

NiemanReports

July, 1957

Problems of Reporting in Latin America

Paul B. Kennedy

Eberhard P. Deutsch

Trial by Newspaper

Joseph M. Harvey

One Way to Keep Good Reporters

Donald M. Schwartz

A Reporter Raises Some Questions

L. M. Wright, Jr.

The Genuine Glamour of Journalism

John Hulteng

City News Bureau

Victor J. Danilov

Role of Press in Urbanization

Sylvan Meyer

End of Newspaper Row

John Mason Potter

U. S. I. A. and the Press in Senate Debate. . . . The Pulitzer Prize Editorial in Tuscaloosa News . . . Professor Merk Retires: An Editorial Roundup. . . . Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Address on the Press, by Louis M. Lyons

Reviews . . . Scrapbook . . . Nieman Notes

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; 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; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; Charlotte F. Robling, Norwalk, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; 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. XI; NO. 3

JULY, 1957

Nieman Fellows for 1957-58

Harvard University has announced appointment of the 20th group of Nieman Fellows. Eleven newspapermen are awarded a college year of study at Harvard to start in September. Appointed also as associate Nieman Fellows are five foreign newspapermen, three sponsored by the Asia Foundation, two by the Carnegie Corporation. The Asian associates include the first Filipino newspaperman to receive this award. The Australian and New Zealand associates are the seventh group of British Commonwealth newspapermen selected by the Carnegie Corporation. This is the third Asian group.

The Americans appointed to Nieman Fellowships include the first education reporter in the 20 years of the fellowships, Mary Handy of the *Christian Science Monitor*, who is the sixth woman among the 240 newspapermen appointed since the fellowships were started in 1938 under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*.

The selecting committee for the Nieman Foundation were: Barry Bingham, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*; Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*; John M. Harrison, editorial writer of the *Toledo Blade*; William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard News Office; and Louis Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The Nieman Fellows will come to Harvard on leave of absence from their work, to pursue studies of their own choice for their background for journalism.

The Nieman Fellows for 1957-58 are:

JOHN A. ARMSTRONG, Sunday editor, *Portland Oregonian*. He is 35, graduate of Linfield College, and has served the *Oregonian* for ten years. He plans to study the arts, theatre and music.

DEAN BRELIS, 33, foreign correspondent, author, television writer. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1949; he was undergraduate correspondent of the *Boston Globe*; then five years for *Time-Life*, most of it abroad; and the last two years with CBS as news writer and producer of TV shows. He plans to study the Russian Language and Russo-Sino relations.

J. SIMMONS FENTRESS, 33, editorial writer, *Charlotte Observer*. He is a graduate of Wake Forest College; was ten years on the staff of the *Raleigh News and Observer* covering politics; and joined the editorial page of the *Charlotte Observer* in 1955. He plans to study the Southern problems of race relations and labor relations.

MARY HANDY, 34, education reporter on the *Christian Science Monitor*. She was graduated at Principia College; taught a year at the Putney School in Vermont; studied in Paris and at Oxford; and in 1949 joined the *Monitor* as copy girl. After general reporting, she has specialized in education. She plans to study education and government.

STANLEY A. KARNOW, 32, Paris correspondent of *Time-Life*. A graduate of Harvard College, he went to Europe right after college and has written about France for ten years, the last six for *Time-Life*. He plans to study some economic problems of Europe in relation to its former colonies.

PETER J. KUMPA, 30, born in Poland, graduate of Georgetown University school of foreign service; has been on the *Baltimore Sun* seven years; was their Middle East correspondent last year; now covers the White House. He plans to study Russian and the Russians.

JOHN J. LINDSAY, 35, reporter, *Washington Post*. Native of Westboro, Mass., and graduate of Westboro high school, he began newspaper work in 1949 on the Bangor (Me.) *Commercial* and covered Maine politics before he joined the *Washington Post* in 1954. He plans to study American government and politics.

WILLIAM F. McILWAIN, JR., 31, copy editor, *Newsday*. A graduate of Wake Forest College, he spent nine years on Southern newspapers, the *Winston-Salem Sentinel*, *Charlotte Observer*, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, before going to *Newsday* in 1954. He plans to study American history and foreign policy.

JOHN ED PEARCE, 38, editorial writer, *Louisville Courier-Journal*. A graduate of the University of Kentucky, he served three years in the naval air force before joining the *Courier-Journal* in 1946. He has written editorials on Kentucky affairs for 11 years. He plans to study American economic and political history.

J. WESLEY SULLIVAN, 36, news editor, *Oregon Statesman*, Salem, Oregon. A graduate of the University of Oregon, Sullivan joined the *Oregon Statesman* after three years as an army air force pilot. He has been its news editor 11 years. He plans to study business and science.

(Continued on page 4)

Trial by Newspaper II

Lawyers Have A Responsibility, Too

By Joseph M. Harvey

Down the road a piece—as any good New England Yankee would describe it—is being reenacted the Landing of the Pilgrims.

The old Pilgrim Fathers in their graves up on the hill behind the harbor must be watching it all and congratulating each other on how lucky they were. When they first hopped out on the rock and started to roll, things were quiet.

No newspaper reporters in droves looking for quotes and statements. No lawyers to examine titles and pass papers. Just a few Indians with bows ready to give them the shaft. Since which time, Americans have made a custom of giving people the shaft.

There were no lawyers or journalists aboard the first Mayflower. Yet without these, there were trouble makers.

In explaining why it became necessary for the Pilgrims—dedicated though they were to a new kind of liberty—to sign the Mayflower Compact, William Bradford wrote that there were some in the group making “discontented and mutinous speeches.”

These, he said, had declared “That when they came ashore they would use their own liberty; for none had power to command them . . .”

In the Mayflower Compact, the Pilgrims promised not to “use their own liberty,” but to give “all due submission and obedience” to such laws “as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony.”

Thus the Mayflower Compact, often called a cornerstone of our democracy, was at the outset of our country a limitation on the liberty of speech and action for the general good.

That “general good” still is the object of our laws today.

And the question as to what is the “general good” is really the issue in all this talk about trial by newspaper.

In a truly democratic government, there are no absolute rights and interests. There must always be a balancing of these rights whenever one conflicts with the other.

The balancing called for in the so-called trial by newspaper dispute is a reconciliation of the constitutional guarantee of fair jury trials in criminal cases with the constitutional right of freedom of the press.

Joseph Harvey is a Boston *Globe* reporter, trained in the law. This to the Massachusetts Bar Association at Plymouth, June 15, follows one on the same subject to the Boston Bar Association, Jan. 30, published in *Nieman Reports*, April, 1957.

Freedom of the press, and the rights to jury trial, are rights in the people themselves. They are not rights in the state or government, nor in the publishers of newspapers.

Take the right of jury trial. The nature of this right was discussed at length by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Patton v United States* (281 U.S. 276). Historically considered, Justice Sutherland said in that case, trial by jury was not “a part of the structure of government.”

“On the contrary,” the courts said, “it uniformly was regarded as a valuable privilege bestowed upon the person accused of the crime for the purpose of safeguarding him against the oppressive power of the King and the arbitrary or partial judgment of the court.”

Since it was a privilege of the accused, he could forego it as his election if for some sound reason he did not wish a jury trial, the court ruled. The constitution does not force a man to have a jury trial.

Look now at the right of freedom of the press. Alexander Hamilton, arguing as defense counsel in the case of a New York editor charged with libeling President Jefferson, said the freedom of the press “consists in publishing with impunity truth with good motives and for justifiable ends whether it relates to men or measures.” (*People v Crosswell*, 3 Johnsons Cases 337)

But, as Massachusetts Supreme Court Chief Justice Isaac Parker pointed out in the case of Theodore Lyman charged with libeling Daniel Webster, “the press is not invested with the power of right of invading private character, or of circulating falsehood against public or private men.”

So it is plain that freedom of the press also has limitations.

But the private men spoken of by Justice Parker can sometimes by their conduct or by events involving them lose their right of privacy. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court pointed this out in a recent case involving the photographing of a convicted killer.

Justice John C. Bell, Jr., said in that case, “It seems to me that a person’s right of privacy is limited and in some instances lost when he is charged with or convicted of a crime.

“In such a case, he becomes a public figure who, with certain limitations, as for example when he is in the court room or in the county jail is subject to being photographed,” the judge said. He added, “I believe that in such a case, the public interest is paramount to the private right or interest.” (*In re Mack*, 386 Pa. 251)

Here we have an echo of that "general good" first voiced by the Pilgrims.

The public interest in such cases is most easily served by the newspapers. But newspapers cannot under the guise of the "general good" print everything that comes to their attention. Yet they have an obligation to present the facts in a matter of public interest because the people—the holders of the freedom of the press—have a right to know.

Much of the information that newspapers gather, particularly concerning crimes, comes from public officials and those associated with administration of the law.

Stories of this kind, as the *Chicago Tribune* said in a recent editorial, "impose a special duty on newspapers, give a special urgency to their obligation to seek the truth."

Referring to its own coverage of a recent murder in that city, the *Chicago Tribune* said, "We have suspected and we grow more certain as time passes, that some of the statements given in this case and printed in our pages, have been untrue. But this has been the evidence as it was developed by the authorities charged with the duty of finding the killers, and it was our readers' right to know what they were doing."

This printing of what the law authorities were doing in a criminal case is most always the basis of the wails about trial by newspaper.

It could well be that these wails are crocodile tears.

Judge Simon H. Rifkind of New York spoke a few years ago to the New York County Lawyers Association on the subject of "Conflict Between Press and Justice."

After discussing some news stories that admittedly were abuses, Judge Rifkind declared, "If I were to assess blame, I would cast it upon the shoulders of the courts, of the bar, the prosecutors, and public officials generally because most of the information improperly published by the press has its origin in the courts, is distributed by prosecutors or defendants' attorneys, or by public officials." (11 *Bar Bulletin*, New York County Lawyers Association 1, May 1953)

Judge Rifkind seems to be warning that some mouth-pieces need ear pieces to hear what they are saying.

Some limitation on freedom of speech for prosecutors, attorneys and public officials would seem to be the remedy rather than restrictions on the press.

There is no need then to pass new laws concerning the

press. There is no need for new laws concerning jury trials. Some of the lawyers who shout loudest about jury trials are the same who work the hardest with challenges to keep the mental level of a jury panel from rising much above the boob stage.

Though the law says a man is entitled to be tried by a jury of his peers, too often accused are tried by a jury of bad apples.

Chief Justice Leon R. Yankwich of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California summed up trial by newspaper in an article written for the *Marquette Law Review* last year.

Wrote Chief Justice Yankwich, "On a balancing of social interests, we should at all times bear in mind that despite the annoyances and inconveniences caused, and the bad taste often exhibited, by modern newspaper technique, the freedom of the press is still the greatest safeguard of free institutions.

"We should therefore leave unheeded the appeals of those who would encroach upon this great American fundamental." (40 *Marquette Law Review* 1, Summer 1956)

Nieman Fellows

(Continued from page 2)

THOMAS G. WICKER, 30, Washington correspondent, *Winston-Salem Journal* and *Sentinel*. Native of North Carolina and graduate of its state university, he has worked on North Carolina newspapers since 1949, and on the *Journal* and *Sentinel* since 1952, serving as sports editor, Sunday editor, and this year as the paper's first Washington correspondent. He plans to study chiefly American government and economics.

Associate Nieman Fellows are:

DAVID LAWSON, 28, editorial writer, Auckland (New Zealand) *Star*;

JOHN LLOYD MARSHALL, 38, senior reporter, Perth (Australia) *Daily News*;

HIROSHI ISHIHARA, foreign news writer, *Yomiuri Shinbun*, Tokyo, Japan;

JUAN V. SAEZ, 27, reporter, Manila *Times*;

PIYAL WICKRAMSINGHE, reporter, *Times of Ceylon*, Colombo.

Problems of Reporting Latin America

By Paul B. Kennedy

The two greatest difficulties encountered by foreign correspondents in Latin America seem to me to be these:

- 1) Lack of the effective liaison between the foreign press and the various branches of government.
- 2) The total absence in most countries of accurate and workable statistics.

There are other difficulties which we will take up in this talk but it seems to me these are the most important and the ones in which the greatest improvement might possibly be made.

Now to the first point: In all the countries I cover, I believe I can count on one hand the ministries or branches of government which have press relations officers who have the authority to give information to the foreign press on their own responsibility.

In most instances, of course, there simply isn't a public relations officer as such. This work generally is handled by some sub-official in the department who has not had any previous experience in dealing with the press . . . certainly not with the foreign press. Their dealings with the domestic press usually are on a personal basis and the information they give is for background and non-attributable.

These officers are generally sympathetic to the foreign press and they try to be as helpful as possible. But they have their own problems concerning the foreign press.

If they have not had any previous experience in dealing with the foreign press they find it extremely difficult to understand what type of information is wanted and why it is wanted. To them the press is the press, for good or bad, and they fail to comprehend that stories which the domestic press finds of great interest is of no possible interest to the foreign press and vice versa.

Then, too, whether they have had press experience or not they are reluctant to pass along information to a foreign correspondent without getting permission from their senior officer. Their approach and quite understandably so, is that too much information passed out might put them on the fire whereas little or no information passed out will not hurt them.

Their senior officer in turn generally wants an okay from his own senior officer and so on until it finally reaches the minister or the chief of the department or, as more often happens, it gets lost completely.

Sometimes it takes a week or more for the matter to

filter back down to the officer in charge of press relations . . . that is, if it ever reaches him at all.

One of the things that we North American newspapermen miss most of all is swift and easy method of getting certain facts for our stories by telephone. This is especially true in Washington where if one is stuck at a certain point in his story he merely calls the press department of the government branch involved and gets his missing fact quickly.

Perhaps I've never learned the secret of this in Latin America but I find it virtually impossible to get information from the government and from all but very few commercial organizations via the telephone.

I'd like to stress here I am not advocating that news should be gathered principally from public relations sources. When I talk about the need of a press or public relations officer I am talking of a person who would be available to the press at all times and one who has the authority to give information on matters below the top policy level. It would be better still if he were an officer with authority to be quoted as a spokesman for his department.

Now as to the second of the fundamental difficulties encountered by a foreign correspondent in Latin America—the lack of workable statistics.

Thanks to such organizations as the OEA, ODECA and CEPAL in the last two or three years there has been considerable improvement in the field of statistics in Latin American countries.

But one still has enormous difficulty getting reliable statistics in any given country. In some papers in Latin America I've seen up to three sets of statistics used on one matter in the course of a few days. Latin American reporters run up against this statistic problem as much or more than do foreign correspondents. Latin American readers appear to realize the difficulty and make allowance for the discrepancies.

But foreign readers and especially those in the United States and still more especially the readers of my paper make no such allowances. They raise a howl that can be heard from New York to Santiago when the cotton crop of, say, Nicaragua is off a hundred or so bales from one report to another.

I doubt if there's much that can be done about the statistic problem until the organizations I mentioned above have had a chance to get into full swing. But it's a serious problem for us.

Now there is another difficulty faced by foreign correspondents and especially those who have gotten their newspaper training in North America. That difficulty is the reluctance of officials to release copies of their major speeches

Paul Kennedy is New York *Times* correspondent in Central America. This is from a talk to the 4th Caribbean Press Seminar.

before the speeches are actually delivered. We have become so used to having these speeches one, two or even three days ahead of delivery that I for one feel lost without them.

It seems to me that here is a place where newspapermen of all nations could work toward an improvement for their own advantage and for the good of various countries.

These speeches are delivered almost invariably at a time when we who have to file to distant places are faced with close deadlines. In many instances we do not get copies of the speech at all but have to take it off the radio and we have a minimum of time to whip it into story shape. Even those with the best command of the language find it difficult under those circumstances to do a well-rounded story.

I have been told that such speeches submitted to the press before delivery have been published time and again before the release time.

A difficulty that many of us foreign correspondents face especially in the Caribbean countries is in the matter of objectivity in our reporting.

No matter how diligently objectivity is striven for we are constantly being accused of partisanship. This of course is particularly true in times of political upheaval. The irony of it is that at these times of political unrest the nearer one reaches true objectivity in reporting, the worse it gets because then *both* sides become suspicious.

I am not defending the reporting of all foreign correspondents in the matter of objectivity. I know many who because of such things as prejudices or of opportunities for making a good story or of failure to check through on a story sufficiently have been flagrantly biased in their reporting.

But I certainly would defend the proposition that by and large all responsible foreign papers and news agencies want and expect objective reporting from their correspondents abroad.

Thus far I have not touched upon the greatest difficulty faced by foreign correspondents or, for that matter, domestic newspapermen too . . . censorship.

I do not propose to go into this at great length now because it has been discussed pretty fully at any conference where newsmen gather. And furthermore, thank heaven, I have been running into less and less in the past few years.

Certainly, however, I cannot pass over the subject without adding my little bit as to the utter stupidity of censorship generally and particularly that censorship which is clamped on by panicked individuals when their political playhouses are being threatened.

We all of us, I am certain, have seen censorship in many countries and over many years. I certainly have. And yet I cannot recall a single instance in which I have seen it accomplish its purpose. I am speaking now of censorship of the foreign press.

In the first place, I have never seen a censorship of the

foreign press which couldn't be broken some way or another. Of course some of us, myself included, have been thrown out of countries either because of breaking censorship or by getting caught trying to break it. But when one is thrown out he is provided with the perfect opportunity of writing as much as he wants on the outside and it usually is much better writing than he would have done ordinarily. Furthermore when one is thrown out still more are coming in.

I have from time to time talked to officials who during the time of censorship had charge of enforcing it and when it had been lifted, they with few exceptions have admitted that it had been a failure and a mistake.

Then why, in times of stress, is censorship invoked time and again? And by seemingly intelligent people? My own notion is that it's pure panic. It is the old ostrich-head-in-the-sand type of thinking that if one closes one's eyes long enough and tightly enough the danger will pass.

Interior censorship, of course, is a vastly different thing. It is a vicious mind-warping thing and has in some cases at least partially attained its purpose of keeping people ignorant of the true state of affairs. That, however, is beyond the scope of my assignment here.

So, we have seen some of the difficulties faced by foreign correspondents working in Latin America. These are difficulties that the average correspondent comes up against when he takes over his assignment in a foreign country.

I do not think I should finish, however, without evening up things a bit by commenting on the difficulties foreign correspondents build for themselves. Some foreign correspondents in the area I'm presently covering should never have left home in the first place.

These are in the vast minority I'm glad to say. They have never been able to adapt themselves to Latin America or to its customs. They became disenchanted within a few months of their arrival and have never been able to pull themselves out of their depression.

They manufacture their own difficulties so rapidly and efficiently that their usefulness is quickly dissipated. They have no facility for building friendships with the Latin American people and consequently lose the contacts which are so vital in our work. They become so disgruntled they even refuse to speak the language.

As I say, these are few and far between. The remainder are for the most part experienced newspapermen trying to do a workmanlike job of their assignment. They form friendship with their newspaper colleagues in whatever country they're assigned and these friendships work out to the great advantage of all concerned.

Experienced foreign correspondents realize early in the game that no matter in what country they are assigned there are difficulties they had not encountered at home. Overcoming these obstacles is what they get paid for.

“Desacato”

Old Spanish Penal Law Flaunts Press Freedom in Latin America

By Eberhard P. Deutsch

Some 2400 years ago, Socrates, on trial in ancient Greece for defamation of the government of his day, addressed his judges in these ringing terms of defiance:

Men of Athens ... while I have life and strength, I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy ... If you think that by killing men, you can prevent someone from censuring your evil lives, you are mistaken ... The noblest way is not to be disabling others, but to be improving yourselves.

May I not then give you in my text in a modern paraphrase of that classic pronouncement, in such words as these:

Editors of America! While you have life and strength, never cease from publishing the truth concerning the conduct of public officials. They must learn that they cannot prevent censure of their actions, by suppressing ideas. You must teach them that the noblest way is not to be disabling others, but to be improving themselves.

This crusade to which I ask that you dedicate yourselves, forms the contemporary chapter in an evolutionary history which found its best expression in a juridical concept during the formative era of democratic self-government in the Western Hemisphere.

Throughout ancient and medieval times, men lived under the maxim that the king can do no wrong. Corrolary to this was the principle that censure of the king, as of the lords of his realm, and ultimately of any of the officials of his government, constituted not only *lese majeste*, but a serious criminal offense punishable without regard to the merit or demerit of the complaint.

This principle carried over from absolute into even limited forms of monarchy; and it remains as much a part of today's totalitarian tyrannies as it was an accepted concept of governmental philosophy in the most benighted of caliphates.

But in democracies, governmental officials are the servants, not the rulers, of the people. In democracies it is the people, as rulers, who can do no wrong in rebuking their servants, except as any servant is entitled to redress, in an enlightened society, for a wrong inflicted upon him by his master.

The democratic concept of a free press as a guardian of the people against governmental abuses of popular rights has evolved as a vital part of our history.

A century and a half after adoption of the Constitution

Eberhard Deutsch is the New Orleans lawyer who successfully challenged Huey Long's tax on newspapers.

of the United States, an opinion of the Supreme Court written by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, discussed this concept and gave it vital application.

A statute of Minnesota provided for suppression of any publication habitually containing scandalous defamatory matter. Proceedings had been instituted to suppress a newspaper under the statute, on the ground that it had regularly published defamatory charges of official dereliction on the part of public officials of Minneapolis.

The question at issue in the litigation resolved itself ultimately into whether the maintenance of such an action "is consistent with the conception of the liberty of the press as historically considered and guaranteed."

This liberty, wrote Chief Justice Hughes, has been especially cherished for the immunity it afforded from previous restraint of the publication of censure of public officers and charges of official misconduct."

"Public officers," concluded Chief Justice Hughes, "whose character and conduct remain open to debate and free discussion in the press, [must] find their remedies for false accusations in actions under libel laws providing for redress and punishment, and not in proceedings to restrain the publication of newspapers and periodicals."

This "redress and punishment" to which publishers remain amenable is provided under the libel laws of the several states. These laws differ in various respects, but in their broad outlines they are all substantially the same.

They provide criminal responsibility for libel as for any other offense, in an action instituted by the public prosecutor in behalf of the state, the defendant being accorded a public trial with all safeguards guaranteed under the constitutions.

In criminal prosecutions for libel, the truth of the defamatory matter may ordinarily be pleaded and proven in defense, only if the publication was with good motives and for justifiable ends—that is, without malice.

The laws of the several states also provide civil remedies in strictly private actions for damages to persons aggrieved by defamatory publications. In such actions, the truth may ordinarily be pleaded as an absolute defense.

Both classes of actions are subject to pleas of privilege—absolute or qualified.

Absolute privilege grants complete and unequivocal immunity for publication of certain types of defamatory matter, it being in the interests of the public welfare, under our concept of a free press, that the people should be kept informed fully by the press, without fear of responsibility,

civil or criminal, as to such matters as proceedings in legislative bodies and in the courts.

A qualified privilege, on the other hand, applies generally to matters of lesser public interest than legislative and judicial proceedings; and it protects the publisher against liability for defamation, only when the matter published was printed with good motives, without malice and in the public interest.

This qualified privilege, which may also be pleaded in mitigation of damages, is applicable—of particular interest to the present discussion—to charges of official misconduct on the part of public officers, as a fundamental requirement under the American concept of a free press, to give assurance to the public that it will be kept informed as to all matters of public interest.

In this vital sense, the guaranty of a free press belongs not so much to the publisher as a right to print, as it does to the people as a right to read, and thus to be kept informed.

An alert publisher who learns of what he believes to be misconduct by a public officer, should not be deterred from printing an account thereof as a matter of public interest, by fear of civil liability or criminal punishment, as long as his publication is made in good faith.

It is equally as necessary to the preservation of our form of democracy, that the publisher of a free press be privileged to print in good faith, without fear of subsequent punishment, critical news of the conduct of governmental officials, as it is to protect the free press against prior direct restraints by government prohibiting free discussion of public affairs.

If, despite the publisher's good motives in the public interest, he should be deterred from printing an account of official misconduct by fear of criminal prosecution or an action for damages, the public is denied its guaranty of a free press as effectually as by a censor.

In light of the foregoing review of the law of libel, with particular reference to conduct of public officials, under constitutional guaranties of a free press, it becomes interesting to examine, in the light of the same guaranties, the offense of "desacato" in some of the nations of Latin America.

