> The second and far more important reason was this: a few of us were working for something much bigger than the 'Negro problem'—and Mr. White knew it and feared it. He was fighting a battle for the Negro group's civil rights; we were, and still are, engaged in a never-ending war for an open society for all people everywhere. This open society requires that barriers in minds and imaginations and hearts be leveled as well as barriers in the external world. Because we believe this we are as concerned about the segregation of an idea . . . as we are about segregation of people who are different in color. We think the act of withdrawal injures the segregator as much as it does the segregated. We value as much as Mr. White ever did

that idea we call 'human dignity' but we know that the real barriers that cramp its growth are largely inside a man's own mind and soul and that dignity lives or dies because of what it feeds on there.

This concern with the inner man, with the quality of human beings, and with the complexities of the human mind puzzled and frightened Mr. White. He wanted 'sensible things;' he wanted for the Negro group the right to be 'normal Americans,' he wanted for them freedom to conform, and especially did he want for them a big role in the great American success story. The urgent question in Mr. White's mind was, "How soon can we get every Negro into a gray flannel suit, and traveling down the middle of the road shoulder to shoulder with all the other gray flannel suits?"

Traveling where? To the Promised Land? Or to the point of no return? Mr. White never asked himself these questions. He took it for granted that it was the road to the Promised Land. No wonder he was restive around those who kept talking about the problem of the individual versus mass-conformity, the profound right, indeed the necessity, to protect men's differences since mankind's progress comes out of the great deviations—not of color, which is no real difference at all, but of ideas.

That is the end of the quotation. I have included it here not as an attack on Walter White, whom I did not know, but as an illustration of the complexities of this problem and also as a clear statement of the larger issues confronting our society.

It is important that the physical barriers of segregation come down, and they are coming down. It is far more important, however, that the barriers in men's minds be eradicated and this cannot be accomplished by force alone.

That is the essence of gradualism as it is understood by Southern liberals. I know that many professing liberals believe that gradualism and evolution in human relations are inconsistent with what they conceive to be the liberal doctrine. I disagree. Liberalism is an attitude of mind, not a body of doctrine. Moreover, a reluctance to rely on force is fully consistent, I believe, with the liberal spirit. That is why we oppose sweeping laws against political nonconformists in our society and I include Communists. That is why we cannot have faith in a foreign policy that seems to force other nations to be on our side. That is why we find Soviet society repulsive. That is why racial segregation, based on law, is wrong.

The Supreme Court decision in the school cases was the right decision. It was obtained largely through the efforts of N.A.A.C.P., which has steadily eroded the legal basis of second-class citizenship. All this has been accomplished with a minimum of social disruption. There has been a general willingness in the South to accept these changes. That has been the most encouraging aspect of these developments. Southern extremists have said at every stage in this process that calamity was just around the corner. The Southern people proved them wrong. Segregation is coming to be accepted as a vanishing way of life.

But we have now reached a juncture in which emotion has temporarily overridden reason. It behooves us all, I believe, to stop for a moment and consider the prospects.

Tempers are high on both sides. The White Citizens' Councils want the N.A.A.C.P. declared subversive. Congressman Powell wants the Citizens' Councils declared subversive. The Councils threaten or impose economic sanctions. The N.A.A.C.P. tells its people to do business only with their friends. Emmett Till is murdered in Mississippi. Three Mississippi white boys are stabbed by Negro youths on the streets of Washington. Louisiana would expel the N.A.A.C.P. from that state. The N.A.A.C.P. would have Mississippi's representatives turned out of Congress. It protests in *The Crisis* that newspapers opposed to integration overemphasize unpleasant incidents. Yet, reading *The Crisis* is somewhat like taking a blood bath.

What is the proper course for the N.A.A.C.P. now?

I should say that tolerance, like intolerance, is a two-way street. You cannot demand more than you would give. Negroes have been too long aggrieved in this land and their problems are not over. Yet, I would hope that they would not succumb to bitterness, nor allow arrogance to warp their judgment now that the worm is turning. Their aim should be the reconciliation of men, not to create or broaden gulfs of hatred. Many people in the South are committed to that proposition. The N.A.A.C.P. too, has a responsibility in this period of transition from an old world to a new. I do not apologize for urging it to be moderate.

As I comprehend the nature of our mutual problems, there are important tasks for the N.A.A.C.P. now and in the future. The poverty of the South is the problem of both races. The basis of our poverty is underemployment in agriculture. Too many people are trying to scratch a living from little pieces of land. The agricultural programs of this administration and of the one that preceded it are not designed for the relief of the dirt farmer. Commodity price supports, rigid or flexible, tend to perpetuate rural poverty, not cure it. These programs are the creatures of powerful organizations such as the American Farm Bureau Federation which represent, primarily, the large, commercial farms. Some of these groups, such as the Farm Bureau, have been hostile to more vigorous government action in the field of rural poverty. The dirt farmers of the South have no effective advocate. It would seem that the N.A.A.C.P. could aid in filling this need. It has shown interest in the past in the problems of migrant farm workers

in the East. But to my knowledge it has not attacked this larger problem.

It is not merely an economic problem. It is at the heart of our social dilemma. Rural poverty is the Southern Negro's greatest enemy. It is the poverty stricken poor whites, the wool hats and Red Necks, who maintain the strongest racist doctrines. They are keenly aware that lacking any other status, social or economic, they must sustain themselves through the degradation of the only creature lower in the Southern hierarchy of status—the black man. The Southern legislatures that have gone berserk are rural legislatures.

One of the weaknesses of the N.A.A.C.P. is its restricted base of support. Its membership is predominantly urban. Its leaders are ordinarily persons drawn from an urban environment. The result is a program narrowly oriented to urban interests.

When Ralph Bunche appraised the South for Myrdal's study, he said:

"The South must be subject to a new agrarian and industrial revolution before any significant changes in the fundamental relationships—political, economic or racial—will occur."

The industrial revolution is launched. But the agrarian problems persist.

Ignorance, apathy and prejudice are not the exclusive property of the white race. Too many Negroes are apathetic about their civil rights. Too many Negroes in urban areas, North and South, are more interested in big cars than in the education of their children or in the objectives of the N.A.A.C.P. Its membership consists of less than 2 per cent of the 15,000,000 Negroes in America. They contribute to its work less than four one-thousandths of one per cent of their aggregate income. Too many Negroes believe they have a vested interest in segregated life.

A member of the Negro race has expressed the Negro dilemma in the following words:

> One ever feels his (duality)—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.

This is the dilemma of the South and it is the dilemma of America—our ideals of democracy are at war against ancient belief and prejudice.

I do not despair of a solution. Democracy is not viable because it insulates men from problems; rather, it is viable because the structure of democratic society enables the creative capacities of men to deal with problems.

It has been said that the Supreme Court's decision in the school cases foresaw a "gradual and majestic solution" to this problem. If we will approach it in that spirit, it will be solved.

TOO MUCH OF A MUCHNESS?

By Desmond Stone

It had been an uncommonly good year for the 1955-56 Niemans. They had rowed ashore in the beginning like mariners after years of stormy tossing, muscles swelling, oars flashing, eyes glinting. There had been a little confusion as the keel grated on the Harvard foreshore, and a great deal of splashing in shallow water. But the imperturbable Louis had been landmark and lifeline both. He had seen many such landings before and he knew where the quicksands lay—knew, too, that men walking in unaccustomed places needed time to get their legs.

And so it turned out. The first onslaught was magnificent. All the Niemans had gone striding and surging into the citadels of the college, feasting and devouring as they went. As journalists, most of them had already settled the outstanding issues of their day and their place. Now they had come to do the same for Haravrd and the world. All they asked was a little time and some wrapping paper . . . That was in the beginning. As Harvard's knowledge began lapping about them, the first intellectual ferment had fizzled out, and the Niemans had entered the second lap with their gaits adjusted and their breathing coming easier. They were men running within themselves. They knew what they wanted and they knew what they could do.

It had been a fabulously rich and diversified year. And now it was coming to an end with the last Signet Club dinner of the year. Archie had surpassed himself, mixing his martinis and manhattans with the instincts of an artist. Comfortably replete, Niemans and guests had staked out their claims to the chairs. James Reston was in the ring, and Louis, pitch perfect on all occasions, was playing it by ear. Everyone was there—among the guests, the elder Schlesinger, godfather to all Niemans; Schlesinger the younger; Merle Fainsod of the sonorous voice; Dean McGeorge Bundy; Dean Mason of Littauer; Dean Griswold of the Law School. This was indeed a galaxy of stars. Over the year, mixing with deans and professors had come as naturally to the Niemans as breathing. These top scholars of Harvard were all so eminently approachable and all so un-august that it took but four and a half martinis to convert a handshake into a backslap, and deference into downright disagreement.

