

# **NiemanReports**

---

July, 1958

## **Secrecy, Security and Freedom**

**J. R. Wiggins**

**Hands Across the Caribbean**

**Edwin A. Lahey**

**New Typographical Techniques**

**R. D. Allen**

**The Economic Squeeze**

**George Chaplin**

**Sweden's Decorous Press**

**Gerard Fay**

**The Surrender of Privacy**

**Anthony Harrigan**

**Attribution of News**

**Alfred Friendly**

**The Triumph of Trivia**

**William L. Rivers**

**C. P. Scott on Journalism — Elmer Davis and Tom Stokes — “Through an Asian Looking-Glass” by Piyal Wickramasinghe — “Title-itis” by Robert J. Cranford — “Is Newspaper Humor a Lost Art?” by Karl F. Zeisler**

**Nieman Fellows for 1958-59**

**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, Iowa City; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; 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. XII; NO. 3

JULY, 1958

## Nieman Fellowships For 1958-59

Eleven Americans have been awarded Nieman Fellowships at Harvard University for the college year opening in September, and four foreign journalists have been named Associate Nieman Fellows.

The eleven Americans are six reporters, two editorial writers, one telegraph editor, one science news editor and one magazine editor. One of the reporters specializes in education news, three in labor.

The foreign journalists, appointed as Associates, are selected and supported by the Carnegie Corporation and the Asia Foundation. The Carnegie Corporation is sponsoring newsmen from Australia and New Zealand. The Asia Foundation is bringing two journalists from India and Burma.

The American Nieman Fellows make the 21st group to be appointed for a year of resident study at Harvard under a bequest from Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman to Harvard in 1937 in honor of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*.

The Selecting Committee were: Carl E. Lindstrom, executive editor of the *Harford Times*; William J. Miller, chief editorial writer of the New York *Herald Tribune*; Donald C. Shoemaker, executive director of the Southern Education Reporting Service; Steven M. Spencer, associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*; William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard News Office; Carroll M. Williams, professor of zoology, Harvard; and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The Nieman Fellows for 1958-59 are:

Norman A. Cherniss, editorial page editor, *Riverside* (Calif.) *Press-Enterprise*. He is 32, a graduate of the University of Iowa in 1950.

He started newspaper work at 15 on the Council Bluffs

*Nonpareil*, and continued while in college on the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*. For two years after college he was on the *Evansville* (Ind.) *Courier*. Since 1953 he has been in charge of the editorial page of the *Riverside Press-Enterprise*.

He plans to study the role of the Supreme Court and other constitutional questions.

Evans Clinchy, education reporter, *Hartford Times*. He is 30, a graduate of Harvard College in 1949 and has been on the *Hartford Times* for eight years where he has been music and drama critic. But the last few years he has concentrated on reporting on the public schools of Hartford and educational development in Connecticut. Some of this has been pioneer reporting on classroom work.

He plans background studies in his three fields of education, music and the theatre.

Harold T. P. Hayes, associate editor, *Esquire Magazine*. He is 32, native of North Carolina and a graduate of Wake Forest College in 1949. He started news work with the United Press in Atlanta in 1949. After two years of service in the Marines he turned to magazine journalism, first on *Pageant Magazine*, then as features editor of *Tempo* and *Picture Week*, and for the past two years with *Esquire Magazine* as general assignments editor, planning articles on contemporary American life.

He plans studies in American civilization.

Phil J. Johnson, reporter, New Orleans *Item*. He is 28, a graduate of Loyola University in 1950. He started work on the *Item* while still in college ten years ago, as a sports writer. He has since covered major news developments in his region, including the hurricane disaster last year. He plans to study problems of his area, in economics and sociology.

John Kelly, telegraph editor, *Atlanta Journal*. He is 31, a graduate of the University of North Carolina in 1947. He started on the *Winston-Salem Journal* in 1947, became Sunday editor there and in 1953 went to the *Raleigh Times* as news editor, later managing editor. He joined the *Atlanta Journal* a year ago.

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

Mitchel R. Levitas, reporter, New York *Post*. He is 28, a graduate of Brooklyn College in 1951. He served with the Voice of America two years and has been five years on the *Post*. Besides general reporting, he has done special series on the condition of Puerto Rican workers in New York and on New York's garment industry, and labor union problems.

He plans to study economics, including labor, and modern history.

Perry E. Morgan, associate editor, *Charlotte* (N.C.) *News*. He is 31, a graduate of the University of Georgia

(Continued on Page 26)

# Secrecy, Security and Freedom

By J. R. Wiggins

The struggle for liberty is never ending. Here we are, 223 years after the trial of Peter Zenger, still confronted with the necessity of fighting for the right to criticize the conduct of government.

The challenge to that right now comes in a different form. It no longer is mainly the threat of punishment for harmless publication that the people most fear, although that threat has not by any means vanished. If Lloyd Wright, the chairman of the President's Loyalty Commission, had his way, and the punishments of the Espionage Act were made operative against the press, the right might once again be rescued only by juries so sure of their course as to refuse either to indict or to convict. But this is not now the main threat.

The greatest menace is in another form. Criticism of the acts of government is being obstructed by the simple device of so concealing knowledge of what the acts of government are that there can be no intelligent criticism of policy.

The right of citizens to know is a right of so many parts that it may be variously attacked. It happens to be an attack upon the right to get information that most threatens the right to know about government and the right to criticize it in our time.

The secrecy that has resulted from two world wars, from the cold war, from the growth of government and from the mistrust of public opinion has produced a threat to democratic institutions. A government which rests upon the opinion of a fully informed people is a democratic government; a government which rests upon the uninformed opinion of citizens from whom information has been withheld by the government itself is a caricature of democratic government.

It is only recently that we have come to realize that exaggerated governmental secrecy is a threat not only to our liberties, but that it is as well a hazard to our very lives; not only a menace to our freedom, but a danger to our very survival; not only a reproach to our democracy, but a terrible threat to the very security in whose name it is invoked.

After more than a decade of the most absolute secrecy ever imposed upon the American people in time of peace, the Nation finds itself in deadly immediate military peril, in grave diplomatic difficulty and in ghastly danger of losing its place among the front rank of the nations in an age of expanding discovery in outer space. We have arrived in this awkward posture by processes intended to conceal our strength from our enemies, but which in fact have

served only to conceal our weaknesses from ourselves and from our friends.

Those upon whom we so much depend for our survival—our scientists—warned us that this would happen. Let us look at some of these warnings to which our government would not and did not listen. In hearings starting on March 7, 1956, before the House Subcommittee on Government Operations, a whole succession of scientists voiced their alarms at the effects of excessive secrecy.

Dr. Stanley Livingston, professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said:

"To me it seems essential that the present system of information security be revised if our country is to achieve that long-range strength in scientific and technical productivity required for survival in the modern world."

At another point, he testified:

"Almost by definition, the present system of compartmentalization of secrets restricts and handicaps progress. It is essential that we restudy the usefulness of the concept of secrecy-at-any-cost in the present complex situation. The pertinent question is whether the emphasis on secrecy stultifies progress, resulting in an actual decrease in our national security."

He also warned:

"We cannot expect that we can keep secret broad areas of knowledge without unduly restricting our own progress."

He told the committee:

"I don't mean to be facetious, but I really feel that there is a possibility that if we had no security restrictions whatsoever, we might be further ahead of potential enemies today than we are at the present. I have considered this at some length. I think it is entirely possible from the balance of risks and the speed of development point of view that it might be possible that zero security might have led to more progress."

Lloyd V. Berkner, head of Associated Universities and an eminent American geophysicist, told the Moss Committee at these same hearings:

"By 1945 the United States held unquestioned technological supremacy in both civil and military development. . . . Since that time we have steadily lost ground relative to our competitors until now there is serious question whether the United States actually retains leadership in certain critically important fields of military technology. That this is so, in my opinion, lies not so much in the faster progress

of other nations as in the slowing down of our own technological achievement. . . . In my opinion, an important aspect of this loss of supremacy in certain vital fields of technology stems from our present widespread practice of technological secrecy, consequent clearance and security practices, compartmentalization of science and technology and restrictive practices exercised over science and scientists."

Dr. Berkner listed for the committee what he called "a few of the results of policies of excessive military security and restriction of information and men of science over the past 10 years.

Here is his list:

"1. The free flow of knowledge of scientific progress on which really important creative ideas completely depend has been severely hampered.

"2. A sense of uneasiness has been created in discussions among scientists.

"3. A competent scientist can be put on an important task only after months or even years of clearance procedure.

"4. Very few scientists outside the narrow limits of a classified project can be consulted.

"5. Some of our best scientists have been excluded from contributing to American strength on arbitrary grounds.

"6. Our ordinary textbooks and handbooks are in many cases 10 or 15 years behind the times because so many of the advances made in these years remain classified.

"7. Scientific and technical manpower is in short supply. The attractiveness of the scientific career to the student is so diminished that in spite of substantial pay, the number of those entering these professions has fallen to less than half.

"8. Much American science has been removed from the channels of international scientific communication where more than half of its ideas should be derived.

"9. Many friendly scientists who could contribute much to our progress have been badly treated by arbitrary visa restrictions.

"10. Leading American scientists find themselves blocked from visiting many major foreign laboratories.

"11. A sense of mistrust has been created between the public and the scientist.

"12. A sense of distrust of our policies concerning science has been engendered among scientific leaders of other nations."

Dr. Elmer Hutchisson, Case Institute of Technology, warned of another consequence of secrecy. He said:

"In a democracy, the best safeguard against mediocrity is public criticism. If Government-sponsored research work is kept secret and not put into public competition with free knowledge, the work is very likely to suffer and public funds will be very ineffectively used. It is only natural that if the stamp of secrecy is freely used, it may be used to

cover up mediocrity, inefficiency, complacency and even complete incompetence."

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago, told Congressman Moss and his colleagues that "we should recognize that all scientific and engineering knowledge can be learned by others without our help in any any. . . . Secrets about such things will always be lost completely in time, and in the technically advanced countries this time is short. . . . We recognize that maximum secrecy is not the optimum way to promote security."

Dr. William V. Houston, Rice Institute, agreed that "classification of what might be called basic scientific information, such as the fundamental laws of science, is really rather foolish."

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, National Academy of Sciences, acknowledged that "there is certain information which must be restricted in the national interest, but to keep even that under wraps too long after the necessity for it has passed is restrictive of progress."

Sputnik I and Sputnik II may have surprised many Americans, but they were not much of a surprise to the scientists who nearly two years ago tried to tell the American people that secrecy was shackling American science.

Since this spectacular demonstration of our disability, the scientists have spoken again:

Even Dr. Edward Teller, writing in *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, said: "It would seem to me that henceforth it is less important to keep our secrets and more important to produce additional knowledge and additional technical tools. Our security lies in speed; our allies could be most helpful in our efforts to attain it."

Dr. Berkner, also in *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, cited the opportunities we had lost by clothing our atomic developments "in a shroud of secrecy imposed by our preoccupation with military security."

Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, National Academy of Science, writing in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, asks:

"Are we not at last confronted by the tragic consequences of a false feeling of security given by authoritarian attempts to preserve 'secrets' of scientific effort? Before this bureaucratically imposed secrecy destroys what it purports to preserve, would we not be wiser to reconsider it as a national policy, and try instead to restore science to its traditional free, open and democratic state, so that scientists may really help to protect and to extend those freedoms which we profess to cherish?"

He points out that only since the Sputniks "have our people had a chance to see how our own scientific progress can be retarded by interfering with the free exchange of scientific ideas."

As Walter Millis has said in his recent pamphlet, "Individual Freedom and the Common Defense:" "It is rather



suddenly discovered by responsible officials, many in the armed services themselves, that our excessive preoccupation with secrecy and security is an important reason for the relative backwardness of our missile program."

Dr. V. Lawrence Persegian, dean of engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, puts his finger right on a cause of our scientific weakness to which few public men have addressed themselves. He declared on December 15:

"The government's heavy secrecy control has discouraged thousands of the top scientists in American colleges from adding their talents to solve the key problems of the guided missile, satellite, atomic energy and other major technical projects."

President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message said:

"We cannot afford to cut ourselves off from the brilliant talents and minds of scientists in friendly countries. The task ahead will be hard enough without handcuffs of our own making."

Unfortunately, the President did not say anything about other handcuffs of our own making that are preventing Americans from sharing scientific knowledge with other Americans. We need to amend, not only those sections of the Atomic Energy Act which keep us from cooperating with our allies; we need also to amend the sections of the law that keep American scientists from working with each other. The first thing we ought to do, if we wish to free American atomic science to achieve its top potential, is to strike out the sections of the law that make all atomic discoveries secret at birth. This stifling, suffocating provision has slowed the progress of science, deferred the peacetime uses of atomic energy and handicapped even our weapons development.