It would seem to be instructive to review, first, some of the phases of the general law of libel in Latin America, to emphasize the impact, repugnant to the constitutional concept of liberty of the press, of prosecutions under laws denouncing defamation of public officials as a crime.

There seems to be no clear-cut line of demarcation between civil and criminal actions for libel throughout Latin America. As a matter of practice, the offense is ordinarily treated as a criminal one, and civil actions for libel are relatively rare.

Further, even the criminal action for libel is ordinarily prosecuted in behalf of the person injured rather than as a

public offense; and the aggrieved party may actually file civil and criminal actions in a single proceeding.

In most of the countries, the outcome of the civil action depends on the success of the criminal prosecution; so that it seems advantageous to join the actions, and the judge who hears them together may impose both criminal penalties and civil damages in a single decree.

In Chile, for example, a complainant must waive his right to a criminal prosecution if he wishes to proceed with his civil action prior to a hearing in the criminal case.

Under the Civil Code of Brazil, even though a complainant cannot prove actual injury from defamation, the publisher of the libel must nevertheless pay to the person injured, double the maximum fine assessable as the criminal penalty.

Truth may be a defense to the crime of *calumnia*, as under the Penal Codes of Cuba and Venezuela, for instance. Truth may also be a defense, if the complainant demands that the court adjudicate the truth or falsity of the defamatory statement, as a sort of vindication by judicial finding of falsity, in the nature of a declaratory judgment.

Mexico seems to have adopted certain Anglo-American defenses. Article 648 of the Penal Code of that country provides that, in certain cases, a qualified privilege may be asserted as a defense to the crimes of *calumnia* or *injuria*.

If, for instance, in such a case, an accused can show that his article was written in good faith in the public interest, he may not be found guilty. Further, it is not a crime in Mexico as in some other Latin American countries, to publish a report of an address (containing defamatory matter) before an official tribunal.

In some respects, the Latin American legal system may have advanced beyond that of North America in the law of libel. Under the constitutional guaranties of a free press in the United States, a court could not enter a decree requiring a retraction of granting a complainant a right of reply in the columns of the offending newspaper.

Such remedies are ordinarily enforceable in Latin America, while in the United States they come into play by way of mitigation of damages when a retraction or reply has been published voluntarily.

The foregoing brief review may serve as a sufficient background for a brief discussion of the insignificant and unfortunate doctrines which have arisen out of the offense of *desacato* to flaunt the concept of a free press.

The crime of *desacato* is said to have found its origin in the Spanish penal code. It consists of insulting the head of a state or other public official. Its theoretical purpose is to discourage acts which would tend to degrade the dignity of government, or affect international relations adversely.

In theory, *desacato* can be committed only by defamation of an officer in his official capacity. Thus, opprobrium of a judge as such, or while in the performance of his judicial

functions would constitute desacato, while an insult to him as a private citizen would not.

In Uruguay, and perhaps in one or two other countries, desacato may be committed only by a statement in the presence of the official defamed; but in the vast majority of countries the law contains no such provision.

Truth is not a defense to a prosecution for desacato; and such a prosecution results, as a rule, in conviction almost as a matter of course.

The absence of complete separation of the judicial from the executive branch of the government in Latin American nations, renders it possible for the administrative branch to make use of desacato to suppress freedom of the press when the government is attacked.

In Argentina, it is an offense punishable by imprisonment to offend the dignity of a public official in the exercise of his public functions. The story of *La Prensa*, too well-known to require repetition here, serves to illustrate the extremes to which the doctrine of desacato may be extended.

A recent, very striking, case, arose out of the arrest in August, 1953, of Alfredo Silva-Carvallo, editor of *La Union* of Valparaiso, accused of having insulted President Ibanez of Chile and three of his ministers.

All that the newspaper had done, in fact, was to publish, without comment, extracts from speeches by radical deputies at a political banquet, denouncing the infiltration of Peronistas into the Chilean government. The charges were finally dismissed—largely, however, because of vigorous protests by the press against the trial.

In Chile as in some other countries, desacato includes not only an offense against local governmental officials. It is equally a crime to offend the head of a foreign state, or even representatives of a foreign state in Chile.

Not long ago, representatives of the Dominican Republic filed charges against a Chilean editor for publication of a criticism, by one Galindas, of the regime of President Trujillo; and the charges were dismissed only on proof that at the date of publication, Trujillo had been replaced

temporarily by his brother, and so was not serving as head of a state within the meaning of the desacato statute.

Pause now to contrast such proceedings with John Marshall's declaration nearly a hundred and fifty years earlier, in response to Talleyrand's similar complaint, that "without doubt this abuse of a valuable privilege is a matter of peculiar regret when it is extended to the Government of a foreign nation . . . [but that] is a calamity incident to the nature of liberty."

Just twenty years ago, Mr. Justice Sutherland wrote the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States holding invalid a statute levying a tax on newspaper advertising, on the ground that the act infringed the liberty of the press.

He said that "since informed public opinion is the most potent of all restraints upon misgovernment, the suppression or abridgement of the publicity afforded by a free press cannot be regarded otherwise than with grave concern . . . A free press stands as one of the great interpreters between the government and the people. To allow it to be fettered is to fetter ourselves."

Permit me, in closing to recur briefly to the story of Peter Zenger, the Printer, who risked martyrdom in colonial America over two hundred years ago that freedom of people to read criticism of their governments in a fearless press might not perish from the earth.

Arthur Guiterman, a contemporary American poet, immortalized in verse the heroic trial of Zenger the Printer. I close with two verses from his poem, in which I have made only a slight revision:

American editors! Your fateful word
Curses or blesses the coming time!
Say! Shall the downtrodden die unheard?
What of your freedom if truth be crime?
Zenger the Printer—his work is done;
Soft be his slumber. Through storm and stress
Guard we the prize of the fight he won—
Bulwark of Freedom, a fearless press!

A Very Human Institution

By Louis M. Lyons

(This is from the Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard, June 10.)

The press, take it by and large as you have to, is not precisely an intellectual institution. I hear some complaint of that from my Egghead friends. But it is a very human institution. Indeed it has all the dimensions of human nature, and that includes curiosity.

Our press, I think, is a very American institution. It has a large element of violence. It follows a Yankee nose for the facts and lets the style fall where it may. The British see it the other way. "A feeling for the quality of words" was Sir Philip Gibbs' essential for journalism. But to Frank P. Sibley of Hingham, Massachusetts, it was "perennial curiosity."

The instinct of our press is against the government, unless the government happens to be Republican. The American press is the very acme of free enterprise. Scoop is its middle name. Being fustest with the mostest counts as much here as anywhere. This indeed is its chief drawback, its deficiency imposed by its deadlines.

President Eliot, in his old age, once told a reporter: "You are in the worst business in the world."

The reporter thought of the seamy side of journalism that so often dominates the headlines.

But no, that wasn't it.

"You never have time," Eliot said.

Gertrude Stein said it years later to a Nieman Fellow: "Journalism is too immediate to be immediate."

James Reston, bright star of the New York *Times* constellation, told the Nieman Fellows once of the reporter's problem of holding attention long enough to tell people anything.

"You have to give the story everything you have in the one hour of its first headline impact," he said. "Tonight you may have a chance to research it. Tomorrow you may consult an authority. But by then it has gone off the front page, and something else has captured attention. Tomorrow is too late."

This describes an impossible job. But there it is. To be sure, someone else with time for research will later do an article or a book on it. But that is something else.

The journalist must serve those who would read as they run, and he has to work as the clock runs. This is both the

limitation and the opportunity of his task. And the opportunity is great almost beyond imagining. For those million readers who will never read the book will decide the issue on what they found or failed to find on the front page. Nothing more needs to be said of the importance of the job and of having the best qualified people doing it.

The community is very lucky that it is so well served. It is an American tradition that we can choose our newspaper. But this is a diminishing chance. In most places it is already an illusion. It is part of the inexorable economics of our times that hardly any cities of less than metropolitan size any longer afford a choice of newspapers. We have quite recently seen the elimination of competition between locally controlled newspapers in Atlanta, Birmingham, Dayton, Memphis and Madison to go no farther.

What has happened in these cities, and many more earlier—Minneapolis, Louisville and Kansas City and Springfield, for instance—is one of two things. One is a merging of two or more independent papers in a single corporate ownership; so that no matter how many names of papers appear on mastheads, you have only one control. The other thing is the passing of control of one or more papers to outside ownership, leaving only one, if any, independent locally owned paper.

The recent Newhouse purchases of papers in St. Louis, Portland, Ore., and Birmingham are cases in point. There is no substitute for local ownership of so strategic a community as a newspaper. No chain paper serves as well as the best locally owned paper. And the best chain paper is the most autonomous. That describes the Newhouse papers, so far anyway. It is too soon to be tested. Pronouncements of continued local autonomy in a purchased paper simply mean that the absent owner will leave it alone as long as it pays to.

The luck of our cities as to newspapers has been very uneven. We can build our own auditoriums, parks, schools and museums. But under the private enterprise system we have to take pot luck on our baseball team and our newspapers. Nor has anyone discovered a substitute. A government newspaper would create more problems than it would solve.

The maximum luck has come, all unearned, to those places where a great individual has chosen newspapering instead of manufacturing, banking or merchandising—an Ochs, a Pulitzer, a Eugene Meyer, a Daniels, a Bingham, a Nieman or a Col. Nelson. The newspapers they created were projections of their personality, reflections of their character. Given continuity of two or three generations in the same family and the individuality and character of such papers become institutionalized.

The chance of persistence increases as the sense of the peculiar responsibility of the newspaperman is accepted as the heritage of a Jonathan Daniels, an Arthur Sulzberger,

a third Joseph Pulitzer. It is a community tragedy when it dies out, as in the fourth generation of the Springfield *Republican's* Bowles.

The precious journalistic resources conserved by such family continuity are chiefly independence, individuality, responsibility, and the character that these add up to.

But the trend is away from this sturdy journalistic tradition, and toward a single newspaper corporation for a city. This we shall probably have to learn to live with. It will considerably condition our lives. It should make us alert to the change of this vital industry of communication.

But we may find some offsetting gain even in the loss of competitive journalism. For with competition the old excuse for sensationalism is gone. If you don't have to worry about that yellow rag across the street, you can put your news in perspective. You can meet your own standards of what is important that should command the interest of the community. The trivial and the tripe you don't have to flaunt in an eight-column banner on the front page.

This chance to eliminate sensationalism—which has been an inherent bane of American journalism—goes far to offset the worry that Morris Ernst feels in his *The First Freedom* for the constriction of the number of channels of information and public opinion. He is right to worry about it. To put power in few hands is always dangerous. The responsibility on those fewer is heavier. Their opportunity is greater.

We all realize that the competitive gap is being filled, in part, from new directions and new dimensions, by radio, TV, news magazines—and books. If we don't hurry, the topical books fill in the background on Hungary, on Suez, on atomic energy, on urban decay, before we get it into the Sunday supplements.

The newspaper, fortunately for its own survival, cannot ever feel secure from competition for its readers, even if it is the only paper in town.

But nobody else is going to cover city hall and the courthouse, unless you wait for a Senate Committee a year late, as some papers did in Seattle and Portland, Oregon. The primary responsibility for an informed citizenry is on the local paper.

The era of responsible journalism in the sense of an obligation to inform the reader began, I suppose, when Ochs took over the *New York Times*.

In his biography of Ochs, Gerald Johnson (a rare combination himself of the vigorous, colorful but responsible journalist) recalls the newspaper war of yellow journalism between Hearst and Pulitzer then disturbing the peace of New York. Ochs, he says, had faith that there were enough readers who wanted the news but liked a quiet life. He proved it.

"The whole history of American journalism is the leadership of great editors," Frank Luther Mott has written.

Some will say that such instances represent only a minority of the Press. So do the great instances of any institution. But they set the standard and define the potential of the institution.

It would be as silly to claim them as representatives as to make the same claim for the Cardozas and Hands of the law.

But to emphasize the great personalities in so personal an institution as journalism is to escape the danger of thinking of the press as monolithic. Just saying, "the press," as we do habitually, creates that illusion.

In so various an institution, we find constant cross currents. Even as competition declines, the number of independent papers increases. In some it may hardly be more than a name. But even at that, it recognizes the strong American attachment to independence.

Of course, advertising freed the press of its original complete dependence on political parties. What newspapers now call independence describes only their political position. To be sure, the larger modern problem is to maintain any independence of the dominant business point of view. But on their own terms, we have an increasing proportion of independent newspapers. The proportion rose between the 1952 and the 1956 campaigns. In this interval, for example, the Portland, Maine, newspapers asserted their independence—that is, of Republicanism. This followed the death of Publisher Gannett. A funeral often opens a door to freedom. That was so in Denver, where in a decade Palmer Hoyt has lifted the paper of Tammen and Bonfils from inferno to decency.

Speaking of elections, a very specific study of newspaper performance in a campaign is just published in Boston, by the Beacon Press, the work of a local newspaperman, Ted Rowse. It examines the handling of a strategic phase of the 1952 Presidential campaign by 35 of the largest newspapers.

Ted Rowse is on the copy desk of the Boston *Traveler*. Erwin Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, writes the foreword.

Its title is "Slanted News." But not all it found was slanted. It shows what causes news slants, and how papers show their character in the heat of a campaign.

We are all against sin and slanted news. But the big question is: how does your newspaper perform in the clutch? A newspaperman, who knows how news is handled honestly, has here examined the way the biggest newspapers handled the hottest news in a Presidential race. Some served their readers and some served their political party. This is highly instructive to the newspaper reader. He needs to know more about the source of his information and the origin of the images in his head. It is *his head*. The more he knows about what he gets into it and how, the better head it will be. Ted Rowse has examined the record and reported it. It is an important piece of reporting—a useful

job of monitoring the institution which monitors everything else.

This comes to the old question of who polices the policeman? Who criticizes the critic? The press monitors our society. But nobody monitors the press.

Newspapers need more self-criticism and more internal evaluation. It is a healthy thing for journalism that more readers are more sophisticated about them.

Readers need to understand the newspaper better. It is a very strategic institution for them. It should not be mysterious. Journalism has been too long a glamorous job, a romantic and mysterious business. We are coming to the end of this romantic era. And that is good.

At this season Harvard boys often come in to see me about going into journalism. They all want to be foreign correspondents.

We could use a few. But we need more at City Hall and the county court house.

That is where Clark Mollenhoff started on the Des Moines *Register*, if I may brag about a Nieman Fellow. He has been a very can-opener to force open public information in Washington. The Ladejinski case, for one. Before the Moss Committee took up the problem of secrecy in government affairs, Clark was fighting a one-man crusade on it.

It is the dilemma of a democracy that a one-party press provides no forum for the great issues. Walter Lippmann's great discussion does not happen. Even more is this so in the one-paper town. How can there be other than a one-party press when business feels a common stake in one side of an issue, and the press is inevitably a business?

The only answer is acceptance by the publisher of a unique role in respect to his own property.

We ask more of a publisher than of any other employer—that he refrain from letting his personal views, prejudices, biases, dominate his newspaper—that he exercise essentially the same detached sense of responsibility as a trustee of a university. That asks a lot. It is essential. It is what we get in our greatest papers. It is the hope of journalism as an institution to serve America.

But communication is a two-way street. The reader has rights but also some responsibility for what he chooses to consume, for the way he spends his time in the process of being informed.

A New York *Times* editor once appealed to teachers to educate better readers. Education to equip the citizen to be informed is one of the conspicuous lacks in our society. Yet it is one of our daily needs, as we are bombarded on every side by our multiple engines of publicity, competing for our attention. If our reporters and broadcasters could count on more intelligent listening, they would have a powerful incentive for more informing reports.

No society ever had such instantaneous and universal communication. We watch the same broadcast or read the

same headlines at the same moment from one end of the country to the other every day. No community is so remote or benighted that sources are not accessible to learn what is going on in the world. Yet in the light of its potential and of our needs, this tremendous industry of communications is in kindergarten. Its leading practitioners are the first to proclaim it. Its techniques are the marvel of the age, but the fare it offers is something else.

The broadcasting industry has come up with a mouth-filling term for their role—"Electronic Journalism." This has the virtue for present purposes of acknowledging that it is all journalism, that the job is fundamentally one, whether you speak your lines or write them. The part of this job that has any call on public attention is that of informing the public of public affairs.

Arthur Sulzberger once said, "The New York *Times* is published for people who need to be informed." This is good enough, whatever the variation of medium or process.

The new dimensions of live broadcasting bring into dramatic focus the opportunities that have long invited creative journalism but are now made vivid by the high visibility of the more penetrating medium. The as yet unrealized potential of television challenges the inventiveness and creativeness of the whole corps of technical specialists it takes to produce a live broadcast. But for the broadcaster the challenge is to bring to the consciousness of the spectator the forces that shape his world, to show him his community in action and his relations to it. If this dynamic camera is to present a true picture, those using it must know the forces that make the community they live in, the elements that shape the institutions men live by, and how these work to affect us all. The greater the achievements of visualization, the more knowledge and understanding is demanded of those who use it. Else the ever more omniscient lens only increases the variety of our distorted images in an ever more sensate world of make-believe.

This is only to sharpen our certainty that the journalist, electronic or typographical, needs to come to some sense of understanding the world he lives in, and this not only as the field of this activity, but to appreciate his own role in it.

Newspapermen are challenging Mr. Dulles' refusal to let them report China.

But Harold Isaacs, an old China hand himself, raises the question whether we are prepared to do the job on China when Mr. Dulles finally abandons his untenable position.

Isaacs observes that the job was not adequately done before the revolution and is infinitely harder now. Few have the essential knowledge of China, even the language, or much understanding of what has been going on there.

To understand China and make any sense of it would be a career.

How many newspapermen think in those terms?

They want to be foreign correspondents. It sounds

romantic. But that isn't doing much for the essential informing of the American public.

This suggests much about the education of the journalist. Indeed it suggests too much. It is all too easy to demonstrate that it is an impossible job to know enough to deal with the unpredictable range of each day's events, for these spread over the whole of human activity.

This infinite complexity ends in simplifying the problem. Nobody can know everything, unless it is that file clerk who was unable to do anything with it but filing, until a quiz program discovered him. No editor hires a reporter with any expectation that he knows everything he may have to report. He hopes to hire one who has a capacity for finding the answers and communicating them effectively.

How shall we identify and qualify those who are to practice this exacting trade?

Professor Luxon of Chapel Hill raises the question whether the newspapers are losing the competition for talent.

Only three out of five of his journalism graduates in the past five years have gone into newspaper work. The rest have been attracted to other work—advertising, public relations, which have paid them better.

He asks why newspapers don't do a little work at recruiting the best men.

Newspaper hiring is the most unorganized, chaotic of any. Scouts come to the colleges to interview chemists. But the bright lads who are eager to enter journalism have to go it blind, to find doors to knock at, and see if anybody is interested. The best men often grow discouraged at the absence of any channel to follow to a newspaper job.

Most newspapers do as little to hold the men they get as they did to attract them.

Newspapers are outbid in pay by about every other line that draws off the trained newspaperman. News training seems to be more valued in a host of other fields than on newspapers.

But Professor Luxon also makes the point that newspapermen gravitate to newspapers they respect with whose views they feel sympathy. There clearly aren't enough of these.

The editor is often quick to blame his misfits onto journalism schools. They are to blame insofar as they have responded to his pressures to devote a disproportionate part of their effort to training people for the techniques which are readily picked up on the job and probably never effectively acquired any other way.

The trouble with too much "journalism education" as presented is, first, that it steals time from the broadbased education the journalist should have; and second, that it drills the students in conventional forms that may already be out of date in a medium that can never move fast enough to keep up with change. Would Luce and Hadden ever have

created a new form with *Time* if their preparation had been limited by the prescriptions of "journalism" courses?

If newspapers are going to hold their own in the fast company of broadcasting and news magazines, they will need people capable of innovation and originality.

We take for granted the form of the news story, and the conventions of what makes news. But both need to become as flexible as the society we are reporting. As easy to read and as interesting as the advertising or political appeals to the same readers.

The amount of energy reporters spend concocting leads to fit a formula is uneconomic. A simple narrative, *Time* has shown, is more readable, has more impact. It also tells the story more intelligibly.

The "today" angle is often frustrating. Many things should be talked about without waiting for a news peg, that is, the "today" angle.

There's too much waiting for the mayor to make a move or the chamber of commerce president to make a speech before moving in to tell people about the need or the problem or the developing situation which is right in front of us.

We need the best writing that's in us. Too often the convention of the news story cramps the natural narrative, makes for poorer writing than would be natural to the reporter. The memos reporters write their editors are livelier than their stories.

Essentially the function of journalism is like that of teaching, and it should be more like it.

Our deadlines are our handicap. Not a virtue.

Scoops are far less important than getting the whole story and making it mean something.

The limitations of journalism are a challenge. But also many are meaningless, and should go out.

Radio-TV priority for spot news should free the newspaper to tell more of what it means, of what goes on. Some recognition of this here and there is seen in the recent acceptance of the so-called interpretive story. This carries back to the older journalism, of having something to say. It is simply reporting in depth, explaining what needs to be explained. In such meaningful reporting a point of view is inevitable.

Some worry about this. Unnecessarily, I believe. A point of view can be discounted by the reader. But if honestly based on facts and the facts are given, it adds a dimension of sense.

Reporters indeed should all be, so far as possible, just as free as sports writers, to call the shots. There is no mystery why sports writing is interesting. There are no sacred cows, no censorship, not much vested interest, not much advertising. The audience knows the score, can't be fooled long, demands full treatment.

Just as in college we need teachers as dynamic as the

coach, so in journalism we need reporting as lively as the sports page.

Some one will caution me on this parallel of the possibility of libel, for you can't easily libel an umpire. But an intelligently run newspaper is not committing libel unintentionally. At times the newspaper should take the risks of a libel suit to serve its community, and the courageous papers will.

As a graduate of an agricultural college, I do not deprecate journalism schools, which use a similar pattern—part education, part craft training. This developed from the Land Grant College emphasis on the practical arts. But the concept was very flexible and it hasn't been stretched enough.

The journalism schools, or the best of them, have recently discovered their limitations and are increasing their content of education and reducing their offerings in the shop practice of newspapers; or so they claim.

I suppose the reason an emeritus professor writes me that he still believes the classics make the best preparation for journalism is the Greek feeling for freedom, order and independence. This was the basic education of the men who made the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. But of course it is not the only way. Some will make the same claim for history which has been the central study of the largest number of Nieman Fellows,—or philosophy or law or science. Only a fatuous pedagogue would claim an exclusive pattern. One mind's meat is indigestible to another.

The lessons learned, one hopes, will include ability to distinguish the important from the trivial, the real from the phoney. But this cannot be guaranteed. The faculty, like the coach, must have material to work on. Those who manage our communications media cannot escape responsibility for selecting people who have what it takes.

All of us who deal in education tend to be too arbitrary and arrogant about it. Often the most original mind turns out to be one that was not clamped in the prescribed format of education.

In journalism the opportunity of education on the job is immense. Journalism is a daily education for the man with any capacity for it.

As all is grist for the journalist's mill, he picks up a useful background almost in spite of what we call education. Often the kind of formal schooling he had seems to be a minor factor in his actual preparation. One way and another he has filled out a background for his job.

The training schools for journalists are as various as the news. Walter Lippmann began as a researcher (we'd say today) for a social reformer. James Reston began as publicity man for the Cincinnati Reds. James Morgan began as a telegrapher. Christopher Rand started in the insurance business. Edwin Lahey, leaving school in the eighth grade, used to read Dickens on his freight handling job and amuse

himself by trying to write sentences like Dickens's. A generation of Chicago *Daily News* readers have had reason to be grateful for the color and movement of Lahey's model. Low, the great British cartoonist, couldn't get into college. He taught himself to draw.

So let no one be dogmatic about the studies of the journalist. Only give him a chance to fill up his mind. He will be drawing on that reservoir the rest of his crowded life.

The student asks if he should not specialize in this age of specialization. Answer, Yes. Cultivate his special interest, but not exclusively too soon. Not until after a general education and some general experience.

Newspapers have done about as well at developing their own specialists for their own purposes as anything. To be sure, these have been chiefly in the conventional grooves of police, courts, sports, politics, finance, and a fringe interest in theatre and books. They were slow about adding labor and science and slower about education—strange in a society that builds so much on science and schools. The cynic says these don't advertise. But neither does crime. The paper has no specialist in theatre if there is no theatre, or in books if the city has no publishing. Artists say you can count the art critics in the American press on one hand and that would be about the census of our military experts. It may be sound instinct that leads the press to deal cautiously with specialization.