There had been no backsliding among the Niemans for this occasion. They were all there waiting to bay—and none readier than the four terrible H's—Harwood, Hale, Healy, and Hansen. Harwood was from Louisville, for he said so himself; a civil war veteran; full of an unquenchable fire and of sharp, probing questions that scythed and boomeranged all year; and withal a grand writer of prose. There was Hansen of Denver, the nomad of the group and the

nattiest dresser of them all; Healy of the cherubic countenance and the agonized voice, and a valiant standardbearer for the Boston *Globe;* and last of the H's, Hale of Buffalo, asking his questions like a pilot breaking the sound barrier and getting as much out of the year as any other man. These, then, were the terrible H's, the wild questing spirits of the group, the guys who played poker while the others played safe. But each of the Niemans had earned his own sobriquet during the year and established his own claim to fame. Thus Rochester's Dougherty was the memory man; Duscha of Illinois was Lamont Library; Seney of Florida was the novelist at work and the man who found the comic page of the New York *Times;* Mooney of UP was the diplomat in split coat tails and West Virginia's Seagle knew all the lines from the poets; Sterling of Oregon was the son of his father and a workmanlike chairman; and San Francisco's Press was nimbleness and rare good humor. The Associates had been a larger group than usual—India's Prasad, cultured and uncommitted, and the speechmaker of the year; Japan's hard working Maeda, who had made an atomic bomb between lectures; Canada's Whealen with his love of ships and "Rule Britannia;" Plater of Australia, a man of the outdoors and an unmistakeable Anzac; and Stone of New Zealand, who was nothing without his brief case.

As they waited for Reston to begin, the Niemans looked back over the high points of the year. There had been so much that would be good to remember. They had soared high with Harlow Shapley as he pondered the mysteries of Creation ("Where did you come from?" he had said, repeating a question. "From a sperm I believe. Was there anything else you wanted to know?"), and they had relished a fear-nothing Yankee in Henry Beetle Hough of Martha's Vineyard, delighting in his scorn of summer vacationers and automobiles and of reporters who turned in less than two columns on a story. They thought of cold pickled herrings and bagles at Quincy and of white and green icecream at the Faculty. They recalled the weekend when they had hit New York and New York had hit them. They remembered with a twinge the scientists they had smitten at the meeting with Gerard Piel of *Scientific American,* and they chuckled over a question that had been put to President Pusey about scholars who worked in remote areas of knowledge ("it's hard you know to see the point of research like —well like Emily Dickinson place names for instance").

Memories were crowding quick around the Niemans at the last Signet dinner—memories of a visiting French professor who had scorched the table with a licking fire at the suggestion of French decadence, and who had been heard to say to Louis as the curator opened a window for ventilation —"Now you've made a draught; I can feel it distinctly around my feet." They kept thinking of the moving lips and the faraway eyes in the reading rooms of Lamont and Widener; of summer shade and winter snow in the Yard; of girls made for love and laughter studying Greek and the isosceles triangle; of crudely defaced books that somehow made them feel better for knowing that Harvard students were human; of deep-seated chairs in the poetry room; of somnolent afternoons in Widener stalls; of lecturers who had received a prima donna's applause. There were so many things to remember; the charm and the wisdom of Chester Bowles, the scholarship of Carl Friedrich, the keen perception and the delightful wit of Alistair Cooke, speaking with a brilliance that cast a shimmer on his words.

Now it was nearly all over. The last bourbon and water was being drained as James Reston began speaking in his quiet, unhurried, charitable way. As one of the deans of the Washington press, he had much to say that was worthwhile. He was using Senator Vandenberg to show how far the Republicans had come since the old days of isolation, and the Niemans were following him with a lean and hungry attention. There seemed to be no ink running in their veins any more, and not the least desire among them to write on the cuffs of their shirts. A year's exposure to the atmosphere of Harvard had done strange things to sixteen hard-boiled newspapermen, obliterating all thought of deadlines and the desk editor's tyranny. They had been reading newspapers for a year with a curious sense of detachment, and they had only just restrained themselves from writing long furious letters to the editor.

Towards the end, of course, there had been that inevitable falling away after a year's concentration. Niemans who began by arriving five minutes before the lecturer, ended by arriving 20 minutes after. Here and there a lecture was thrown overboard with a positively lighthearted abandon. John Harvard was passed with scarce a second thought. A little of the old awe and tremulousness had gone, for Harvard Yard had become almost as familiar, if not nearly as littered, as the copy desk room. And yet the year had its mark. It was clear to see in the way the Niemans had fallen into the Harvard rhythm, in their adoption of the long perspective and the many-sided view.

It was plainest of all in the complete attention they were giving now to Reston as he talked of the philosophy of government. Not a chair was being scraped and scarcely a glass being chinked. All absorbing was the pursuit of knowledge, so absorbing that not even the distant scream of a fire siren disturbed the silence that lay like a pool around the speaker. As Reston talked on, the fire engine raced closer. "There's a subtle but very distinct difference in the climate of government since the Republicans came to power," Reston was saying. And in Holyoke Street the fire engine was thundering past the Signet Club, throwing a shriek into the rooms as it went by. Not a Nieman twitched a muscle. Reston was talking now about the science of politics. And barely a hundred yards away the fire

engine was panting at the curbside and a commotion of voices was rising into the night. The fire was close and urgent. And all the while the Niemans, as composed as Nero when he fiddled, kept right on listening to Reston. It seemed that all their instincts as journalists were dead.

Just when the suspense was becoming unbearable, a chair scraped in the corner by the windows. But this was no newshound answering the call. It was the younger Schlesinger unable to stand the strain any longer. Curiosity flooded Merle Fainsod at almost the same time. Here was a fire and a story the Faculty at least were not going to miss.

And that, of course, was the breaking of the spell. One by one the Niemans put off their scholar's garb and surrendered to questions about the fire. It was only then perhaps that they realized how far the rot had gone. Clearly it was high time to be going home. And as if to shock them further into reality, Reston ended his talk with a flourish. Reporters, he growled, had become far too polite and apologetic. "They've got too educated altogether," he said. After that, there seemed nothing left to do but slink home.

Desmond Stone was the Associate Nieman Fellow from New Zealand 1955-56.

The Grass Roots Foreign Correspondent

By Blair Bolles

The way to cover Europe in these times is first, to spend half of every month of every year away from the great capitals, and second, to leave the capitals by conveyances where you are likely to meet the undistinguished people. Go in second-class or third-class train coaches, or in a car with enough jalopy flavor not to awe hitchhikers and discourage them from talking frankly. The Europeans you meet under these circumstances are the Europeans who in the long run decide what way the political news is going to run. As individuals they are seldom quotable, but a few words with many plain people are essential to give a balance to the many words a reporter exchanges with the few "important people"—prime ministers, foreign ministers and such.

One reason is that politicians in the capital are often out of touch with their publics in the provinces. The success, for example, of the followers of Pierre Poujade, the anti-tax rebel, in the elections in France last January took government officials in Paris by surprise. Reporters who left the glamor of Paris and carefully combed the grass roots caught the trend first. At a luncheon of politicians in Paris the day after the government called for elections, the name Poujade was not once mentioned. But the name Poujade never failed to appear in the course of fifty talks with fifty people along the banks of the Loire 140 miles southwest of Paris where two correspondents headed a week after that luncheon. On December 17, more than two weeks before the election, the Toledo *Blade* was able to run a story under the head, "Poujadists Are the Group to Watch." Yet while it was obvious outside Paris that Poujade had large popular support, in Paris he continued to be regarded as powerful only because he had tremendous gall. Even when Paris papers began to report that Poujade possessed an unexpectedly sizeable following in the country, Paris experts to whom foreign correspondents occasionally talk dismissed the news as unsound. Disagreement between capital and provinces about what was going on in France did not end until January 2, when the French elected 54 members of the Poujade parties to the National Assembly.

Late in the winter of 1955 I took the four-cylinder family car on an 1,800-mile trip around West Germany. Almost the last point of call was Bonn, the capital, where, at the beginning of the trip, the German government and the American high commissioner's office were showing real satisfaction because the Bundestag, the lower house of the German parliament, had approved the London-Paris agreements which joined Germany to NATO and authorized Germany to rearm, up to twelve divisions. Officials made two assumptions which created news—one, that with West Germany in NATO, Russia would no longer raise objections to West German union with East Germany under circumstances that would safeguard freedom; two, that the new German army would soon exist.

But away from Bonn it was difficult to find a citizen who shared the government's interest in arming, and one could not help meeting dozens of citizens willing to make the kind of concessions to the communists that might put West German freedom in danger if only the concessions would bring unity. Businessmen, bricklayers, women who were mothers, women unattached, students and retired old men said arms were a bar to unity and that unity would make arms unnecessary. They did not share the government's confidence that for West Germany to ally itself with its

---

Blair Bolles has been for several years European correspondent of the Toledo *Blade*.

neighbors would destroy Moscow's interest in East Germany.

They gave other reasons for objecting to the 12 divisions. Remembering Hitler, they suspected the raising of an army was inevitably the first step toward the outbreak of a war, instead of an action to prevent war. They did not want a military program to get in the way of prosperity. These opinions were impressively universal, expressed in the Black Forest and in Hamburg, in Frankfurt and the Schleswig peninsula. Despite the public sentiment, it seemed unlikely Chancellor Adenauer, with his tremendous authority, would not get his way in his policy of arming. Yet a year later the new German force he wanted to create consisted of only a few volunteers, and the Bundesrat (Senate) had approved a conscription bill only after cutting the period of service to 12 months, less than the time required by any other NATO member, a time so short it created doubt whether Germany could maintain an army of 12 divisions without dislocating its industry. A year after approving NATO membership, the Bundestag had yet to approve the creation of a real German military force within NATO. And a year later Russia had refused to permit the unification of the two Germanies on any ground but grave concessions from West Germany to East Germany. Chancellor Adenauer had proposed, but the public both foresaw the future more clearly and affected its character more certainly than he had.