The Gaither Report (officially still a secret) and the Rockefeller Report have shocked the American people by surprising disclosures of the dangerous state of our defense, and the even more dangerous disadvantage under which we are going to exist if current faults are not speedily remedied.

The relative secrecy in which the Defense establishment has operated has made even more dangerous to society the historic tendency of governments to purchase current popularity at the cost of defense.

Only now, in the gravity of our plight, can we see and understand how dangerous it is to confine to a privileged power elite the knowledge necessary to the formation of opinion on the soundness of defense policy. And how this danger multiplies when this elite is composed entirely of those whose professional and political future depends upon escaping criticism for the policy decisions which are concealed from the general public!

It is to be hoped that this crisis will at last persuade the American people how dangerous secrecy is both to their

liberties and to their defense. It is secrecy that has denied them knowledge both of the weakness of American military power and the strength of Soviet military power. Is there any one who dares to hold the popular intelligence in such contempt as to suggest that if the American people had known of their own military shortcomings and of the Soviet gains, they would have applauded or supported policies certain to bring us to the brink of military ruin? No one dares to say it. If the people had known the whole situation, no considerations of a balanced budget or an intact debt ceiling would have calmed their clamor for actions aimed at righting the deplorable disadvantage under which we labor.

Our secrecy has frustrated the work of our scientists, complicated the tasks of our defense personnel, concealed delay and inefficiency, hidden the consequences of budgetary limitations and prevented the healthy operation of public opinion. If secrecy continues unaltered and unabated, it will end by destroying either our democratic institutions or our defenses or both.

One would like to say that surely now, after all that has happened, there no longer is any confidence in secrecy. One would like to say that with assurance. But it is not possible to do so.

We have had proposals for increasing appropriations, for furnishing more funds for science, for education, for defense, for otherwise repairing the consequences of our secret policies. We have not yet had a forthright and frontal attack upon the secrecy that is responsible, along with parsimony, for the precarious plight in which we find ourselves.

It is by no means our military posture alone that secrecy imperils.

Our diplomacy as well is blighted by our addiction to secrecy. At the very juncture when the price of secrecy is mounting up and up, we hear voices raised in behalf of old-fashioned secret diplomacy.

This nostalgic yearning for ancient secret forms of diplomacy displays an unwillingness to acknowledge that we are not operating in the climate in which old-fashioned secret diplomacy worked. As Dr. Henry Kissinger has warned: "Diplomacy has a different function in a revolutionary international order" like that imposed by Soviet Russia. He points out that "diplomatic conferences become elaborate stage plays which seek to attach the uncommitted to one or the other of the tenders." A conference is no longer just a "struggle to find formulae to achieve agreement," but becomes "a struggle to capture the symbols which move humanity." He admonishes us that by "failing to cope adequately with their psychological aspect, we have given the Soviet Union unnecessary opportunities."

Sydney D. Bailey, writing in the British magazine, *History Today*, has traced Soviet diplomacy from its begin-

ning. He pointed out that even at Brest Litovsk, the Bolsheviks had a double and linked purpose: "to secure the best terms they could for their country and to bid for the support of world opinion."

To attempt closed or secret negotiations with such a power is an exercise in futility. Since the Soviet press is an arm of the state and enjoys access to the deliberations which are secret to the press of all the rest of the world, there is no effective secrecy. There is only secrecy for that part of the proceedings which the Russians find it advantageous to conceal and publicity for that part of the proceedings which serves their diplomatic, political and propaganda purpose. Yet, in conference after conference we have collaborated in helping them achieve to their advantage this one-sided secrecy. And at some conferences we have even been the first to insist upon a secrecy which has kept nothing from the Russians but everything from our own people. Cautious and circumspect American briefings have diminished but not eliminated the damage.

A faithful adherence to the spirit of open conduct does not preclude the man-to-man, personal, informal contacts of every international gathering. They are often as im-

portant as the official conferences and sessions. Nor does the open record preclude the give and take of ordinary diplomacy by preliminary conference and conversation and correspondence. What citizens have a right to ask is that statesmen conduct themselves in the spirit of the philosophy that the people have a right to know about proceedings at which their lives, their property and their country are at stake.

In the age through which we have been passing, secrecy has put us in grave peril. It will be even more dangerous to use in the age we now enter. We stand, for better or for worse, upon the threshold of a new age of science and discovery.

With this new world, secrecy, and all like devices for confining the human mind and spirit, will be even more incompatible than they have been in the old world that is forever left behind.

---

Mr. Wiggins is executive editor of the *Washington Post*. This is from his Zenger Awards address to the Arizona Newspaper Association, January 25.

---

## The Surrender of Privacy

By Anthony Harrigan

Since the first settlers came to these shores in the 17th century the right to privacy has been stressed time and time again. Freedom from unwarranted intrusion and the surveillance of the community has been deemed to be among the most desirable features of life in a land wedded to libertarian principles. Presidents, artists, billionaires, scientists—even newspapermen—have been among the seekers after privacy. The belief has prevailed that there exist areas of a man's life that should not be exposed to public view.

Despite this centuries-old belief in the right of reasonable privacy, a condition has developed in recent decades that negates almost completely this important right. One exaggerates not at all when one asserts that Americans today live a goldfish bowl existence in comparison to the life led by their forebears. Strange and tragic as it seems, not a few Americans have learned to enjoy and revel in the exposed life—the life open to public view and, often as not, public ridicule.

The instruments of American undoing in the area of privacy are the inventions of Americans. Citizens of this republic have created the conditions that have brought

about the attacks on privacy. Americans have developed the techniques whereby a treasured right has been invaded. The radio and television, the giant metropolitan newspapers which consider all human experience their province, the nationally-syndicated columns, the mass circulation magazines that emphasize "inside" news of people, industry and government-inspired questionnaires and polls that probe areas of life considered private not long ago, credit bureaus and private detective organizations, wiretappers and security personnel reports—all these institutions, inventions, and developments have been employed in an assault on the walls raised to shield citizens from the public gaze.

In the van of the anti-privacy forces is the federal government. At mid-century, American citizens are being subjected to a bombardment with forms and questionnaires which require them to lay bare the details of their lives and associations. In order to obtain a position with the federal government, it is necessary to answer Civil Service questionnaires that probe into a person's past. Every time one attempts to file a claim against the government, pay a tax bill, obtain a license, or secure a contract, one is required to supply masses of background information. It is understandable why it is the government desires and, in-

---

Anthony Harrigan is on the *Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier*.

deed, needs the desired information. Nonetheless, the questionnaires are narrowing the area of privacy in the life of a citizen.

The citizen hardly realizes how much information is available to the government. On the local level, governmental authorities have arrest cards at police headquarters (though the offenses be nothing more than minor traffic violations), marriage records, wills, birth certificates, real estate transfers, health cards, applications for health department licenses, state income tax data, and state police arrest cards. In addition, investigators can rely upon school transcripts, warrants sworn out, data pertaining to incorporation of business firms, and material in the files of the state departments of education. In certain areas, where the federal government has major installations and gives financial aid to school districts, the school systems have cards on school children containing information pertaining to all the places parents have resided, religious affiliation, work experience, and so forth. State courts have records of judgments, lawsuits, divorce transcripts, information on mortgages and inheritances, will contests, juvenile delinquency reports, lunacy commission hearings, jail records, trustee applications, and quantities of other information. On the federal government level, U. S. agents have access to the records of the federal courts, the immense dossiers of the Pentagon, FBI reports, hospital records of ex-servicemen, psychological test data, insurance applications, federal insurance loan applications, Treasury Department files, NLRB records—the list is endless on the federal level. The total quantity of information on a citizen's life available to investigators is astonishing.

Equally disturbing is the widespread use of poll-takers and fact-finders hired by corporations and quasi-public organizations.

Though there is some element of necessity in the poll-taking undertaken by business firms, there is little excuse for the foundations who indulge in the practice. Indeed many foundations or project directors hired by foundations have confused truth and legitimate research with snooping activities and unwarranted intrusion in personal affairs. In the area of knowledge concerning mores, especially sexual mores, certain foundation projects have reached the point where they actually work unwittingly to loosen public morals and titillate the lascivious. Inquiries, direct questioning of anyone who will answer questions, with regard to the rightness or wrongness of chastity, the prevalence of perversion, views of abnormality—all these have been too frequent, too publicized, too well-supported financially, and too available to everyone, including the teenager who peruses paperback editions at the corner drugstore. The reports are part and parcel of modern sensational literature. Odd as it may seem to Europeans, Americans find statistics—when they relate to sexual matters—spicy reading. This

notion is surely the original American contribution to the history of erotica.

An individual's privacy was respected in the America of 75 years ago. Snoopers, hiding their true intent behind a mask of alleged scientific respectability, dared not knock on front doors and inquire of the lady of the house (as is done in the present era) whether she prefers to use rough or soft-grained toilet paper or whether she believes that her husband had extramarital relations while overseas.

Had a man of the 1880's dared to affront a housewife of his day with the type of question asked by poll-takers and interviewers today, police would have been summoned or the offender taught his manners by the housewife's male relatives.

Poll-taking is closely tied in with commercial enterprises. Americans today are easily impressed by scientific assertions of one sort or another, and all desire that their habits be excused by scientific theory. They want a man with a Ph.D. and a white laboratory jacket to offer justification for their folkways. The most obvious instance is cigarette smoking. Hundreds of thousands of cigarette smokers are impressed—they forgot about the threat of lung cancer, that is—when they read on a page printed in four colors that Doctors Blooba and Bole have said that a poll of nose and throat specialists from Alaska to Alabama have revealed the majority of physicians advise that one smoke Old Folks cigarettes.

Other hordes of gullible Americans flock to shoe stores in their towns to buy a pair of Heeler's brand shoes inasmuch as 2,200 chiropractors, assembled in convention at Miami Beach, voted the Perko Arch (a trademark) Heeler Shoe as the shoe which helps feet retain "that youthful appearance and, thereby, prevent the rundown look." Hokum? Yes, but there is a demand for it in this land.

Television is the perfect vehicle for this invasion of privacy. Indeed it is clear that a number of television programs are posited on the principle that people like to view other people when they are being made fun of, laughed at, or made to look downright stupid, greedy, naive, or pitiful. These programs are a modern vision of bear-baiting—these quiz shows in which a panel of supposedly intelligent people are set to the task of finding out what a guest has done. Is she the first or the latest girl to kiss the program emcee? The secret is imparted to the video audience and the audience is supposed to delight in the fumbings of the panelists. Why all this? The answer is for the purpose of selling soap or soup, cars or cakes, refrigerators or perambulators, toothpaste or towels. That is the distressing, the fearsome truth. Unfortunately, a plentiful supply of saps, boobs, and barbarians of all sorts exist who were willing to expose themselves in the hope of a reward.

Though the invasion of privacy has been achieved in many areas of American life, valiants, here and there, have



taken a firm stand against this evil work. More than a handful of determined individuals of powerful integrity have shown up the invasion of privacy for what it is in actuality: an assault on essential humanity.

This writer encountered one such determined individualist and believer in privacy not so very long ago. The individual was a motorcycle repairman who had gone on a fishing trip with a friend, a colonel in the Marine Corps. The colonel had been killed by a bolt of lightning during a sudden storm which came up while they were out on a big stretch of water.

The fatal accident happened in an isolated coastal region of North Carolina. The mechanic carried the body of his friend to shore in a leaking boat and then transported the body across a wide marsh. One day later the news reached the afternoon newspaper serving the area.

A reporter called on the mechanic and obtained a story and a photograph of the mechanic, promising to keep the photograph small and not sensationalize the unhappy event. The photograph was blown up, however, as was the story. To the average reader the story read as though the mechanic had taken pleasure in having his part in the event recounted in the newspaper columns.

When this reporter telephoned the mechanic the evening after the first news story appeared, the mechanic refused to cooperate at all, repeat any of the details, or allow a photograph to be taken. The mechanic was not an ignorant man, and he was mindful of the fact that the press had to carry an account of the accident. He was determined, however, that the tragic death of his friend and his own genuine sorrow would not be exploited in the service of raising newspaper circulation. This quiet determination was admirable. It is what the country as a whole must discover anew if privacy, a right bequeathed to Americans by our forefathers, is to be theirs again completely.

Neither high nor low in our society is safe in the invasion of privacy. It is a threat against all elements. Perhaps the most victimized of all is the President of the United States. Once, not so many years ago, the President was entitled to an area of privacy beyond affairs of state and free of press coverage; nowadays, nothing is sacred, nothing is private.

Several years ago former President Herbert Hoover said a good word with respect to presidential privacy when he accompanied Dwight Eisenhower on a fishing expedition in the Rocky Mountains. The newspapermen present were all set to note and photograph every cast with the fly-rod, every word shouted across the trout stream, every pop of grease in the frying pan. Hoover chided the reporters, saying that when he was in office a president had the right to privacy at prayer and while fishing. Eisenhower had the opportunity on that occasion to regain at least a minor area of privacy, but either privacy isn't appreciated by him

or he lacked the fortitude to tangle with the press on the issue of maintaining privacy equal to that enjoyed by a president 30 years ago.