Newspapering has more demand for the kind of man who can adapt himself to specialize in one thing this week and another thing next week. For the period of his assignment he must absorb and understand all the details, to know as much as anyone in town about the zoning plan or the rate case.

The field of one's keenest interest is almost surely the most profitable to study. To know something well is vital. To dig deeply into any subject is to discover unsuspected relationships with other fields. Relationships are perhaps the most important thing for a journalist to understand.

But however much one specializes, there will be areas beyond. Whatever Homer Bigart studied at school, it would hardly have been Yemen. Yet it remained for Bigart recently to be the first journalist to illuminate the remote and obscure issue there for New York *Times* readers.

What a godsend to the harassed city editor to discover a reporter who is never blasé and not easily bored, who is exhilarated at each day's grist of unanswered questions, who has a capacity to pursue the trail—a need to know how the thing comes out, to keep up with the score.

The crisis of confidence in the press that Erwin Canham described when he was president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors carries its own prescription for the qualifications for journalism. A capacity for independent examination of a question is an obvious need to meet Mr. Canham's crisis. This is not to accuse education of any fail-

ure to develop a critical sense in the best minds of its students. It means that not enough of these minds have been attracted to or acceptable to the controlling forces in communications.

The journalist needs to appreciate both the importance and the difficulty of independence of mind. For the dominant pressures in his work are apt to discourage it or eliminate it. Such pressures are only powerfully exerted when strongly resisted. A Casper Milquetoast will never encounter them. Only those who stand up can be knocked down.

The journalist who is capable of recognizing those forces that must be fought to keep a decent society will have to stand up again and again for the necessity to publish or broadcast facts that will be unpalatable to some: to insist on repeating truths that have become uncomfortable. The cards will always be stacked against him, for the stakes on the side of following the groove of whatever is commercially profitable or politically comfortable are always high. William Allen White observed, when he had to stand against his friend, the governor, and the misguided law of his own state about strikes, that the only time freedom of speech is important is when it is suppressed. Such a time is the clutch for which all one's education has proved either preparation or failure. In such a situation the public is sometimes dependent on the courage of one man, or one paper, which in its critical decision will be the projection of the character of one man. So crucial may be the role of the journalist. And so lonely that he must draw upon inner resources.

In this, indeed, he is performing his most essential professional responsibility. The modern journalist is an employee. But his responsibility remains to serve the reader as his client. He departs from it or compromises with it at the peril of his soul. Faithfulness to it is his only road to salvation—his only chance of living on acceptable terms with himself. The reason this has to be said with emphasis is that it is the hardest part of the role of the journalist—or any other professional—and it comes harder in a society that is receiving the images of its world from commercials.

Journalistic standards can be high in America, but they

are so far individual standards, and so their uniformity cannot be certified. If they characterize an institution it is because an individual planted them there. They do not grow automatically in commercial journalism; they will be sustained only by stubborn insistence of individuals who may sometimes need to be unpleasant about it.

I don't want to make a metaphysics of journalism or its qualifications.

Most of the time, to be sure, it may make little difference who handles the run of the news. On routine days the reporter's role may be that of a combination fireman and special delivery man. But in the clutch of every so often, and you never know when, it makes all the difference whether an intelligence and a conscience are at the controls and setting down the words that put the images in our heads.

Simple honesty, intelligent curiosity and sensible judgment are the essential qualifications. Journalism is neither science nor art. It is as much as anything else a way of looking at things.

The words for it are detachment, objectivity—to deal with facts factually, to sift out the fact from a jungle of claims and the sense from a welter of irrelevancy.

Objectivity is the essential discipline of journalism. It is a habit of mind, a factor of temperament almost a trait of character. These qualities probably are not produced in any classroom but are part of the process of growth. What we should be looking for is a man who will grow on the job. The vital question isn't, what is his education?, but, can he learn? Will he grow to the job? This is the larger question.

Association with 250 Nieman Fellows from newspapers over 19 years and contact with 2,000 more who wanted to be Nieman Fellows have shown me the character and potential of the present generation of our journalists. They are up to whatever demands their vital role makes on them.

I am sure that the best of them would agree with the late James Morgan, who, as emeritus editor of the *Boston Globe*, after more than 60 years of newspapering, told me, at 85, "I wouldn't swap my luck for any other."

A Reporter Raises Some Questions

By L. M. Wright, Jr.

For a long time I believed the old saying that a newspaperman is never bored. But recently I have begun to doubt. In fact, the more I think about it, the more I become quite certain that (1) I am a newspaperman, and (2) I am bored.

(Those who wish may debate the first point. On the second point I refuse to hear argument.)

I am, as a reporter, not bored with my job. Instead, I am bored with what some of the other people in the newspaper business have been saying and saying for years and years.

These people fall in three rather broad categories: (1) publishers, (2) managing editors, and (3) professors of journalism. There are, perhaps, other categories that could be used; but for purposes of this discussion, these three will be quite sufficient.

The publishers, for as long as I can remember, (and, although I do *not* speak from the vantage point of extreme years, there are those who confirm my suspicions that this thing has been going on even longer than I can remember) have been meeting annually to complain about the price of newsprint, in particular, and the cost of production, in general.

The managing editors have been at it, too. Although they, *not* the publishers, are frequently the ones who decide just how much newsprint is to be consumed from day to day, the price of newsprint never seems to worry them at their annual meetings. What concerns them, it seems, is the—to me—questionable statement that too many of the talented college graduates are going somewhere other than to newspapers to get jobs.

Then there are the professors at the journalism schools. They make speeches and write articles frequently, telling both the publishers and the managing editors that the price of newsprint is, indeed, high and that much of the college talent is, indeed, going places other than city rooms. Dean Norval Neil Luxon of the University of North Carolina Journalism School made that point quite well in the April *Nieman Reports*.

So we have the three groups, each taking its turn, this year in Philadelphia or New York and next year in a couple of other places, and each saying just about what it was saying the year before and the year before that, too.

As for the publishers' problem of newsprint prices, I have *no* suggestions. But I have been in the newspaper busi-

ness long enough to realize that I, as a reporter, am a part of what the publishers are talking about when they bemoan "the cost of production." Too often reporters shrug off this phrase, having had in their minds only a fleeting image of a row of Linotype machines or a pressroom where, indeed, many people do work and where, indeed, prices are quite high.

Whether the publishers talk about newsprint prices and *not* about how much to pay or how to keep good reporters because the publishers are more concerned about newsprint than about reporters or because they just don't want to talk out loud about the cost of reporters, I don't know. As a reporter, I would be less than frank if I failed to say that I find little comfort in either conclusion.

The managing editors, on the other hand, ought to remember a few figures when they worry about why the talent went the other way—if it did go the other way. Dean Luxon's article had this to say about starting salaries on newspapers contrasted to industry in general: "The newspaper average is \$89 a month below that of the corporations and more than \$100 below next June's probable average." (His estimate was made last November, so if he was even close to right the \$100 gap is here now.) Managing editors, better than any other group in the country, know two things well. They know which reporters write their newspapers and they know how much those reporters are paid. They also know that with an estimated starting gap of \$25 per week between what they will (or can) pay and what industry will and can pay, the average increase obtained by reporters in annual guild negotiations ranges from \$10 per week down, and is frequently below \$5.

Perhaps at this point it would *not* be facetious to suggest that maybe the publishers and the managing editors ought to meet in the same city one year to talk this thing over. *Not* much attention is paid these days to how much reporters get a few years after they start in the newspaper business, but this is as important as, if not more important than, the starting salary. It is possible that some publishers and managing editors have talked this problem over already. If so, a lot of reporters would like to have a report.

Now the professors of journalism, to complete the list, ought, it seems to me, simply to be ashamed. If they are training journalism graduates whose educational background is so ambiguous that it permits them to go with equal grace (and at higher salaries) into (1) advertising, (2) public relations, (3) sales, or (4) trade journalism, then it would seem that the catalogues need to be rewritten. And, if the people who wander astray into those other,

L. M. Wright contributed this piece as he completed a Nieman Fellowship to return to the Richmond *Times-Dispatch*.

more lucrative fields never intended to be newspapermen in the first place, then let us not count them in the totals when statistics are cited, and, most of all, let us *not* bemoan their loss as some of the best newspaper talent of the day. Although this is debatable and there are exceptions, I would be inclined to contend that the taking of a job somewhere other than in a city room is perhaps the strongest evidence possible that a person doesn't belong in a city room after all.

Dean Luxon made another point, too. This one, more than money because money only pays the rent and feeds the children, needs desperately to be discussed by publishers, managing editors, journalism professors and, most of all, by reporters. He said: "Most newspapermen, I believe, tend to gravitate to newspapers whose news and editorial policies they are in sympathy with or respect."

For publishers, managing editors, reporters, or anyone who might be interested, I suggest that there is a crucial point. No matter what his salary, no matter how much copy he must turn out, no matter what the size of his newspaper—a reporter, if he is to do anybody any good, must respect his own newspaper. He must be able at all times to have complete faith in the integrity and ability of his superiors; he must know at all times that every decision will be made in the interest of the public, in the best traditions of an independent (and whatever happened to that old word crusading that newspapermen used to love?), free honest press, and never in the interest of someone's fears or in the interest of the business office's doubts.

A reporter without respect for his newspaper might as well be in public relations or advertising, for he is already selling a little of his soul every day. Indeed, this may be one of the basic considerations, *not* only for people about to go into the newspaper business but for people already in it but about to leave.

To put it bluntly, it seems to me that the issue most often *not* discussed by newspapermen today is this one: If a reporter has to sell part of his soul to his newspaper for \$6,000 per year, why should he *not* sell all his soul to a corporation whose sole purpose is to make money for \$10,000 per year?

The publishers can worry about their newsprint prices, the managing editors can bemoan the loss of talent and the professors of journalism can add up the statistics and shake their heads—but they are all missing a vital point until they begin to realize and do something about the fact that a reporter—slave to objectivity though he may be—is an individual, with a heart, with a soul, with feelings, with opinions. I have *no* statistics to back me up, and Dean Luxon's statement is *not* being disputed when I say I believe the number of reporters who disagree with the basic editorial direction of their own newspapers would shock the publishers. The sooner publishers and managing editors begin

to take ideological problems into account, the sooner they can expect to attract more good people—regardless of salaries.

Most newspapers in this country have honest news columns, and most reporters who work for these newspapers can do so with clear conscience. But many consciences are clear only because reporters say to themselves: "I do *not* write editorials, therefore I am *not* in any way responsible for them." This, I submit, is a rationalization and nothing more. A reporter, despite the centuries of objectivity which he uses as a shield, is a part of the total organization which produces the total product—editorial page and all—which is his newspaper. He *cannot* approach a reader or a news source and say he represents only the objective news columns. Even though he may *not* be in any sense responsible for his editorial page or for many of the other things in his paper, he is widely identified in his community with the totality that is his newspaper. This is where the ideological problem arises.

Now, the newspaper business, even if it can't seem to afford them at the moment, is calling for some of the best brains in the country. If it gets the brains, with or without the money, it is going to get some of the most interesting and some of the most strongly held opinions in the country. All reporters *cannot* become editorial writers nor will more extensive use of interpretative articles solve the problem. There is, as a matter of fact, a bottled up mass of these opinions already in city rooms over the country. And the opinions will continue to come in every time another managing editor thinks he has hired himself another bright boy.

In passing, it should *not go unmentioned* that one of the best ways for the newspaper business to attract some of the brains is to demonstrate that it can put to good use some of the brains it already has. Too many times, after the bright boy is hired, not much, if anything, is done for or about him. If a man is really intelligent, he isn't going to sit around writing obits and weather stories indefinitely at \$75 or \$85 per week waiting for his bright future to unfold.

Some of these complaints may seem a little far-fetched. Nowhere have I given any real solutions to problems posed. What is intended here is an effort to promote discussion—particularly among reporters, for it is their job, perhaps more so than management's job, to begin to find the solutions to their own problems. Reporters, too, have a personal stake in newspapers. They ought to begin to think and suggest, to worry and discuss in order to find a way to protect that stake—while finding, at the same time, a way to produce better newspapers.

As for the complaints, it is very easy to get the impressions recorded here. Publishers, managing editors or journalism professors can be judged only by what they say and do. After listening to reports from recent conventions, it

is very easy to get the impression that publishers worry more about what to print on than what to print, more about the width of columns than about who writes the stories in the columns, and more about whether the "package" (a word which has slipped into some newspapers and is being used to describe the living documents as if they were so many yards of dry goods and as if reporters have only to make them pretty to sell) is attractive than about the contents of the (pardon the word) "package."

It is also easy to get the impression that managing editors think they are hiring a lot of second-rate reporters these days. If we are breeding a generation of reporters with inferiority complexes, it will be no wonder. A man who was hired last month must be both disappointed and surprised to hear his managing editor at a convention a month later agree with the statisticians and the professors that the talent is going to the big corporations. If this moaning about the loss of talent continues, the day may come when not only the reporter but also the people he goes out to

interview will begin to wonder if he does have any talent.

And the professors. Whose side are they on? Are they training people to be reporters of news in the old tradition or are they training clever phrase-makers who don't really understand the difference between working for an honest, independent newspaper and a corporation? Or, are the young men coming out of these journalism schools today so *unconcerned* about the difference that \$25 per week (or, in some fortunate cases, less) makes the difference seem *unimportant*?

If we are going to put out better newspapers, the publishers are going to have to solve their newsprint and their payroll problems and the managing editors are going to have to solve their problem of how to attract better men. The journalism professors can help, too. But the real problem, the one so rarely discussed today, is the one that publishers, managing editors, professors and reporters—and perhaps even readers—are going to have to solve together. It is the problem of the reporter's conscience.

Education Reporting Conference

At the request of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors, the Nieman Foundation set up a two-day session on educational reporting, May 12-13.

Twenty-two reporters from four States took part in five seminar sessions, two mornings, two afternoons and one evening, held at the Harvard Graduate Center.

The program of the conference:

FRIDAY, MAY 10

9:30 a.m.—How our public school system developed to its present form: history and orientation

Bernard Bailyn, History Dept., Harvard

11:00 a.m.—Teaching and learning: I What is good teaching and how is it done to meet variety of need in public school? Florence C. Guild

Textbook Dept., Ginn and Company

Luncheon—Faculty Club—1:00 p.m.

2:15 p.m.—Teaching and Learning: II Motivation for learning: varieties of educational need

Francis M. Moran, Assistant Superintendent
Silver Lake Regional High School, Kingston

3:45 p.m.—The school plant—economy of its development
Cyril G. Sargent

Director, Center for Field Studies
Graduate School of Education, Harvard

Dinner—Faculty Club—7:00 p.m.

8:00 p.m.—Structure of responsibility for education:

Local—State—Federal Herold C. Hunt

Prof. of Education, Harvard

The education editor Fred M. Hechinger

Associate publisher, Bridgeport *Herald*

SATURDAY, MAY 11

9:30 a.m.—Some practical local school problems

Eugene L. Belisle, Research Associate
Center for Field Studies

11:00 a.m.—The Pawtucket school story Vincent Bartimo
Pawtucket *Times*

Luncheon—Harkness Commons—1:00 p.m.

2:30 p.m.—Reporting clinic

Mary Handy, *Christian Science Monitor*
Paul Perry, Worcester *Telegram*
Evans Clinchy, Hartford *Times*

PARTICIPANTS:

CONNECTICUT—Bridgeport *Post-Telegram*, Russell J. Redgate; Hartford *Courant*, Mary Goodwin; Hartford *Times*, John Bloomquist, Evans Clinchy; Meriden *Record*, Sheila Leighton; Naugatuck *News*, Kenneth W. Clymer; Waterbury *Republican & American*, Mrs. Gertrude Moran.

MAINE—Portland *Press Herald*, Nicholas W. Panagakos.

MASSACHUSETTS—Boston *Globe*, Ian Forman, Joan McPartlin; *Christian Science Monitor*, Mary Handy; Fall River *Herald News*, Meredith Stebbins; Greenfield *Recorder-Gazette*, Thomas Merrigan; Haverhill *Gazette*, John L. Gaffney; Malden *News*, Arch Birtwell; Medford *Mercury*, Esther Engelman; Newburyport *Daily News*, William B. Coltin; Quincy *Patriot Ledger*, Mary Fitzpatrick; Worcester *Gazette*, Timothy B. Blodgett; Worcester *Telegram*, Paul Perry.

RHODE ISLAND—Newport *News*, James T. Kaull, Jr.; Providence *Journal*, James Sunshine.

One Way to Keep Good Reporters Without Paying Them Any More

By Donald M. Schwartz

Treat them as if being a reporter is important—and mean it.

That is the key. The rest will all be details, but it will explain why the key will work.

Let's begin with the kind of situation that must cost newspaper managements aggravation, money and in some cases monetary lapses in the quality of their product.

A reporter on an opposition paper—a big city daily—asked me why a top general assignment reporter on our staff had left the paper to take a job outside newspapering.

I tried to answer briefly. "He felt he had gone about as far as he could go on the paper. He became concerned for his future. He quit."

"Well," the other reporter replied, "there are only about three good jobs on a paper—any paper—city editor, managing editor and editor."

This reporter's comment—an evaluation, incidentally, of his own job—paralleled exactly the feelings of the reporter who quit, and it was at the heart of why he quit. When he thought of himself as a reporter, he thought of himself as "just a reporter," and for him that wasn't good enough. Of course there were other factors in this case, as in all human decisions; but the phrase "just a reporter" sums up a major factor.

Now where do reporters get such an idea? Mainly, I think, from their bosses.

To put this assertion into focus, let me cite first a management attitude that does not devalue the job of reporter.

I once said to the editor and publisher of a medium size, immensely successful paper for which I was working that I was "just a reporter."

"Young man," he objected, "don't say you are *just* a reporter, and don't think that way. A reporter is the most important person on this paper; without them there'd be no paper."

His paper did treat reporters as if they were important. More specifically, it treated them as if they knew best about information the paper was publishing and were therefore to be relied upon. This was, of course, especially true of beatmen.

In operation this attitude produces many beneficial results. For example, reporters' stories are not rewritten without their knowledge, beatmen who have proven their worth

are not shuffled around like so many chessmen, city desks do not tend to think their man is incompetent and therefore are not inclined to order his story changed to conform to the opposition or the wires for trifling reasons, etc etc. This is just a starter.

Also, this attitude when applied makes for happy, contented reporters; its reverse speeds their flight into public relations and other such fields, places to which good reporters by and large have to be driven.

On the medium size paper I mentioned the contentment was demonstrated by the sizable number of long employed reporters—10, 15 and 20-year men. But not only that. They were not there because they were in a rut, their spirits broken, their energy to strike out elsewhere sapped. They remained enthusiastic about their work (about the daily stories and how they were handled), enthusiastic about being reporters.

It was a badge of real respect and esteem that the senior man was regarded as a sort of "Mr. City Hall" (his run). Other reporters, too—the political writer, a local columnist, even a weather specialist who kept his own records—were accorded a special personal importance.

This, I think, is the core of it—on that paper and on others: reporters, in order to be kept happy and kept, must be allowed to create for themselves a distinctive importance that they and their colleagues can recognize. This dictum is probably hardest to apply to big city shops; it is all the more necessary there.

It shouldn't be applied only to beatmen, although it is most easily applicable there. Maybe the general reporter is a digger and can be used mostly in investigations; maybe he is a thinker and can be set to unravelling complex issues; maybe he is a deft feature writer and can make a page glitter nearly every day. Something can perhaps be devised for even the rewriter, although this admittedly will be difficult and maybe he will have to be rotated judiciously on other tasks.

Whatever is worked out for each individual's sphere of influence within the paper—and none of the things mentioned are really unusual—that sphere should remain inviolate within the limits of the real, not the imagined, necessities of over-all newspaper management. That is the crucial point. The reporter's confidence in his value as a reporter should not be allowed to be whittled away by bromide copy desk concepts of style, by city desk tampering with leads for no better reason than that some deskmen like to tamper and by the top editors' notion that they must initiate all policy stories, crusades, and investigations rather than allowing some of this initiative to rest with the men who are closest to the facts underlying such editorial commitments.

There is, too, I think a significant new element entering this whole picture. To state first the conclusion it implies:

Donald Schwartz is on the staff of the Chicago *Sun-Times*.

it can be said that it will not do to have too many bright young men for what is, unhappily, the dull old routine of much newspapering. The obits must still be gotten out every day, the yearly written-to-form stories still come around with the seasons ("Even the inmates of City Jail will have a turkey dinner on Thanksgiving. . ."), etc. etc. But many of the better-educated newcomers to newspapering will be unable to achieve any satisfaction within the narrow confines of such tasks. Thus, until these routines are heavily reduced as a major element of newspaper work, it is just as well to keep from being overloaded with bright young men. They are likely to be turned into bitter young men. Certainly no employer would hire engineers to do repetitive hand work on a production line merely because the production had something to do with engineering.

There are innumerable other factors to consider if newspapers want to stop peopling public relations agencies, magazines, government, etc., with their good reporters—both the experienced ones and the promising. (And they can't all be made managing editors to hold them.)

But newspaper managements might do well, to begin with, to adopt that editor's sentiment that, "A reporter is the most important person on this paper," and mean it, and put its implications into practice.

The Genuine Glamor of Journalism

By John Hulteng

It is time to think about re-glamorizing the newspaper business.

A couple of decades ago, there was a debunking job to be done. Hollywood and the novelists had created grotesque stereotypes of newsmen: the dashing foreign correspondent, saving thrones and wars singlehanded; the hard-mouthed police reporter, solving crimes between slugs of bourbon, hat glued to his head; the flashing-eyed crusader, ever fearless and imperious in the public interest—until some moneybags advertiser bought him off.

Responsible newspapermen devoted a lot of energy and time to the task of uprooting these stereotypes in the public mind. They bore down particularly hard on the glamor aspect. Jobs were scarce, and the youngsters who kept flocking into newsrooms with Hollywood visions bright in their eyes were bound for disappointment. So we flailed away at the false legends and the tinsel and sent the kids away. I was as industrious as any at that task during my years as an active newspaperman.

But now it is apparent that the job was done too well. The starry-eyed kids have been scared off too far. In erasing the stereotypes, we have also depreciated some of the legitimate glamor of the newspaper business. And as a result we are failing to attract into the business some of the young

blood that has always been and should always continue to be an essential force in American journalism.

Each year a national survey of job opportunities is made for the magazine *Journalism Quarterly* by Dean Charles Duncan of the University of Oregon school of journalism. Every such survey since 1953 has shown a nationwide shortage of J-school graduates. All but two of the 76 schools surveyed regularly reported more job openings than graduates. Increasingly, small dailies are obliged to take on inexperienced help from the ranks of high-school graduates, because no one else is available. And anyone without a college education or its equivalent simply isn't equipped to do a competent job of reporting the news in this era of incendiary social tensions, of expanding American responsibilities abroad, and of vastly complex citizen-government relationships in our own nation and local communities.

But it isn't the quantitative shortages in news staff that are most disturbing. There are grave qualitative causes for alarm.

Many of the young men and women in the colleges and journalism schools, and those who are coming to newspaper staffs through other channels, are lackluster in their outlook. There are no stars in their eyes—not by a long shot.

Few of them have decided on newspaper work with any sense of high purpose. Instead, too many of them have come to the resigned conclusion that they might as well try journalism, since they don't seem to be fitted to take on something more lucrative like physics, or engineering, or business administration.

There are, thank God, still some who go into newspaper work with a sense of excitement and lively eagerness, who see more than a job. But the point is we aren't getting enough of the good ones.

They've been turned aside somewhere along the way. Their parents, high school teachers or college advisers—all echoing the earnest debunkers within the press itself—have steered them away from the "discredited" field of journalism.

That's why it is time to think about re-glamorizing the newspaper business.

Obviously, we don't want to revive the stereotypes. What we need to do is restore an honest perspective.

There is plenty of genuine glamor in journalism. The job of those of us concerned with the business is to bring the pendulum back to realistic center, now that it has swung from one extreme to the other.

The challenge of newspaper work today is dramatic and profound. The overwhelming majority of Americans learn all they know about what is going on in the nation and the world through their reading of the daily newspaper.