The practice of getting the clue to the reality in the news from simple people is vital (although not always possible) in dictatorship countries, where governments are even more inventive and more outrageously optimistic, than they are in democratic countries. Cyrus Sulzberger caught Poland for the readers of the New York *Times* when he quoted a French Pole who had gone back to his native land. The Pole said he missed France. "Why?" he was asked, "for its wine? for its food?" "For its liberty," he replied.

Poland is easier to get around than the buffer between it and the western world, the Democratic Peoples Republic of East Germany, but East Germany is accessible at the time of the Leipzig Fair (twice a year). By luck, it was possible to go to Leipzig this past February from East Berlin via the East German railways and thus to ride the way the East Germans themselves have to ride. The police checked on the passengers three times in a journey of 120 miles, all of which lay within one sovereign area, about the distance from Boston to New London but no state lines crossed. The return train, reserved for western travelers to a destination not in East but in West Berlin, had only one simple police check, when it crossed the East-West boundary. In Leipzig the East German government was offering a Potemkin-type show of a happy population in a burgeoning city. But Leipzig citizens, courteous to all and talkative to those they trusted, told a different story.

"Dead," said one man, "Leipzig is dead between fairs."

In contrast to government reports on improving standards of living, a housewife described the difficulties of feeding her family with meat rationed (four pounds a month), potatoes rationed and milk rationed 10 years after the war in what once had been a principal agricultural region of an earlier Germany. An old man wept when he described the police's vigilant discouragement of get-togethers by friends. When those police are not listening, the irreconcilables in the lands of tyranny take off their masks for Americans. Officials talk often to the press also, but what they say is different.

Such reporting produces little spot news and no great exclusives. But it adds richness and trueness to the reporting of spot news, and sharpens even the best reporter's judgment about the merit of exclusive news thrust into his hand. For the foreign correspondent must perform a service which is less important at home. He needs to put the news abroad into its setting abroad. The reader of the paper at home is part of the home setting and has a feel for it. He can spot political insincerity or hot-air wishfulness because he knows what political acts reflect or distort the reality he sees around him. But on the shores of Lake Erie he cannot easily see the reality around events across the Atlantic Ocean. He needs more than explanation or interpretation of the foreign news. He needs to have laid bare for him the roots of the news. Public pronouncements sometimes deserve a skeptical, even a cynical, reception, but the skepticism ought to rest on experience and knowledge. The plucking at the grass roots gives reporters experienced judgment which adds to their readers' knowledge.

The best foreign reporting was ever thus produced. Almost 100 years ago the *Times* of London sent John Russell to the United States to cover the Civil War, and he at once began to put the war into its setting. He paid less attention to generals than to enlisted men and to the non-combat population, less to sheer military power than to the economic organization and the state of the societies behind the military in the North and in the South. His paper favored the Confederacy, and he was reporting the war when the prospects themselves seemed also to favor the Confederacy. But his stories gave the Union the better of it, both on the basis of the justice of the cause and the potentialities of the North. Because he had the extraordinary sensibilities of an able newspaperman, he figured out for himself what generals and presidents could never give him—a true measure of the situation.

Examples continued to multiply long after Russell. Years later H. R. Knickerbocker went to Russia and found out first hand what it was like for a Russian to live at home. Dorothy Thompson served up the alarming facts behind the sweet facade Adolf Hitler and the Nazis tried to erect for the benefit of western observers of his Third Reich. The

tradition of the search for basic reality behind official cant goes on today through the work of Cy Frieden and Crosby Noyes, of Henry Wales and Barrett McGurn—luckily for the modern newspaper reader, because the usefulness of this kind of reporting has increased in the century since Russell's day, for several reasons.

In the first place, the interest in the story of simple people, the dress-maker contrasted with the debutante, has grown. The way in which history is written shows the growth; the histories of society, of the way people lived, how they amused themselves, by Arthur Bryant and other moderns, have become the necessary companions of the histories built merely around political events and personalities, such as Macauley used to write, however brilliantly. The model history in 1956 rests on the entwining of people and politics. What the historian does for yesterday the foreign correspondent does for today.

A second reason why grass roots reporting has increased in usefulness during recent years is that the power of public opinion—perhaps public feeling is a better phrase—has grown abroad. When Glubb Pasha, the British general who for 26 years had led the chief military force in Jordan—the British Legion—was dismissed from his office as commander this year, a few critics of British diplomacy in the Middle East remarked that the passing of Glubb was the consequence in part of the passing of the era when "palace politics" meant the difference between political success and failure. Glubb in particular and the British in general were popular and respected in the palace of Jordan's king, Hussein. But the king was pushed by Jordanian popular sentiment, which was perhaps aroused by Jordanian army officers, into dropping his friend. As the palace politics or palace diplomacy long practiced by the British in Jordan is going out of date, so is palace reporting of the old-fashioned glamor kind that made reporters the confidantes of great kings. It is going out of date even in countries where public opinion has no outlet through voting.

Two years ago in voteless Egypt I took the poor man's bus from Cairo to Ismailia alongside the incredibly named Sweetwater Canal. It was at a time when Colonel Nasser, the revolutionary prime minister, was planning, in his Cairo office palace, the reconstruction and improvement of Egyptian society. It was a time also when the long negotiations to persuade the British to withdraw from the Suez Canal zone were approaching their end, to the accompaniment of predictions that once the British left, Egypt would range itself with the west in the cold war.

There was no way to foretell the future exactly, but the uncomfortable traveler could expect the worst. So it is not surprising that two years later life along the Sweetwater has not changed, that Egypt is not an ally of the west, that the retirement of the British from the Suez was followed by a heightening in Egypt of anti-foreign tension—over the Jewish regime in Israel and by intensification of Egyptian hostility toward the French masters of the Moslem Egyptians' brothers-in-religion in Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria. If the miserable Egyptian cannot enjoy economic stability at home, he can divert himself with excitement abroad, and the well-meaning colonel of Cairo, dictator though he is, has been unable to keep his policy calmer.

Whether they live in palaces or democratic houses, the essential characteristic of most men and women responsible for making the policies of nations is that they are incurable optimists, and the unimportant people are the realists. Never was there such a rosy glow as the heads of state at the Geneva summit conference last summer created with their confidence in eternal peace to come. After the conference I set out by train and car to beat the back bushes of Italy, Yugoslavia, Austria and Germany. The trip turned out to be an exercise in shroud-making for the optimism of the west at Geneva. It appeared to be Russia that had gained from the conference. Before the summer ended the *Blade* carried a story on cracks in the western alliance—a situation now too well known, but then, in the hazy aftermath of Geneva, a rather new phenomenon. Presidents and prime ministers make the historic decisions, but it is the public, without often being conscious of it, that first pushes them toward this or that decision and then determines whether the decision is to stand. So the foreign correspondent goes after the story in three dimensions, to get the public into the picture.

Nieman Fellows 1956-57

The Nieman Foundation at Harvard University announces appointment of eleven American newspapermen as Nieman Fellows at Harvard for the academic year opening in September. Five foreign news men are appointed Associate Fellows by arrangement with the Carnegie Corporation and the Asia Foundation, which sponsor and finance the associate fellowships.

Six reporters, two editorial writers, one city editor, one country editor and one foreign correspondent make up the list of Nieman Fellows.

Their fellowships cover one college year of resident study at Harvard where they will pursue studies of their own choice for background for further newspaper work.

The Nieman Fellows are on leave of absence from their newspapers for the period of study. This makes the 19th annual group of Fellows appointed under the bequest of Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of the founder of the Milwaukee *Journal,* Lucius W. Nieman. Mrs. Nieman left an endowment to Harvard in 1937 "to promote and elevate standards of journalism."

Two hundred eighteen American news men have held Nieman Fellowships. For the past five years the Carnegie Corporation has financed associate fellowships for newspapermen from British Commonwealths, this year from Australia and New Zealand. The Asia Foundation began similarly last year to sponsor fellowships of Asian journalists. Those appointed for this year came from India, Pakistan and Japan.

The Selecting Committee for the Nieman Fellows this year were:

Milburn P. Akers, executive editor of the Chicago Sun-*Times;* C. A. McKnight, editor of the Charlotte (N.C.) *Observer;* Dwight E. Sargent, editor of the editorial pages of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald* and *Express;* Merle Fainsod, professor of government at Harvard University; William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard News Office; and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Nieman Fellows for 1956-57

ROBERT FISHBURNE CAMPBELL, editorial writer, Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel.* Native of Asheville, N. C., graduate of Washington and Lee University and Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, Mr. Campbell is 35, was a Navy supply corps officer in the second World War, and has worked on North Carolina newspapers ten years. He was reporter, then city editor of the Asheville *Citizen* until he joined the editorial page of the Winston-Salem papers two years ago. He is married, has two children.