A happy future of life in the United States is the code of the medical profession which forbids physicians to advertise or publicize themselves. The code is a bulwark of professional integrity and decency, and is a standard with respect to privacy and self-respect which other professions would do well to adhere to closely. There is an unfortunate tendency for scientific workers, explorers on the frontiers of research, to become drawn into commercial enterprises and advertising campaigns. Thus vigilance on the part of men of science is a stern necessity. Truly, there is in America a great need for a passion for anonymity and a tolerance and respect for scientific privacy while research projects are under study and development. A felt need for privacy and lonely endeavor has always been a hallmark of high scientific achievement. One wonders precisely what Charles Darwin would have achieved as he travelled the face of the globe if, in his researches, he had been forced to stop frequently and make on-the-spot reports on his researches to a battery of news service feature writers and globe-trotting TV cameramen. The confusion with regard to the Salk vaccine is eloquent testimony in support of the argument for privacy and limits on publicity.

The device most destructive of privacy is the camera. While the camera has enlarged human experience, in that it has allowed people glimpses of the joys and pleasures and sorrows of ordinary life, the poignancy of little things, also the terrors of war and disasters, the bounds of decency have been often exceeded by cameramen and the most elemental privacy invaded.

The special field of the news magazine is the picture story that tends to rob an individual of his essential dignity. Readers of news magazines have thrown up before their eyes each week picture stories which show theologians in undershirts heavy with sweat, a bride changing her clothes after the wedding service, the reaction of a pregnant woman to the result of a saliva test used in determining the sex of the unborn child, an exhausted athlete vomiting under the stands after a grueling race. The moments in life which ought to be private, the property of the individual experiencing whatever is happening to him, are recorded on film and transferred to the pages of several millions of copies of magazines.

Unless positive steps are taken to restore elemental privacy, unless the concept of respect for human life and dignity enjoys a restoration, the situation will become worse. The day will arrive when the mobile television camera is on the spot to record the flow of emotion at the moment a reporter tells a young wife that she is a widow—that her husband died in a jet fighter crash after having been dragged in flames from the molten cockpit of his plane.



**WGBH, Boston, May 19.**

## Elmer Davis

Elmer Davis died yesterday at 68, two weeks after a stroke. A great journalist. A great American.

The broadcasting industry should set their flags at half staff this week. No finer figure ever served the American public with news. Nor are we apt to find his peer.

Ill health had kept him from broadcasting for several years.

War service, as head of the Office of War Information, broke off that classic five minutes nightly that through the years gave the gist of the news with an authority none has matched. After the war he resumed, in a fifteen minute broadcast, until 1954.

He had a genius for expressing the essentials in pithy sentences. He knew his world. He had an eye for what mattered. He wasted no time on triviality. He disdained sensationalism. He saw things in perspective and saw them whole.

His character was as rugged as that flat voice that was the most familiar voice in America in the years after CBS discovered him by accident in 1939.

He set a standard for compact reporting of what needs to be known. He was wise and he knew the quality of words.

But the key to Elmer Davis was his sure sense of values. His integrity crackled like his Indiana twang. He could spot a phony or a demagogue and he had no time for either.

His final period of broadcasting was in the hysteria of McCarthyism and he stood up, a voice of sanity, unterrified by invective, unmoved by pressure.

The New York *Times* is moved by his death to the most magnificent obituary they have done in a long time, starting on the front page, surrounded by crises, as Elmer Davis was in his working life.

The *Times* says of Davis:

"He was called the Mt. Everest of commentators, towering in serenity and grandeur over the foothill Cassandras of his time.

"His integrity was undisputable.

"A horse sense liberal, Mr. Davis was given neither to hysterical handwringing, nor to fuzzy optimism. He was not a specialist in raising goose-pimples on his listeners.

"When most commentators were either very shrill or very unctuous, he always sounded like a rational adult.

"One of his great contributions to national sanity came during the years when Senator McCarthy was most active. Mr. Davis insisted that the greatest internal menace to the

United States was not communism, but the steady encroachment on freedom of thought.

"It took courage in those days to speak forthrightly and plainly. He had this quality.

"His dry sardonic voice, vibrating with contempt, was another potent weapon.

"Finally, and most important, Mr. Davis' patriotism was unassailable." This from the *Times* today.

His final book, *But We Were Born Free*, summed up Elmer Davis' stout stance.

The *Times* quotes its final paragraph:

He reminded his readers of the Philistines, who feared before a battle that their cause was hopeless.

"Realizing that nobody else was going to deliver them, they said to one another: Be strong and quit yourselves like men and fight. And they did fight and delivered themselves. So may we but only if we quit ourselves like men. This republic was not established by cowards, and cowards will not preserve it."

These words will do, being his own, for a final tribute to Elmer Davis.

---

## Thomas Stokes

Last week saw the death of another news man, whom Elmer Davis admired for qualities much like his own.

Tom Stokes was a reporter who could ill be spared. A plain man and a blunt writer. Tom Stokes covered national politics the same way he had covered the local court house. He dug for his facts and dug hardest for those hardest to get and that most people didn't get. A Scripps Howard man, Tom Stokes had kept the dogged spirit that had made the Scripps papers, in their early days, a voice on the side of the people. He never got over it. He was a watch-dog of the public interest. He played no favorites. He had no heroes. He didn't let up when an issue was unpopular with rich publishers. If they left out his column when it treated a hot issue, as often they did, he was unperturbed. So he didn't get rich. But when his Washington colleagues voted for the reporter who had best served the public, Tom Stokes' name led all the rest.

Tom Stokes and Elmer Davis are the end of a journalistic generation, and the best of it.

It is vital to their country that the standards they set be those of their successors.

This is a course to set one's teeth into and not to forget.

—L. M. Lyons

## The Triumph of Trivia

By William L. Rivers

It was inevitable: Presidential Press Secretary James Hagerty couldn't stay all alone up there at a high temperature. After the Art Buchwald Incident, with everyone including the President (who "laughed like mad" and advised Hagerty to simmer down) laughing at him, Hagerty had to simmer down. It has even been reported that Hagerty recently managed a somewhat forced smile and admitted that it certainly was one on him.

So it's all over. Too bad. For awhile, Art Buchwald, the *Herald Tribune's* fun-and-games columnist in Paris, had grasped and mangled one of the subtlest techniques known to the engineers of consent. It's evident in every line of his parody of Jim Hagerty's press conferences:

"Q. Jim, did the President speak to anyone before retiring?"

"A. He spoke to the Secretary of State."

"Q. What did he say to the Secretary of State, Jim?"

"A. He said, 'Good night, Foster.'"

"Q. And what did the Secretary of State say to the President?"

"A. He said, 'Good night, Mr. President.'"

"Q. How many blankets were there on the bed?"

"A. I'm not sure. Maybe two or three . . ."

This captures the essence of the Hagerty methods and carries it—bodily—to its logical extreme. Buchwald, a light-type columnist, squeezed everything out of it that was there for those of his calling, managing to build another parody based on the first for the following day. Now he has done with it and is back on the saloon circuit.

But Buchwald left in his wake a suspicion that this extravagant attention to minutiae is the most dexterous technique in political engineering—a suspicion that has led me to give the technique a name: The Truth According to Trivial Detail. It works because, given an unexpected, perhaps shocking, bit of personal information in company with a few other facts, most Americans won't doubt that the whole truth has been painstakingly gathered, dissected for better viewing and shoved into the public spotlight. Try it; tell someone that the mayor has trouble with his teeth, or that he likes his Martinis wet. Your thoughts on his political philosophy will then be received with new respect.

The method will serve in almost any circumstance. The President of the United States is knocked flat by rumbles in head, heart or stomach; we start to say our prayers and sell our stocks. Then it's announced that the President had broth, creamed cabbage and a bacon-lettuce-and-tomato

sandwich for lunch, and an anti-coagulant afterwards. The important thing here is not the medication but the menu. If the man's *diet* is a public record, who can doubt that the whole truth is on display?

Next, we hear that the President had bowel movements both morning and afternoon. A cynical voice may ask whether such interesting reassurances constitute the full picture, but that's an absurd question, clearly. When they've done everything but lead you into the *bathroom*, how much more truth do you want?

Another view of the method can be explored by touring a copy of *Time* Magazine, which is published by the most astute practitioners of The Truth According to Trivial Detail. Take a recent cover story on Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts. One might wonder, considering Mr. Luce's slant, whether to trust this account of Senator Kennedy's career.

But the most cursory reading is convincing; we can trust these writers. *Time* offers no cloudy generalizing, for example, on Senator Kennedy's courtship and marriage; he "leaned across the asparagus" to ask his future wife for their first date. Consider: *Time* not only knows when Senator Kennedy had his first date with his wife-to-be, and not only knows when he asked her for it, it knows that he "leaned across the asparagus." Believe everything—this is as far on the inside as you can get without serving the asparagus yourself.

Other areas nearly as wealthy in convincing trivia remain untouched in this analysis, for we travel now to the end of the line.

It was early December, there was crisis in the pressroom, the President had suffered a stroke. Associate Press Secretary Anne Wheaton—who had taken over temporarily for Hagerty with the prideful comment, "I am not a panic person"—panicked. She first identified the stroke as "a form of heart attack," then followed that with, "Cerebral does have something to do with the head." But worse, she had offered no reports on menus, no word on the President's regularity. Her panic was contagious. Some of the President's firmest newspaper friends began to talk of an Eisenhower resignation.

However, as *Time* pointed out, Hagerty returned from Paris to fill in the important gaps: "Back from Paris, Old Reporter Hagerty breezed into his first press conference next morning with clear-cut answers and a passel of tidbits such as his report that Ike had shaved himself (safety razor) and had eaten a hearty breakfast (grapefruit, creamed chipped beef, toast and honey, Sanka)."

Hagerty and The Truth According to Trivial almost did their work too well: Hagerty was soon protesting to the suddenly optimistic reporters that the medical case was not closed just because the President was making plans to go to church the following Sunday.

---

William Rivers is about to start a year in Washington on a study of the capital press corps, for which the Fund for Adult Education has made him a grant.

# Attribution of News

## Memo to All Hands

By Alfred Friendly

*One of the most vexing of all problems of the news is the story that, for one or another reason, cannot be attributed to its source. After long wrestling with this puzzler, the managing editor of the Washington Post gathered himself together one day and got off this policy statement to all his staff.*

Some questions have arisen recently about the various conventions about attribution of news, and our policy on them. The following summary is in explanation.

Direct attribution is the best way of handling news and information about an event or conditions or situations of which we do not have direct, eye-witness knowledge ourselves. This is always the best way, inasmuch as it provides the reader with a knowledge of the source, enabling him to evaluate its credibility for himself. It involves no pretense of having direct knowledge which we do not have. It avoids the risk of having the newspapers used to disseminate material for which the author is unwilling to take public responsibility.

However, when sources will not allow attribution, or will not talk if there is attribution, we are driven, along with others, to move from the best way of presenting the news of which we are not the witness to second-best ways.

These methods, because they lack the virtue of complete candor and do not have the advantage of straightforward processes, get newspaper people into a great many misunderstandings. They are, in many cases, a means by which officials seek to evade responsibility for knowledge and information for which they should be willing to assume responsibility. In many cases, citizens have a right to know, not only the information, but the source of it.

Still, we do not make the circumstances under which some information is available. They exist. We have to live with them. It is the purpose of this memorandum to make it more convenient to live with them and to minimize the possibilities of misunderstanding between the newspapers and our colleagues and our sources.

**1. OFF THE RECORD.** In a small gathering, or an interview, if a news source asks to put the remarks he is about to make off the record, the reporter has the choice of agreeing or of asking the news source not to make the intended comments at all, in order to remain free to seek the story elsewhere.

If the reporter agrees to the off-the-record basis, he must then hold the disclosure in absolute confidence. He may not use it in anything he writes, even without attribution to the source, however guarded. A violation of a confidence of

this kind is considered, and properly, a cardinal newspaper sin.

He may, unless forbidden by the original source, seek out the same information from another source, but without in any way indicating that he already has heard the news, or is in possession of it, from someone else.

If he accepts the off-the-record condition as to the information itself, he usually may use it upon its public disclosure somewhere else, but in all such cases where a question may arise about a breach of confidence, the reporter should act only after discussion of the matter with his editors and the appropriate desk.

An even more difficult problem arises with respect to disclosure of the source when that source has been publicly identified elsewhere. Again, the proper course is to bring the matter to the attention of the desk and the editors, who will determine what can be published and whether prior clearance with the source is called for.

The reporter will choose the other course (asking the source not to mention the subject if he can do so only off the record) when he believes that he has an opportunity to find out about the matter in some other way and does not, therefore, wish any conditions hanging over him or limiting his future inquiry.