The newsmagazines do a part of this job of informing; radio and television newscasts and backgrounders do a much less significant part of it. But the backbone source of news remains the daily newspaper.

1956. The *Boston Post*, oldest of the Hub's papers, ceased

This news report establishes the climate in which the citizen's ballot box decisions are reached. This news report provides the flow of facts and opinions by which national attitudes are slowly molded—attitudes toward allies and enemies abroad, toward domestic demagogues, and toward the social adjustments that confront us.

The power that rests in the hands of America's reporters is enormous. The responsibility that must accompany that power is staggering. There is glamour in wielding such power in the public interest—real glamor, not tinsel.

Every man born of woman is equipped from the start with an urge to create. Some men find ways to satisfy that urge in the work they do, some in the hobbies they follow, some in the shaping of children's personalities within the family circle. But one of the most immediately gratifying ways to satisfy the universal creative urge is through newspaper writing. Your words, written at high pitch, reproduced minutes later in thousands of copies and sped to every home in the city to inform and influence—this is glamor, this is a rich ego-satisfaction peculiar to newspaper work.

There is no need to deal in improbable stereotypes. There is honest glamor in newspaper work, and if we can make that fact clear we can win back to newspapers some of the imaginative, energetic minds we have been missing out on in recent years.

Salaries are a factor in this; there's no blinking that. On a competitive basis, newspaper work is way down the list of occupations. But even if salaries were boosted a good deal we wouldn't be sure of getting the men of high purpose who come to do more than a job. It is the nature of the business that will lure them—as it has lured their like throughout the history of American journalism. The problem is to disclose the true nature of the business, without falsely exaggerating on the one hand or unduly deprecating on the other.

And this assignment falls first to those of us in the business or allied with it. That means the publishers, editors and reporters in big towns as well as small. It means the journalism educators, at secondary school as well as college levels. And it means the professional societies linked with the business.

If all of us do what needs to be done to set the record straight and depict the real character of American newspaper work today, the gospel will spread to the parents, advisers and the youngsters themselves. And we'll get back our full quota of the eager young men of high purpose whose services the press of America urgently needs if it is to remain a live and constructive force in our society.

John Hulteng left the editorial page of the *Providence Journal* to teach journalism at the University of Oregon. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

End of Newspaper Row

By John Mason Potter

The last great "Newspaper Row" in America—and its oldest—is slowly going out of existence. There was a time when a quarter mile of downtown Washington Street, Boston, was lined with newspaper plants, standing side by side on both sides of the narrow, busy thoroughfare, and satellite news bureaus, newspaper union offices and the like clustered around them. Today only one newspaper remains on Newspaper Row, and that is planning to move, only one news syndicate bureau is still located there.

Newspaper Row used to be an institution in almost every American city. Newspaper publishers located their plants next door to or across the street, whenever possible, from their competitors. Newsmen raced off to fires and other spot news events either in each other's company or they raced in competition with each other. An editor, by watching out his window, could sometimes discover what his opposite number was doing in coverage, as he noted which reporter or how many photographers were dispatched, or the quality and quantity of the photographic opposition.

Slowly these Newspaper Rows have disappeared from our cities, as weak newspapers closed up, or were absorbed by their rivals. More and more cities became one-paper cities. In more and more instances, the entire newspaper industry of a city is housed in a single building.

In Boston, Newspaper Row continued long after it had disappeared elsewhere. It was really a row, the center of the newspaper industry in a multiple-paper town. Office workers from surrounding areas thronged the Row at noon to read news items posted outside the *Globe* and the *Post*, to patronize restaurants which had specials—usually sandwiches—named in honor of the Row's newspaper tenants. And some of these eating places appealed to the sense of humor of its newspapermen clients by naming baloney and ham sandwiches after papers located elsewhere in Boston.

The newspaper unions had their offices in the Row, or around the corner. The Press Club was nearby. The Parker House, a block away, was a hang-out for the more prosperous of the newspaper fraternity. It has a handrail on a staircase dedicated to General Charles Taylor, who built the *Globe* into a leading Boston newspaper—and also gave the Parker House the recipe for its famous Parker House rolls.

The death of newspapers, and the pressure on surviving ones to escape the strangulation of downtown traffic, and to move into more efficient plants, have doomed Newspaper Row, which had its beginning when most of America was still in the hands of the Indians.

The death of Boston's Newspaper Row was foretold in

publication for a third and last time in October and went into bankruptcy. Even though it had lost heavily during the last year or so of its publication—and had interrupted its publication twice within two months, it was still the largest standard-sized morning paper in Boston.

Earlier, the *Globe* had announced plans to move to a new plant in suburban Dorchester, where its fleet of delivery trucks would be able to get onto express highways with greater speed and with a minimum need to venture into downtown Boston.

With the *Globe* giving up its present plant, the Associated Press, which has had offices in the *Globe* building for 30 years, faced the necessity of moving. It had to locate in a building which would be open 24 hours a day, and finally found what it was seeking in the Western Union building on Congress Street.

Both the *Globe* and the now defunct *Post* occupied several buildings which had once been the homes of now defunct newspapers. As Boston's newspapers died, survivors expanded, took over their buildings and converted them to their own uses. The result was that both the *Globe* and the *Post* found themselves with floors of different levels. In some cases the *Post*, for instance, had four separate levels for the same floor. The lower level of the third floor in the *Post* was actually lower than the upper level of the second floor.

These split levels have long made newspaper production expensive both in terms of money and in effort. Moving a table of type from one part of a floor to another necessitated using an elevator to another floor and back again, in some instances.

The mushroom growth of the *Globe* and of the *Post* during the past half century gave the first paper one of the biggest cellars and the latter the deepest cellar. The *Post*, unable to expand horizontally, dug deep. It pushed down below sea level and pumps worked 24 hours a day carrying away water that seeped into the cellar. It was often said that more of the *Post* was below ground. Actually there were six floors up, and six floors down.

The *Globe's* cellar was wide, stretching clear to the corner of State Street. One evening when the writer was a member of the *Globe* staff, a fire alarm sounded in the Row area. The city editor sent him to cover the fire. As he left the front door, he followed fire engines to the corner of State Street, and around it. As he ran to keep up with them, he was joined by John Mannion, then a reporter and later the city editor of the *Post*. The two newsmen followed hose carrying firemen into an office building, down a flight of stairs, up which billowed clouds of smoke—and found themselves in the *Globe's* pressroom. Some of the rolls of paper were on fire, but the blaze did not make either paper's columns.

Newspaper Row, for today's newspapermen, starts

where the old *Transcript* building stands at the corner of Washington and Milk Streets. The *Transcript*, once the most famous Boston newspaper, with readers throughout America, died in 1941. Downstairs are shoe and clothing stores, upstairs the windows still bear adjectives describing the quality of the *Transcript*. The *Transcript* building stands next door to the birthplace of Benjamin Franklin, who was, among many other things, a newspaperman.

The Row continues along Washington street, where it makes a slight curve, and on to Court Street. It was on Court Street that Benjamin Franklin's brother printed his paper. Benjamin, a printer's devil, wrote contributions for the paper, and slipped them under the door so that his brother would not know who wrote them. The brother published the contributions while wondering about the identity of the contributor.

In that short stretch of street—Milk to Court—many papers have existed. Some of them, such as the Boston *Herald* and the Boston *Traveler*, are to be found elsewhere. Among the papers still recalled by older members of the newspaper fraternity are the *Journal*, *Daily Advertiser*, *Star*, and the *Commercial Appeal*.

At times of important news, Bostonians have been wont to gather at Newspaper Row. For many years, telegraphic reports of championship fights, or world series baseball games, of state and national elections, would see Newspaper Row jammed with thousands of men and women—with men in the majority—cheering or expressing dismay or disapproval, as the news was displayed in bulletin form or announced by loud speaker. This custom died with the advent of television.

Boston's newspaper history goes back to 1690 when "Publick Occurances, Both Foreign and Domestick" made its appearance, with the announcement that it was going to tell the truth at all times, and an "expose" of the colony's treatment of the Indians. It was promptly suppressed.

The next newspaper appeared in 1704. It was the Boston *News Letter*, America's first successful newspaper.

During the 18th century, many newspapers appeared in Boston. Some of them had brief existences, others continued for many years. At the time of the American Revolution the Boston *Post* was being published by a family named Fleet.

The early *Post* had no connection with the *Post* of present day history. Many well known Boston newspaper names have appeared on earlier publications.

No one knows what will happen to the *Globe* and *Post* plants, what will happen to Newspaper Row. Will the restaurants rename the sandwiches in honor of insurance firms?

John Potter saw the Boston *Post* through to the end. He now serves the Harvard News Office.

City News Bureaus—Past and Present

By Victor J. Danilov

Nearly a century ago a new type of news gathering organization that was to have a far-reaching effect on metropolitan journalism came into being in New York City.

It has been given many names through the years, but it is best known simply as the "city news bureau."

The typical city news bureau has been—and still is—an agency concerned with the gathering of certain news in a metropolitan area for two or more media in that area.

The first city news bureaus, however, were nothing more than smart operators who systematized the joint coverage of local news. They offered their services during the Civil War because of the manpower shortage on New York newspapers. One of these pioneers was Thomas Stout, who organized "Stout's Agency" to cover local assignments ordered by short-handed city editors after the war. Stout had a 10-man staff that first covered the city on an assignment basis, and later as a regular service, charging a fixed amount per week.

Stout was only one of a number of enterprising men who recognized the need for such a service. His agency, however, is regarded as the forerunner of the present local service operated by the Associated Press in New York.

The first newspaper-owned city news bureau was the City Press Association of Chicago, established on June 19, 1890. Eight publishers of 10 Chicago daily newspapers signed stock subscriptions for the cooperative experiment—designed to cut the cost of covering routine news and to serve as a training ground for reporters.

Victor F. Lawson, publisher of the Chicago *Morning and Evening News*, was instrumental in organizing the agency during a period marked by news "scoops" and a bitter circulation and advertising war.

The success of the City Press Association prompted Lawson to use the cooperative undertaking as the model for the Associated Press several years later.

In addition to the city news bureaus in New York and Chicago, similar agencies were formed in Boston, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, Washington, and other major cities.

Not all survived, however. Many suffered the fate of Pittsburgh's Tri-State News Bureau, which folded from lack of support in 1927 when the number of newspapers in the city was reduced from five to three.

Mr. Danilov is manager of public relations of Illinois Institute of Technology.

In many large cities there were too few newspapers—or too little interest—to justify starting a city news bureau. Such was the case in Philadelphia, where a cooperative arrangement was worked out only to handle election returns.

The Philadelphia City Editor's Association was organized in 1880 to eliminate duplication of effort and to provide faster and more accurate election coverage. The special election handling still is going strong in Philadelphia, servicing the city's three dailies, the wire services, and radio and television stations.

Today, there are only three full-fledged city news bureaus in operation—the Associated Press local service in New York, the City News Bureau of Chicago, and the City News Service of Los Angeles.

Washington, D. C., has two local wire services—operated by the United Press and the Associated Press—but they are not city news bureaus in the true sense, and they do not serve the city's three newspapers.

The services were established to provide a tailored news digest and schedule of governmental happenings for special clients, such as government officials, diplomats, businessmen, lobbyists, and others interested in capital news.

The Associated Press local service in New York is quite different from the Washington operation, being set up specifically to serve New York's seven dailies—the *Daily Mirror*, *Daily News*, *Herald Tribune*, and *Times* in the morning field, and the *Journal-American*, *Post*, and *World-Telegram and Sun* in the afternoon.

The AP took over the old New York City News Association in 1942 at the request of the metropolitan dailies. Under the arrangement, the newspapers pay extra for the service.

New York's radio and television stations do not receive the local service, largely because they have not asked for it, according to Samuel G. Blackman, chief of the bureau.

The service is a 24-hour operation, with direct wires feeding the newspapers. A schedule of events to be covered—as well as a list of stories not worth covering—is sent to the papers twice a day—at 7 a.m. and 4 p.m.

The Associated Press has a local staff of 53 reporters, rewriters, and editors. Most of the reporters handle beats; the others are on general assignment.

Manhattan, the Bronx, and the two airports, La Guardia and Idlewild, are covered by the AP local staff. New York newspapers cover the other three boroughs on their own.

Beats include the East Side, West Side, Bellevue Hospital, city hall, police headquarters, and the city, state, and federal courts.

The pay scale for local staffers is the same as it is for Associated Press personnel in New York, starting at \$70 a week for beginners and advancing to \$148.50 after six years of experience.

The scale is somewhat lower at the City News Bureau of Chicago, but the bureau functions are quite different. It is operated by Chicago's four dailies—*American*, *Daily News*, *Sun Times*, and *Tribune*—for three principal reasons:

1. Provide general protective news coverage.
2. Serve as an internship for young reporters.
3. Handle the tabulation of election returns.

Because of this training responsibility, the City News Bureau's reportorial staff is much younger, less experienced, and has greater turnover than its New York counterpart.

A beginner with no experience starts at \$50 a week at the City News Bureau. If he works out, he can earn up to \$80 by the end of the first year. In all probability, however, he won't be around that long. The poor ones flunk out, and the good ones are snatched up by the short-handed papers in Chicago and other cities.

Managing Editor Isaac Gershman, a veteran of 40 years with the bureau, reports that the CNB suffered more than a 100 per cent turnover in its reportorial staff during 1956.

Some 3,000 newsmen have received their basic training at the City News Bureau since it was founded in 1890. Included on the roster are such notables as Walter Howey, Clifton Utley, O. O. McIntyre, and Charles MacArthur, as well as most of the news staffs on the Chicago papers.

The bureau's 52 man staff falls into three categories: faculty, key men, and cubs. The "faculty" is composed of eight experienced newsmen who make the assignments, edit copy, and give pointers. Eight other veterans hold down the key beats and rewrite posts. Everybody else is considered a "cub."

The staff works on a three-shift basis, with 20 inside men and 32 covering beats or doing general assignment. Most of the news is picked up on beats because of the restrictive nature of the bureau's coverage.

Beats include city hall, county building, federal offices, civil courts, criminal court, central police, west police, north police and south police. In addition, the bureau's sports department covers 106 high schools and junior colleges, the armed forces, and some civic associations.

Many of these beats also are covered by the Chicago newspapers, and the young CNB reporter lives in constant fear of being scooped by the more experienced hands. But this is considered an integral part of every cub's training.

The radio and television stations are serviced by teletype, but a more intricate system is used for sending stories to the newspapers—underground pneumatic tubes.

The tube system was constructed in 1910 and connects the City News Bureau with the four dailies, the Board of Trade and the county building. The 14 miles of tubes would take something like \$1 million to duplicate today.

The importance of the tubes is reflected in the number of times it was used in 1956. This figure came to 362,141 trips, which included 61,432 tubes of official documents, weather reports, publicity releases, news photographs, and other material sent by government, publicity, and other people not connected with the bureau.

On election nights, the City News Bureau covers the biggest voting area and the largest number of precincts in the nation—954 square miles and 5,038 precincts. Weeks of preparation and years of experience go into the job.

The bureau moves into the third floor of the county building and recruits a special staff of 465 comptometer operators, file clerks, statisticians, auditors, and people to answer telephones. Some 7,000 others—policemen, students, election officials, and volunteers—also assist in gathering and reporting the election returns.

Using this system, it generally is possible for Chicago morning papers to carry the complete results.

The newest and smallest city news bureau operation is the City News Service in Los Angeles. Founded in 1928 by the United Press, the agency changed hands many times before being acquired in 1954 by Fletcher Bowron, mayor of Los Angeles for 15 years, and Joseph M. Quinn, Southern California—Arizona business representative for the United Press at that time.

The City News Service has a staff of 17 full-time reporters and editors and 15 stringers who cover the vast Los Angeles County for 14 newspapers, 7 radio stations, 5 television stations, and the United Press.

The bulk of its news originates from eight long-established beats in the downtown Civic Center, although considerable copy flows in from its bureau in the San Fernando Valley and from its corps of stringers.

Most stories are telephoned to the agency's office near the Civic Center, but the reporters at the city hall and county building are pioneering in transmitting their copy on the new Western Union "Intrafax" system.

On an average 120 to 200 stories are processed daily and transmitted by teletype to subscribing media. The teletype circuit operates from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and from 3 to 11 p.m. on Sunday. Morning and afternoon copy is prepared in newspaper style, while evening and Sunday copy is written in broadcasting style.

Biggest problem, according to Quinn, president and managing editor, is the staff turnover. The starting pay for beginners is \$75, scaling to \$115.

"But the metropolitan newspapers and broadcasting stations continue to hire away reporters after they have six to nine months experience with CNS," he said.

In addition to providing news and manpower, the city news bureaus have had their share of excitement over the years.

At the City News Bureau in Chicago, for example, they still talk about the scoops scored by Walter Howey, noted Hearst editor; Hildy Johnson, star reporter of the old Chicago *Herald-Examiner* and "The Front Page," and the cubs who first reported the St. Valentine's Day massacre and the slaying of John Dillinger.

Howey was a young CNB reporter on a routine assignment in 1903 when a blackened figure in a stage costume suddenly popped out of a manhole and gasped that the Iroquois Theater was ablaze. Minutes later the City News Bureau told the world about the fire in which some 600 died.

Johnson scored a string of courtroom beats as a bureau legman by holding a stethoscope to the paper-thin walls of Chicago jury rooms. He was able to get the verdicts to his city desk before the foreman handed them to the judge.

City news services also have played a pioneering role in the handling of certain types of news.

One practice that attracted considerable attention was the "SXI" system instituted by the old New York City News Association. As a guide to newspapers, the agency placed the symbol as the beginning of all material furnished by a press agent or other interested person. The symbol was created from the first letters of "sent in," with "X" being inserted to make a three-letter combination.

Just two years ago, Gershman of the City News Bureau in Chicago was instrumental in getting the city's nine major radio and television stations to eliminate the use of inflammatory statements in reporting racial riots, juvenile gang fights, and clashes between ethnic or nationality groups.

Under the program, the City News Bureau still continues to send out news tips to radio and television stations, enabling them to dispatch reportorial and/or camera crews to the scene and to prepare for emergency broadcasts by civic leaders. However, there is one major change—the tips are sandwiched between the following warnings:

"Attention editors and station managers—not for broadcast—note serious nature of this information. Broadcast may heighten tension and draw crowds. This is not for broadcast. . . .

"This is one of those conditions that could become worse if broadcast. We will keep you advised of developments. Meanwhile, this information is not for broadcast."

Once police have the situation in hand, the bureau sends out details of the event, urging caution in use of the information. Thus far, the program has worked quite successfully, and there are indications that the policy may be copied elsewhere.

The Role of the Press in Urbanization Problems

Sylvan Meyer

Communicating today's complex social, technical and humanistic problems to the people at large poses a tremendous challenge to newspapers—and tremendous problems as well.

The newspaper is a part of the community, however you define the particular community in question. Yet it must stand aside and see that community objectively. It stands between the scholar and the technician, between the technician and local governments, between governments and the people. It must tell the large, overall story, yet must include the details.

On its newspapers it must report and instruct. On its editorial pages it must exhort, advise and criticize.

Quite a big order.

Urbanization is one of the factors of the times. Unfortunately, it is a big word and eludes sharp, brief definition. It applies equally to problems faced by Atlanta and by Gainesville, for example. It applies to Gwinnett County where four-lane highways, sudden expansion of water and gas services and sudden development of an attractive recreation area around Lake Lanier are expected—and will, I'm sure, create another bedroom for metropolitan Atlanta. A county with a rural type of government, with leaders unschooled in planning administration, a tax structure that is unrealistic and archaic, an overburdened school system, may within five years, be forced to absorb 10 to 15,000 people.

Similar events are taking place in Hall County and other relatively small counties. Gainesville grows and overflows county areas, the city encroaches on nearby incorporated places until such a network of separate governments—each at a different stage of sophistication regarding the obligations of local government—exists that even a lecturer can't devise a plan for pulling them together unless the central city can find a municipal oil well to finance ambassadors, negotiators and salesmen.

But you are familiar with these problems. The question is: how does a newspaper fit in and what can it do—what should it do?

First, it has some general obligations.

The newspaper is a community's centralizing force. With all respects to other media, only the newspaper combines factual reporting with editorial guidance; only the newspaper maintains staffs of people and tries to assign one of them, who may even become a specialist, to government and

Sylvan Meyer, editor of the Gainesville (Ga.) *Daily Times*, addressed the Emory Conference on Urbanization, April 22. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

developmental matters; only the newspaper can go into the wealth of detail necessary to promote full understanding of problems and solutions. The newspaper can offer sufficient diversity of subject matter at one instant so that it can forget about the ratings on page 5 and count on the funnies to sell papers that day.

The newspaper should be accurate and up to date. This means its reportorial staff has to be alert and editorial staff aware of the meaning and significance of the news turned in by reporters; it means that the editorial management of the paper must keep a long view in mind where the future of its community is concerned.

It does not mean necessarily that the technicians and scholars are always happy with what the paper prints. These people, discerning though they are, demand an accuracy of nuance that isn't attainable in the same paragraph with compelling reading matter and terseness.

A newspaper isn't a trade magazine for a professional organization, or for interest groups of specially inclined citizens. It is an interpreter. We have to keep the readers' interest or lose effectiveness. We have to sum up. We have to quote, then explain the quote.

Furthermore, the newspaper has an obligation to print bad news, too. Publicity has been defined as what you want in the paper, and news as what the paper wants in the paper. We find that in the long range programs particularly in planning fields, the people involved want to time their news to some imagined moment of prime reception on the part of the reader. A setback, a program that might injure some feelings or, worse yet, arouse the suspicion of some antagonistic person or group, finds the professional way of the press. The professional also wants to avoid controversy. A good, healthy, noisy controversy does more to inform the public than pages of charted and illustrated scholarship reprinted under the guise of public education.

Remember that the public is made of people who don't ordinarily become exercised about words such as "urbanization," "Master planning," "Community coordination" and the like.

But they can become conscious of what is happening about them. Let's look into some of the positive things the press can do, if it keeps itself alert and informed and its sources keep it informed.

Organizing the things the press can do in terms of the people it is caught between, we have:

The readers and the public at large; government; the professional or technician (who is usually so wrapped up in his work he needs all the public relations guidance his newspaper can afford him).

The readers: among a newspaper's readers are a few people genuinely and dispassionately interested in the future and welfare of their towns and counties. Don't worry about them. They'll stay abreast of the times. For the others,

we must dramatize and personalize. We need speeches to report, statements to quote, pamphlets to review, showing how the future relates to the direct business and economic interests of Mr. Citizen. We need stories that show that amorphous character, the man in the street, how certain influences on the complexity of his life will cost him money, time and taxes if he does not move to meet them head-on.

There is no use editorially telling him to show more interest unless we tell him why he should do so. Workers in associated fields can provide newspaper people with statistics, details, specific and horrible examples. We had some success in Gainesville with local pictures illustrating horrible housing and business development that might have been avoided with proper planning procedures. It made some landowners rather warm under the collar; but it brought planning home in terms of what it means to a man who buys a lot or builds a drive-in Dairy Queen.

People have imagination and people are willing to endorse bold public solutions to their problems if they understand the problem and believe the solutions impersonal and unselfish. A simple mistake can foil a good program. A man named Ehrenborg, a Texan, did a tax study in this state. It was a good equalization program and something desperately needed. His name killed it. "That foreigner came in here and told us how to rig our taxes. He raised 'em all..." people said. Mr. Ehrenborg needed better public relations; or a name like Smith. Opposition developed, a court case resulted, the project died and has not been revived. I like to believe the paper did all it could. Sometimes you just lose.

Long and thorough reports are good. They're needed for the few people who will struggle through them, look at the illustrations and ponder. They need to be repeated. Often. To repeat them, the newspaper requires new ideas, material and approaches. You can provide these by developing teamwork with your newspaper and including the paper in local conferences, meetings and discussions.

Government: local government changes often. Commissioners and councilmen go through a long educational process. They can't be expected to jump into offices as full-blown experts in every phase of municipal or county administration. There are many things they don't know; there are processes they don't comprehend; there are administrative techniques they never hear of. They don't know how to use their planning boards, their city managers, their citizen committees. They are subjected to many pressures and they never have any money in their treasuries.