He plans to study the politics and economics of the South.

CHARLES HALE CHAMPION, reporter, San Francisco *Chronicle.* Mr. Champion began his news work with the United Press in Madison, Wisconsin, and served on the staff of the Milwaukee *Journal* and Sacramento *Bee* before joining the San Francisco *Chronicle* four years ago. He is a graduate of Stanford University, is married, has one child.

He plans to study history, particularly of California.

BURNELL ALBERT HEINECKE, reporter, Chicago *Sun-Times.* Born in Mascoutah, Ill., Mr. Heinecke was graduated at McKendree College in Illinois, spent two years on the Belleville (Ill.) *Advocate* and has been four years on the Chicago *Sun-Times* where he has been covering state and national politics. He is 29, single.

He plans to study political history and government finance.

J(oseph) ANTHONY LEWIS, reporter, New York *Times,* Washington Bureau. Former editor of the *Harvard Crimson,* Mr. Lewis worked on the New York Sunday *Times* Review of the Week for four years after his graduation, then joined the Washington *Daily News* where he received a Pulitzer Prize for reporting in 1954. He has been covering national news in the *Times* bureau since 1955. He is 29, married, has one child.

Mr. Lewis plans to study law with especial reference to the Supreme Court.

HAROLD VINCENT LISTON, JR., city editor, *Daily Pantagraph,* Bloomington, Illinois. Native of Indianapolis, Mr. Liston attended Illinois State Normal College three years before starting newspaper work as a reporter on the *Pantagraph.* He has served that paper 13 years, the last four as city editor. He is 35, married, has one child.

He plans to study local government, community planning, social relations.

JOHN CHESTER OBERT, city editor, *Park Region Echo,* Alexandria, Minn. (twice weekly). Born in Minneapolis, graduated at the University of Minnesota, his whole career has been on the community-owned rural paper, the *Park Region Echo,* once awarded the National Editorial Association trophy as "the best weekly newspaper in the United States." He is in charge of its news side. He is 32, married, has four children.

He plans to study local government and political history and theory.

FREDERICK WATTERS PILLSBURY, editorial writer, Boston *Herald.* Native of Boston, Mr. Pillsbury was educated at Milton Academy and Harvard College, served in World War II as an American Field Service Ambulance driver and then as a Marine Corps amphibian tank driver, then started newspaper work on the Quincy *Patriot Ledger,* in 1946. He was editor of the editorial page of the *Patriot Ledger* from 1951 until he joined the Boston *Herald* in 1954. He is 33, married, has three children, lives in Milton, Mass.

He plans to study in the fields of education, defense and conservation.

FREDERICK WILHELM ROEVEKAMP, reporter, *Christian Science Monitor.* Native of Germany, Mr. Roevekamp came to this country in 1950, after post-war work in Germany for the U.S. Army and the United Press. He has been five years on the *Monitor* as a staff reporter, is now on a tour of Europe for the *Monitor.* He won the Amasa Howe award of the Boston Press Club for a series on the connections of race tracks with politics, in 1954. He is 32, married, has one child, lives in Wellesley, Mass.

He plans to study American history and government and economics.

MARVIN DAVIS WALL, reporter, Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger.* Born in Quincy, Florida, Mr. Wall is a graduate of the University of Georgia. He began news work with INS in Atlanta in 1949, then worked two years on the Macon *News* and has been five years with Columbus *Ledger* where he covers state and local government and politics. He worked on the exposure of Phoenix City corruption which won the *Ledger* the 1954 Pulitzer award, has recently done an extensive series on "Interposition." He is 29, married.

Mr. Wall plans to study city planning and public finance.

WILLIAM WORTHY, correspondent, *Afro-American* and CBS. Native of Boston, graduate of Bates College (1942), Mr. Worthy is 35, single, has been a reporter and foreign correspondent for *Afro-American* since 1951. The past year he attended the Bandung Conference, reported from Moscow and traveled through much of Asia and Africa, writing for *Afro-American* and serving as special correspondent for CBS. Most recently he has covered the segregation issue in the South.

He plans to study history and literature, with special reference to Africa.

LAWSON MARTIN WRIGHT, JR., reporter, Richmond *Times-Dispatch.* Born in Thomasville, N. C., graduated at Wake Forest College, he started newspaper work on a small North Carolina paper (Thomasville *Tribune,* semi-weekly), was editor of two weekly papers in Hamlet, N.C., before joining the Richmond *Times-Dispatch* in 1953. His reporting has covered the whole development of the segregation-integration issue in Virginia the past two years. He is 29, married, has one child.

He plans to study race relations and constitutional law.

Associate Nieman Fellows

(Sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation)

JOHN CORNWELL, 33, agricultural correspondent, *New Zealand Herald,* Auckland. Graduate of the University of Auckland, Mr. Cornwell served five years in the N. Z. Royal Air Force, was four years on the Timeroo *Herald* before joining the *New Zealand Herald* in 1951.

He plans to study the American economy, especially agriculture.

DENIS ASHTON WARNER, foreign correspondent, Australian newspapers. He served as war correspondent for the Melbourne *Herald* and as a correspondent in Asia after the war for the *Herald* and other Australian papers. He was in combat landings with the U. S. Marines at Saipan, Guam, Peleliu, with the U. S. Fleet in the Battle of the Philippines, later covered the occupation in Japan and the war criminal trials. He is 38, married, has three children.

He plans to study the U. S. government and foreign relations.

(Sponsored by the Asia Foundation)

KAZUO KURODA, staff writer, *Nippon Times* (English language). A graduate of Tokyo University, he is 35, has been since 1949 with the *Nippon Times.* He covers politics and general news. In World War II he served two years in the Japanese Navy and after the war as a translator in MacArthur's occupation staff and taught high school English two years before starting newspaper work.

He plans to study U. S. government and foreign policy.

G. K. REDDY, foreign affairs writer, *Times of India.* Mr. Reddy is 35, a graduate of the University of Andhra, and has had extensive experience as a foreign correspondent. He started with the Associated Press of India in 1943, assigned to Kashmir. With the *Times of India* since 1952 he has been a correspondent on the Middle East, the Far East, the Soviet Union, and covered Nehru's European visits last year. He covered the Korean truce talks, the Bandung Conference and the Seato talks.

He plans to study the American economy and politics, including foreign relations.

MARGHUB SIDDIQI, contributing editor, *Civil and Military Gazette,* Lahore, West Punjab, Pakistan. He is 33, was graduated at Allahabad University, taught two years at Islamia College, and for eight years was news editor of the *Gazette.*

He plans to study U. S. government and public opinion.

Two Books on India

By Sharada Prasad

AS I SEE INDIA: By Robert Trumbull. William Sloane Associates. 256 pp. $4.00.

AT HOME IN INDIA: By Cynthia Bowles. Harcourt, Brace and Co. 180 pp. $3.00.

What is the world's worst newspaper assignment?

"First-wave" Jones, untamed by all the beachheads between Guadalcanal to Tokyo Bay, went under after only eleven months at this place. A British correspondent died of heat stroke and his predecessor, in a fit of hot weather despondency, had shot himself.

The hideous place is called New Delhi. Robert Trumbull braved it all, for seven and a half long years. He went there at possibly the worst possible time for going to India, when the Partition riots were turning large numbers of people into human beasts and the gore stained the fields red. When he went there he did not go as an Indophile or admirer of the history and heritage of the people. When he left years later there was no doubt where his sympathies lay.

"Look back on India," Trumbull says in his last paragraphs, "I can understand why the old British are loath to leave, though they curse the climate, the people, and the surroundings. . . . The starkness of the country, even the rigors of the climate, have a grandeur about them that can be found nowhere else. . . .

"Both in its physical character and in its problems, the country is a challenge to the builder, the politician, the writer who tries to interpret India to the rest of the world. . . . Everything in the world is wrong with India, but there is not a thing amiss for which a corrective is not being undertaken. . . . The Republic of India today is the largest democracy in the world in terms of population. She may well hold the balance of the future for Asia, and perhaps most of the world."

But it was not all summer sweat and the sight of blood and endless toil for Trumbull in India.

The most colorful portions of the book are devoted to the fine time he had amidst princes and maharajas and others.

The chapter "Happy Birthday, Maharajah!," for example: "The way was lighted by a serpentine of flickering torches, and at the towering gates we were guided to the banquet hall by retainers dressed in the court costume of medieval Rajputana, of the days when Bundi was a great and powerful state. . . . Inside the palace was illuminated by hundreds of candles. At the banquet table, behind each chair a servant kept the hot, still air moving pleasantly by gently waving a huge, graceful fan of ostrich feathers studded with precious gems."

Then there are the usual number of anecdotes that any foreign correspondent's book must have on the wealth of the Nizam of Hyderabad. "I heard that the ruler kept an uncut diamond, as big as his fist, on his desk as a paperweight. I asked one of his secretaries if this was true. 'Good heavens no, what utter rot!' the secretary replied. 'It is only an emerald.' "

It is a readable book. That seems to be the intention. It suffers from the drawback of books by overseas correspondents. You get the feeling you had read it earlier, in the reports by the same man. Scissors and paste, and some crayons for color, and lo, a book. *As I See India* lists most of the sights, but just does not give new insight. It fails to give a vision of the sources of India's urges and passions, but it gives a good idea of the pace of change in India.