In a public meeting or gathering, open to all without specific invitation, any attempt by a speaker to put all or part of his remarks off-the-record may be firmly and blandly ignored as an absurdity.

In a large gathering—say 20 persons or more—but sponsored by a private organization, club, committee or the like, where the reporter is present in his role as a reporter but also as an invited guest, he must protest vigorously any attempt by a speaker to go off-the-record. He should point out that the meeting was scheduled as open to the press, that any attempt at secrecy with a group that large is manifestly meaningless, ineffective, nonsensical, etc. If the speaker persists, and insists that his remarks be off-the-record, the reporter must leave the meeting at that point, complaining as loudly as he can, and report the matter to the editors of the appropriate desk. They will decide whether and how the event should be reported, and what sort of a protest should be made.

**1a. PHONY OFF-THE-RECORD.** Many persons new to the Washington scene or to contacts with the press may say they are speaking off-the-record, having heard the phrase but misunderstanding it, and intending only to mean "for background only" (see #2 below). The reporter's objection may then serve to clarify the situation and put the story on a usable basis. In all cases, make sure you and the source are clear on the meaning of his injunction and its limitations.

2. **FOR BACKGROUND ONLY.** This convention, also known as "Without attribution," "The Lindley Rule," "The Rule of Compulsory Plagiarism," or simply as "Don't quote me," is a common one and is used—or should be—when a person of considerable importance or delicate position is discussing a matter in circumstances in which his name cannot be used for reasons of public policy or personal vulnerability. It is often abused by persons who want to sink a knife or do a job without risking their own position or facing the consequences to themselves.

Obviously, it is much better to obtain a story in circumstances which permit the identification of the source. In certain types of stories, particularly those arising on the police and court beats, it is often not possible to report the event at all without attribution. In some cases, attribution is needed as a matter of fair play to the other side of the controversy, or sometimes attribution may be needed to pin responsibility for potentially libelous statements where it belongs. In some cases, however, the "background only" procedure is legitimate and provides an honest, worthwhile story which could not be obtained in any other way.

In such cases the reporter may not, of course, identify the source and may not hint, imply or suggest his identity. In some cases, the source may insist that no attribution be given even to the agency or organization of the source, forbidding the reporter even to indulge in such vague attribution as "State Department sources," or "Internal Revenue Service officials," and the like.

In all such circumstances, the reporter is on dangerous ground. He must take pains to establish clearly and without any ambiguity in his own or the source's mind exactly what the conditions are, and must tell the appropriate desk the circumstances of the story, following instructions from the desk, as if on his own cognizance, or with whatever kind of attribution has been allowed.

In all, the reporter must remember that a violation of confidence is accomplished just as surely by disclosure of the news and/or the source to an authorized person as it is by printing it in the paper. He breaches the confidence he has undertaken by telling someone who was not included in the original session who the source was, and what transpired.

He has the right to, and should, inform his desk and editors of the event and the source, but making clear what the conditions were; if he writes a memorandum to his editors on the session he must precede it by a clear and obvious caveat about the circumstances under which the information was obtained.

For a reporter to give the story and/or source to another person who was not invited to the session is not merely a breach of his commitment, it is often a sure way to guarantee that he himself will be scooped; the

other person, not bound by the original conditions or not understanding them, may blithely proceed to publish the account. The reporter who disclosed the matter to another cannot console himself in the thought that the second man may have acted unethically; the fact remains that he committed the initial breach of confidence himself.

If a story obtained on an Off-the-Record or Background-Only basis is published elsewhere with a disclosure of the source, the reporter who agreed to the terms in the first place must seek guidance from his conscience, his editors and, if possible, from the original source.

The ugliest and most lasting quarrels between the press and the news sources in Washington over the last 30 years have come from deliberate or, most usually, unwitting misunderstandings of the ground rules in situations of this kind.

3. **NOT FOR DIRECT QUOTATION.** This convention, fortunately now rare, is tailor-made for confusion. When someone speaks but asks, "Don't quote me directly," take infinite pains to make sure exactly what he means.

The custom came into being with press conferences of the President and the Secretary of State some years ago. It meant that the speaker's remarks could be fully and clearly attributed, but that his words must be paraphrased rather than used literally inside quotation marks. Thus a reporter could write, "The President said he felt fine and would go to New York next week," but not, "The President said, 'I feel fine and shall go to New York next week.'"

The purpose, if any, was to spare the speaker the cold printing of the solecisms common in conversational remarks.

Now, with televised White House press conferences and a transcript made of the Secretary of State's conferences, the injunction is rarely used. Occasionally, a speaker whose native tongue is not English may ask to be spared the risible consequences of direct quotation. In such cases, common politeness indicates compliance with the request.

*But make abundantly clear whenever someone says "Don't quote me directly" that he means what he appears to say. Ninety-nine times out of 100 he means, in reality, "background only."*

4. **HOLD FOR RELEASE.** Statements, speeches, hand-outs reports, etc. are often embargoed for publication until a certain time, with the provision expressed on the document. Ordinarily, there is no room for ambiguity; if there is, check with the appropriate desk, or the issuing agency.

Occasionally, in an interview in which several reporters participate, they may agree by common consent among themselves and the news source not to use the information until a certain time. Such bargains must be kept. Make



sure that you understand the terms exactly and that all of those present do, too, lest you be double-crossed inadvertently or otherwise. The reporter who sees brewing a proposal to embargo the information after a news session, and ducks out deliberately in order to steal a march and contend that he knew nothing of the latter agreement, will not last long or do his paper and himself any credit. If he does not like the terms of the embargo, he can object and his sole objection prevents the deal, for this is a case where reporters are morally bound only by unanimous consent.

If a release is broken, accidentally or by design, it is customarily a sign for general release by all. But in all such cases, check first with the appropriate desk.

5. PRIVATE GATHERINGS. Reporters, if they are worth their salt, will pick up much information from conversations at parties, private visits and social gatherings. There is a real problem on what use may be made of the information so received. No flat and general rules about procedure can be made to take care of all cases of this kind.

Basically, however, the reporter's own sense of what is fit and morally proper will be the best guide. If the reporter is at a private gathering because of his person and not because of his position and profession, politeness and

decent social relations indicate that he must specifically ask the person who discloses the information whether it may be published, and under what conditions. He may choose to do it on the spot, or to call on the source at a later time, operating without ambiguity as a reporter, and not as a social contact.

If the reporter has been invited to the gathering in his role of a reporter, and if he is told something by someone who knows he is a reporter and is working at it at the moment, he may ordinarily write what he learns.

\* \* \*

In all circumstances, and whatever the conventions, stated or implied, remember that a cheap beat, won by cutting a corner, by a technicality, or by violating the spirit if not the letter of the understanding of the news source and of other newsmen, is empty, usually worthless, and is followed by penalties and regrets far heavier and longer enduring than any momentary gains that are obtained.

Conduct yourself so that you can look your source in the eye the next day.

Alfred Friendly  
Managing Editor

## Through an Asian Looking-Glass A YEAR AT HARVARD

By Piyal Wickramasinghe

Why did I come to the United States—as a matter of fact, to Harvard? I did not have any notion of what my work would be here, when I set out from Ceylon. Now that I have spent nearly a year here, am I to return with the same question in mind? Perhaps I have learned a lot, but I cannot assimilate everything at the moment. It may take time—perhaps years.

What do you think of the United States, or of Harvard? This is the question I have faced ever since I set foot on these shores. Can I answer this? No. I will not, for Harvard or the United States each stands for what it is and my comments made at random may not matter. Who am I to pass judgement on one of the greatest nations and on an institution of such magnitude?

Harvard is unique in every sense. Where else can I find this type of instruction that ebbs into the hearts of young Americans? Here, I found not only education of the people, by the people and for the people, but also people of education, by education and for education. It all sounds very American.

If I carry away the idea that Harvard teaches young Americans to cultivate unity and loyalty among themselves and the rest of the world, I am not to be blamed, for

through this Harvard has taught me to be true to myself. I will go back and work to re-create the community of interest between the men of different class, race and creed, which was lost to us with the advent of "Western Civilization."

Harvard's system of education based on national history and literature produces men of science bent on construction rather than destruction. I have been fortunate to come to a place where national unity and clear thinking are being shaped in an era when national character is being destroyed to give place to what is termed "civilization"—in the true sense, modern commercialism, which makes men slaves of civilization instead of masters of the art of life.

Last month, a few friends from New York visited me and when I took them around Harvard they said: "Harvard buildings look old and out of date, yet they are beautiful; the atmosphere is charming." I do not know what they really meant by this, but I was surprised at their seeing beauty in the midst of ugliness, which is a fundamental fact of the old wisdom. My friends, who do not despise the new, saw beauty in the old. Should this be found only at Harvard?

Once I had settled down at Harvard I looked for culture—Art and Drama. This may surprise many who do not see any value in culture for the “advancement of mankind.” In the West today art is a mere spectacle, a thing which excites. Westerners go to the theatre to be excited, to be entertained, or to be amused. I agree, this does nothing for the advancement of mankind. We of the East look at art from a different angle. We go to the theatre to seek stimulation for the mind. The theatre is not for amusement alone but for instruction—a place to find food for thought. Therefore, my main task was to see where these two concepts meet and to find any qualities that could enrich each other. For this purpose, I found the course I followed in the first term, “Methods of Criticism, Interpretation and Research,” by Professor Rosenberg, very helpful. This I followed up with “Masters of Modern Art,” by Associate Prof. Fowle, in the spring term. I could not find any course on Eastern Art during the year.

The lack of a sufficient number of courses in the field of Drama and Theatre was a drawback. The only course I found interesting was “Drama since Ibsen” given by Asst. Professor Chapman in the spring term. This too, being given by the English Department laid stress on literary form rather than theatrical methods. To compensate, I went to many Broadway productions and a few plays by University dramatic groups.

Of the other courses I followed, Social Science 111, “History of Far Eastern Civilization,” stands foremost. The profound knowledge of the professors, Fairbank and Reischauer, who taught the subject fascinated me. No person sensitive to the cause of humanity who followed this course could fail to get a clear picture of China, Korea and Japan. What is necessary in the world today is more and more understanding between peoples. I wish every student, whether from East or West, could sniff the air of Emerson D on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays between 11 am and 12 noon.

The Humanities course “Religion, the Arts and the Sciences,” by Professor Tillich, was another that should not be missed. The German accent of the professor may bother the average American, but the stimulating ideas put forward by him should be of immense value towards understanding the wisdom of the old which seems to be absent from modern trends of thought. Here I may mention one other point I noted. That is the fear and shame for religion in American society. This may be the result of being conscious of being “educated.” I mean modern “education”

that despises culture. No man is complete without culture. Therefore, let us know that there are limitations to the human being and begin to learn with due regard to religion and culture.

My observations would be incomplete without a word about the Nieman program. This is one of the best conceived programs that America could offer without hesitation to the world. Here, we journalists are free in every sense of the word. There are no editors or news desks to send you on assignments. You are on your own to pursue your own ends. This above all gives journalists the sense of responsibility which is lacking in many, especially in the East.

A well-informed journalist is an asset not only to the journal he represents but to the nation as a whole, for in many respects he leads the average man. The weekly seminars and dinners with eminent people in and out of Harvard offer what is needed for the improvement of the background knowledge of the journalists. I was a silent listener at many of these gatherings, contemplating the methods of eliminating the chaff from the seeds.

The International Centre at Cambridge offered me opportunities to meet American families on many occasions. My impression of Americans are based on informal talks and observations I made during these visits. If I am to sum up in one sentence what I think of Americans, I would say that they are a friendly, peace-loving people trying their level best to keep pace with machines of their own making.

I do not know whether I have let the cat out of the bag, but looking back once again I am reminded of Plato, who said: “To know oneself is the whole aim of life.” It has been necessary for me to cross half of the world to see myself, and if I have a fragment of better sight than I had before, a year of my life has been well spent. And I think it was John Ruskin who said something to the effect that the way to help another man is to help him to do his own work as he ought to do it. If this is what Harvard has taught me I will live up to it. How else could I honor Harvard?

Piyal Wickramasinghe  
Sunday Editor  
Lankadipa  
Colombo.  
May 3, 1958.

# Hands Across The Caribbean

By Edwin A. Lahey

I wanted to talk to working members of the press from Latin America because of some very strong feelings I have about the relationship between my country and the nations south of the border.

If you read the press releases of the Organization of American States, or listen to the formal declarations of friendship exchanged at every hemispheric meeting, you get the impression that the North Americans and their Latin cousins are as happily adjusted as a couple of turtle doves.

This is bosh.

It would be a refreshing bit of frankness and honesty if politicians, journalists and others who shuttle between these two worlds were to admit that the spiritual gulf between the United States and Latin America is a great deal wider than the Rio Grande.