The newspaper should help them. It should criticize with understanding, like a theater reviewer dealing with an amateur production. The newspaper should slash away at wrong motives, but should guide right ones. Many editorials are written for only three or maybe five sets of eyes. The public often reads them and doesn't understand them,

but that's all right. They are directed to the men in the office, suggesting methods of operation; hinting that the policy discussed last Monday will get in the way when they try to build a ring road or locate another grammar school.

Much of a newspaper's best work along these lines never reaches print. It consists of matters left unsaid editorially, of patience, of explaining official attitudes and problems in a manner helpful to local government. It often consists of off-the-record talks in which the press informs government, sometimes at government's request, of how the public may react to such and such a program. Of course, the editor here is tactfully telling local government whether the paper will pummel or praise a particular program, if that program is brought out. It often consists of advising activity where there is none, thereby initiating projects and ideas in local government. This is not only a press function, but a citizen function. I've found local officials particularly open to constructive suggestions; and most stiff-necked about criticism from groups that never offer such aid, nor work to carry out the beneficial programs of local government.

By and large local officials want to do a good job. They may be technically ignorant, they may suffer from misinformation, lack of information or poor judgment. But once convinced, they can move with some courage, especially when they feel the public understands what they are doing and why.

We urge the professional working on either the planning, sociological, economic or political aspects of the problems of urbanization to tell us something startling. He looks into the crystal ball: we hope he finds there not gobbledygook, but challenge. Let him tell us what is significant and what is not.

Let him also give us his best solutions, spelled out one, two, three like directions on a package of dog food. What do we do first, and then, and then, and after that? How do we pay for it, how much will it cost and what will we have when we get through? Can he draw us a picture?

One of the knottiest problems of mounting population concentration is the automobile. This machine is wrecking business districts, ruining streets—not to mention dispositions—fragmenting our shopping areas and creating more problems of population concentration. It sends residents to the suburbs, but in creating shopping centers it means that no one area can afford the diversification of shopping opportunity required to provide a real city business center.

Is that the fate of Gainesville, for example? Will our town be fractioned off by inadequate shopping centers until it's own center is lost, and four-lane highways, Atlanta's growth and scattered industrial jobs make it just a satellite town, a suburb in the true sense of the word? I hope not. How do we avoid this? How do we keep our identification and our sense of community?

The professional must tell us. And he must tell us in time—not AFTER we wake up to our problems and employ him as a consultant. He must not be too professional. He needs to go after work. Life insurance agents would be useless to us once we are deceased. They arouse us to a problem and show us the solution. If we don't buy, at least, we have been alarmed, made to think a little. This conference is part of that pattern.

The press can help with this job and I think it wants to help. A newspaper thrives on a strong sense of community among its readers. They give the paper response and usefulness. When the paper shows that a community exists, that its people have mutual problems, likes, needs and interests, it also contributes toward a solution of those problems.

One of our greatest concerns, I feel, as we become more urbanized and more mobile, is that the sense of community will dwindle. Our urban people are still largely rural in background and attitude. They are suspicious of city ways even though they are part and parcel of those ways.

They know how to work with neighbors, but not with strangers. They don't feel a part of the urban situation, but they are.

These people must be made to understand what is happening to them and what needs to be done about it.

Many of us are lost in complexities, in the old ways of doing things; we are bogged down with inexpert—though well-meaning—city and county officials; there are conferences we should attend, books we should study. We need prolonged steeping in taking the long view and seizing on bold preventive programs in urban problems.

In all these factors, the newspaper's duty lies. That duty isn't always clear, but it is always present. Every one of these problems we are discussing can be turned into news stories, illustrated features, editorials, special reportorial projects, man on the street interviews, talks before civic clubs, pointed questions in interviews with local officials.

City desks, reporters and editors have an obligation to become sufficiently informed to ask intelligent questions and to fit the answers into some kind of totality of community action.

I assure you that the press is aware of its shortcomings in the face of such an obligation, but I also assure you that it is deeply interested in improving itself and looks to the worker in the fields involved for guidance.

As newspapermen, we are the mirrors of our communities in which to sell papers and advertising, so we do have peddlers of idealism.

We need good copy; we need good editorial ideas; we need background material. We need prosperous communities in which to sell papers and advertising, so we do have the stimulus of self-interest as well as that of altruism.

We can help you cross the bridge to the people.

Professor Merk Retires

Prof. Frederick Merk, who teaches the Westward sweep of American history across the continent, retired in June. He will be 70 in August. He has taught American history to Harvard students for 39 years.

For nearly all of this period he was one of a trio of distinguished teachers of American history at Harvard. His contemporaries, Samuel Eliot Morison and Arthur Meier Schlesinger, retired earlier. Merk's retirement completes a chapter of nearly four decades in which these three Harvard scholars deeply influenced the teaching and writing of American history.

Merk is the Gurney professor of American history. His teaching and scholarly work followed in direct line from that of his own great teacher, Frederick Jackson Turner, who first developed the influence of the frontier in American history. Like Turner a native of Wisconsin, Merk did his early work in history there, came to Harvard for graduate study under Turner in 1916, and remained as tutor, instructor and professor.

Merk's primary influence on Harvard students has been in two great courses. One is a basic course, "The Growth of the American Nation," which he long shared with Professor Schlesinger; the other is "The Westward Movement" for advanced students. In this course he follows the frontier and its influence on Americans, as it moved from the Atlantic colonies westward. Harvard students nicknamed it "Wagon Wheels." It has a broad sweep of historical movement from the earliest settlements to the current farm problem. In its path it picked up all the problems, the issues, the political currents and economic developments of the American society as it occupied a continent and was shaped by the land it occupied.

Prof. Merk put his life's energies into this teaching. He brought to it such seemingly limitless scholarship, such infinite pains, such imaginative teaching and such dynamic discovery of the meaning and relation of historical facts, as aroused enthusiasm for their country's history in thousands of students, and led scores to become history teachers. He put all of himself into his teaching.

He has published pieces of the history he lectures on. "Economic History of Wisconsin during the Civil War Decade" appeared in 1916. "Fur Trade and Empire—George Simpson's Journal" appeared in 1931. For the past 20 years, he has studied the story of Oregon, and parts of this study have appeared in a half dozen articles and in "Albert Galatin and the Oregon Problem." His published articles also deal with the Granger movement and the history of the westward movement. He shared with four other Harvard historians in compiling "The Harvard Guide to American History" in 1954. With Frederick Jackson Turner, in 1922, Mr. Merk published "List of References on the History of the West."

But his own broad sweep of American history, which his lectures encompassed, he has never been ready to commit to permanent shape. He has refined it year after year. Now that he is putting his classroom chores behind him, his colleagues and former students anticipate that Merk's own history of America will be prepared for publication.

Down the years he has resisted pressures and maneuvers, by colleagues, students and university officials, to commit his lectures to permanent form. He has been urged to let his lectures be recorded by every device from a dictating machine to live television. But he was not ready and has held out for the full ripening of his life's work.

Merk's work has become widely known to a larger than university audience, especially during the past 19 years through the presence at Harvard of newspapermen on Nieman Fellowships. The Nieman Fellows early discovered Merk's "Wagon Wheels" and felt its stimulus. They have gone to all corners of the country carrying word of "the greatest course in American history." Of the 235 Nieman Fellows at Harvard through the past two decades, three-fourths sat in Merk's course and in their own later editorials, articles and books have been influenced by it. A. B. Guthrie found in Merk's course the thread of historical research for this first novel, "The Big Sky" and his Pulitzer prize novel, "The Way West."

They have carried away also a deeply impressed image of Mr. Merk as their prototype of the dedicated teacher. Many have called him "Harvard's Mr. Chips." A slight figure, with a thin voice, Professor Merk finds power and eloquence in his subject that cast a spell over the classroom as he expands the drama of the American story in its westward march. His lectures are lightened by whimsical humor, which students remember as "Mr. Merk's little jokes."

One of his graduate students was a girl named Lois Bannister, an instructor at Wheaton College, whom he married in 1931. He had been a bachelor till 44. Mrs. Merk continued her history studies while bringing up her family and completed her doctorate in history two years ago, after her daughter and son were already in college. Mrs. Merk now teaches history at Northeastern University.

Prof. Merk was born August 15, 1887, in Milwaukee, went to high school there and then to the University of Wisconsin, where Frederick Jackson Turner had made his seminal contribution to American history in "The Frontier in American History." On graduation in 1911, Merk immediately went to work editing historical papers for the Wisconsin State Historical Society. For five years he worked the local history field there to publish articles on Wisconsin history and "The Civil War Messages and Proclamations of Wisconsin War Governors."

His work in Wisconsin won him the Edward Austen Fellowship which permitted him to follow Turner to Harvard and continue his doctoral studies under him.

Editorials on Professor Merk by Nieman Fellows

Toledo Blade, May 5 Last Class

There must have been a thunderous ovation Tuesday in the Harvard classroom where Prof. Frederick Merk delivered his last lecture as a teacher of history. And how much louder it would have been had all his former students who would have liked being there been able to take part!

Fred Merk was all teacher. To the consternation of some academicians, who judge a teacher by his degrees and his published titles, he never took time out from classroom work and the extensive research he conducted to write books. There will be time enough for that, now that the teaching is done.

Meantime, in 39 years as a member of the Harvard faculty, Professor Merk has created more enthusiasm for the study of history and more interest in the frontier and its influence on the nation's development than perhaps any other historian of our time. His course entitled "The Westward Movement" (Harvard students long since named it "Wagon Wheels") has excited the imagination of thousands. It has profoundly influenced teaching and literature in our times.

This remarkable teacher was not well known personally beyond Harvard yard. He had so little time for the books, the speeches, the magazine articles many present-day historians live by that none of the aura of authority and fame attached itself to his name.

As principal spokesman for the interpretation of history propounded more than 40 years ago by Frederick Jackson Turner, whom he followed from the University of Wisconsin to Harvard (that most of the political and economic history of the United States is explainable in terms of the frontier as safety valve) Professor Merk invested it with both drama and authority. Even after the Turner thesis had been subjected to extensive re-examination and attack, he continued to defend it cogently and eloquently.

Great teachers are scarce. When their number is depleted by one of Fred Merk's caliber, the loss reaches out far beyond the

N. Y. Times, April 30 HARVARD COURSE GOES WEST AS "DRIVER" QUILTS Special to The New York Times.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., April 29—A history course known to Harvard students as Wagon Wheels will finish its last academic journey across the continent tomorrow.

The scholarly "driver," Prof. Frederick Merk, has decided to retire. He will be 70 years old Aug. 15.

At 9 A. M. tomorrow, students will hear Professor Merk's final lecture in thirty-nine years at Harvard.

He is Gurney Professor of American History and Political Science. His primary influence has been in a basic course, The Growth of the American Nation, and another for advanced students, The Westward Movement. The lecture will be in this course, which follows the frontier from the Atlantic colonies to the Pacific, and has been dubbed Wagon Wheels.

campus where he spent his teaching years.

In this case there is the compensation that the retiring teacher may at last find time to put on paper for the enlightenment and entertainment of millions who had no chance to hear him, something of the intense feeling and extensive scholarship concerning the Westward movement of American civilization which helped to make his teaching great.

Denver Post, May 1 Goodbye Mr. Chips

The retirement of a Harvard professor ordinarily would rate less than passing comment in the distant West. But Westerners, nettled by Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, the Texas historian who has written us off as a vast desert of little significance, will regret the retirement of Prof. Frederick Merk.

For 39 years, in a course fondly dubbed "Wagon Wheels" by his students, Merk popularized and extended the great Frederick Jackson Turner's thesis that the

Western frontier was the dominant force which forged the course of the nation and the character of her people.

Slight and scholarly, with a thin voice, Merk nevertheless drew power and eloquence from the westward sweep of American history. He cast a spell over his classroom and a profound influence over his students, who carried his ideas to all parts of the nation and all walks of life.

Three-fourths of the 235 Nieman Fellows in journalism at Harvard during the past two decades sat in Merk's course. Affectionately, they named him "Harvard's Mr. Chips," and later in their editorials, articles and books they reflected his teachings.

In thousands of students Merk aroused a vivid enthusiasm for their country's history as they re-lived the problems, issues, politics, economics and significances of the pioneers during the long march West.

Today his views are deeply ingrained in the teaching and writing of American history and literature, but never did he himself put into writing his own broad knowledge and keen insight of American history from the earliest settlements to the TVA, the Pacific Northwest and the current farm problem.

He never had the time. Maybe he will have now.

Salt Lake Tribune, May 4 A Teacher Retires

It is practically impossible to define the ideal teacher. The human personality is too bound up in the formula.

A slight, thin-voiced little history professor now retiring, very likely comes close to embodying the many attributes of a good teacher in the minds of thousands of his former students. He is Frederick Merk, American history professor at Harvard for 39 years. Though modest and unassuming and the author of comparatively few published works, his retirement will be noted in many states.

Mr. Merk attended school in Milwaukee, city of his birth, and naturally gravitated to Wisconsin University. There he had the

good fortune to have a good history teacher, Frederick Jackson Turner, who was to become famous for first developing the influence of the frontier in American history.

It was also natural that Mr. Merk should follow Mr. Turner to Harvard and pick up where he left off in teaching the westward sweep of American history.

What made Mr. Merk's lectures great? Well, what makes a good teacher? Behind his 50-minute lectures were seemingly limitless scholarship, infinite pains and the dynamic discovery of the meaning of historical facts and their relation to present-day situations.

One reason that Mr. Merk's retirement will get more than ordinary attention this spring is that of the 235 American newspapermen who have had the good fortune to be Nieman Fellows at Harvard in the last 20 years, three-fourths sat in Mr. Merk's most popular class, the History of the Westward Movement. Historical research he inspired has gone into some important books and other writings. He made many Westerners aware of their heritage.

Professors' salaries aren't comparable to those of some other professions and industry, not even at Harvard. They should be higher. But we suspect that Mr. Merk would agree that there are other compensations.

Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard
May 5

A Mr. Chips

"Harvard's Mr. Chips" delivered his last lecture last week and stepped down after 39 years of classroom teaching. Frederick Merk was, and is, one of America's great historians, but his name is rarely included when the "prominent" are mentioned. This is so because he confined his activities to the classroom and the library. He "published" little. But he taught much.

An expert on Oregon history, he rarely visited here because he found more useful information in libraries in the East and in England. But while he rarely visited the West, he believed in it passionately. He was a disciple of Frederick Jackson Turner, studied under that great man at Wisconsin and at Harvard and eventually

took over Mr. Turner's Harvard platform.

At Harvard for many years Mr. Merk taught a course in "The Westward Movement in American History." The course was called "Wagon Wheels" or "Cowboys and Indians" by irreverent Harvard students who give nicknames to favorite courses. (A course in architectural survey is called "pillars," a maritime history course is "boats" and a course in American civilization is "bathtubs.")

The Westward movement began, Mr. Merk felt, when the first Jamestown settler went a little farther upstream. It's still going on. The student who sat at his feet felt the sweep of the empire across the Appalachians, into the Mississippi Valley, across the Rockies and to the Pacific.

A small man with a high, thin voice, he delivered as perfect a lecture as we've ever heard. Each morning he'd begin at 10 minutes after the hour, "Now in the last lecture, we saw . . ." For 50 minutes he'd talk without interruption, and without a flaw in the perfectly organized presentation of his material. Fifty minutes after he began, he'd close by saying, "And that matter we'll consider at the next lecture." As he said the word "lecture," the clock in the memorial tower would begin to strike.

He didn't write much. He felt, he told admiring students, that he did not yet know the whole story. But someday, he often said, when retirement came, he might write his own book on the history of the West. It's a book we await eagerly.

St. Paul Pioneer Press, May 4
Harvard University
Salutes A Teacher

Harvard university and many of its graduates are saluting a teacher. He has not been a prolific writer, he has not originated a new theory or process or substance, he's not been a flamboyant personality—the principal contribution of Frederick Merk has been inspired teaching, the key element of any strong university.

Professor Merk gave his last lecture this week. For 39 years he has taught the Westward sweep of American history across the continent. He, like Arthur Meier Schlesinger and Samuel Eliot Mori-

son, conveyed the thrill of new insight into the story of America in classrooms over nearly four decades. Now all three, who have led scores of students to become history teachers, have retired.

Professor Merk had a thin, dry voice when he started his lectures. But when he got into the brawling frontier, how it pushed relentlessly West, sometimes despite even might and right, he could sound like the voice of nineteenth-century America itself when, eyes agleam, he spoke its cry: "It is our manifest destiny!"

Professor Merk, a Wisconsin native, followed his own great teacher, Frederick Jackson Turner, also of Wisconsin, to Harvard. There he pursued and developed Professor Turner's influential thesis that shed new light on United States politics, economics, issues.

These days, with vast enrollments shaping up for our colleges, teachers most often are thought of in terms of quantity, and universities in terms of expansion and buildings. The time is all the more appropriate, then, for this salute to quality teaching, wherever it is found, personified in Professor Merk. Gifted, dedicated men such as he are the heart of a true university.

Portland Oregonian, May 1
Wheels Roll to Stop

This week in a Cambridge, Mass., classroom a slight, bespectacled man, who probably knows as much about Oregon history as anyone living, gave his last regular classroom lecture. Frederick Merk is retiring at 70 after 39 years of teaching American history at Harvard University.

For the last 20 of those years he has specialized in the study of the history of Oregon, combing original sources the world over. The fruits of his research have appeared in such works as *Albert Gallatin and the Oregon Problem* and in his lectures to advanced history students in his celebrated course, "The Westward Movement" or, to the irreverent, "Wagon Wheels." His influence on the writing of history compares with that of his former teacher, Frederick Jackson Turner, who developed the theory of the frontier in American history. In a popular sense, Merk's influence has gone

further. A. B. Guthrie found in Merk's course the thread of research for his best-selling novels, *The Big Sky* and *The Way West*.

Merk knew Oregon, but Oregon didn't know much of Merk. There was good reason. He found that his chief source of historical information about this country was to be found elsewhere, in the archives, say, of the Hudson's Bay Company in England.

There is a moral here: Oregonians should do their best to keep their historical records and relics where they belong—in Oregon. The Oregon Historical Society has been doing an increasingly able job of collecting and providing useful custody for such materials. It will do a better job when it obtains new quarters. Yet there are some Oregonians, including some legislators, who question the value of historical holdings and the place of a historical society in the state. Their questions could be answered by Frederick Merk and the thousands of men and women who have profited from his research.

Oregon Journal, May 5 **Influence of** **U. S. Frontier**

Precisely at 9 a. m. last Tuesday a bright-eyed, birdlike little man named Frederick Merk walked into a Harvard university lecture hall, laid a big gold pocket watch on the lectern and delivered his last regular lecture in a career of 39 years at Harvard.

His name probably will be little known to most Oregon residents, but his influence long will color the teaching and study of American history, and in particular the history of the West. Prof. Merk has been one of the leading continuers of the "frontier thesis" of American history, first developed by his own great teacher, Frederick Jackson Turner.

The "frontier thesis"—revolutionary when it was first presented—is that above all else it has been the challenge of a Western frontier which caused the United States to develop into a great nation and gave it a distinct national character.

Prof. Merk traced the influence of the frontier in his course on "The History of the Westward Movement," a course which

Harvard students nicknamed "Wagon Wheels." He found the pattern of subduing the wilderness everywhere essentially the same, whether on the rocky hills of Massachusetts, the prairies of Illinois or the valleys of Oregon. First came the missionary, the soldier and the trader, then the adventurous, drifting ax-man, after him the land speculator, and at last the industrious farmer and the builders of towns and cities.

In Prof. Merk's eyes, the West still challenges this country, demanding solutions to problems of crop surpluses, resources development and conservation.

Prof. Merk's particular specialty is the history of the struggle between Britain and the United States for control of the Oregon country. He has traced the roots of the eventual boundary settlement not only in the deeds of the actual settlers of the Northwest, but in such remote and twisting recesses as early Victorian British party politics and the closely guarded home records of the Hudson's Bay Company.

He has written comparatively little, his influence being that chiefly of a teacher. One well-known direct result of his inspiration is A. B. Guthrie's grand trilogy of novels on the West, "The Big Sky," "The Way West" and "These Thousand Hills," the second of which won Guthrie a Pulitzer prize. The series was started while Guthrie, a newspaperman on leave, was studying under Merk at Harvard on a Nieman fellowship.

As Prof. Merk enters retirement from the classroom, we Westerners may well hope that he turns to writing the analysis of our history which he has developed for so long in his lectures.

Christian Science Monitor, **May 2**

Now That Rain **Has Come**

The rains came to Texas and Oklahoma. For the first time in a decade there is hope that drought conditions in large areas of the American Southwest may be on the way out. In fact, in some areas the land is so saturated water is running off and causing serious floods.

The drought and the floods add another chapter to the history of the semiarid regions of the United States. For well over 200 years Americans have tended to be profligate with their land, oversettling and overfarming it in time of good rainfall; then deserting it to have it blow away in time of drought. It looks as though another cycle of heavier rainfall is about to begin.

This is a good time, then, to remind the American West that it is not the lush Middle West or the South, but an arid and semiarid region which cannot be farmed as though it were anything else. Suitcase farming, it is true, is not the large problem it once was, but the tendency remains.

It happens that a man who has done more than most Americans to alert them to the nature of the Western country and the danger of overfarming has come into the news, Frederick Merk of Harvard, one of the truly great teachers of American history, is now retiring after 39 years of teaching Harvard students about the Westward movement and about the towering problems of conservation which the dry West faces.

With his whimsical humor, respect for ideas, and integrity, he has inspired scores of young men to take up teaching and historical writing as a career. More than that, their teaching, plus his, has had a measurable impact on public policy with respect to the management of Western lands.

This policy of setting aside forest and park lands, limiting grazing, and stopping misuse through federal legislation has no doubt ameliorated the recent decade of drought. Now that rain has come we must remember that the West cannot afford to forget conservation and careful use of the dry lands.

THE EDITORIALS reprinted are by the following former Nieman Fellows:

Toledo *Blade*, John M. Harrison; Salt Lake *Tribune*, Ernest H. Linford; Portland *Oregonian*, Malcolm C. Bauer; *Oregon Journal*, Donald J. Sterling, Jr.; Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*, Robert B. Frazier; Denver *Post*, Robert H. Hansen; *Christian Science Monitor*, Robert R. Brunn.

Harvard Historian Retires

Merk Makes Mark as Maker of Teachers

By Robert R. Brunn

*Assistant American News Editor of
The Christian Science Monitor*

Cambridge, Mass.

Frederick Merk is a teacher. What is a teacher? A teacher is a person who makes learning an adventure. And when you leave his classroom you want to know more. More important than that, you naturally relate his teaching to things about you.

For 39 years historian Merk taught at Harvard University until his retirement April 30. His subject: "The Westward Movement." In other words, the frontier. It has been a rich experience for Frederick Merk.

For two reasons: What subject is more at the core of American history and the American character? Can there be more reward than seeing your students learn and then make a mark themselves in public policy, and as teachers, too?

Both have happened to Professor Merk.

He taught not "cowboys and Indians" but the history of the real frontier, the struggle with the land in overcoming a continent. In his last lecture in Harvard Hall, in a full classroom, he called the frontier "a glacial movement," "magnificent and majestic" in its making of a nation.

Nor did he forget in his summation of his great course to remind his students that there was financial speculation, exploitation, and violence as the frontier advanced.

There was evidence, too, in that last meeting of History 162 at Harvard Hall that Professor Merk has made his mark as a maker of teachers. For sitting in one of the back rows were two other fine Harvard historians, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and Oscar Handlin, two of "Merk's boys," there to pay their respects.

Many Nieman fellows were there, too, newspapermen having a year at Harvard, many of whom in the last 19 years have sat in the front row. In fact, A. B. Guthrie, as a Nieman fellow, was introduced to the raw material from which he wrote two among the first accurate novels of the frontier, *The Big Sky* and *The Way West*.

Facts have been Professor Merk's undeniable forte. History 162 has been jokingly described as "inch by inch across the continent with Frederick Merk." It was a flood of facts that caught his listeners up and transported them on wagon wheels across America in a way that Hollywood never will.

Then, too, there is now and then a little joke, the wave of a hand, a rather shy smile, and the slender, small figure set against his prodigious subject.

Many of his students are hoping that Professor Merk will now take some of his time to put together the lectures in a history of the frontier.

The work is done in a sense. Since he followed his teacher Frederick Jackson Turner from Wisconsin for graduate study in 1916, historian Merk, as tutor, instructor, and professor, has been collecting material.