If Trumbull writes about India, Cynthia Bowles writes about Indians, the ordinary, everyday folk. Cynthia was in India as the daughter of the 'shirt-sleeves' ambassador, Chester Bowles. She did not meet the high and the mighty. She mingled with the plain folk. She went to school with Indian children, and liked it. She went to the villages and achieved instinctive sympathy with the people. She made many friends. These friendships taught her "not simply that East and West can meet, but that the very difference between the girl from India and the girl from America is not so great as is thought." Cynthia is now in Oberlin College. After graduating she hopes to specialize in public health nursing and go back to "that second home."

Cynthia is not the professional writer that Robert Trumbull is, but their books supplement each other excellently. He sets out to report, she to understand. He is busy with the busy, the big and the powerful; she has time to mix in the unhierarchical American way with the chauffeur's and the sweeper's children, to work as volunteer nurse in a hospital, and to live in Indian homes. Trumbull had the excitement of being amidst the Naga tribesmen, of reporting the Kashmir war and of unsuccessfully planning the escape of the Dalai Lama of Tibet. He had no time for the villages. Teen-age ability to go to the heart of the matter often achieves what sophistication and professional expertise cannot.

Sizing Up The Voters

By Julius Duscha

REVOLT OF THE MODERATES. By Samuel Lubell. Harper & Brothers, New York. 308 pp. $3.75.

Here are one man's answers to the big political questions of this Presidential election year:

Voters want the moderation of an Eisenhower or a Stevenson, not the give-'em hell approach of a Harry Truman.

Like most of the rest of us, farmers vote for the party which they believe will best take care of their economic interests.

In the South, as in the rest of the country, the prosperous middle class is Republican while the tenant farmers, like the tenement dwellers of New York City, are Democrats.

Negro voters, North or South, are more Democratic than they were 20 years ago and are the only large bloc of voters where the Republicans have failed to register some gains.

When a Democrat makes enough money so he can move to a suburb he does not necessarily become a Republican.

Samuel Lubbell's answers are worth careful consideration because he is one of the few politicial experts who gets out and talks to voters.

"During the 1952 campaign," Lubell notes, "I managed to talk with about 3,500 families—roughly equal to the number of interviews pollsters conduct in a national sampling. My interviews, though, were spread carefully through areas, which, taken together, constituted a miniature reproduction of the Roosevelt coalition."

To a newspaperman Lubell's techniques are as challenging as his conclus-

ions. It is Lubell's contention that "voting returns are like the boundless sea—the further and deeper the net of inquiry is cast, the more revealing are the historical facts brought to the surface."

In this sea Lubell finds many currents: "It is this I consider the key concept in interpreting election statistics—that Americans have always voted less as individuals than as part of a particular voting stream, with its own marked flow."

"These streams," he explains, "may have taken their original form from the economic contours of the country, as with the tidewater-back country cleavage in many Southern states. Or they may have been shaped by human differences in cultural outlook, religion or even between family clans. But it is these voting streams—and the barriers of prejudice and interest which channel off one from the others—which explain why our political parties have behaved as they have."

As readers of Lubell's book, *The Future of American Politics,* know, he stresses economic motivations and ethnic backgrounds in seeking to determine why Americans vote as they do. Lubell is not the first political analyst to answer questions of voting behavior in these terms. His contributions to the study of politics are the thousands of interviews he has had with voters and the extensive research he has done on election returns. His conclusions are impressive because they are buttressed by facts. Still, one cannot put down *Revolt of the Moderates* without feeling that Lubell is too wedded to two pet theories.

It is Lubell's findings, not his writing, which keep the reader turning the pages of *Revolt of the Moderates.* Unfortunately, Lubell's style is as cliche-ridden as most newspapers.

Some newspapers use Lubell's techniques in covering election campaigns. More newspapers should. If they did, their campaign coverage would have a greater meaning. Lubell probably knows the voting habits of people in many cities and states better than do the newspapers published in those areas. He is a good reporter. He goes out and talks to the people. And he understands the background of his subjects. If Lubell can do what he has on a national scale, why can't more newspapers do the same thing in their own areas?

The Why of It

By Volta Torrey

HOW TO WRITE AND SELL NONFICTION, by Hal Borland. Ronald Press, $3.50.

If all free-lance contributors were as reliable and competent as Hal Borland, an editor's life would be pleasant indeed. Mr. Borland is a magazine editor's magazine writer. He can take someone else's idea and produce almost exactly what that person had in mind; he can come up with ideas of his own that still are recognizable when delivered in manuscript form. Few writers for popular periodicals are so thoroughly professional.

Like many other experienced writers, Mr. Borland doubts whether writing can be taught. There are tips that a veteran can pass on to a beginner, nevertheless, and he has put some of them into *How to Write and Sell Non-Fiction,* published this fall by the Ronald Press Co. The title is misleading—titles that begin with "how to" usually are—because the book is an informal chat rather than a set of instructions. But this book can be read in an evening, and should be read by every journalism student or newspaperman who toys with the idea of writing for magazines for pay.

"Every good article or book answers a whole series of whys about some topic," Mr. Borland notes. "Any writer who is consumed by the persistence of the *why* has the whole world open to him as subject matter for his writing." Mr. Borland's little book deals with the whys of magazine writing, and makes them as fascinating as he has made strolls in the woods for readers of the New York *Times.* Reading it will not help you apply the seat of your pants to the seat of the chair. But reading it may help you produce something, when you do sit down to write, that will be worth printing.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter

By Irving Dilliard

OF LAW AND MEN: PAPERS, ADDRESSES OF FELIX FRANKFURTER, 1939-1956, edited by Philip Elman. Harcourt, Brace and Co., 364 pps., $6.75.

The life of Felix Frankfurter is one of the evidences that the American experiment works. From his birth in Vienna 73 years ago and his arrival as an emigrant from Austria at the age of 12, he rose by 1939 through legal scholarship and teaching to the United States Supreme Court where he is now one of the senior jurists. His students occupy many places of importance in the country. And he is much sought after as a speaker on notable occasions that reflect the finer side of the national life.

Of Law and Men is a collection of Justice Frankfurter's writings and speeches since he put on the black robes of the Supreme Court Judge. He gives advice to a young man about to enter law, he discusses the treatment of criminals, he tells how the judicial process operates and he evaluates the life and work of fellow judges, political leaders and private citizens.

Invariably he does it with that felicity of expression, that turn of phrase that helped make him a great teacher at Harvard before the late President Roosevelt chose him to succeed Benjamin Nathan Cardozo on our highest court.

Of Law and Men contains not only Justice Frankfurter's model article on Justice Holmes for the *Dictionary of American Biography,* but his article on Justice Cardozo written for a supplemental volume of the *D.A.B.* that has not yet been published.)

Since this is the centennial year of the birth of the late Justice Louis B. Brandeis, it is appropriate to turn to Justice Frankfurter's appraisal of that great judge. Said Frankfurter of Brandeis:

"He distrusted grandiose schemes, tall talk and easy ways. Painful thought, generously bestowed upon the matter in hand seen in all its fullness, early became a habit with him. He regarded generalities as traps for error and rhetoric as the enemy of

wisdom. Problems that seemed simple to mere shallow minds almost oppressed him with their complexity."

Included are comments and memorials on many others, including: Chief Justices Marshall, Hughes and Stone, Justices Jackson and Roberts and Judges Learned Hand and Patterson, Thomas Reed Powell, Harold J. Laski, Alfred North Whithead, Joseph B. Eastman, Florence Kelley, John G. Winant, Thomas Mann, Alfred E. Smith, Rabbi Wise, Msgr. Ryan, Sir Willmott Lewis and F. D. R.

Among his writings selected for the book is his article, "The Big City Press and Democracy," which appeared in the seventy-fifth anniversary issue of the *Post-Dispatch,* in December, 1953. In it he quoted the words of the Manchester *Guardian's* great editor, C. P. Scott, "Opinion Is Free; Facts Are Sacred." Then he wrote:

"The ascertainment of facts, the sifting of the relevant from the irrelevant and confusing, the balanced statement of the relevant, call for a disciplined profession, for the will, capacity and opportunity for disinterested communication."

What Justice Frankfurter wrote as advice to a young man interested in going into law is readily applicable to training for other professions:

"The best way to prepare for the law is to come to the study of the law as a well-read person. Thus alone can one acquire the capacity to use the English language on paper and in speech and with the habits of clear thinking which only a truly liberal education can give. No less important for a lawyer is the cultivation of the imaginative faculties by reading poetry, seeing great paintings, in the original or in easily available reproductions, and listening to great music. . . ."

—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* June 10

SOVIET AIR POWER,
by Richard E. Stockwell
Pageant Press, N.Y. 256 pp $7.50.

Received too late for review, this is an important book, thoroughly documenting the dramatic development of the Russian air force. Richard Stockwell, is an aviation authority and also he can write. Former editor of *Aviation Age* and director of American Aviation Publications, he is now consultant on aircraft to the General Electric Company. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1946.