They are different worlds, with different cultural, religious and political backgrounds. The men who run Latin America still seem to tolerate illiteracy rates of 50 per cent or more among the Indians, even after four centuries of white settlement. But what right does a citizen of the United States have to criticize Latin Americans for neglect of the aborigines? After all, we must face the fact that our grand-parents solved the problem of the Indians by exterminating them.

I cite this exaggerated and wholly irrelevant example of the difference in background merely to emphasize that there is a real spiritual gulf between us. To sweep this fact under the bed is a service to no one. This gulf between our worlds is generally overlooked in Washington, where we take for granted a "hemispheric solidarity" that may exist on the parchment of Inter-American treaties, or in the uniform shininess of the military hardware we send to South America, but which is far from a reality in the souls of men and women on the opposite sides of the Rio Grande.

The overworked phrase of "hemispheric solidarity" sounds grim to me when I think of a proud young woman running a coffee bar in Guatemala City a few years ago. She had a fine Indian face. She harbored deep resentments over a number of social humiliations she had experienced in college in Oklahoma, also over some obvious cases of economic discrimination she had encountered when she tried to find office work in a

couple of cities in the United States. She blamed her Indian face for her humiliating experiences. She was kind enough to hoard lamb chops for me during the food shortage just before Guatemala City fell to Castillo Armas in 1954. But this girl wasn't buying any "hemispheric solidarity."

This gulf between our two contiguous worlds can be shown again in the difficulty of "selling" Latin American news. There are a number of technical aspects to this problem which refer to the evaluation of Latin American news on cable desks in New York or Washington.

Actually, this "blank spot" in Latin American news publication in the United States may not be as dismal as the beat men in Latin America believe. (All foreign correspondents feel that editors underestimate the importance of the country they are covering and reporters on the Latin American run probably feel this worse than anybody else in the business.)

Contrary to the popular belief that people won't read Latin American news, the Miami *Herald*, the New Orleans *Times-Picayune*, and other papers in Texas and Southern California have greatly expanded their Latin American news reports in recent years. Our own Chicago *Daily News* foreign service, administered by "Stuffy" Walters, executive editor of the Knight Newspapers, has particularly contributed much to the better dissemination, publication and understanding of Latin American news, if I may put in a plug for my own organization.

The Chicago *Daily News* foreign service does not attempt to produce a conventional news report, of day by day events. Rather, it strives to catch news on the rise, and treat it with topical freshness. "Stuffy" Walters has an electronic nose for news, and from his desk in Chicago can usually detect the first wisp of smoke from a basement fire in Guatemala, Buenos Aires, Warsaw, Jakarta or Amman. Air transportation being what it is today, "Stuffy" will have one of his foreign service men on the spot before the smouldering fire bursts into the open, to saturate the news report with background, interpretation and color and then to move on when the news event itself starts filtering back toward the want-ad section.

If I seem to dwell overlong on my thesis that the gulf between our Latin American and North American worlds is wider than we publicly admit, it is only to emphasize my belief that these two worlds can be brought closer together. There is much evidence that

---

Edwin A. Lahey is chief Washington correspondent of the Knight Newspapers. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1939. This is from a talk at the Fifth Caribbean Area Press Seminar at New Orleans.

can be put forward to support this belief, but I shall content myself with citing two experiences in my own assignments as a reporter in Central America, South America and the Caribbean.

The operation of the Point Four program is one proof that our people can be brought closer together spiritually. Back on January 20, 1949, I was sitting in the press stand at the east portico of the U. S. Capitol in Washington, shivering with the cold and trying to write a running story of the inauguration of Harry S. Truman. On page one of the text of Mr. Truman's inaugural address, there were four enumerated paragraphs. As newspapermen, you all know that any paragraph that's enumerated in a speech must be important, and belongs high up in your story, whether you understand it or not. The numeral "4" on the paragraph of Mr. Truman's speech which suggested the program that came to be known as "Point Four" impressed me, but the real meaning of that program didn't sink in until I had seen it in operation in Latin America. (Incidentally, you know the people now running the government in Washington don't like to give Harry Truman credit for anything. So if you ask about "Point Four," a government man might correct you gently by referring to this as the "Technical Assistance Program.")

Point Four in Latin America is an inspiring human story, and if the United States could spend as much on this as it does on military hardware, I think the gulf between our two worlds would be closed in a generation. (This assumes, of course, that folks in Latin America during that time would make the democratic process work. They might even pass laws during this transition period making it a felony for politicians to steal.)

I could go on at great length about the many little ways in which Point Four programs in Latin America have reached the human spirit. Fifteen years ago in San Salvador, for example, the profession of nursing had about the same social standing as the profession of prostitution. This would have been all right if there had been as many nurses as there were members of the other profession, but there weren't. Today, thanks to self-help and a U. S. technical assistance program, nursing is an honored profession in that city and the number of nurses increases each year through education sponsored by Point Four.

Point Four, small as it is in terms of the dollars we spend on some pretty dubious and wasteful mutual security programs, is the perfect example of what we can do to narrow the spiritual gap that separates the two worlds of the Western Hemisphere.

A second illustration of how to close this gap is quite personal.

Latin American newspapermen have been my interpre-

tive guides on many of the Latin American stories I have covered. This is, of course, a spiritual affinity between newspapermen, which rises above the barriers of language, nationality or political belief. I don't think we're unique in this respect. The same affinity exists in the case of pickpockets, travelling salesman, street-car motormen, or any other craft that tends to be clanish.

Because this affinity exists, I have been the beneficiary in many Latin American cities of the detached judgment of local reporters whose opinions have been most important in my evaluation of the facts. Needless to say, I am grateful.

The point of what I'm saying is this:

The "spiritual gulf" between Latin America and the United States is narrowed by personal experience. The gulf doesn't exist for a girl in San Salvador whose useful and dignified career as a nurse began with the wise guidance and encouragement of a U. S. technical adviser.

The gulf doesn't exist for me when I recall the number of fine reporters in Latin American cities who have accepted me as one of their own. Late one Sunday night last July, in the government palace of Guatemala City, I was struggling with the Spanish diary of the young man who had assassinated President Castillo Armas. My story would have been pretty lumpy that night had it not been for the kindness of two local reporters, who helped me translate the real meaty parts of that remarkable document in jig time.

The best thing that could happen in our western hemisphere, I believe, would be a tremendous increase in these personal exchanges that truly bring peoples closer together. There are many wholesome and effective ways for doing this, of which I have cited only two. If my personal experience in Latin America could be multiplied a million times over, and put on a two way circuit, the "spiritual gulf" I've been talking about would disappear in an atmosphere of friendship and understanding. There are some "cultural exchanges" going on now between the United States and Latin America, I'm sure. But they must be very small in terms of the larger problem of aloofness between us. Personally, the Latin American visitors I hear about most frequently in Washington are the groups of military brass periodically brought up by the Pentagon to be impressed with our industrial and military power.

Nothing would gratify me more, as an individual, than the opportunity to repay Latin American newspapermen for their kindness to me in the past, by helping some day to interpret Washington for them, dubious as my credentials as a guide might be.

Washington is difficult to interpret whether the interpretation is for a foreign visitor or for the folks back in Chicago, Detroit, Akron, Charlotte or Miami, the cities for which I write.



Washington really is shadow—the shadow of substance that exists elsewhere. Some reporters, and I am one of them, never seem to be able to get their teeth into a news story in Washington for that reason. I'll give you one quick example of this "shadow and substance" theory. I was in Little Rock at the beginning of the Central High School trouble. There were "Little Rock" stories coming out of Washington every day, as well as out of Little Rock. It was legitimate and necessary news to explore the avenues of action available to the President and the Attorney General, to write reaction stories, etc. But this was at best the shadow of the substance that was down in Little Rock. Out in front of Central High School each morning you saw the human bitterness, you felt the tension. You saw the State of Arkansas and the United States of America finally standing toe to toe in a conflict that could no longer be averted. This was substance, and believe me, it was much easier to write about.

The most important fact I could tell about Washington, from a newspaperman's standpoint, is that it's just too big for human comprehension. There are well over a thousand newspapermen in the town. There are a dozen or more press agents and lobbyists for every newspaperman. There are 96 Senators, 435 Congressmen and nearly a quarter million government workers, and any one of them at any given moment might be hiding behind that bland and tired face some data that would be worth publication in any newspaper.

Washington is the only major capital in the world whose only business is government. The principal commodity shipped out of Washington by freight car is waste paper. I'm sure much of it is in triplicate, and probably some of it is stamped "confidential."

The most trying problem for a reporter in Washington on any given day is to decide what NOT to write about. With so much substance in this tense and angry world, the shadows of it awaiting examination in Washington are simply too many, too varied for the human mind to cope with.

Since Washington is an unmanageable mess, from a reporter's standpoint, it is little wonder that a thing called the "background dinner" has become one of the important, and to my mind very dubious aspects of covering the city.

The "background dinner" goes something like this:

A select little group of eight or ten senior correspondents,

usually representing the larger newspapers of the country, will arrange a private dinner for some important government payroller, maybe the Secretary of State, an assistant to the President, or some cabinet officer who happens to be involved in undertakings that are currently of some moment.

Usually the dinners are innocuous and boring. The great man on the public payroll says what he wants to say, with the understanding that reporters present (and paying for his booze and food) will write what he says without attributing it to him. The reporters get a tedious story about what "high administration figures" are thinking about some current crisis, and when they send the office a bill for \$20 for having dinner with Secretary Dulles or some other big wheel, the editors back home are impressed and don't even bother to inquire what the paper is getting for the \$20.

Once in a while, however, these "background dinners" are used by public officials for very meretricious purposes, and the reporters at the dinner are apt to find that they have been victimized by a predatory public payroller. There have been many instances where public officials used these dinners to float "trial balloons," containing their own private views on controversial matters that were still subjects of searching discussion at the White House, the Department of State, or the Department of Defense. The official who launches these trial balloons of course assumes no responsibility. If the story he "plants" at the background dinner backfires, the reporters are honor bound not to attribute his own remarks to him.

Let me give one final example of the appalling size of official Washington. Periodically the delegates to the Organization of American States get angry because the O.A.S. is "lost" in Washington. In their pique they threaten to pack up and move the whole Pan American Union to some place like New Orleans or Miami, where they'll be appreciated.

But they never do. That reveals another important fact about Washington. People get beaten to death by lady fingers up there. Once you get softened up by rubbing elbows with the lords of creation at cocktail parties on Embassy Row, you never want to go back to your roots. This phenomenon is worth a discussion by itself, on the subtle impact of Washington, which can turn a simple bumpkin into a self-important statesman, or a pedestrian news reporter into a pretentious journalist.

# New Typographical Techniques

By R. D. Allen

The development of new production methods for newspapers is vital to the survival of a free press. Finding newer, faster and less costly ways of publishing is essential if newspapers are to stay in business.

How can any newspaper remain free and honest in voice and action if its production is inefficient and unprofitable?

Enormous economic pressures are working against all newspaper enterprises. Spiraling costs for labor and materials, plus the limitations of our tired old type-setting methods are reducing continually the number of newspapers in the free world.

Look at the record.

Here in North America, 82 dailies have suspended publication since 1950 and 28 others have disappeared through mergers. Still another 55 have been reduced to weeklies or semi-weeklies by the economic squeeze. The total is 165.

Sadly, this has happened while the literacy rate has been climbing. More than ever, the hemisphere and the world need those newspapers to spread truthful news and editorial opinion.

Yet they are gone—most of them killed by high printing costs which their revenues could not meet.

It is to escape the same doom that a handful of American newspapers, including the Quincy *Patriot Ledger*, are pioneering the development of photographic composition, a radical new production process. Though it is still young, it is showing exciting promise.

It would be reasonable to assume that most of you have heard little more about photocomposition than the tongue-twisting word itself. But as newspapermen you are familiar with the conventional "hot metal" system by which your newspapers are produced.

In contrast, photocomposition is known as "cold type" and it combines type setting with type composition in a single operation. Modern electric and electronic machines are employed to compose photographically on film or paper. Far more versatile than Linotypes, they can boost composing room productivity to new levels and create substantial savings in time and labor.

The photo-composed type, whether film or paper is used, is pasted up into assembled form, then photographed to produce a negative. From the negative a zinc engraving is made for stereotyping or direct printing.

This is not a process to be viewed as a means of eliminat-

ing jobs in the mechanical department nor to make labor work harder. It achieves increased productivity by providing labor with the tools and techniques to accomplish more with the same effort.

Photocomposition is growing rapidly, but at the moment is in the awkward stage of adolescence. It has survived its infancy, but has not attained full manhood. This will come in the next few years.

In some aspects—particularly in the composition of advertising matter—the process is already an established improvement over the old methods. In advertising there is almost nothing which cannot be done better, faster and more profitably by cold type techniques. In fact, the advantages of photocomposition increase in direct proportion to the difficulty of the work.