A year never went by without additions

to the Merk lectures, and in his last lecture there was mention of the administration's soil bank.

Mr. Merk is the Gurney professor of American History. Beside "The Westward Movement" he taught "The Growth of the American Nation," which he shared with Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. For the past 20 years he has had a special interest in Oregon and has written a half dozen articles and "Albert Gallatin and the Oregon Problem."

Speaking of his career, a Harvard statement says, "Professor Merk put his life's energies into this teaching. He brought to it such seemingly limitless scholarship, such infinite pains, such imaginative teaching, and such dynamic discovery of the meaning and relation of historical facts, as aroused enthusiasm in thousands of students and led scores to become history teachers. He put all of himself into his teaching."

All of this was as true between 9 and 10 o'clock on the morning of April 30, 1957, as it was 39 years ago when he came to Harvard. Coming to pay tribute to a great teacher many forgot their mission in fascination for the subject as he recapitulated his course.

The nation in its movement west, he said, has moved "from wild youth to maturity." He looked beyond the continent to the world as the new frontier. Then a few words of appreciation, and his students rose to fill the room with their applause.

—*Christian Science Monitor*, May 1

The Pulitzer Prize Editorial in Tuscaloosa News

Segregation And Integration

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Today's editorial space is used to reproduce the full text of an address made Friday night by Publisher Buford Boone before the Citizens Council of West Alabama. In it are expressed opinions that also are the editorial opinions of this newspaper, and the speech is presented as today's editorial discussion on a question that continues to be a major problem in the nation.)

If you are surprised to see me here, let me assure you that your feeling is no different from mine. I know how a burglar felt who found himself on the end of a ladder short of an old maid's window. There was a bulldog on the ground. The poor man couldn't go on up, and he dared not climb down. To his utter amazement, between barks of the ferocious dog, he heard the old maid put in a call to the fire department.

"Please send a ladder out here," the old maid said. "There's a man trying to get into my house."

The burglar didn't hear the fireman's protest: "You want the police department, lady," he said. "They handle burglar cases."

"Wait a minute," said the old maid. "I know what I'm doing, and I want a longer ladder!"

You have kindly provided the longer ladder so that I can discuss with you a difficult question to which there are no ideal, easy or pleasing-to-every-one answers. It is not the easiest speaking assignment I ever have accepted. But I believe the problem of segregation and integration is one that needs to be discussed rationally, fully and intelligently. I shall try to be rational. I shall go into the matter as fully as a limited amount of time allows. You may judge whether my remarks are intelligent, and if your chairman wishes to do so I shall be glad, after the conclusion of this prepared talk, to engage in a discussion and attempt to answer any clarifying questions you may have.

Advocate of Order

I was, and am, pleased that you should

have invited me here. I shall not be able to fill the advance billing of—and I quote—"an outspoken advocate of integration," for I believe, and have stated at every opportunity, that the problems to which we turn our attention this evening are most difficult. I know that quick answers are not possible if we are to avoid violence and if we are to maintain good will between the races.

I come, rather, as an advocate of law and order. I shall try to suggest to you some of the things that I believe we shall have to do in the way of adjusting our thinking and our attitudes if we are to continue to stand for law, order and recognition of the courts as the proper places for the settlement of many questions, including those relating to civil rights.

Your organization has taken a position in support of lawful procedures. For it is my understanding, and I ask your correction if I am wrong, that it is the stated policy of this group to take no action outside of the law. I would not expect any other position from a group of neighbors among whom I am honored to live, move and work.

There is a lot I don't know. But I did learn some things on the Georgia farm where I grew up. I've tried on plow handles, and they did fit in my hands. On our hundred acre farm we had a family of Negro tenant farmers. I worked, played, hunted, swam and sometimes fought with the Negro children on our place. Their parents, friends of mine for many years, still live over in our neighboring state. I went to see them recently, and the gray-haired grandmother in whose kitchen I had eaten more than one meal made me proud when she said: "Mr. Buford, you is still my boy."

Too Many Labels

I believe I pretty well understand the Southern attitudes toward the difficult situation in which we find ourselves. There are, of course, varying opinions, and we cannot talk correctly in terms of what the white man or the colored man thinks.

In fact, it seems to me that our prob-

lems are complicated by the ease with which we apply labels and the facility with which we speak of large groups of people as if they were only one individual. All whites are not honorable, upright and fair. All Negroes are not dirty, ignorant, shiftless and lazy. In fact, one of the very greatest things about our country is the privilege of any person to be judged on the basis of what he stands for and what he can amount to.

You may not be as sensitive to this label business as I am. I've been called a "nigger-lover," a Communist, the hired servant of owners of the Tuscaloosa newspaper property who have been incorrectly described as Negroes. And I've even been called a Yankee. There have been other names to which I shall not refer. If any of you here tonight have used such terms in reference to me, I forgive you in the assumption that you must have thought you were right, even though I knew you were wrong.

Let's take a look at the local newspaper situation. The *News* is published by Tuscaloosa Newspapers, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Alabama and chartered right here in Tuscaloosa County. All stock in the corporation is owned by myself, members of my family living here, and one other person who works at the *News* and is our business manager. All directors and officers of the corporation live here in your midst. We, and we alone, are responsible for setting policies aimed at giving you a decent, honest and fair newspaper.

No Easy Job

Publishing a newspaper is not an easy job. Some folks think it should be possible to print the good news and leave out the bad. Some others, reading of developments to which they object, resent the use of news, stories or pictures to acquaint readers with those events. But in publishing the news part of the paper, we try not to be protective or selective, but to give adequate coverage on all events and developments that might be of interest to our readers. We have been criticized for publishing too much and damned for

printing too little. We have been asked to leave things out of the paper and to play up other things. But we have tried consistently, and we shall keep on trying, to print the news impartially, to display it as we newsmen think it should be displayed without consideration for our own attitudes toward the content. We try to do this news end of our job as impersonally and as impartially as a surgeon performing an operation.

On the editorial page comment is printed. We believe in free American citizens having, and expressing, views on important questions such as this one before us tonight. We have, and we always will have, ample space in our newspaper for any person to express himself on matters of current public interest whether we agree with what he has to say or not.

We have had a lot of news, and we have given our views freely in the editorial columns, on developments of a racial nature in Tuscaloosa and the South in recent months. I believe you will agree that you have been kept well informed by our news coverage. If you have disagreed with our editorial viewpoint in any way, let me assure you that your right to disagree is unquestioned.

While the newspaper operating company to which I have referred publishes the *News*, the property itself is rented from another corporation which owns it. This is the same kind of arrangement that exists between the owners of some downtown stores and the occupants of the buildings. The newspaper property is owned by Public Welfare Foundation, a corporation organized for charity purposes in which there is no stock. Its headquarters is in Washington, Virginia. Its trustees, making up what corresponds to a board of directors, and all of its officers are white people.

Have Two Camps

In looking at the difficulties that have developed since the decision of the Supreme Court in May, 1954, it seems to me that much of our trouble has come from fear, from lack of understanding and from failure of communication between whites and Negroes on basic issues. Consequently, we have two camps, with each largely keeping its own counsel, making its own decisions, and reaching its own conclu-

sions on situations vitally affecting the other. Such a situation makes for difficulty, because it promotes the mistaken idea that we have two problems, one for whites and one for Negroes, when actually we have a problem that affects and concerns us all. And, if it is to be worked out with any degree of sanity, both elements are going to have to do a lot of working together.

Many people realize these things. They know, too, that this is not a Southern problem or a Northern problem. We have, instead, a problem of national proportions requiring the understanding, the sympathetic attention and the tolerance and patience of many millions of people living and acting like free Americans should.

We have had some truly wild moments. There have been perfectly serious suggestions that all Negroes should be sent to Africa. Where did your ancestors come from? Personally, I do not care to be sent to Wales, England or Scotland, from which I understand mine came.

And our state Senate, during the height of the racial problem hysteria that gripped Alabama, formally suggested that the federal government should enter into an agreement to deport Alabama Negroes to some other part of the country. Remember, these suggestions have been made about people who legally are free American citizens, entitled under the law to all privileges, liberties and protections you and I expect from our governments.

Some have talked seriously of fighting another Civil War over the issue. Fortunately, I believe, such a rabid element is limited in number. But no less a personage than the governor of Georgia was quoted as suggesting the possibility of such a development in a public address in New Orleans last May.

Had Good Luck

We had some instances here of Negro women being grabbed, shaken and told by strange white men to get off the streets. So far as I know, such cases were few. But some did occur. Some servants became afraid to go home alone. Delivery boys sometimes became afraid to make deliveries.

Fortunately, we came through our most difficult period with no lives lost and little blood spilled. But we had a lot of ammunition sold. A lot of people were ready for a great deal of trouble. We could have

Scrapbook

had it in abundance the day that Autherine Lucy was taken from the campus and was given refuge in a Negro business establishment.

I did not know it at the time, but I learned several days afterwards, that some Negro citizens of Tuscaloosa, fearful that law and order had broken down, armed themselves and surrounded the business place. I also was informed that a carload of mobsters from the University area found the girl's whereabouts and that one of the number went into a place of business operated by a white man and asked to use the telephone to summon reinforcements. Further, I have been told that the white man, upon learning the nature of the call, said that his phone could not be used for such purposes. His refusal might have saved a number of lives here last February 6.

We got by then. But what about the next time? Court orders applying to all Negroes give those who are qualified to enter the University of Alabama the right to do so. Your organization has taken a stand against activity outside the law. What are you going to do when the next Negro student appears on the University campus under the protection of our courts and with the right to expect assistance from law enforcement officers, if needed?

Right now, tonight, you can put off the answer to that question. But sooner or later, and I have no idea how soon or how late it will be, another Negro student will appear on the University campus. Under such circumstances are whites again going to attempt to take the law into their own hands? And if so will you be a party to such mob action either in person or in moral support?

It's easy to blame our troubles on things that are far away. We can criticize the Supreme Court and mentally and orally horsewhip the NAACP. They are convenient targets. But our problem is not the Supreme Court. Nor is it the NAACP. Our problem is with ourselves, and what we are going to do as responsible American citizens to recognize, or deny, privileges which our courts have said are the proper rights of Negroes.

Decision Was Right

I believe the Supreme Court decision had to come and that it was morally right.

Nothing in it is inconsistent with my conception of democracy, even though a background of Southern living, Southern custom and Southern tradition tells me it will be strange to see colored faces at the University of Alabama. But I believe we should prepare ourselves to accept this development, since it has been ordered as rightful and just by our courts.

We are on the front line of democracy. We are being tested as a people, as a community and as a state, and we alone can give the answer on whether we can and will make the compromises and adjustments that will be unnatural, difficult and hard. But make them we must, if we are to stay within the law. If we go outside the law, we deliberately place ourselves in the wrong. Then we become out-laws.

This whole situation, boiled down to a point that every man, woman and child can understand, can be likened to a declaration to the whole world by a community in our midst that it always has made bootleg whiskey, doesn't want to quit, is not going to quit.

This United States is one country. We in the South are outnumbered. We don't like what the Supreme Court has said. But we have been telling the rest of the country to go to hell and we can't do that and get away with it.

They're going to do like you and I would do if one of our communities told us it meant to violate the law as much as it pleased. We'd control them lawfully. So will the rest of this country use the full force of the law on us if we drive them to it.

No Easy Choices

The choices are not easy. But circumstances have made them necessary in Clinton, Tennessee, and in Montgomery, Alabama. We were on the same spot here briefly last February, and with the court decisions standing as they do we could find ourselves back there almost any time.

I anticipate that all other possible legal steps will be taken to evade and avoid compliance. But I cannot see any reasonable possibility of such moves being successful at doing more than delaying the inevitable.

If this is a correct appraisal, and I believe it is, what are the practical and sensible approaches? First, I suggest that we must accept the Supreme Court's decision in principle and make some moves toward compliance.

Some plan based upon admission of qualified Negro students to graduate and professional schools offering courses not now available in Negro institutions seems to me to offer the best possibility. If, in return for this concession, Negro students could refrain from making other applications to white schools for a period of trial and adjustment, that would contribute to a gradual solution. But we are going to have to make some concessions, whether they be gradual or sudden.

In the public school area, the problem is far more complicated and difficult. I cannot see how integration can possibly be accomplished on any major scale in Alabama anytime soon. Pressure for that development should not be exerted. And if it is done our public school system will be abandoned and possibly wrecked.

School integration has been tried in Washington, D. C. Problems have been many and difficult and I believe the experience there will have a helpful effect in slowing the demand for quick and complete public school integration in the Southeast. But there is no turning back, for the school board in Washington has voted to continue integration regardless of the results.

If a compromise solution is to be accepted at least temporarily, however, the white people of Alabama must continue to push harder for elimination of great differences which have existed in the educational opportunities offered whites and Negroes. Much has been done in the Tuscaloosa area to bring equality of

facilities, but in some other sections little has been accomplished toward this end.

Patience Needed

If we are to work out of this difficult situation, sacrifices, patience and tolerance will be required from whites and Negroes. For whites, the contribution must be in a willingness to give up some of our traditions and customs so as to share more equally the blessings of education.

For the Negro, the contribution must be acceptance of less speed than could be demanded legally in implementation of newly-established rights. Meanwhile, time and attention can be directed by our Negro groups and institutions toward a greater understanding of the responsibilities of first-class citizenship. For there is much responsibility along with privilege.

The reward for such charity and forbearance will be overall betterment of all our peoples. Bitter determination on one hand to give nothing, and on the other to push for everything at once would bring much trouble that I hope can be avoided.

I have no quarrel with you as a Citizens Council for making any legal and ethical fight you might choose to make to preserve a system which you honestly think is just and right. That is your unquestioned privilege in a democracy—the finest system of government yet devised. But if others are refused the same privilege—in fact, if we do not support the right of others to do the same thing—I believe a great mistake will have been made.

Extreme attitudes hold no promise for peaceful extension of the blessings of democracy. I believe that if we really stand for liberty and justice, it must be for all. And I believe that if all of us will combine these great principles with the teachings of our religions, we shall find the correct answers. That is what we must seek—the way that is fair, the way that is just, and the way that is right.

Thank you for all the help you can give in trying to find, and to follow, that way.

USIA and the Press

Senators Debate Ethics of Agency Buying Stories from Reporters

(*Congressional Record*, May 29.
Pages 7153-7186.)

Mr. BRIDGES. I think there is a need for a strong United States Information Service and a strong program of that kind. But I do not think any member of the committee was happy about some of the situations which came to light.

One matter which came to my attention—and I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he was aware of it—was the information appearing in the House hearings about the rather universal hiring of writers on various American newspapers. I was shocked by that. It is one more indication that the congressional committees must keep in very close touch with the United States Information Service, because it seemed to me that it ran wild in hiring key editorial writers and key newspaper correspondents, who in turn are very enthusiastic about the United States Information Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is available in the House hearings, for the information of all who may care to read and to learn, a list of the special correspondents selected by the USIA in various regions of the country, serving various daily newspapers, who from time to time have been engaged to write special articles. The name of each such person is given, and also the name of the newspaper by which he is presently employed, the subject of the article, and the amount of public funds he has been paid. All that information is available in the House hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I make my statement, I want to be sure that the Senator from Texas will put in the *Record* the information with regard to the employment by USIA of persons employed by newspapers. Did he agree to do that in his colloquy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say that the information appears on page 345 of the House hearings. That information relates to approximately 475 writers, many of them employees of news-

papers throughout the country, from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic coast. These persons have been employed by the USIA for special articles from time to time. I believe the period in question extended over 18 months.

Approximately 475 persons were involved and approximately \$70,000 was spent. One individual, employed by a St. Louis newspaper, received approximately \$1,800 in a little more than one month for special articles. I do not know the conditions under which these persons are employed, that is, whether the director reserves to himself the right to employ them, or whether it is the assistant director. I know that the information is available. If the Senator desires it, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the *Record*; or he may ask unanimous consent to insert it in the *Record*.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], through inadvertence, I stated that an individual employed by a St. Louis newspaper received approximately \$1,800 in a little more than one month for special articles he had written for USIA.

The facts are that a St. Louis newspaperman received \$1,800 in 18 months, whereas another individual, Mr. Michael Lever, received \$1,800 in a little more than one month.

In a rapid exchange, the two separate facts became merged into one, and I wish now to make the record abundantly clear. I do not know where Mr. Lever resides. The record shows that he is a writer who received \$1,800 in a little more than a month; whereas a St. Louis newspaperman received \$1,800 over a period of 18 months.

I desire the record to be clear, so that no false impression will be left and no one will be done an injustice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not know that this was going on until the very last stages of the conference.

I had overlooked it. I thought I had looked at most of the House hearings, but I did not see it until the conference. Although I had known that the USIA was employing former newspaper employees, persons who had left the employ of newspapers, I certainly did not know that they were employing persons who were working with newspapers. To employ persons who are still working for newspapers and influencing the publication of newspapers, strikes me as a rather questionable practice. That may have some bearing on the universally favorable press for USIA that I have observed during the last few days in which this matter was under debate in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is an illustration. It may be extreme, or it may not. I should like to have every Senator aware of it, particularly Senators who would insist on increased appropriations.

On October 19, 1955, Arthur Daley, of the New York *Times* sports department, was paid \$100 for a story on Casey Stengel and the New York Yankees baseball club.

On May 31, 1956, a Mr. Walter W. Cunningham, who seems to have written many articles for USIA, one for as high as \$400, for press coverage on a Salute to Rome, was paid \$20 for a story about the Harvard Glee Club.

I do not pass judgment on the propriety of such employment, or the necessity for the articles in connection with our foreign policy. I simply say that I was startled; that my attention was arrested, and that I became determined to go to the bottom of it. I am very fearful that if we pursue such a policy and place in a propaganda agency or in any one man, whether he be a modern Democrat or a modern Republican, the power to go out and employ people from various newspapers throughout the country and pay them so much a piece to write articles about glee clubs, about the New York Yankees, and other things; it might lead to having a Government-kept or, at least,

a Government-directed press to the tune of perhaps 500 or 600 writers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Texas has placed that information in the *Record*. Of course, this bears upon the basic principle of the free press under our constitutional system. To some extent, when the Government begins to subsidize the press or the writers for it, the press is no longer free.

I think this practice ought to be stopped, and Congress ought to stop it, if the administration will not. The situation is quite different if the employee is someone who formerly was with a newspaper. That is his profession, and such employment would be legitimate.

But to employ a person who is now employed by a newspaper and to have him working in a dual capacity by having him, in a sense, on the Government payroll and accepting pay from the Government at the same time he is on the staff of an important newspaper, is, I think, contrary to good public policy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I must confess that I am somewhat disturbed by the moral and ethical implications of the points raised about newspapermen being employed by the United States Information Agency. One reason why I am disturbed is that there is a definite inference that a member of the American press would, ipso facto, give favorable coverage to the United States Information Agency because he received \$100 for writing about the New York Yankees, or \$80 for writing about the Harvard Glee Club, or \$150 for writing about the national forests in Idaho. It is difficult for me to believe that the members of our journalistic profession are thus readily contaminated.

I decline to believe that any Member of the Senate has his viewpoint contaminated because he may accept thousands upon thousands of dollars from big business or trade unions. But I do not see how the Senate can say its Members are not influenced by campaign contributions, while some newspaperman will have his attitude and his coverage affected because he may take \$80 or \$100 from the United States Information Agency for actually composing a piece of prose or any essay which the Agency can use in disseminating information

about the United States to countries abroad.

Perhaps I am wrong, but I think morality is indivisible. I do not see how we consistently can erect any higher standard for the representatives of the press than is established for those who hold the highest offices in the Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is raising, of course, a question of ethics and morality, which I think is a very subtle and difficult one to deal with off-hand.

In such a case, I think the public policy properly prohibits the Federal Government, by means of the RFC, from lending money to newspapers. Newspapers have a very special protection under the Constitution and under the traditions of our democratic society; and the other day I drew a distinction between newspapers and the United States Steel Co. or any other company, in the case of such a special relationship. The newspapers create news and mold public opinion. A free press is considered essential to the healthy and lively functioning of a democratic system.

I only say that as a general principle it is a bad policy for a Government agency with large amounts of money to spend to be permitted to employ existing employees of newspapers and to do so on a more or less permanent basis. In the hearings we see the names of literally dozens of employees of important newspapers.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My point is that there are no more members of the press corps who are subject to improper influence by accepting fees for writing for the United States Information Agency than there are citizens in politics who are subject to improper influence in political life by accepting campaign contributions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not make such a comparison. I did not make such a statement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I cannot believe that the attitude of these journalistic men toward public policy is for sale, or that it is influenced by having them write for the United States Information Agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I do not want the *Record* to indicate that either the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Arkansas has said that anyone is

for sale, or that anyone has acted improperly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to conclude my part of the discussion regarding the practice of the United States Information Service to employ, from time to time, journalists on the staffs of various United States newspapers, in order to have them write various articles and essays used by the United States Information Agency.

I was pleased to hear the able Senator from Texas announce that he was withholding judgment until a further examination of the matter could be made. I believe that is an advisable policy. In my opinion, the average journalist is honest and ethical, and I do not believe his political views will necessarily be influenced by what he has written for the United States Information Agency.

The Senator from Texas said we should note the geographical distribution of the newspapermen employed. I would remind him—and I am sure he would agree with me on this point—that if the United States Information Agency is to present abroad an accurate picture of life and culture in the United States, it is necessary that those who provide that information and material be selected somewhat on a broad geographical basis, so that the entire nation—throughout its length and breadth—will, as a result, be portrayed.

In conclusion, I would add this one comment. I believe the tendency of this kind of employment must be analyzed, when we examine it for any possible sinister purposes or any result which would jeopardize a free press in this country. If the men were employed to write political tracts, to write material favorable to the United States Information Agency, to take a side in partisan politics, I think that is one thing, and I certainly disapprove of it. If they were hired merely to portray what life is like in the United States—whether it is about athletics, music, geography, recreation, scenery, or wildlife—I would say that is quite a different thing than employing them to take a side in some partisan political matter, to urge some particular Government appropriation, or to take the side or slant or bias of some particular agency.

Tom Murphy Vs. Dynamiters: Long Campaign Was Not Against Unionism, But for Fair Play

By EDWARD J. DONOHOE

Times City Editor

Let me tell you about a fellow named Tom Murphy.

He happens to be a newspaperman.

But more than that, he is a citizen who believes in the American way of life . . . in orderly process, human dignity . . . in fair play, and in moderation.

Tom Murphy is a quiet man, but he is a fighter, too.

His rugged Irish face, disarming smile and gentle voice do not betray the intensity of the burning, hereditary love of freedom that has been his trademark over some 60 eventful years as reporter and editor of the *Scranton Times*.

He is no Johnny-come-lately in the defense of human rights. And nowhere in the vibrant editorials which fill the pages of Tom Murphy's long journalistic lifetime has it been written that he ever chose expediency over the dictates of his conscience.

In what kind of community does Tom Murphy live and work? What did he do to safeguard those principles of fair play and moderation upon which the American tradition is based?

Not, necessarily, the ancient traditions that bulwark powerful, articulate rights such as free press, free speech and freedom of worship, but the newer brand that guarantees to the lowliest or most ordinary citizen, under the law, the fullest privileges of thought, decision and action.

And even more, in this complex age, a guarantee of the modern application of fair play, assuring complete, uninhibited protection, also under the law, from vandals who, by unlawful acts, would wantonly seek to deprive any American of his rights.

I give you this example:

* * *

Scranton, Pennsylvania, where Tom Murphy has labored long as Associate Editor of the *Times*, is known as "a union town."

Here, John Mitchell organized the coal miners and as president of the United Mine Workers of America, led them through one of the most violent eras of this nation's industrial life.

Tom Murphy and John Mitchell were friends.

Here, in Scranton's Cathedral Cemetery, John Mitchell lies at rest. Here, on Scranton's Courthouse Square stands an imposing granite likeness of frock-coated John Mitchell. It is America's first such memorial to a labor leader, built by public subscription.

Tom Murphy has written many editorials on the significance of Mitchell Day (Oct. 29) when hard coal miners suspend their labors and place floral wreaths at Mitchell's feet.

Miners Once Marched

In Tom Murphy's time as a *Times* reporter, tens of thousands of miners marched around Courthouse Square in celebration of economic gains won for them by John Mitchell.