The Manchester Guardian Weekly May 3, 1956 ***Scrapbook***

Mr. Lippmann's First Quarter-Century

By Alistair Cooke

It is a surprise to an Englishman visiting the United States to see that more and more American papers, not least the "tabloids," maintain a strict distinction between the news columns and the editorials.

Reporters who slog along behind Adlai, or mush with Estes, are likely to turn in very similar accounts of their expeditions, no matter whether their publishers are hot for Truman or still convalescing from the rampages of the hated Roosevelt. When an American reporter begins to mistake himself for a seer, or otherwise develops a taste for opining, he can do one of two things. He can grow gray in the service of the news, and hoard his adjectives against the day when he is promoted to the editorial page. Or he can quit and try his hand as a "columnist."

The signed column of comment and reflection is the last refuge in America of personal journalism. In the 40 years since Don Marquis pretended to come in the office in the morning and file the thoughts of a pet cockroach that worked the night-shift on his typewriter, the American columnist has been all things to all men. Sometimes he is a genuine solo performer, a roving acrobat exploiting for his own audience a trick or two with the language; or, like Art Buchwald, a man who sees every place and every problem of the globe with the wry unconcern of a permanently displaced G.I. More often he is a persuasive bigot, either of the Right or Left, who offers his publisher the chance to fulminate vicariously in language that would look too strong on the editorial page.

The columnists are by now a profitable by-product of the newspaper industry; and astute agents breed them like yearlings and sell them in strings for syndication to papers with lots of money and presumably, no very strong thoughts of their own. In a recent cross-country jaunt, I read scores of papers which printed the most popular columinsts of the day in every possible combination. In theory, the reader can discover the truth by hearing every side of a current argument. In practice, his confusion or stamina must be something remarkable.

Of this now venerable breed of journalist, the most singular is Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has just finished his first quarter-century of handing down the oracles and whose retirement would rob innumerable Americans of the most thoughtful and majestic political commentator of their time. There are said to be publishers and editorial writers who have Lippmann's copy flown in at dawn to ensure that their own subsequent parodies of him shall preserve for their paper some reputation for judicial opinion. There are certainly admirals and Cabinet officials who bone up on him at breakfast in order to make some sense at the noon briefings in the Pentagon or the White House. His column has been called "the one continuous act of cerebration" in American daily journalism. And this compliment is just in conveying that though Lippmann's pieces, like those of any self-respecting journalist, are complete in themselves, they are each an interim report on the unending complexities of politics, another brave stab at the obscure verities of power, justice, and good government that have bogged philosophers from Plato to Toynbee.

This approach is more familiar in English literary and political comment, and it is doubtful if Lippmann's huge number of readers appreciate the novelty of his disinterestedness any more than they would a close imitation of it. Lippmann is now in his sixties and so much of a national institution that parodies of his grave and speculative style are frequent. They are, all the ones that I have seen, crude stuff: side-swipes at a pompous judge, full of hedging qualifications, open gibes at the sort of teetering, on-the-one-hand, on-the-other-hand mind which passes so often among soldiers, lawyers, professors, and research students for the very act of scholarship. These lampoons miss their mark not because they are crudely done but because they are irrelevant to Lippmann's cast of mind; which is that of a genuine inquirer with no axe to grind, a pioneer researcher who uses great knowledge of the past as a handy but treacherous guide to the present.

There is more of the forest ranger about

him than the plant collector, and more of the skeptical, wise judge than either. He takes a lot of kidding with ease and good humor, for he has been a prodigy since childhood and learned to accommodate himself with good grace to that off-hand deprecation, bordering on scurrility, which is the mediocre newspaperman's form of envy.

He was born of the well-to-do offspring of German-Jewish immigrants. The best schools, private libraries, regular trips to the Louvre and Salzburg, a brilliant record at Harvard were matters of course. So, in his younger days, which rumbled with the machinery of sweatshops, the cannon-fire of the Fabians, and the growing pains of American labor, was his early conversion to socialism. He worked, like Attlee, in settlement houses, became a legman for the muck-raking Lincoln Steffens, and then a secretary to a Socialist mayor in Schenectady. After two years' daily contact with the grimy politics of city precincts, and the bewilderment of the poor, he decided that Marx was a bad prophet and that there was something "monotonously trivial" and self-serving about the intellectual's condescension for the working-man. He took at an early age the mature, if unpopular, decision that the intellectual's front line is in the war of ideas. Ever since then his critics have seen in his serenity, his sometimes Olympian detachment from the American ferment, a meek retreat into the library and a tractable world of well-groomed ideas and books that do not kick.

But one man's library is another man's battlefield, and Lippmann is more self-searching in the presence of his books and the surrounding silence than a strike-breaker heading for the enemy's factory. In the First World War and after he made famous contributions to the clarifying of labor relations in the Secretary of War's office; he was the secretary of the committee that drafted for President Wilson his Fourteen Points; he has turned out a classic paper on banking policy; about thirty years ago he conceived the "trusteeship" system adopted in 1945 by the United Nations. But these were not sallies into "practical politics" to relieve the imputed guilt of his retreat to writing and brooding. They were the useful fruit of that retreat. It is not so lonely a place as his detractors would like to think. He never has to go after the news, in the mechanical Washington fashion, because so often the news comes to him. He must be the only Washington newsman whose invitation to lunch is accepted as a command by generals, judges, Air Force strategists, and Presidential candidates.

When they are gone he settles to his daily routine, which is as strenuous and unvarying as training for a championship bout. He goes over the column he has written in the morning. He meets—as only the most scrupulous do—the daily temptation to "coast" on his style, to let his working vocabulary do the thinking for him. He struggles with his memory, his historical analogies, and his conscience. He weighs the justice of this phrase and that. Although innumerable swine will use these pearls to wrap tomorrow's fish, he lets his essay go from him at last as reluctantly and hopefully as if it were a State paper. Sometimes it is.

Thankless Tasks

One of the unpleasant and sometimes onerous tasks that come to lawyers occasionally is assignment to represent an accused person who does not have the means to employ counsel. In his new book, *Of Law and Men,* Justice Frankfurter tells how the late Arthur D. Hill of the Boston bar became counsel for Sacco and Vanzetti in the last stages of the unsuccessful legal struggle to save them from the death chair as alleged murderers in 1927.

Justice Frankfurter was Prof. Frankfurter of the Harvard University Law School at the time. He was asked to approach Mr. Hill to enlist the legal services of that distinguished member of the Boston bar in a final effort, on behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti, hopeless though it seemed, by appeal to the federal law. Felix Frankfurter not only told Mr. Hill that the task would be thankless but that "it would have to be solely an exercise of the public profession of the law, for it would have to be done without a fee."

Arthur Hill's reply, as Justice Frankfurter says, "deserves permanence in the history of the legal profession." Mr. Hill replied:

"If the president of the biggest bank in Boston came to me and said that his wife had been convicted of murder but he wanted me to see if there was any possible relief in the Supreme Court of the United States and offered me a fee of $50,000 to make such an effort, of course I would take the retainer as would, I suppose, everybody else at the bar.

"It would be a perfectly honorable thing to see whether there was anything in the record which laid a basis for an appeal to the federal courts. I do not see how I can decline a similar effort on behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti simply because they are poor devils against whom the feeling of the community is strong and they have no money with which to hire me. I won't particularly enjoy the proceedings that will follow but I don't see how I can possibly refuse to make the effort."

These words of Arthur D. Hill have a timely application in St. Louis as the Bar Association goes about the task of providing counsel for witnesses summoned to appear before the Moulder subcommittee. Assigned counsel may not "enjoy the proceedings"—and doubtless they will have little liking for some clients—but they will be participating in the processes of justice.

—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* June 1

Letters

Historical Correction

I see that you reprinted the Chicago *Tribune* item of Feb. 10—"The Tribune Goes to Moscow," in which the *Tribune* states, "This is the first time this newspaper has had a permanent representative in Moscow since the 1917 revolution." I saw the mention in *Time,* and they have already printed a letter from me denying this statement.

I sent my resignation to Colonel McCormick to take effect December 31, 1928. Subsequently, in books on journalism, I criticized the *Tribune* and Col. McCormick, and in revenge the Colonel had my name actually chiseled out of a bronze plaque in the London office, and removed from the entry of the *Tribune* tower—for which I had supplied two stones, one from St. Peter's and one from the Colosseum.

I thought all this was high humor. But I did not believe the *Tribune*—like Stalin—and other Moscow communists—could alter history. Stalin eliminated Trotsky

from the Russian history books, and now the *Tribune* has eliminated me as their first and only permanent correspondent in Moscow.

In August, 1921, while W. L. Brown was negotiating the Hoover-Litvinoff treaty in Riga, which opened the iron curtain of that time, Floyd Gibbons, head of the Chicago *Tribune* Foreign News Service, went to Moscow, Samara, the famine-stricken Ukraine, and scooped the world on the story (because he got it out to me, in Riga, and I cabled it to London and Chicago). After Floyd scooped the cream off the great Russian story, he assigned me permanently to Moscow, and I took up residence there (along with a dozen others). I stayed on about a year and a half.