A look at some of the benefits will show why the users of "cold type" are pushing forward in volume production of advertising. Nearly all of the limitations of hot metal make-up are overcome when a compositor is working with paste-up material instead of lead slugs. Angle boxes and other types of difficult assembly in hot metal are simply and easily done with pre-printed tapes. White space, which is laboriously based out in conventional composition, is free in cold type. Composed material from machines is handled in whole ads or whole sections of ads, not line-by-line as in the lead process.

Small wonder, then, that the same ad can be produced in much less time in the new composition methods.

There are two photo-composing machines used in actual newspaper work today. One is the Photon; the other the Fotosetter. A third, the Linofilm, is being field-tested and will be available in a year or so.

At Quincy we employ the Photon, which we helped to develop by field-testing the earliest models back in 1954. Having seen all others, we regard the Photon as the solid leader in the field.

Photon has two great virtues. It is amazingly versatile and astoundingly productive. No other machine in existence can approach the large variety of type faces and point sizes which Photon provides by push-button operation.

What you might call the "heart" of the machine is a glass matrix disc on which 16 different type faces have been prepared photographically. An adjacent turret of lenses permits the use of each one of the 16 type faces in 12 different point sizes from 6 point to 48 point.

Thus the 16 families multiplied by the 12 point sizes in each family provide no less than 192 fonts of type which the operator of a Photon has complete freedom to mix or intermix in any manner desired.

---

R. D. Allen has been directing the development of the Photon process at the Quincy (Mass.) *Patriot-Ledger*. This is from a talk at the Fifth Caribbean Area Press Seminar in New Orleans.

It is worth noting that 192 fonts, if you purchased them for Linotype machines, would cost about \$76,000. A Photon disc, made to order, costs \$2,000.

Along with the tremendous selection of type faces and sizes, Photon allows the operator easy push-button control over such operations as justification, centering, inserting leader dots, the length of a line, vertical spacing, corrections of errors and many more. The machine accomplishes these things automatically; the operator merely pushes buttons or shifts levers.

The type-setting speed of a Photon is 8 characters per second.

Either film or paper may be used in a Photon. At Quincy we prefer paper for economic reasons, although our editorial page is photo-composed every day on film. All of our retail display advertising is done by photo-composed paste-up.

Several other papers have acquired Photon machines in the past year or so and are building photocomposition departments around them. Among these are the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, the *Allentown Call-Chronicle*, the *New York Times*, the *Boston Herald-Traveler*, *Time Magazine* and others.

The Fotosetter, which has been in use since 1953, is a less drastic departure from conventional type-setting equipment. It is made by the Intertype Corporation and resembles a standard machine except that a camera-and-lens arrangement has replaced the melting pot. It employs the same circulating matrix principle as hot metal machines.

Perhaps the outstanding user of Fotosetter is the *South Bend Tribune* in Indiana which is converting all of its advertising composition to cold type with four machines. Other successful Fotosetter operations are at the *Milwaukee Journal*, *St. Petersburg Times*, *San Diego Tribune*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Washington Post*, and at *Panama City* in Florida.

In all, nearly 30 American newspapers are working with photo-composition as of today.

Along with the two photo-composition machines, which have provided the unique type-setting means, credit for the progress of photo-composition must also be given to the Dow Rapid-Etch machine for making possible the volume production of engraved plates. The Dow etcher has outstripped conventional engraving just as photo-typesetting has taken the lead over hot metal.

Invented by the Dow Chemical Company, the etching process has come closer to automating newspaper engraving techniques. High quality halftones can be etched in two and a half minutes and deep linework plates turned out in less than 15. The plates, suitable for either stereotyping or direct printing, convert the products of the photo-composing machines into useable printing media for our newspaper presses.

In most cases, Dow plates are stereotyped and the printing process follows conventional methods from that point. On a limited scale, but with strong ambitions for the future, the *Patriot Ledger* and a few other newspapers are working to develop direct plate printing. That is, use of the Dow etched plate directly on the press.

The benefits of by-passing the stereotyping process are manifold.

Quality improves because stereotyping shrinkage is eliminated and because zinc is a better ink carrier than the conventional lead cylinders. There is also a saving in time and labor.

Most of our experimenting at the *Patriot-Ledger* has been with the daily editorial page which has been printed from zinc plates for about a year. Occasional full-page advertisements have also been directly printed with good results. Color printing is vastly superior when engraved plates are used on the press.

I have said little about cold type production of news and editorial matter. The editor or journalist who operates a world apart from the advertising and mechanical departments might very well ask "What's in it for me?"

Frankly, the surface has hardly been scratched. The problems involved in handling news, with its extremely short deadlines, are sharply different from complicated advertising with its longer deadlines.

As good as they are, the phototypesetting and etching processes existing today cannot compete with hot metal for speedy handling of late news. We must await faster and faster type-setting machines and speedier etching systems which are already in the developmental stages. They may be a year or two away, but some-day you will see machines producing type at more than 60 lines per minute and engraving processes that will turn out a full-page plate in less than ten.

Aside from the late news, photocomposition can offer much in editorial fields. I regret to say, however, that only limited application is being made in these areas because most users are devoting their full cold type productive capacity to advertising. There are a few exceptions.

At the *Milwaukee Journal* and the *New York Daily News*, photographically-set type is being used regularly in rotogravure and other Sunday sections.

*Panama City*, Florida, using tape-operated Fotosetters, is making commendable strides in composing combination news and advertising pages every day.

At Quincy, we have photocomposed our editorial page for more than three years and have, in the past, composed sports, social, church and ROP pages on occasion. We have strong hopes that we will be the first to produce a totally photo-composed newspaper.

The successful extension of photocomposition into all areas of news handling is vital and it will come.

To established papers it will open new possibilities of improved typographic treatments, and printing quality, equalling that which is found today only in "slick" magazines. Readers will benefit from increased readability and legibility.

More important, we think, is what it will do in promoting the birth of more newspapers everywhere by reducing not only operational costs, but the investment capital necessary to start in business.

Even today, one Photon and one etching machine could produce at least one and possibly two weekly newspapers.

Considering that the Photon could be leased, rather than purchased, the amount of capital required to finance a new publication would be completely reasonable.

Such things must surely begin in America, but ultimately will affect the entire free world. Research already has established that Photon machines can be built to set any known language directly from a keyboard—even Chinese.

Two American-built Photons are in operation in Sweden, setting type in five languages, and European models of the Photon are being manufactured in France.

This is a glimpse of photocomposition. Its development is blowing refreshing and stimulating breezes through some stuffy old composing rooms.

## The Economic Squeeze

By George Chaplin

In 1882, James Gordon Bennett of the New York *Herald* wrote a memorandum to one of his editorial executives who had just come over from the *Telegram*: "Carry out the . . . principles of economical management combined with enterprise and thorough condensation of the news."

Publishers had urged that on editors before the days of Bennett and they most assuredly have been urging it on them since. The fact is the editor, in charge of a department that accounts for 10 to 15 per cent of the paper's expenses, can never get far from economics. He may not be good at figures and he may not like them—but he cannot escape them. There are payrolls and expense vouchers, wire service and syndicate bills, Guild negotiations, and almost daily decisions on whether a story is "worth" overtime or costly out-of-town investigation.

Any editor worth his salt does his best to produce a lively, honest newspaper that is in tune with his community and meets its responsibilities. He may battle for a bigger budget—what editor doesn't?—but he cannot dodge the fact that for a paper to be editorially independent it must be economically independent.

\* \* \* \*

Today, all across the land, newspapers are facing real economic problems. Operating costs are—and for a decade have been—rising faster than revenues. Last year, the annual survey by *Editor & Publisher* showed, newspapers had the smallest per centage increase in rev-

enue in any of the last 11 years . . . And in only one of the previous 11 years (1955 compared to 1954) was the percentage gain in revenue higher than that for expenses.

Newsprint, the largest single item of cost—ranging from 15 to 40 or even 50 per cent, depending upon the paper's size—has doubled in price since the end of World War II, and more than tripled since 1940.

Salaries and wages on many papers in recent years have risen more sharply than the cost-of-living. Productivity has not kept pace, and, in many instances, has actually gone down.

Unions are reluctant to give up traditional practices, no matter how wasteful. On some papers, long after certain types of ads have arrived in plate or mat form and been printed, the union requires that it reset this material, assemble, proof and correct it, then dump it. It has been estimated that this practice—"Bogus"—costs a paper, depending on size, from \$5000 to \$150,000 a year. On many papers, pressmen stereotypers and mailers have manning requirements that call for the use of more men than are actually needed. Most unions require apprentices to serve too long (five years for the pressman, six years for the printers) and often restrict them from doing work of which they are capable. Needless to say, this all costs a paper heavily.

A word on "fringe costs," which to most newspaper people is just a phrase covering the paper's outlay for vacations, holidays, sick pay, social security, state and federal unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, health insurance, etc. A study of 197 U. S. newspapers showed they were paying an average straight-time pay per employee of \$2.05 an hour. The fringe

---

George Chaplin is editor of the New Orleans *Item*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1941. This is from a talk at the Fifth Caribbean Area Press Seminar at New Orleans.



costs added 41 cents, raising the total to \$2.46 an hour. I am not questioning the need or the validity of such benefits. I am simply pointing out that the word "fringe" is far from precise in definition and in attitude.

Externally, television and radio are competing for the advertiser's budget and for the reader's dollar and his time.

Part of the time that goes into viewing and listening goes to movies, which had 90 million attendance in 1946 and only half as much (46,500,000) in 1956—but some of it obviously has been taken out of reading time, too.

\* \* \* \*

From the continuing economic squeeze, from inside the plant and out, have come more newspaper mergers, more suspensions, more sales, less competition.

Judge Learned Hand, 15 years ago, wrote this: The press "serves one of the most vital of all general interests—the dissemination of news from as many different sources, and with as many different facets and colors, as is possible. That interest presupposes that right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues, than through any kind of authoritative selection. To many this is, and always will be, folly. But we have staked upon it our all."

Reality, however, has not kept pace with this ideal.

The 1958 yearbook of *Editor & Publisher* notes that in only 5.9 per cent of U. S. newspaper cities—89 out of 1452—does competition exist, with two or more dailies separately owned, although in some cases printed in a common plant. Fourteen of our states have no competition. Eighteen other states have only one competitive city.

Some of the papers that disappeared were poorly directed, out of step with changing times, either unaware of their community responsibilities or faulty in meeting them. In other cases the papers that died were good papers, ably directed, well edited, aggressively promoted—but simply unable to stay afloat in the economic riptides.

\* \* \* \*

Looking to the future, what can newspapers do?

For one thing, they can lean more heavily on research and on improved equipment and techniques.

More than 30 U. S. dailies, ranging from the Panama City, Fla. *Herald* (circulation 13,203) to the Milwaukee

*Journal* (494,619 on Sunday) are producing some of their ads by photo-composition.

More than 100 newspapers and 140 job shops are using new fast-etching machines. In research projects conducted by the American Newspaper Publishers Association and a major chemical company, etching time for half-tones has been reduced from 20 minutes to one and a half minutes; line engravings from an hour and 15 minutes to 16 minutes.

More newspapers are using tele-typesetter equipment, in which a tape is fed into the type-setting machine. There are now some 2400 TTS machines operating in 400 to 450 dailies and some 250 to 300 TTS units in 175 weeklies.

Another new development is the packless mat, now in use in 12 papers and being tested in others. An ancient Egyptian doing rewrite on papyrus would be right at home today in most stereotyping departments, watching grown men pasting colored strips onto the backs of matrices.

Newspapers generally are reducing their page widths, going toward an 11-pica column. One Oklahoma publisher recently spent \$300,000 remodeling a comparatively new press to reduce the width of newsprint required. Pressroom waste is being watched and there is tighter control on "returns"—those street-sale papers that aren't sold.

More experimentation is a must in newspapering. But at the same time costs are cut, revenues must be increased. Newspapers have been selling too much for too little, to both advertisers and readers.

National income and magazine-and-TV rates have risen faster than the price of newspaper space. And the five-cent newspaper has to go up. Nowhere else can anyone buy as much for a nickle—or a dime. Some papers have raised to seven cents, some to ten. There are now more than 50 dailies with a single-copy price of ten cents and there will be more. The kind of circulation that is lost through a price increase is the kind that isn't doing the advertiser a great deal of good anyway.

In the newsroom there must be more awareness of costs. Copy should be written to size, to reduce overset. Stories which can be written in advance of deadline should not be written on it. Library research should be done before the interview, not after. Accuracy should be achieved when the story is written, not with a replate.

## Title-itis: A Creeping Malady

By Robert J. Cranford

The more discerning newspaper readers are likely to have noticed an insidious sort of creeping malady which has been infecting the public prints increasingly in recent years. It might be diagnosed as title-itis, or a compulsion to confer titles upon persons in the news.