Yes, and in Scranton, even before John Mitchell, lived Terrence V. Powderly, Grand Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, the secret labor union which was the forerunner of the American Federation of Labor.

Tom Murphy came to know Terrence V. Powderly, too. A colorful and controversial union figure, "T.V." was thrice-elected mayor of the City of Scranton, the first "labor mayor" on the American scene.

And what about Tom Murphy's own personal participation and contributions to the cause of organized labor?

* * *

Before the turn of the century, Scranton had become known as a "newspaper graveyard." It was said that a good re-

porter worked only long enough on some publications to earn the price of a train ticket out of town. Tom Murphy helped organize Scranton Newswriters Union No. 3 which brought that unpleasant era to an end.

* * *

Charter Member Twice

Labor union charters were obtained by Scranton newspapermen in 1904 and again in 1907. Tom Murphy was one of the incorporators both times. He planned and worked in behalf of the union with other visionaries of that day: John F. Sullivan of the *Boston Globe*, noted labor writer of his time; John P. O'Connor, brother of the famous "Tay Pay" O'Connor of England, and many more.

That union and its successor, the American Newspaper Guild, have had more than a half century of uninterrupted contractual relationships with Tom Murphy's publishers. Within the same newspaper framework are a variety of other unions, each with its own history of amicable, gainful and mutually beneficial dealings with the *Times* management.

* * *

Greatness, circulation and affluence came to Tom Murphy's newspaper as over the years it championed the rights of labor. It defended the miners through the dark days when feudal coal barons were invoking their "divine right" to do what they pleased with a God-given natural resource. Tom Murphy's editorials contributed much to this success and prestige.

Editorially, under his aegis, and in the news columns, all labor disputes were treated on their merit, equity and relation to the public interest. Always, there was constant awareness of the fact that there are two sides to every controversy and that any given situation can generate contradictory interpretations. As Tom Murphy often observed: "It all depends

on which side of the street you're walking."

In this favorable climate, unionism in Scranton has flourished for more than a half century.

Indeed, it is "a union town."

And Tom Murphy, union charter member, likes unions. He couldn't feel otherwise.

But let's not forget. Tom Murphy believes, above all, in the American way of life . . . in fair play, and in moderation.

* * *

Andrew Ruby, a middle-class dental technician, decided to build a home for his family. He chose a plot of ground only about two miles from the central city business district.

Wage rates of building tradesmen are high in Scranton. It is "a union town." The only construction work that isn't "union" falls into the "do it yourself" category.

Andrew Ruby decided to utilize non-union labor, or in any event, he elected to deal with a contractor who wasn't "union." He had a right to do so, if he felt like it. There's no law against it.

His builder, Edward Pozusek, began the job. Shortly, he had "visitors." There was some tough talk about somebody "getting ulcers" if union labor wasn't employed.

Edward Pozusek, who lives some 16 miles from Scranton, was not persuaded to go along. He kept his men working.

* * *

Sometime after midnight on May 1, 1954, a charge of dynamite was set off in the basement of Andrew Ruby's partly completed home.

Police were called. Damage was not extensive, in fact it was quite minor. But the technique of "goon squad" was unmistakable. Tom Murphy's newspaper gave the story a pretty good play in the news columns, others paid little or no attention.

Forty-eight hours passed. The investigation lagged. No one seemed overly interested. Perhaps it was cynicism, probably it was simple public apathy. That might be par for the

course in "a union town." When good wage scales are threatened, not many unions stand idly by—but there are effective legal pressures, too.

Here, however, was a clear, open challenge to the principles in which Tom Murphy believes above all, in the American way of life . . . in fair play, and in moderation . . . 20th Century style.

* * *

On the second day after the dynamiting—there was an intervening weekend—Tom Murphy sat down and wrote an editorial: "Get the Dynamiters." It was calm, mild and reasonable. But those who knew Tom Murphy recognized his hallmark. He had enlisted for the duration.

This was the first of many editorials.

Police statements to reporters that the dynamiting baffled them, left Tom Murphy unimpressed. His first editorial had pointed out that the identity of the "visitors" to Andrew Ruby's home was no mystery. From the beginning, he urged that Scranton police, if they "find themselves stymied," should avail themselves of the crime detection facilities of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Writes Provocative Editorial

Weeks passed and nothing developed. Tom Murphy's seventh editorial was a provocative one: "Are the Dynamiters Laughing?" There had been no apparent change in the earlier disinterest of townspeople. Perhaps their attitude had by this time resolved to cynicism.

Union circles, generally, swung to the view that Tom Murphy, friend of long standing, had launched a persecution of organized labor per se. To them it seemed out of focus. Were not the police professing complete bafflement? Other newspapers had yet to publish a single line of editorial opinion on the dynamiting. No one but Tom Murphy, really, seemed to care whether arrests were made. Why not forget about the whole thing? Nobody was hurt, much.

During the first 10 weeks following the dynamiting, Tom Murphy wrote 11 editorials, repeatedly demanding that the city investigation be broadened. It

was after the 11th editorial that the District Attorney's office entered the probe, along with crack men from the Pennsylvania State Police.

* * *

On Oct. 8, 1954, five months after the dynamiting, the augmented police detail arrested one Paul Bradshaw, a minor union figure, an ex-prizefighter, reputed to be a "strong-arm guy." Subsequent events were to show, after the roof fell in, that he wasn't so tough, at all.

Bradshaw pleaded innocent but a Criminal Court jury did not believe him. He was convicted on Saturday, Feb. 5, 1955. On Monday, Feb. 7, his first publishing day following the conviction, Tom Murphy told colleagues: "Watch things happen from here in."

Then Tom Murphy wrote another editorial: "Now Get The Others."

* * *

Thereupon ensued feverish activity back of the scenes.

Bradshaw, sweating out the prospect of a long penitentiary imprisonment, called a "conference" in the apartment of his sharp-witted girl friend.

The room was "bugged" for a hidden tape recorder. Everybody had lots to say about the Ruby job, including the invited "guests" who didn't know, of course, that a concealed microphone was recording the discussions.

"Music Starts Going 'Round"

Not long after, Bradshaw decided that he was not going to take the rap alone. He "sang." The first perjured lyrics—there were variations as time went on—implicated four accomplices, small-time hoods like himself.

They pleaded guilty in Criminal Court.

Now there were reports that the case was ended with the hoods behind bars and Bradshaw, referred to flatteringly by his accomplices as the "master mind," awaiting sentence. These reports were given widest currency in union circles.

Tom Murphy just kept writing editorials: "What About The Others?"

* * *

Then, suddenly, came a Grand Jury

probe, ordered by the President Judge of Lackawanna County.

Six top-flight officials of four big unions in the building and transportation fields were indicted on Sept. 23, 1955.

These men were prominent in community politics, civic activities, etc. They occupied positions of power and influence in areas beyond their union jurisdictions.

The sweeping indictments—felonious use of dynamite, conspiracy, malicious mischief—in varying combinations of defendants, embraced additional figures.

Goodbye, 'Goon Squad'

The grand jury too, had dug into instances of "goon squad" hoodlumism that had gone into the records as "unsolved." Perhaps this was due to someone's misinterpretation of "a union town."

But at the top of the list were those Tom Murphy had repeatedly referred to over the period of his unrelenting editorial campaign as the others."

* * *

For the first time in 16 months, Tom Murphy rested at his editorial labors. Younger colleagues were asked to finish the job.

The top defendants went on trial. When a Criminal Court jury deadlocked, 11 for conviction and one for acquittal, and was discharged, Tom Murphy came forward with the benefit of his long newspaper experience.

The district attorney immediately launched investigation into rumored "jury fixing." One juror was arrested on a morals charge.

The second trial was as lengthy and hard-fought as the first. But this time the verdict was conclusive: "Guilty as charged."

* * *

Tom Murphy wrote all but a few of the 26 editorials appearing in his newspaper between the time Andrew Ruby's home was dynamited on May 1, 1954, and the conviction of the top union leaders on Oct. 23, 1956. He directed the writing of the several he didn't do personally.

The 27th editorial was written Oct. 24, 1956. It was captioned:

"Justice Is Served"

—Scranton Times.

The Truth at Harvard

In confirming Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's appointment to deliver the William James lectures this spring, officials of Harvard University have upheld its reputation for devotion to the pursuit of learning which gives meaning to its motto—Veritas, the Latin word for truth.

Ironically, the group of eight Harvard alumni who had demanded that the appointment of Dr. Oppenheimer be reconsidered had sought to establish a corner on truth, calling itself the Veritas Committee. In a letter to other alumni throughout the country, the group complained that the director of the Institute for Advanced Research Study at Princeton, N. J., has a "highly questionable moral background."

We are not sure what the Veritas Committee considers morally questionable in Dr. Oppenheimer's background. We do know that few men are so well qualified to "analyze the unprecedented nature of our times compared with the high cultures of the past in the rapid increase of knowledge, the multiplicity of human communities and the increasing difficulty of communication"—the assignment he has undertaken in these lectures.

By participation in and leadership of the actual development of the thermonuclear forces which have so overpowering an influence on our civilization today and by a demonstrated inclination to analyze their impact on human beings and human problems, he has proved himself a uniquely qualified philosopher of this atomic age.

There may be room to question the wisdom of some of Dr. Oppenheimer's individual acts in the past. This probably can be said of most of us—including most other philosophers and scientists. But there are very few among us who have had our loyalty and our morality examined by two quasi-judicial groups in Government who have specifically endorsed our loyalty even as they withheld security clearance.

* * *

In choosing him to deliver the William James lectures, and in standing by its choice, Harvard has made another important contribution to the pursuit of truth.

—Toledo Blade,
March 28.

N. Y. Herald Tribune, May 27 A Guest Editorial

By William J. Miller

From time to time the Herald Tribune will print opinions of writers and periodicals on subjects of current interest, in the form of guest editorials written especially for our readers. Mr. Miller is an editor of Life and a North Carolinian.

"Virginian"—that is a proud name to wear. The father of our country was a Virginian. The golden voice of our rebellion was a Virginian's. The author of our independence was a Virginian. The institution of our government under law is, in a sense, the lengthened shadow of a Virginian chief justice. A Virginian said: "We must make the world safe for democracy." And so we must.

On May 17 Virginia celebrated its founding at Jamestown in 1607. It was a homecoming banquet for those of its distinguished sons all over the land. Their number, and their far-flung distribution, honored their mother state, proving it still fruitful of American greatness.

But an ugly thing marked the occasion. Some of the distinguished Virginians first invited were later "uninvited." The list was compiled from Who's Who and only too late did the banquet committee discover that Who's Who applies no color test for distinction. Consequently, invitations went to five Negro Virginians, who were asked to return them. This hardly does credit to Southern hospitality, much less to Virginian gentlemanliness. It seems downright ill-bred. It seems, in fact, boorish.

It is sad that Virginia's measure of distinction should be so much at variance with the nation's. It is hard enough for any man, white or black, to achieve distinction. It might be argued that to do so, with the added handicap of color added to the obstacles faced by all of us, makes the accomplishment all the greater and all the more worthy of note. Such men deserved a preferred position at the Feast. But instead the insult of public humiliation was added to the intended original injury of exclusion. What a travesty on democracy, on gentlemanly conduct, on *noblesse oblige*.

It is even stranger because Virginians,

Scrapbook

however they felt about civil rights, have never refused to sit at the same table with Negroes. Many Virginian leaders have done so on many occasions. This new tactic must be some strange aberration growing out of resentment over the Supreme Court's rule of law, which John Marshall did so much to establish. If so, it is an unmannerly one. And we are glad to see that at least one Virginia gentleman, Lambert Davis, director of the University of North Carolina Press, refused to attend such a dinner. We would go so far as to wager that there are enough other such Virginians of distinction as to get up a banquet which would include colored Virginians of distinction. It would be fine if they did.

But for those who perpetrated or by their silence condoned this public outrage, we should like to remind them of an episode that happened in devastated, impoverished Richmond not long after the stillness at Appomattox. One Sunday, in the middle of services at the leading Episcopal Church an elderly white-haired ex-slave walked down the aisle and knelt, in his rags and tatters, before the altar. A buzz of anger ran among the members, until an elderly, white-haired, white Christian rose, with a soldier's stiffness, in his front-row pew, and went forward to kneel beside his black brother. The man was Robert E. Lee.

William Miller is an editorial writer for *Life Magazine*. He was a 1941 Nieman Fellow.

"Dr. Livingston, I Presume."

After two months in Moscow for the *New York Times*, Max Frankel writes in *Times Talk*:

"There is no doubt we are getting acclimated. Irving Dilliard of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* got lost in the capacious caverns of the Metropole hotel the other day. After receiving instructions from a stranger named Frankel, he asked, politely: 'Where did you learn such good English?'"

Needed: A New Design For the Presidential Press Conference

In the British parliamentary system, the leaders of the government—including the Prime Minister—are regularly subjected to questions at each session of the House of Commons. In the American system, such questioning of the chief executive has only one close equivalent: the presidential press conference. This week President Eisenhower, who started out haltingly at these ordeals, held his 100th presidential press conference. It was apparent that he has become complete master of the situation. But it was equally apparent that the presidential press conference—in its present format—is a tattered instrument for putting questions to the President and reporting his replies to the public.

At the 100th Eisenhower conference this week most of the 270 newsmen gathered in the Indian Treaty Room of the old State Department building had well-prepared questions in mind. In the 33 minutes that the conference lasted, 26 of them actually got to ask their questions. But they did not have a chance to follow up their original questions; and their fellow newsmen did not do the job for them. As a result, when one reporter asked about the ban on admitting correspondents to Red China and received an unclear answer, before he could request clarification, another reporter was firing away on a different subject. The topics switched politely but chaotically from the trouble in Montgomery, Ala., to the satellite revolt.

Out of this welter of give-and-take, a number of news stories developed. But with the ground shifting so fast and each newsman vying for a precious opportunity to make himself heard, more questions were left unanswered than were answered. There was no opportunity—and there rarely is at a presidential press conference—for the orderly pursuit of a point that has been raised but not answered. It was not the President's fault, nor even the fault of individual reporters. It is the fault of the system.

The system, of course, has its virtues. It is completely free, enabling a newsman

from the Arkansas' *De Queen Citizen* (circ. 1, 037) to compete for an opportunity to question the President with a reporter from the London *Daily Mirror* (circ. 4,664,919). But the price of freedom in this instance is confusion. Isn't there a better way to do it?

There is no fool-proof answer to the question. But we would like to see Washington newsmen, especially such professional groups as the White House Correspondents Association, give some thought to a revised format for the conference. For example, one possible alternative, which is not without flaws, but might be explored, would be to have a rotating panel of, say, four correspondents representing the others present at each conference. For the first 20 minutes the panel might ask all the questions. With the questioning limited to four for the first 20 minutes, the panel would get an opportunity to explore carefully with the President the key problems of the day. (Other members of the press not on the panel would make suggestions to the panelists in advance.) After 20 minutes, the conference could be thrown open to anyone—as it is now.

Legend has it that the first presidential press conference was held involuntarily by John Quincy Adams when he went swimming nude in the Potomac and a female reporter spotted him, refusing to give Adams back his clothes until he answered a few questions. Since those days the press conference has gone through many stages until today it is an elaborate show, recorded, filmed, and televised with complete transcripts printed identifying the questioner by name and newspaper. The modernization has evils as well as virtues.

Washington newsmen should energetically and seriously set themselves to the task of working out new ground rules and perhaps a totally new system that would make the press conference of today a valuable instrument for putting questions to the President rather than the frenetic grab-bag it has become.

—*Newsday*—January 25, 1957.

Still Time to Help Hungary

The confirmation of the facts [about Hungary] by a judicial body made up of impartial small nations now provides an unassailable legal basis for the U.N. to take new action upon Hungary, and to take it quickly.

Cynical and weary men—some of our State Department spokesmen among them—are asking feebly, "What can the U.N. really do?"

The answer is: It can do plenty.

It can reconvene, now and urgently, the General Assembly which suspended its session in March pending this investigation. If the Assembly is not called it will not meet until September.

The reconvened Assembly can demand that the Soviet Union show cause why, if it continues to violate the resolutions of the General Assembly, it should not be expelled.

It can expel the Kadar puppet delegates.

Secretary-General Hammarskjöld, who was long denied access to Budapest but was told recently he can now "come anytime," ought to go there immediately to present this indictment on his arrival and

demand answers. His mere physical presence in Hungary would go far toward halting the execution of patriots. Some 2,000 of them have already been sentenced to death.

Economic sanctions against the Soviet should be considered by the 59-nation majority which voted for this investigation. It will be argued these would not be very effective but the taking of them—as a display of moral opprobrium—is all-important.

A permanent UNEF military force, ready to act in future Hungarys, should be created.

Not only action by the U.N. is needed. A vigorous worldwide protest by individuals and organizations should be made to the Soviet Union. In Warsaw the Polish Writers' Union, even under Communism's eye, has just had the courage to protest it. U. S. and other writers and journalists can demand, specifically, the release of these Hungarian writers now known to be imprisoned: Zoltan Molnar, Gyula Fekete, Aneras Sandor, Joseph Gall, Mik-

los Obersovsky, Julius Hay, Zoltan Zetzky, Tibor Tardos, Balasz Lengyel, Domokos Varka, Sandor Novobaczky, and the world-renowned Gyorgy Lukacs. Let the eight Nobel Prize winners who cabled their outrage last year cable it again, to prominent opposite numbers in Soviet professions. Let British Laborites send a new and sterner protest. Let Pandit Nehru recall his sorrow of December and give it voice anew. Let the U. S. Congress solemnly memorialize the Supreme Soviet on the crime of Hungary.

The Kadar regime, after promising amnesty to the Freedom Fighters, has begun exterminating the survivors. It proclaims: "*We have two paths ahead of us, a merciless government or a state of chaos.*" The U. N. clearly has two alternatives: a somnolent summer undisturbed by the death cries of forsaken patriots, or the path of duty to keep a merciless spotlight upon the murderers so that their guilt will stand clear in the glare of condemnation from the world.

—Life, June 24.

A 9 Million Gallon TV Rating

By Bennett Karmin

Concrete evidence that people desert their television sets during commercials was revealed yesterday with the Bridgeport Hydraulic Co. disclosing that water consumption climbs as much as two million gallons here during video advertisements.

The Hydraulic Co.'s engineers have discovered that there is a direct and accurate connection between the amount of water consumed in a locality and television viewing habits.

Says Donald Loiselle, superintendent of supply:

"With the advent of mass TV, we noticed we were recording momentary peaks on the graphs used to measure the consumption of water at our purification plants in Hemlocks, Trap Falls and Easton."

The peaks were recorded strangely enough on the hour or half hour, sometimes very late at night.

"We tried to figure out why," Loiselle remembers, "but there was no logical explanation. Then we started noticing the TV program schedule. We found the peaks occurred at the end of a popular TV show.

"Apparently hundreds of thousands of persons who were watching the program were getting up just before it was over, in time to escape the commercial.

"The television watchers were either going to the kitchen to drink some water or going to the bathroom. As TV shows became more popular, these peaks increased.

"Then we began to record tricky variations," notes Loiselle. "We found we were getting little peaks between hours. We could almost determine exactly what time the commercials were on just by watching our water gauge."

"Later we began to record small peaks at 11:15 when most of the news programs

ended," continues Loiselle. "After 11:15 our load usually drops off. Why? Simple. Most people go to bed after 11:15 P. M."

But the water company did not reckon with that nocturnal marvel of the age, "The Late Show." Peaks started to crop up at odd hours, further and further into the night. Viewers were using more water and getting less sleep.

Today, the Hydraulic Co. has perfected its water-rating system to a near science and can accurately tell the time of almost any commercial on a popular show.

"A good program can make a difference of 6-8,000,000 gallons in our entire system," notes the superintendent. "We find water consumption increases by about this figure after a good show."

And how are the top TV shows rated by The Bridgeport Hydraulic Co?

Ed Sullivan's Sunday night show is very popular in Bridgeport, judging from the

company's TV water meters, but he can't "draw" the crowd that orchestra leader Lawrence Welk does on Saturdays from 9-10 P. M. When the popular bandleader says goodnight a veritable Niagara flows out of the local reservoirs.

"On May 11, we recorded an increase of 8,500,000 gallons at the end of Welk's show," says Loiselle, a note of awe in his voice. "Jackie Gleason and Perry Como combined never topped more than 5,500,000 gallons."

"One of the times when we catch a heavy load is on Mondays at 9:30 P. M.," adds Loiselle. "That's the time for 'I Love Lucy.' We've given this show a 9,000,000 gallon rating."

Unlike old fashion ratings, The Hydraulic Co.'s meters not only record the popularity of a show but its unpopularity as well.

"If a program isn't interesting," explains Loiselle, "we get a steady load or consump-

tion during the entire show rather than a peak at the end."

The most difficult hours to sell a product appear to be from 11:15 to the last of the "Late, Late Show."

"I can tell you the time of almost every commercial on the late shows," says Loiselle. "Apparently people don't watch commercials at these hours."

The Bridgeport Hydraulic Co.'s ratings are no fluke. The water superintendent of Toledo, Ohio, recently compared the increase in the use of water with TV's Nielsen rating and found there was a direct correlation.

The water popularity method is more accurate during the winter than in the spring or summer, maintenance men point out. On warm nights, many homeowners desert their sets to sprinkle their lawns, thus confounding confusion, and making accurate ratings extremely difficult.

—Bridgeport *Sunday Herald*,
June 23.

For Better Law Reporting

So much has been said and written of late regarding publicity given to courtroom proceedings that some of us may have overlooked the fact that this is just one of many legal subjects dealt with in the news every day. Supreme Court decisions, for example, are a prolific source of news, as witness the recent series of decisions on racial integration. Another is legislation, pending and proposed, in Congress, state legislature and city council. State and federal administrative agencies make a lot of news every day of the year.

We may not think of all this as legal news, because of a tendency to associate the news with the field of its subject-matter rather than with the law. Thus, to a lawyer, the law is the day's work, while a highway is a means of escape from the day's work. Yet toll road legislation, the contesting of highway bond issues, and highway safety legislation, are all legal subjects, and the reporting of them is law reporting.

In fact, Louis M. Brown, chairman of the public relations committee of the Los Angeles Bar Association, estimates that up to 40 per cent of the news space in the average daily paper is devoted to law re-

porting. In one issue of a Los Angeles paper a few weeks ago, for example, he found 29 law news stories aggregating 278 column inches, or about 10,000 words, plus photographs.

It was not a particularly law-newsworthy day—there were no inquests, no indictments, no important criminal trials. He did not count news of politics and politicians, nor of finance, though related to law. His count did include some court trials, arrests, proposed Congressional and state legislation, criticism of laws, a social gathering of lawyers' wives, and a lawyer's European trip. Here are a few of the headlines:

Senate Group OK's Omnibus Farm Bill
Policeman Granted New Trial in
Paternity Case
Four-Cent Letter Postage Asked of
Congress
Deputy Coroner Named
Pollution Claim Action Sought
Teacher Named to Arbitrate Dispute

Several constructive suggestions for the improvement of law reporting have come to our attention. Many faculty members in large schools of journalism have specialized in the reporting of public affairs, including court coverage, and several

available textbooks devote space to methods and terminology designed to assist students in learning to cover trials accurately. An Oklahoma attorney, Paul W. Updegraff of Norman, has proposed in a letter that bar associations offer assistance by—

1. Preparing a handbook for law reporters similar to handbooks for jurors, explaining the judicial system and legal terminology in non-technical language with particular reference to journalistic requirements;

2. Setting up evening clinics for the same purpose, with free lectures by lawyers, followed by questions and answers;

3. Offering such lectures by practicing lawyers to schools of journalism, either as a regular course or on an extra-curricular basis.

A suggestion for consideration by the newspapers themselves is offered by Mr. Brown. He points out that it is remarkable, in view of the predominance of legal news, that no newspaper has an officially designated law department or law editor. They have sports editors, of course, as well as finance, movies, music, society, real estate, science, books, politics, education, and radio-television editors. Actually, various big dailies do have one reporter whose by-line will usually be found over stories having a legal angle. Such a man is Lou Tendler, veterans Detroit *News* reporter, who is a member of the State Bar of Michigan. But we know of no paper or syndicate with a regular law department or law editor.

"If we can have a science editor to write about current scientific developments," asks Mr. Brown, "why not a law editor to write about current legal developments?"