I was deported by order of Foreign Minister Chicherin after Col. McCormick, reading a letter I had smuggled out to him on the censorship, cabled Chicherin:

YOU MUST ABANDON THE CENSORSHIP AND GUARANTEE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION OTHERWISE OUR CORRESPONDENT WILL BE WITHDRAWN AND SO WILL THE CORRESPONDENTS OF OTHER AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS SO THAT RUSSIA WILL FIND HERSELF WITHOUT MEANS OF COMMUNICATION WITH THE OUTER WORLD R R MCCORMICK.

Chicherin sent for me and protested that Col. McCormick "addresses me as an equal power—I cannot accept ultimatums from him."

At the time I was expelled the following correspondents were either expelled or left voluntarily: Francis McCullough of the New York *Herald,* Sam Spewack of the New York *World,* and Percy Noel of the Philadelpiha *Ledger,* all resident or permanent correspondents. Bella Spewack, who was doing a mail column for the *Evening World,* of course left with Sam.

The Chicago *Tribune* hailed my expulsion with delight and syndicated a series of ten articles I wrote denouncing the Soviet system. It stated proudly in editorials that its correspondent (me) had been expelled. In August, 1925, when Mussolini expelled me from Rome, it was again a series of articles (denouncing fascism) and editorials boasting their man would not be bound by censorship.

The *Tribune* of course can erase my name in copper or stone in Chicago, and bronze in London, but how are they going to change all the existing copies of their issues from 1921 to 1925?

GEORGE SELDES
R. D. Number 1, Windsor, Vermont

"First" Radio Editorial

To the Editor.

In your last issue, you carried a reprint of an editorial from the *Independent* in Littleton, Colorado. This reprint opened with this sentence, "Hugh Terry of KLZ made history Friday night when he broadcast the first radio editorial ever to go on the airwaves in this region." The headline read "The First Radio Editorial."

Though the original story in the Littleton *Independent* may have been correct since it localizes the event as having occurred "in this region," your headline makes no such reservation and therefore creates an erroneous impression. It is a matter of record that WMCA has been broadcasting radio editorials, expressing the clearly-defined viewpoint of the station, since November 19, 1954, fully sixteen months before the broadcasts referred to be the Littleton *Independent.*

Since *Nieman Reports* has a reputation for accuracy amongst its subscribers, you will undoubtedly wish to correct in a subsequent issue the erroneous impression created by your headline.

LEON GOLDSTEIN
Vice President in
Charge of Programs, WMCA
New York City.

From the Buffalo News

To the Editor:

Last week Mr. A. H. Kirchhofer, editor of the Buffalo *Evening News* distributed to the reporters and rewrite men in the editorial department, the April, 1956, number of *Nieman Reports.*

I have enjoyed the issue so well that I enclose $3 (*in cash*!) for a subscription to start with the next issue following April.

MONTGOMERY MULFORD

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* was awarded an honorary degree, D.C.L., by Brandeis University, June 10. A few years ago he had delivered the first annual Brandeis Lecture there.

Justice Felix Frankfurter received an honorary degree from Brandeis the same day. Dilliard, perhaps the closest student of the Supreme Court among American editors, had lived in Frankfurter's house in Cambridge when he was a Nieman Fellow. He characteristically observed his notification of the up-coming degree by writing an editorial on Frankfurter's new book, *Of Law and Men.* (See Scrapbook section.)

1940

The Lasker award for outstanding magazine writing in the field of health and medicine during 1955 went to **Steven Spencer,** associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post.* This was for an article "Mystery of the Blinded Babies" published in June, 1955. Spencer has received other science writing awards including the Westinghouse Award by the AAAS.

1947

Frank Carey, science writer for the Associated Press, is as impersonal a reporter as any, but he found a front page story in his own daughter March 15, when she won a $500 scholarship award at Holy Cross Academy in Washington, D. C. What made it a story was that Barbara also took her 1,561st daily shot of insulin that day and had achieved distinction in school activities in spite of her struggle against diabetes.

1948

Charles W. Gilmore of the Toledo *Times* was married, May 25, to Margaret Batsch Lang at Perrysburg, Ohio.

The Ohio State Bar Association made an award to Gilmore for "constructive contributions to the administration of justice" in recognition of a series he did in the *Times* under the title: So You've Been Arrested.

Nieman Notes

1948

Christopher Rand has returned from a two year stretch in South Asia for *The New Yorker*. He was in Cambridge in April and spoke to a Nieman seminar. He has a book in process and expects to work in New York for some months before returning to Asia.

Walter G. Rundle is now associate foreign editor of *Newsweek*. He has been with the United Press for 25 years, and China manager from 1944-47 and German manager for several years after his fellowship.

George Weller came home from his Mediterranean assignment for the Chicago *Daily News* in April and is now on assignment in Mexico. He and his wife spent a month in Gloucester and George spoke at a Nieman seminar about his observations in the Middle East. Based in Rome since the second World War, his assignments have stretched across the Arab world.

1950

In the same week, **Clark Mollenhoff** was given the Clapper award for distinguished Washington correspondence by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and **Murrey Marder** received the Sidney Hillman Foundation award. Both awards were for vigilant and vigorous reporting in the field of civil liberties. Mollenhoff is a correspondent of the Cowles papers, Marder for the Washington *Post*. Mollenhoff earlier received the Broun award.

The night of the annual A.S.N.E. dinner, the Mollenhoffs entertained visiting and local Nieman Fellows and their wives. Those attending, George Chaplin, editor, New Orleans *Item,* and Mrs. Chaplin, Robert Brown, editor, Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger,* Irving Dilliard, editor, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* Sylvan Meyer, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times,* and the following from Washington included Mr. and Mrs. Richard Dudman, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Gonzales, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. Herb Yarhaes, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hoyt, Mr. and Mrs. Murrey Marder, Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Kilpatrick, Justin McCarthy, Mr. and Mrs. Osburn Zuber, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Zagoria, and Lawrence Fernsworth.

1951

Dwight E. Sargent, editor of the Portland, Maine, newspapers, was awarded an honorary degree of Master of Arts by Colby College May 17. He was graduated at Colby in 1939. Pres. Bixler, in his citation, said Sargent was chiefly responsible for the establishment of the Elijah Lovejoy annual lectures and awards, signalizing American press freedom. The following week Sargent interviewed candidates for Nieman Fellowships with the Nieman Selecting Committee and joined in picking the 1956-57 Fellows. On this trip in Chicago, four members of the 1951 Nieman group got together at a party given by Milburn P. Akers, executive editor of the Chicago *Sun-Times* for the Chicago Nieman Fellows. The others were Hoke Norris of the *Sun-Times,* Roy Fisher of the *Daily News* and Sylvan Meyer, editor of the Gainesville (Ga.) *Times.* Others attending were Melvin Wax (1950), Carl Larsen (1948), Fletcher Martin of the *Sun-Times* (1947), Robert Fleming of *Newsweek* (1950), and the wives of all these Fellows.

1952

John M. Harrison of the Toledo *Blade* editorial page reports a visit he and his wife made to Shane and Shirley MacKay in Montreal where Shane is editor of the Canadian edition of the *Reader's Digest.* He was the first Canadian Associate Nieman Fellow in 1952 when he was on the Winnipeg *Free Press.*

1953

Mr. and Mrs. **William Steif** (San Francisco *News*) had a daughter, Ellen Rogers, born March 12.

Mr. and Mrs. **Kenneth E. Wilson** (San Francisco *Chronicle*) had a son, born May 10.

After eight years residence in Japan, **Keyes Beech** has moved to Hongkong which he says is a more central base from which to cover his Asian waterfront, from Korea to Karachi for the Chicago *Daily News.* He recently completed a swing from Karachi to Tokyo, sometimes travelling with Secretary John Foster Dulles. He reports also another son, Barnaby, whose brother, Kimo, was born in Cambridge during Keyes' fellowship. His wife, Linda, is working at fiction and Keyes himself is working on another book, a novel with an Asian background, he says.

John Strohmeyer became editor of the Bethlehem (Pa.) *Globe-Times* in May. This is his home town paper where he started newspaper work 16 years ago. It was a hard decision, he says, to leave the Providence *Journal* where his distinguished investigational reporting had made him a top reporter. *Harper's* Magazine announces an article by Strohmeyer for July. He reached Bethlehem in time to attend the Pennsylvania Press Conference at State College where his paper received an award.

Other Pennsylvania Nieman Fellows at the Conference were Rebecca Gross, editor of the Lock Haven *Express,* Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the Scranton *Times,* and Louis M. Lyons of the Nieman Foundation, who made a speech to the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association.

1954

A son, Roger Carlton, was born April 16 to Elizabeth and **Robert Bergenheim,** in Boston, whose municipal affairs Mr. Bergenheim covers for the *Christian Science Monitor.*

Hazel Holly has returned to newspaper work in San Francisco as woman's editor of the *Call-Bulletin.* She was one of the San Francisco newspaper stars whom Paul Smith took to the Crowell-Collier publications and she spent last year in a globe-girdling correspondent's job for the *Woman's Home Companion.* But when this led to an editor's desk, she decided she preferred writing to editing and San Francisco to New York.