The illness, which seems to be epidemic in the bright-eyed new generation of journalism, makes some old-timers wonder what has come over the men of the muscular index fingers who type out the news of the day. More incredible is the fact that it gets by the stalwarts of the green eyeshades who move among the paste pots and shears and traditionally lay a heavy blue pencil upon the reporter's product.

No one has to be reminded that nowadays the wire services and the syndicates are serving media of oral presentation as well as those of print. And the rewrite men who prepare the news bulletins for velvet-voiced and telegenic dissemination might argue that there's justification for the practice of preceding the name of a person in the news not only with his proper title but also his age, his vocation, his notable achievements, his pedigree, and anything else that comes to mind.

The argument can be made that it makes smoother oral presentation to say "U.N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjold," than "Dag Hammarskjold, secretary of the U.N." Admittedly, commas and other punctuation necessitate pauses and voice breaks and result in an uneven rate of speaking. And the chances are that a newspaper which wrote it "U.N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjold" would not get a single letter to the editor from an objecting reader.

But what about this one: "Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs Davie Keye. . ."? Even if this were the exact official title, it takes eight words or one and a half to two lines of the average body type set single column. Isn't it a bit awkward? Doesn't it keep the reader in suspense too long?

The reader with an appreciation of the niceties of grammar isn't jarred nearly so hard by this sort of usurpation of the place and function of the title as by the inclusion of occupations, ages, and other identifications.

For example:

"Underworld Figure Johnny Stompanato," "British Diplomat Harold Beeley," "Famed Air General George C. Kenney (Ret.)," "Singing Cowboy Hero Roy Rogers," "Former Dirt Track Auto Race Driver and Race Car

**Prof. Cranford's** ear has been sharpened against hack writing by 25 years of practice and 10 years of teaching journalism. He is at the University of Nebraska.

Builder Robert Kelsey Watkins," and 21-year-old Mother Mrs. Charles Kinlaw"?

The news pages are not the only culprits. Although one may turn with annoyance from a news page story which begins, "National President of the Guild and Assistant Record Managing Editor Joseph Collis. . .," he can in no wise be certain that the sports pages will afford escape. For example, he might have seen "Eastern Champion Maryland and Southern King Louisiana State University" opening a story about a football game. Or, in season, the reader may have spotted a story beginning, "Northwestern Basketball and Baseball Star Larry Kurka. . ."

A story a few years ago about the discovery of two ancient boats near one of the pyramids in Egypt said one of the boats "apparently was the one ordered built by Dying Pharaoh Cheops," etc. The question naturally occurs, was he "Living Pharaoh" until he began to die, or was he just "Pharaoh"? After the process of dying had ended, did he become "Dead Pharaoh"?

I have capitalized in the foregoing examples because, some newspaper stylebooks to the contrary, it is proper to capitalize titles. They become even sillier in lower case letters.

Students at Northwestern University presumably had read so many indiscriminately conferred titles in their newspapers that they got into the spirit of the thing.

Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, president of the university, among other things lighted the candles at a campus ceremony; so the student newspaper carried a front-pager referring to him as "Founders' Day Candle-lighter J. Roscoe Miller." I was teaching there at the time, and I forthwith challenged the students in my journalism classes to greet the president by that title. As far as I know, the dare was never accepted.

It may be argued that a practice which eliminates the necessity of setting commas on the linotype machines, or moving them on the teletype transmitters, saves time. How much time? Enough to justify the awkward and sometimes ungrammatical usages?

Pity the copyreader who sees in a wire service story "ASSISTANT RECORD MANAGING EDITOR." Does it mean the assistant managing editor of the Record (capitalized) or, if grammar is applied accurately, is it the Record that is the assistant? Isn't Record obviously a noun in this context? Or is it a jerry-built adjective? Or did the writer mean to say merely that the man referred to was a rip-snorting assistant managing editor who consistently broke all records for assistant managing editing? How to mark the copy? Wouldn't the confusion beginning on the copydesk grow thicker and deeper as the story reached the readers?

An academic question? Perhaps. But it is certain that packing stories with such muddy passages will not increase reader respect for the papers which do it.

Besides being unnatural, awkward, illogical, and in general monstrous, the practice has some ethical implications.

A news story referred to a man as "Convicted Bank Robber Joe Blank" when, according to the accounts I read, he long since had served his sentence and had paid his debt to society for his offense, which no one would argue was trivial. The question is: Is the man going to have this "title" affixed to his name henceforth when he gets into the news? How could he forget and live down his past if so disposed?

My dictionary, a little and abridged one, defines "title" as used in this context: "A descriptive or distinctive appellation, esp. one belonging to a person by right of rank, office, attainment, etc."

I doubt that the lexicographers, in their use of the word "descriptive" intended such "titles" as "250-pound Guard Dick Laak" or "Buxom Blonde Betty Boop." Nor do I think for a moment that a title accorded by "right of attainment" means such as "Former Dirt Track Auto Race Driver and Race Car Builder" Whoosis.

"Dying" certainly is not distinctive. It is something that

king and beggar alike will do eventually. Can it by any stretch of the imagination be an appellation? Should the man who has no other title but "Mr." be addressed on his deathbed as "Dying Mr. Blank"?

To be 21 years old may be a distinction of a sort, but does the phrase, "21-year-old Mother Mrs. Kinlaw" make it proper to greet her with "Hello, 21-Year-Old!"—or for any but her children to address her as "Mother"?

This thing has been growing until it seems it's about ready to break out into full bloom. Imagine finding a story in your paper beginning, "Dental Surgeon at Massachusetts General Hospital and Instructor in Oral Surgery at the Harvard School of Dental Medicine Dr. Walter C. Guralnick. . ." or worse:

The Ancient and Honorable American Association for the Preservation of Barber Shop Quartet Harmonies, Assonances, Dissonances, Lyrics and Modulations Fellowship Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Relations, Publicity, Education, Records and Archives Joe Blow. . ."

## Re-Exclusion of Negro Reporters from Little Rock High Graduation

June 6, 1958

**Memo to: Magazine Publishers Association  
From: Simeon Booker, chief of Washington Bureau, Johnson Publishing Company (Jet and Ebony.)**

On Saturday, May 24, 1958, I and Ernest Withers, a photographer, learned of a press conference at 10:30 a.m. in the offices of Little Rock School Superintendent Virgil T. Blossom. I had called Mr. Blossom since Wednesday advising that I was in town and would like to be briefed on preparations for the graduation. However, Mr. Blossom's office kept saying that no plans had yet been made but that we would be advised, so I assumed, upon learning of the press conference, that he had forgotten same in rush of duties.

After taking a back seat in a room of some 25 reporters from local and out-of-town newspapers and magazines, we were suddenly shocked to find Mr. Blossom informing us that we were not invited and that he would discuss some matters which he didn't think we should hear. I asked whether there would be two press conferences and he said no. He did say that he would see us later. My first impulse was to remain sitting and tell him that I wouldn't leave voluntarily. If he was putting me out because I was non-white, I would rather dramatize the issue by being arrested. However, I got to thinking about the boy to grad-

uate, and decided I would try to work out this matter peacefully—angry as I was to be humiliated in such a manner.

At 1:30 p.m., Withers and I met with Blossom in his office and he told us point blank that "tickets would be required for admission to the graduation and that he wasn't giving us tickets." He further said that he had no valid reason to deny admission to Negro reporters but that because of the emotion attached to the services, he and the board felt it the best policy. In reply, I told Blossom that as an American I thought it utterly foolish with Little Rock such an international issue for him to deny a reporter entrance because of race. I explained that the Negro press was here to cover the event and try to bring back some of the prestige lost during the fall's uprising, hoping, of course, city and school officials were a lot more alert than they were previously. We discussed the matter for fully an hour and finally Blossom said that he would take the matter up again with his board and let me know by 1:30 p.m. on Sunday the day of the baccalaureate services. I learned later that Blossom had called the mother of the Negro graduate and told her not to allow the Negro press to use any of her son's tickets—a sort of sneaky action.

Not hearing from Blossom as promised, I then called Harry Ashmore, managing editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, and stated the case. He is a Harvard Nieman Fellow, as am I. Calling the denial "absolutely stupid," Ashmore

called Blossom and urged reconsideration of the policy. After two hours, Ashmore returned the call to say that Blossom had just advised him that the board was sticking fast to their previous policy.

A few minutes before the Sunday services, Blossom located me and advised me that he was sorry about the decision. Mrs. L. C. Bates, co-editor of the *Arkansas State Press*, the Little Rock Negro Newspaper, and NAACP leader, then protested to Blossom. She asked pool accreditation for the National Newspaper Publishers Association, the group of 40 Negro newspapers.

As a last minutes gesture, Blossom then said that he was calling an emergency meeting of the school board on Mon-

day at which time Mrs. Bates and I would be invited to make a direct plea for representation of the Negro press. After some consideration, we turned down the offer because we felt that we should not be asked to do anything more or less to get inside the stadium than any other reporter.

That closed the Little Rock press fight.

Sunday afternoon, meanwhile, scores of white students at Central made available to the ministerial association tickets to the graduation. One Negro reporter, Sarah Slack, of the N. Y. *Amsterdam News*, used one of the tickets to cover the graduation. I refused to accept a ticket on the grounds that I would be weakening my case of exclusion from the press box because of race.

## Is Newspaper Humor a Lost Art?

By Karl F. Zeisler

Is it tragic that humor long ago deserted the funny papers and is hard to come by anywhere in the daily press?

Don't answer.

The funny news story, thanks to humanity, is still with us. I recall, in the 1952 election, the Alaskan candidate who inserted a card of thanks for those who voted for him, and his wife, who placed one thanking those who voted against him, in a decisive plurality. Last month the same story, word for word, turned up with a Sleepy Eye, Minn., date-line. Good humor never dies.

Equally recurrent is the yarn about the mountaineer town councilman elected on a hand-hewn platform of sturdier law enforcement. His zeal resulted in his arrest as a moonshiner.

And I am preserving in cellophane this jim dandy:

WOODBRIGE, N. J. (AP)—The 7:10 may be just a train, but it's got feelings. Its iron heart was pained when a lady left it waiting at the station here two mornings in a row.

The Pennsylvania Railroad's 7:10 had been making unscheduled stops here for about a week to accommodate the lady who had some temporary work here.

When she failed to show up twice earlier this week, rumor spread that she had been seen aboard a Jersey Central train.

The jilted 7:10 felt it was time to call off the romance. It roared nonstop through town Wednesday and didn't even give a hoot.

Its rarity makes this one stand out like a typo in a wedding announcement. The funny piece, written by the newspaper staffer, is scarcer than a hen's denture. Of course there's the interview with the bewildered Miss Permanent Grinding Wheel of 1958 who missed the bus to the

convention of the Abrasive Society of America and wound up at the Federated Cosmeticians' ball.

Humor, self-generated out of impish imagination and composed in the newsroom just for the hell of it, ain't. Yet Frank Sullivan started that way on the old *World*. Petroleum V. Nasby, Josh Billings, M. Quad and their host of fellow-minstrels went the way of the trolley car when a bimotored plane crashed in Alaska carrying Will Rogers to an untimely end.

My students can testify. We discuss humor and invite a real live humorist—city editor of the *Ann Arbor News*—to class. He brings the disturbing news that his major outlet, a Sunday supplement, has just quit buying humor, perhaps to celebrate the recession. And the class combs dozens of papers to find scrawny examples of newspaper humor, occasionally unearthing one setting the Geigers chattering. Long since I have come to spot the authors—Knight McKesson, Louie Cook, Dick Emmons, our local boy, and one or two local or syndicated columnists.

The onetime lapidary art of the editorial paragraph is lost.

One theory is that all extant humorists outside Bedlam have crossed the line into television, rehashing Joe Miller for Hope, Skelton, Benny et al. If this theory has chinks, they must have been caulked when the *Saturday Evening Post* disclosed that Goodman Ace grosses \$9500 every seventh day composing Como's soft-sell dialogue.

But I don't quite go along with this. Whipcracking mots at Benny penury aren't, surely, the dish of tea of every contemporary citizen with a funny bone.

What's funny any more?

What chance does newspaper humor have in a world geared to Gomorra, artificially triggered by an errant patrol bomber or a guided missile?

Walt Kelly, who finds humor still rampant in, of all places, Okeefeenokee Swamp—and possibly its last refuge

Karl F. Zeisler teaches journalism at the University of Michigan.



in the "comic" strips—tells of a recent flight around the world. He and Pogo followed Sputnik I, which he declares produced the classic humor situation. Fat Uncle Sam, whom everyone expected to win, lost the space sweepstakes to tortoise Russia, or as Walt puts it, the reverse side of the coin, the unexpected one, came up. But bracing people around the world, he found no one who thought it very funny.

Great humor, to Kelly, is kindly—not the jibe at the expense of the other fellow. Surely the other side of the coin of this kindly humor is that of *Krokodile*, the Soviet humor magazine. Its existence testifies to Marxism's tenet that humor can't be ignored as a vestigial facet of frail man.