Mr. Brown would have the law editor—

1. Check all stories for legal accuracy;
2. Keep his eye open for recent decisions, new and proposed legislation, bar association activities, even law review articles, of public interest, and offer them to his readers; and,

3. Keep his readers informed about the law behind the news.

Here, indeed, are challenging opportunities for better relations between the legal profession and the press and public.

—*Journal of the American Judicature Society*, Vol. 40, No. 1.

Reviews—

What Was News in 1952?

Slanted News, by Edward A. Rowse. Beacon Press. 137 pp., \$3.95.

This is a study of the performance of the 35 largest newspapers, in handling the Nixon Fund and Stevenson Fund stories in the 1952 Presidential campaign. Edward Rowse is on the copy desk of the *Boston Traveler*. Erwin Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, writes a foreword. It examines precisely the handling of a strategic phase of the campaign. It is first of all notable that a young copy editor should sit down and do this job himself, after great foundations and national newspaper societies had talked about doing it and then let themselves be talked out of it for four years. Rowse has efficiently limited his one-man chore to a key sample of campaign coverage. Using his own nickels to buy newspapers over a period of a week or so, he has simply looked at the record and reported it. Each of the 35 selected papers is given a short chapter of its own, and the story traced there. One might wince at the title. Not all he finds is slanted. The book shows what causes news slants and how papers show their character in the heat of a campaign. There are no surprises in this, or hardly any, if you know the papers. Some will shudder at the inclusion of some of the papers, and complain at the omission of others. But he took them by circulation, the largest. This brings in some of the worst but also some of the best and it can't be proved that if he had doubled the number the balance would have been changed. The biggest reached the most people and presumably their impact was proportional to circulation. It would be highly instructive for those readers now to read this book. We are all against sin and slanted news. But the big question for the reader is: how does your newspaper perform in the clutch? Here a working newspaperman who knows how news is handled honestly, has examined the way the biggest papers dealt with the hottest news of the 1952 race. Some served their readers. Some served their political party. It is a very simple story. Any reader can figure it out. Some papers put the Nixon story on page one. Some buried it on page 37. Some ran it the first edition

(In the summer absence of available reviewers, the editor has gone on a reading binge and offers these book notices and prejudices as a substitute for the usual reviews.)

it would make. Some held it three days until the party managers had figured out a way to minimize it. Rowse just tells you which day and which page, and fills in for you the circumstances of the story's

origin and what was going on that affected it, mechanically, journalistically, politically, in the critical period. A book for the newspaper reader. He needs to know more about the sources of his information, about the origin of the images in his head. It is, after all, his head. The more he knows about what goes into it, the better head it will be. This is an important piece of reporting, a useful job of monitoring the institution that monitors everything else.

The Wisdom of Barbara Ward

The Interplay of East and West, by Barbara Ward. W. W. Norton Co., N. Y. 152pp., \$3.50.

The common sense and convincing clarity of everything Barbara Ward says give distinction to this book. It is a delight to read, just as every talk she has given in America has delighted her audience. The same intellectual quality shows here that led American universities to tumble over each other to award honorary degrees to this British critic of world politics. Here is an economist who can write, a political scientist who knows history and a journalist who has thought and felt deeply enough to have something to say. The power of Barbara Ward reflects her rare combination of talents and character. Wisdom and understanding shine through her pages.

In this book all she asks is that the statesmen and peoples of the West try to understand the East and its massive importance in the world, and learn to co-operate on the essentials of living together. To get to this, she gives a penetrating review of the historic relations of East and West which goes far to explain their lack of confidence in our foreign offices. But if we took the trouble to understand their philosophies and explain ours, she is sure they would find more appeal in freedom than in the police State. But capitalism in their experience is synonymous with imperialism, so it is stupid to face them with a choice between Communism and Capit-

alism. It is insensitive too, to offer them private enterprise when their goal is to build their communities and their ideal is public service. But the West, whose cheap industrial goods destroyed the old village economy of Asia, can help them through to the economic freedom that only industrialization achieves in the modern world. The simple thing then, she argues, is to help, without insisting that they first worship the profit motive. This will all be wasted on the Dulles department. But she is a charming guide in exploring the basic facts of life about Asia.

The book is based on her Beatty lectures at McGill in the fall of 1955. She has since lectured at Harvard, Kenyon and other universities whose audiences will find here the distillation of the many perceptive and lively talks on world politics that they have so often applauded.

Low's Own Story

Low's Autobiography, Simon & Schuster, N. Y. 387pp. \$5.

Here is British imperialism in reverse. Here is the concept of Rhodes' scholarships turned inside out. An irreverent little artist comes up to London from New Zealand and for a long generation his drawings give the world its picture of England—its politicians, its social delinquencies, its foibles, its character. Low, the greatest of modern cartoonists, here gives us his own insights into thirty years

of British politics. He has caricatured the public men, sized up the writing men too, and dealt with the publishers. Low's own story is worth more than a history of modern British politics. The creator of Colonel Blimp has not missed anything. His art and his instinct penetrated to the reality behind the illusions and pretenses of public life. He contrived symbols to illumine the central issue and the moral question. He was a great craftsman and an incomparable social critic. A thorny individualist, bred to the free climate of the antipodes, he never ceased to bring discomfort to all who lived in a stuffy atmosphere. He was uncompromising, but without a trace of the doctrinaire. It made no difference whether he drew for a radical or reactionary paper. His sharp pen destroyed smugness and punctured hypocrisy like a bad conscience. That was his role. He revelled in it and had a vast impact on his time.

Books and Censorship

The Freedom to Read, by Richard P. McKeon, Robert K. Merton and Walter Gellhorn. R. R. Bowker Co., N. Y. 110pp. \$2.50.

This is the report of a commission on censorship, appointed by the National Book Committee, published by a grant of the Fund for the Republic. The three authors are college professors, McKeon a classicist at University of Chicago, Merton a sociologist at Columbia, Gellhorn a Columbia Law School professor. The purpose of the Book Committee, as stated, is to keep books free, make them widely available and encourage people to read them. The study deals with the effect on these purposes of censorship. It describes in detail the varieties of censorship, their bases and motivations, and their effect on books and reading. It includes case studies of censorship drives and community efforts to meet them. It studies the effect of pressures for censorship on libraries and on authors and on textbooks. It takes up the laws in this area and suggests changes in the interest of freedom. All these contents make it a valuable handbook. Beyond that, it is a cogent essay on freedom of the mind.

Freidel's Roosevelt Biography

Franklin Roosevelt: The Triumph, by Frank Freidel. Little, Brown, Boston. 432pp. \$6.

This is why historians should write biography. This is why newspapermen should read biography and history. It is why historians should be writers. This is great biography. It is the third of Frank Freidel's volumes on Roosevelt. He has three more to come. He had given us first *The Apprenticeship*, then *The Ordeal*. Now *The Triumph*, and it is his own too. This is the period of Roosevelt's governorship of New York through to his election as President. Here we see the development of the master politician and the shaping of his leadership. Freidel shows Roosevelt working at the job of becoming President. It was a tough job. He had to keep one step ahead of the entrapments of the Republican legislature, escape from the shadow of Al Smith, evade the fate of affiliation with Tammany, keep in the national spotlight and yet keep uncommitted on national issues while he learned the issues and the men and the strategy that would make him President. Roosevelt never took his mind off this in his four years as governor. This volume is the picture of a man at work building himself up to be President.

Frank Freidel goes about this as methodically and unspectacularly as a man building a fence. He just takes up one piece at a time and fits it in place. But then it's there for keeps and that won't have to be done again. Gradually the structure builds up and you can see all around it and see where it is going and that it will be all of a piece. All the qualities of FDR as the world came to know him are shaped and proven in Albany. Freidel doesn't miss a trick. He's as objective as the stock market tables and as definite. But he sees every angle, and FDR was looking for all of them. FDR fascinates Freidel but he doesn't fool him for a minute. His views of Governor Roosevelt is that he brought more of self confidence than experience to Albany and showed more energy than knowledge about the issues of the day.

But his ordeal had given him fortitude, and he had great human sympathy for the victims of depression. If he had no special insights into the dismal economic problem, he had an inclination to experiment, and this was lucky, when government was paralyzed in inaction to mounting crisis.

He had to learn by trial and error. But when he muffed one, he could always count on the stupidities of the reactionary legislative leadership to make him look wonderful. He had no more ideas than Hoover about dealing with depression. He was as conservative as the bankers while the banks crashed. But he learned, one step at a time, and he had the superb luck of an opposition that never learned anything, until the Republican politicians at Albany lagged even behind the power companies on power policy and behind the bankers on bank law reform. Freidel shows Roosevelt's instinct for the political jugular. He picked the issue that counted most, or avoided the dangerous one. He reached out nationally for the men who had the answers, tapped their brains, cultivated them, gradually won them to him.

Freidel watches Roosevelt's genius for organization grow, and never takes his eye off the wizardry of that incredible political gremlin, Louis Howe, who never ceased building the machine that would carry his hero to the White House. Freidel introduces the Brain Trust, one by one, beginning with Moley. Farley comes into the picture here and Freidel follows him on his glad hand tours and through his infinite rivulets of green ink, spreading the word from Albany to the farthest precinct of the land. He traces the machinations to avoid commitment to either Wets or Drys on the Prohibition issue that became more complex than a Who-done-it. The cunning of the politician enabled Roosevelt to avoid commitment on this or other issues that would have alienated strategic groups. But finally the insight that other politicians lacked led him to seize the dominant issue and convince a stricken land that he was the Moses to lead them out of Depression.

Nothing in the New Deal will surprise

any reader of this volume that ends as the words "New Deal" first catch on, from an accidental phrase in Roosevelt's acceptance speech in 1932.

My only complaint is that there isn't enough Eleanor in this book. We know so much of her later role, and Freidel showed her so heroically in *The Ordeal*, that it seems incredible she should not have been a key force at Albany. She

contributes the instinct that leads FDR to decline the services of Mrs. Moscovitz which would have kept him in the shadow of Al Smith. But after that start, Eleanor seems only to have run a school and a factory and her family, which surely wouldn't have kept her busy for four years. Freidel must be saving her for a big chapter in the fourth volume.

L. M. L.

Schlesinger Starts His Second Age

Age of Roosevelt: End of the Old Order, by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. 542pp. \$6.

This is a modern parallel to the author's earlier *Age of Jackson*. That was one volume. This is the first of three, which suggests that it is easier to distill history after 100 years. Of course newspapers are bigger too, than in old Andy's day. This first volume is really two books in one, and so much the more for your money. Its first 300 pages is *The Age of Hoover*. Then comes a dramatic resume of the preparation of Roosevelt, up to the start of the New Deal. This book is a major event on the historical and literary scene and it is as brilliant as Schlesinger's readers had anticipated. It is of course one of the most ambitious projects a modern historian has assigned himself. And a tough one. Jackson's time was 100 years gone. That book was a refining of historical record, to interpret the main forces and currents of the age from a long look back. It is as natural now to draw the lines of parallel forces 100 years later, as it was for Henry Adams to try the same thing between the medieval and the modern time. But if Schlesinger was to do it, he had to write while the stuff of his second history was still live controversy. Even many of the characters are still living, notably Hoover and Eleanor Roosevelt, who are leading characters in this first volume. A further problem was that Schlesinger himself was well known as a participant in the polemics of the New Deal and still an active advocate of successor Stevenson. So he would be suspect. This problem was aggravated from the fact that the book was done while the rash of so-called revisionist (or reactionary) books, aimed at destroying

Roosevelt, was in full flood. This petty movement seems now to have exhausted its febrile energies without changing the score, any more than similar past attempts to deny the record. But Schlesinger had been engaged in brushes with three Quixotic writers throughout the decade of his work on this book. His frequent effectiveness in writing confusion to the traducers of Roosevelt is reflected now in the venom of 'reviews' from that quarter.

If he gave this problem slight concern, he must have given more to the problem of form, and this he never did resolve—or his publishers either. So we have in this volume two books tied together, and they are one only because the author says so. Presumably if he had stopped when he had finished the book his title describes, he would have had to plan on four volumes instead of three, and the second would have been practically a straight biography of FDR, which his colleague, Frank Freidel, was already turning out to the queen's taste.

All this has mighty little to do with the quality of this exciting book, but it gives reviewers something to talk about. Neither of these factors seems to have got in Schlesinger's way at all.

The End of the Old Order sets the stage for the *Age of Roosevelt*. It tells us where we were when the New Deal was born and what were the conditions that required it. The Old Deal was washed up and the country pretty well washed up with it, fed up too, as it hadn't been in Jackson's time. Schlesinger's chapter headings present all sides of this: *The Age of Business*, *The Economics of Republicanism*, etc., etc. Big business had been in the saddle. Its economics had crashed. It had no ideas to meet the crisis. It had lost face and faith with the country. Ap-

proximately a vacuum in public policy faced FDR when he swept the country in 1932. Everybody has long known this. But Schlesinger paints in the detail. He has given us a human dramatic record of the depression and of the forces that built up to it. Any reporter who covered that epoch will recognize the infinite details and yield the palm to the master hand that has woven these into great dramatic history of an era. It is terrific reporting, and highlighted with innumerable profiles of the dramatis personae who people the period—the politicians, the reformers, the men of business, the depressed farmers, the spokesman for the agony of unemployment. The story of the bonus army in Washington is a classic of historical reporting, and only one of many. The 25-year reunion classes of this June's commencement should be giving this book to their children of a boom time to show them the world that faced the graduate of 1932. Or have they forgotten? Their descendants will not be permitted to forget if they study American history. For the 300 pages that describe the events that led to the crash of 1929 and the slough of 1932 are now a permanent depository of our American saga, and being among the most strikingly written of any pages in that annals, will be a vital force in our historical memory.

The second section of the book is a swift graphic biography of Franklin Roosevelt up to his Inauguration Day. It is probably the most readable writing about the young Roosevelt we have yet had and shows him warts and all in the years when he was just another Roosevelt in politics, and then the years when he realized he could be more than that, and how he realized his chance for a great role.

The student of politics will most appreciate the insights of Schlesinger's penetrating glimpses of the many substrata and conflicting currents of factional and sectional politics that Roosevelt had to come to terms with in that marvellous machiavellian period of making himself the inevitable nominee of 1932. Southern Dries. Big City Wets. Western Reformers. Eastern Conservatives. Hull and Col. House, Wheeler and Tom Walsh, Pinchot and Rascob, Tammany and the Farm Bureau. McAdoo and Hearst. Henry Wallace and Key Pitman. Lick 'em or join 'em, by appeasement or cajolery or compromise

or bluffing, he brought them all into camp. Managing the New Deal must have been second nature after that. But up to 1932 the one proven hero of the book is Eleanor. The proof of Franklin begins in the next volume.

L. M. L.

Modern Text on Journalism

Exploring Journalism, by Roland E. Wolseley and Laurence R. Campell. Prentice-Hall, N. Y. 636pp. \$5.75.

This is a third edition and thorough revision of the text by these two directors of journalism education. A solid, comprehensive work, its subtitle notes its emphasis on its social and professional aspects. It deals extensively with television and radio, with motion pictures, with magazines and books, as well as with the older areas of journalism. Interpretation, public relations and typography are major sections. Well printed, graphically illustrated, it describes the structure of the communications industries and treats their problems of providing a complex society with its vital needs in information. The authors deserve a citation for recognizing style, vocabulary, "good writing" and parts of speech as factors in journalism. This is probably as complete and careful and up to date a journalism text as one is apt to find.

The Heyday of the Review Scotch Reviewers

The "Edinburgh Review" 1802-1815, by John Clive. Harvard University Press. 223pp. \$5.

One hundred fifty years ago the *Edinburgh Review* was becoming the leading critical review in Europe and shaping the trend of 19th century public opinion in Europe, then in transition from the old Whiggery to the new Radicalism of Reform. Like all publications, its tone, character, politics and style largely reflected its editor, Francis Jeffrey, who guided it for 27 years to make it both a powerful political voice and an arbiter of literary taste. A key chapter is on the editor's methods and problems. Another is on the politics of the *Review*. Another deals with the Whig Party. Still another discusses Classical economics and the middling classes. This is a scholarly work in literary history. But it is a gem for a review editor and a classical education for the serious reviewer.

Nieman Notes

1939

The Paducah *Sun-Democrat* published a special 12 page television section, May 30, to inaugurate its new television station, with Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., as general manager. He had been in charge of the paper's radio station and earlier was city editor of the *Sun-Democrat*, serving under his father, who recalled at the dedication exercises that the paper had 1200 subscribers when he took charge 57 years ago. Its circulation is now 104,000.

In his initial broadcast, Ed told his TV audience:

"We are aware that the people of this area have a rather strong feeling about our station—a feeling that it belongs to them. That is another reason we will do our best to live up to all responsibilities of a broadcast licensee. We want them to continue to feel this is their station.

Because of the display of public interest in our venture, I feel certain of an understanding reaction in asking a little patience with all of us—especially during our early weeks of operation. We have chosen to employ men and women from this area in every case where area residents met the qualifications of the job.

Some of our people are new in TV—so am I. We all have much to learn and our early operations may show it. While it will take some time to knit ourselves into a smoothly-working team, we expect to put forth extra effort all around in order to acquire the needed "know-how" more quickly.

Our long efforts to date have enabled us to start operations with a program schedule of which we are, we believe, justly proud. Many a station has gone on the air with less than our programming line-up of some 10 hours a day. By fall, we have every confidence we'll be signing on at 7 A.M. for a full-time day-night schedule."

Irving Dilliard, editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* editorial page, returned in June from a trip around the world. This included a talk with Nehru, a visit with Sharada Prasad, former Associate Fellow from India, and having his picture taken with Capt. Bill Lederer and Mrs. Lederer in Hawaii.

The Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard Commencement was delivered by Louis

M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, whose youngest son, Thomas, was a member of the graduating class. The curator had been, in May, the annual professional lecturer at the University of Montana School of Journalism, and visiting speaker at a journalism seminar at the University of Washington.

1940

William Hodding Carter III, oldest son of Betty and Hodding, was married to Miss Margaret Ainsworth Wolfe in New Orleans on June 21. He graduated from Princeton University on the 18th, and was inducted into the Marines as a second lieutenant on the 25th.

1941

Two national awards have recently come to William J. Miller for editorials of his in *Life* Magazine. The Education Writers Association gave him a special citation for an editorial last September, "How to Help Our Schools." The American Heritage Foundation gave him its magazine award for a November editorial, "Let's Have a People's Election." The New York *Herald Tribune* recently ran a guest editorial of Bill Miller's which is reprinted in this issue. A series he did in *Life* on Hungary led to an invitation to address a meeting of the representation for Free Hungary on April 4 in Carnegie Hall, New York.

The Louisiana State Bar Association gave its first annual press award to George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans *Item*. The silver plaque is in recognition of "a meritorious contribution to a better understanding of the law." Chaplin accepted it on behalf of colleagues, whom he named, who had done a series on the grand jury and other articles about the operation of legal processes in the State.

Lowell Limpus of the New York *Daily News* delivered a lecture at Fordham University, March 21, in the fifth annual Joseph Medill Patterson lecture series. His subject: Role of the newspaper in meeting social responsibilities of modern communications media.

1942

Don Burke of *Time* and *Life* writes May 12:

After nearly four years in London I've come back to the Middle East where I am teamed up with Jim Whitmore, the

photographer. A great change, but a welcome one, from running a large bureau.

We live, by choice, in Greece and cover the Middle East with such areas as India and Pakistan thrown in. We got here in February and have spent most of the time since on the road. We covered the Gaza story, the end of the Suez Canal story and, latterly, the crisis in Jordan. Before Jordan we went to the south of India to take a look at Kerala, the new communist state.

Right now we are home for a short stretch but before you get this it's odds-on we will be off again.

1943

Fred Warner Neal has been appointed associate professor of international relations and government at Claremont Graduate School in California. He held a similar post at UCLA the past year but looks forward to full time with graduate students. He announces also a new son, Alexander Frederick, born Jan. 18.

Thomas H. Griffith has contrived a half year leave from his duties as a senior editor of *Time*, Inc. He and Caroline plan to live and write for six months in southern France.

1946

Charlotte Robling reported she couldn't attend the Nieman Reunion because she expected a baby, her fourth, at just that time. The John Roblings were also moving into a new house. New address: 24 Oak Street, New Canaan, Conn.

1948

The Argonne National Laboratory announced appointment of Carl W. Larsen as executive assistant for public information on April 15. He had served the Chicago *Sun-Times* most of the past ten years and had handled many assignments on atomic energy.

1949

Alan Barth took a ten weeks sabbatical from the editorial page of the Washington *Post* this spring to be visiting lecturer in journalism at the University of Montana. This was an innovation at Missoula. But Barth made such an imprint that they intend now to try to pry some top newsmen off his job for a stretch of lecturing each year.

In May and June the *Christian Science Monitor* featured a series of twenty articles by Robert R. Brunn, assistant Ameri-

can news editor, under the heading Arms in the Atomic Age. It followed a five weeks trip to visit modern weapons and discuss weapons developments and policies with military officials.

1950

Robert H. Fleming, Chicago bureau chief of *Newsweek* since 1954, joined ABC in Washington, D.C., on June 1.

1951

The Portland *Press Herald* sent its editor, Dwight Sargent, on a trip around the world in April and May. This produced one world-wide news story when Dwight gave the wire services the results of an interview his group had with President Nasser of Egypt. He interviewed also the heads of several other nations in the Middle East and Asia.

Bob Eddy has been managing editor of the St. Paul *Pioneer Press* since June 1. Bob spent last year with his family in Europe on a Reid Fellowship and published the family saga in the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Wellington Wales was appointed director of the division of State publicity in the New York State Department of Commerce in May. He had been editor of *Woman's Day* the past year.

1952

The Dartmouth *Alumni Magazine* has an article in its January issue "Mr. President" by John L. Steele, White House correspondent for *Time Magazine*.

1954

Elizabeth and Robert C. Bergenheim announce the birth of a son, Robert Carlton, Jr., on April 14.

1955

Sylvia and Sam Zagoria have a third child, second son, Ronald Jay, born May 10.

William H. French is on a roving assignment in Spain and Italy for the Toronto *Globe and Mail*. After a year of editorial writing, he is now working with the paper's new roto magazine section.

1956

Sharada Prasad was married in Delhi May 19. He is now editor of the *Indian Listener*, Curzon Road Barracks, New Delhi.

Desmond Stone was appointed assistant

editor of the *Southland Times*, Invercargill, N. Z., early this year. He is also writing on special assignments for the McGraw-Hill publications.

NIEMAN REUNION—

A triennial reunion of former Nieman Fellows and families of some of them filled three days of June, 18-19-20 in Cambridge.

The first morning session was on questions about the Soviets, with Prof. Merle Fainsod and Marshall Shulman of the Russian Research Center at Harvard answering the questions.

The first afternoon Prof. Frederick Merk responded to the presentation of a volume of editorials and letters from Nieman Fellows, students of his course on The Westward Movement. Announcement was made of a gift by Nieman Fellows to Radcliffe College Library for books on the history of the West, in honor of Professor Merk, who retired in June.

Robert M. Hutchins and Walter Millis of the Fund for the Republic addressed that session. Mr. Hutchins' subject: "How Can We Maintain a Free Society?" Mr. Millis spoke on "Individual Freedom and the Common Defense." A reception for faculty friends closed the day.

The topic of the second morning was "Information and Secrecy," opened by a talk from Gerard Piel, publisher of *Scientific American*. President Nathan M. Pusey and Mrs. Pusey and Dean McGeorge Bundy joined the group at luncheon. The president and dean spoke after luncheon. The afternoon session was a discussion of problems of relations with the uncommitted peoples of Asia, led by Col. Edward Lansdale of the U. S. Air Force, joined by Prof. Edward Reichauer and Prof. John Fairbank of the Harvard Far Eastern Studies Program.

At a dinner at the M.I.T. Faculty Club speakers were Dwight Sargent, editor, Portland (Me.) papers, Bob Eddy, managing editor, St. Paul *Pioneer Press*, Shane McKay, editor, Canadian edition, *The Readers Digest*, Hazel Holly of the San Francisco *Call-Bulletin*, and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger.

M.I.T. was host to a demonstration of their new IBM Calculator on the final morning. The last event was a clambake at Wingaersheek Beach in Gloucester. Largest attendance, the first day, was 84.