Nieman Notes

1955

Fred Flowers of the Melbourne *Herald* writes: "Perhaps you could ask any Nieman Fellows who intend coming down for the Olympics to write to me. I have a thought that we might be able to stage Australia's first Nieman dinner if several are coming down. . . . We are shivering as Winter moves in."

Selig Harrison took a six weeks leave from the *New Republic* to accompany Walter Reuther to India and the magazine got a lead article from him on it when he returned.

Harrison had spent three years in India as correspondent of the Associated Press.

Two articles of his were published in June: "Caste and the Anhandra Communists" in *Americal Political Science Review;* and "The Challenge to Indian Nationalism" in *Foreign Affairs.* The latter, Harrison reports, is "in a very real sense the upshot of my Nieman year."

Thomas G. Karsell is Sunday editor of the Indianapolis *Times.* He was formerly managing editor of the Greenville (Miss.) *Delta Democrat-Times.* Native of Indiana, his first newspaper work was as a cartoonist.

Guy E. Munger, assistant city editor of the Greensboro (N.C.) *Daily News,* was married to Joan Taylor in Topeka, Kan., April 21.

Mort Stern was named managing editor of the Denver *Post* on May 12. In five years on the *Post* he had been reporter, rewrite man, assistant city editor, city editor and assistant Rocky Mountain Empire editor. Born in New Haven, Conn., he was educated at the University of Arkansas and Columbia Graduate School of Journalism and began newspaper work at Fayetteville, Ark., in 1947. He was Phi Beta Kappa in college and won a Pulitzer travelling fellowship at Columbia. He has two Nieman Fellows on his news staff, Donald L. Zylstra (1954) and Robert H. Hansen (1956).

Henry Shapiro left the Moscow bureau of United Press to cover the British visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev and then got home for a month in Cambridge where he spoke to a seminar of the Nieman Fellows. United Press sent him on a speaking tour that included talks to NEA in Louisville, June 7 and to the Mississippi Press Association in Biloxi June 9.

Albert L. Kraus joined the financial news staff of the New York *Times* in May. He had been nine years on the Providence *Journal,* where he covered business and financial news.

1956

Two Nieman babies were born in the last week of the current Nieman program: to Mr. and Mrs. **Robert Healy** (Boston *Globe*) and Mr. and Mrs. **Ronald Plater** (Brisbane *Courier-Mail*).

Nieman Tour

Nieman Fellows of San Francisco and their wives got together for dinner to entertain Mr. and Mrs. Louis M. Lyons on May 12. The occasion was a trip to interview fellowship candidates on the West Coast. Those present were: Mr. and Mrs. Robert de Roos, Mr. and Mrs. William German, Mr. and Mrs. William Steif, Jack Foisie and Kenneth Wilson.

Three days later in Portland the Cambridge travellers were guests of Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm Bauer and Mr. and Mrs. Edward Miller of the Portland *Oregonian.*

The next night in Salt Lake City they enjoyed the hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Linford and Mr. and Mrs. Hays Gorey of the Salt Lake *Tribune.*

Back home in Cambridge the Lyonses have enjoyed visits of two members of the Nieman Selecting Committee, C. A. McKnight of the Charlotte *Observer* and Dwight Sargent of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald* and *Express;* Mr. and Mrs. Norman Isaacs of Louisville; Phil Locke of the Dayton *News;* Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch.* Mr. and Mrs. John Harrison of Toledo have promised a visit before this issue comes out.

Washington Nieman Dinner

Fourteen Nieman Fellows in Washington joined in a dinner May 9, with Secretary of Labor James Mitchell as their guest. Those who attended were:

Clark Mollenhoff, Cowles Publications; John Steele, *Time* and *Life;* Robert Hoyt, Chicago *Daily News* and Akron *Beacon Journal;* Ed. Edstrom, Louisville *Courier-Journal;* Robert Lee, St. Paul *Pioneer Press;* Carroll Kilpatrick, Washington *Post;* Frank Hewlett, Salt Lake *Tribune;* Larry Fernsworth, Concord (N.H.), *Monitor;* Justin McCarthy, *United Mine Workers Journal;* Herb Yahraes, free lance; Osborn Zuber, free lance; Sam Zagoria, administrative assistant Sen. Case of N. J.; Charles Molony, Federal Reserve Board press; John Shively, Federal Housing Administration; Alan Barth, Washington *Post;* and guests George Bookman, *Time* and *Life;* James Haswell, Detroit *Free Press;* William McGaffin, Chicago *Daily News.*

Where They Are Now

(Continued from page 2)

the Stephen Fitzgerald Company, which employs Stephen Fitzgerald. This leaves a miscellaneous group of ten that includes one priest, one medical doctor, one man who has sold his weekly paper and is looking for another to buy; two ex-bureaucrats (under the Democrats) addresses unknown; and one curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The 94 who have remained with their original employers are too large a group to cite completely. But as they make the largest part of the Nieman Fellows, the following partial list is a substantial illustration of the present activity of Nieman Fellows:

Harry Montgomery, assistant general manager, Associated Press; Victor O. Jones, managing editor, Boston *Globe;* Dwight Sargent, editor, Portland (Maine) papers; Edward J. Donohoe, city editor, Scranton *Times;* Hays Gorey, city editor, Salt Lake *Tribune;* Mort Stern, managing editor, Denver *Post;* William German, news editor, San Francisco *Chronicle;* Harry Ashmore, executive editor, *Arkansas Gazette;* Clark Mollenhoff, Washington bureau, Cowles papers; Alan Barth, editorial page, Washington *Post;* Edward Miller, assistant managing editor, Portland *Oregonian;* Malcolm Bauer, editorial page, *Oregonian;* Robert Frazier, associate editor, Eugene *Register-Guard;* Richard Mooney and Donald Gonzales, Washington bureau, United Press; Houstoun Waring, editor, Littleton (Colo.) *Independent;* Neil Davis, editor, Lee County (Ala.) *Bulletin;* E. L. Holland, Jr., editorial page, Birmingham *News;* Rebecca Gross, editor, Lock Haven (Pa.) *Express;* Robert R. Brunn, assistant American news editor, *Christian Science Monitor;* Frank Carey, science writer, Associated Press; Francis P. Locke, associate editor, Dayton *News;* John Harrison, editorial page, Toledo *Blade;* Hodding Carter, publisher, Greenville *Delta Democrat-Times;* William Gordon, managing editor, Atlanta *Daily World;* Carl Larsen, assistant city editor, Chicago *Sun-Times;* William Freehoff, editor, Kingsport (Tenn.) *News;* Henry Hornsby, city editor, Lexington *Leader;* Grady Clay, real estate editor and Hugh Morris political writer, Louisville *Courier-Journal;* Mary Ellen (Leary) Sherry, associate editor and William Steif, assistant news editor, San Francisco *News;* Edward Wyatt, editor, Petersburgh *Progress-Index;* Delbert Willis, state editor, Fort Worth *Press;* Bob Eddy, telegraph editor, St. Paul *Pioneer Press;* John Dougherty, telegraph editor, Rochester *Times-Union;* Henry Tanner, foreign news analyst, Houston *Post;* Lowell Limpus, television editor, New York *Daily News;* Charles Wagner, Sunday editor, New York *Mirror;* Robert Brown editor and Carlton Johnson, city editor, Columbus, (Ga.) *Ledger;* Sylvan Meyer, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times;* Cary Robertson, Sunday editor, Louisville *Courier-Journal;* Peter Lisagor and Robert Hoyt, Washington bureau, Knight papers; Guy Munger, assistant city editor, Greensboro *News.*

The following foreign correspondents: Ernest Hill, Keyes Beech and George Weller of the Chicago *Daily News;* Walter Waggoner and Tillman Durdin, New York *Times;* Arch Parsons, New York *Herald Tribune;* Richard Dudman, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch;* Henry Shapiro, United Press.

The following reporters: Edwin Guthman, Seattle *Times;* Calvin Mayne and Harold Schmeck, Rochester *Times-Union;* Boyd Simmons, Detroit *News;* Watson Sims, Associated Press; Clark Porteous, Memphis *Press-Scimitar;* Nathan Caldwell and Wayne Whitt, Nashville *Tennessean;* Henry Trewhitt, Chattanooga *Times;* Robert Bergenheim, *Christian Science Monitor;* Roy Fisher, Chicago *Daily News;* Murrey Marder, Washington *Post;* Robert Healy, Boston *Globe;* Jack Foisie and Kevin Wallace, San Francisco *Chronicle;* Donald Sterling, *Oregon Journal;* Don Seagle, Charleston (W. Va.) *Gazette;* Robert Bordner and Theodore Andrica, Cleveland *Press;* Robert Hansen, Denver *Post;* Harry Press, San Francisco *News* and Edward Hale, Buffalo *News.*

The careers of Nieman Fellows have twice been the subject of dissertations in journalism schools, and this statistical review was suggested by the latest of these: "A Brief Study of the Careers of 139 Nieman Fellows Since 1939," by Robert Chatten at the University of New Mexico, done this Spring. Mr. Chatten is in no way responsible for the above summary, which is from later data than he had. But his essay is far more detailed and interesting and much worth a review when we are not up against a deadline.

—Louis M. Lyons