So in *Krokodile* we have the savage, primitive humor of malice. The *New Yorker* of Moscow ridicules the pomposity of bureaucrats, pricks the stuffed shirts pretending to status in the classless society and holds capitalism up to scorn. It exemplifies humor with a purpose, which is about as funny as a prosthetic device.

Is there any place left then, in the H-ridden world, in inner space, so to speak, which concerns Walt Kelly, for real newspaper humor? Yes, of course, if we look at humor not as *Krokodile* does but as Walt Kelly does and as the late Stephen Leacock did. This Canadian political economist viewed humor as the kindly contemplation of the incongruities of life, artistically expressed.

An artistic expression of the incongruities of A-Space life, it seems to me, might be a cartoon on the Kalamazoo concrete contractor's backyard family fallout hideout, elaborately described, deadpan, in the press. The derivative cartoon simply raises the kindly question, does the hutch come equipped with a decontamination delivery tube for the Sunday paper?

Cartoonists, bless their nicotine-stained souls, seem better able to tilt their crowquills against today's fissionable windmills than writers.

Humor, since TV, has become almost entirely pictorial, which is too bad. Today's conformist culture admits no Artemus Ward, with weekly wacky comment on the world's wacky happenings, or Mr. Dooley's acid bog-Irish explications of why the Supreme Court follows the ballot box. George Ade's Fables in Slang died with him, though the Chicago *Tribune* profitably resurrected Abe Martin's rural japes at flapperdom and upkeeping with the Joneses.

What would Will Rogers have sent from Cape Canaveral, shrewdly taking in his fellow skywatchers instead of what went on on the launching pads?

Pre-Hitler, Leacock delineated the unjokable provinces—the Bible, death, patriotic songs and hymns, among them. It almost seems as though our yen for security-conformity has added, without Leacock's blessing, A-Space Age survival.

Well, the incongruities of life today include the possibility

that a B-52 might wander over an international boundary, as Moscow complains one does occasionally, and lay an uncalculated H-egg, as one did over North Carolina recently. Or a Soviet submarine, scouting Canaveral, might by a navigation error surface in Miami's yacht basin. Or an eager-beaver radar scanner might mistake a natural satellite, a meteorite, for a guided missile. One scientist points out that two tremendous ones have fallen in Siberia in a half century; a third might well put the finger on the Kremlin panic button.

What is a more cosmic jest than a mistaken jab at the push-button that signals Armageddon? Yet if the cosmic finger were directed by a non-electronic brain schooled in the kindly contemplation of the incongruities of life it might be interrupted by a chuckle. And even a microsecond's hesitation might put off the irrevocable count-down.

## Education Among Weekly Staffs

By Ruth Peeling

From the moans and groans that arise occasionally from weekly publishers, one might conclude that all of the college-trained people are being siphoned off by "better paying" dailies.

Is there basis for such lament? Reports from weekly editors of North Carolina show that quite a few college graduates are attracted to the weekly field.

Sixty-eight of North Carolina's 147 weekly editors replied to a recent questionnaire on the education level of their editorial staff members (society reporters, news reporters, sports reporters, editorial writers). Of the 190 persons on the editorial staffs of those 68 weeklies. Fifty per cent hold a bachelor's degree, 6.8 per cent a master's degree and .5 per cent a doctorate.

Of the others, 41.7 per cent completed high school and many of these also received some college training, but did not complete requirements for a degree. Less than 1 per cent completed no more than the eighth grade.

For ease in analysis, editors' replies were divided into five categories, based on the newspaper's circulation.

Only in the category of under 1,500 were less than half (34.1 per cent) of the questionnaires returned. In the other categories, returns ranged from 50 to 80 per cent.

The table below shows the percentage of college-trained personnel in each category:

Size of Paper (Circulation)	Percentage of Persons Holding College Degree
0 - 1,500	49.9
1,500 - 3,000	50.6
3,001 - 4,500	67.0
4,501 - 6,000	60.0
Over 6,000	61.0

Based on these figures, the following can be concluded:

1. A large number of the weeklies in North Carolina are, apparently, "holding their own" in vying for college-trained personnel in the newspaper field.
2. Since many weeklies have personnel on their writing staffs with college and college graduate training, the editors might do well to inform their readers, through promotion ads and other means, of that fact.

Good writing appears in the grass roots press, yet readers frequently apologize for their hometown paper.

### Nieman Fellows

(Continued from Page 2)

in 1949. He began news work ten years ago with the AP in Atlanta, was three years with Macon *News*, and has been for the last three years on the editorial page of the Charlotte *News*, for the past year and a half as associate editor.

He plans to study problems of his region, economic, social and political.

**Wilfrid C. Rodgers**, 38, reporter, Boston *Globe*. He started as a copy boy on the *Globe* in 1939, returned after four years of war service as a reporter and has studied under the GI Bill at Boston University and Northeastern University. After covering the police beat, politics and general reporting, two years ago he became the first reporter on his paper to specialize in covering news of labor.

He plans studies chiefly in labor and economics.

**John L. Seigenthaler**, reporter, Nashville *Tennessean*. He is 31, has been nine years on the *Tennessean*, covering county government, criminal courts, and doing investigative reporting that led him into the conditions of the teamsters' union. His reports led to Senatorial investigations and to the impeachment of a Tennessee judge.

He plans to study problems of the South, economic, social and political.

**Howard A. Simons**, news editor, Science Service. He is 29, a graduate of Union College in 1951, and of Columbia Graduate School of Journalism. After newspaper work in Schenectady and New York (some of it while still in college), he joined the staff of Science Service in Washington four years ago and has become its news editor, directing the science news coverage on which it serves newspapers. He has contributed science articles to magazines.

He plans to study science and Russia.

**Wallace L. Turner**, reporter, Portland *Oregonian*. He is 37, a graduate of the University of Missouri in 1943. He joined the staff of the *Oregonian* in 1943. He has covered major news stories and has turned in investigative reporting that has won him distinction. Exposure of Indian land frauds in 1952 won him the Heywood Broun award. His investigation of teamster union abuses, together with his colleague William Lambert, won the Pulitzer prize for

The fact that a person has a college degree does not mean that he is, by virtue of that degree, an outstanding journalist. Knowledge of the education level of editorial staffers can serve as a yardstick, however, to help evaluate the quality of the weekly press.

**Ruth Peeling** is a weekly editor—the Carteret County *News-Times* in Morehead City, N. C.

local reporting, the Broun and Sigma Delta Chi awards.

He plans to study criminal law and economics.

The Associates selected and financed by the Carnegie Corporation are:

**Bruce Grant**, chief leader writer and dramatic critic on the Melbourne, Australia, *Age*.

He is 33, a graduate of University of Melbourne. He served three years in the Navy in the second world war. In his nine years on the Melbourne *Age* he has been film and theatre critic, served three years as correspondent in London, covered the Pacific part of Queen Elizabeth's tour in 1953-4, reported the Geneva Conference of 1955 and major Middle East events.

He plans to study American foreign policy, theatre and literature.

**Maurice Jones**, deputy-chief reporter of the *Southland Daily News*, Invercargill, New Zealand.

At 28, he has spent 11 years in journalism. Besides general reporting and editing, he was a member of Reuters special staff to cover the 1956 Olympics in Australia.

He plans to study economics, U. S. history and politics of Southeast Asia.

The Associates selected and financed by the Asia Foundation are:

**T. V. Parasuram**, Parliamentary correspondent for the Press Trust of India, Ltd., New Delhi.

He is 35. He began newspaper work with the Associated Press of India in Bombay in 1940 and later became their parliamentary correspondent in Hyderabad and New Delhi. He has been since 1949 with the Press Trust of India. Among his assignments were covering Gandhi in that leader's later years, reporting the Bandung Conference and accompanying Nehru on his 1956 and 1957 tours in Europe, and Bulganin and Krushchev's visit to India.

He plans to study economics and American political history.

**Daphne Whittam**, associate editor of the *Nation*, Rangoon, Burma. She is 35, a graduate of Rangoon University, in 1947, and has been since 1948 with the *Nation*, English language daily in Rangoon, its associate editor since 1952. She plans to study economics and such social problems as industrialization and juvenile delinquency.

## Seedbed of (Balkan) Communism

By David Lawson

LAND WITHOUT JUSTICE. By Milovan Djilas. Harcourt, Brace. 365 pp. \$5.75.

Montenegrins drafted into the Yugoslav Army have been known in the "count-off" of soldiers in the line to call: "First after the first" or "First after the first after the first." No Montenegrin could reasonably be expected to declare himself "second" or "third."

William Jankovic, president of Harcourt, Brace, in his introduction to this book, the first volume of the Djilas autobiography, gives this apt illustration of one aspect of the Montenegrin character. Born into a tradition of violence and heroics, or gnawing poverty and folk epic of strange beauty, the Montenegrin is given also to self-glorification and the Wildean proposition that nothing succeeds like excess.

Unkindly, perhaps, one might observe that these characteristics are not absent from the concept of this work, for it is the first of three planned volumes of autobiography, and its 365 pages take us only to the author's 19th year.

To be sure, they were years as turbulent and changeful as any in Montenegro's proud history, and it was then that Milovan Djilas took his first firm steps towards Communism—steps which were to take him to the post of No. 2 Communist in all of Yugoslavia, and eventually to an "enemy of the people's" cell. Djilas writes about those early years with the sweep and sensitivity of the mountain poet he is.

His handling of his themes, the rhythm of his words and such passages as "He spoke in a drawl and softly, like feathers on a wound" remind us that in him Communism's loss may prove to be a significant gain for literature.

But the romantic aura surrounding his life of daring, defiance and disgrace is not sufficient basis for the near-deification he has been accorded in some quarters. Djilas can be a rather crude political thinker and a sometimes extravagant prose writer.

One reader, at least, after getting

through gory descriptions of mountain blood-feuds and pausing to be charmed by an occasional intimate word-portrait of this little-known land and its people, found the book's greatest value in the clues it gives to the making of a Communist.

Djilas says he was won over to Communism at the age of seven. To Montenegrins, many of whom had already fought in the First and Second Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, World War I meant struggle against the encroaching Austrians and Germans and betrayal, in the view of many, by King Nikola's surrender of his Montenegrin armies.

The year 1918 brought the savagely-contested union with the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in the kingdom that was later called Yugoslavia. Embittered, many turned to Communism.

The first Communist in the boy Djilas' life used to say he was one because he loved justice, like Christ. Ruthless suppression by the "royal dictatorship" of the Communist Party only enhanced the messianic glow which surrounded these peasant idealists. "Communism," it seemed to young Djilas, "was something just and for poor people."

This was indeed a land without justice, a land without recourse, in which new elements of police brutality repression and Serbian megalomania bestrode its black and blood-stained ridges.

Small wonder, then, that Djilas ascribes those first impulses toward Communism to a desire to put an end to the world of force and injustice and to realize a different world, one of justice, brotherhood and love among men. Add a fierce, Montenegrin-type nationalism to this idealism and you have a formula of compelling force for people in many lands. (In one of his few projections into the present, Djilas writes: "The revolution gave me everything—except what I had idealistically expected from it.")

The relevance for places and people elsewhere is again striking when Djilas writes of his "philosophical and moral tie with the bearer of an idea to which I

was increasingly receptive," and in his suggestion that for the many, rather than the thinking few, it was misery that led them to take the Communist path.

For the moral and intellectual dilemma into which the path led Djilas, and for the convictions which were forced out of his disenchantment, the reader is referred to the best-selling *The New Class*.

For the soul-searching and the manner in which the dilemma was resolved, we will have to wait (and hope) for subsequent volumes of this discursive but compelling autobiography.

Here we are given only some hints. He speaks of himself, after World War II, "rebellious inside but nevertheless conforming to the prejudices of the closed circle of Communists, who see only themselves and their charmed world and frozen ideas."

It seems that in 1946, the then-powerful Djilas, jolted by harsh treatment accorded his one-time school teacher, a non-Communist, was already asking himself:

"What was to be done with men who are conscientious and qualified in their speciality, but who are ideologically at odds with the new state of affairs? [The teacher] was a part of that great and general problem. The opposition to its reasonable solution came to have the force of a prejudice that none could control. The new Communist bureaucratic class, though in its ascendancy, had neither grace nor understanding for anything except its own interests."

The time was coming when Tito's first lieutenant could no longer contain his own revulsion from those interests. The Montenegrin rebel was to prove himself of the stuff to make history and with the gift to write it.

### Our Reviewers:

David Lawson, *Auckland Star*; Jack Jurey, *Youngstown Vindicator*; Thomas Wicker, *Winston-Salem Journal* and *Sentinel*; Hiroshi Ishihara, *Yomiuri Shimbun*, Japan; Walter Spearman, professor of journalism, University of North Carolina; James W. Carty, Jr., *Nashville Tennessean*.

## Max Lerner's America

By Walter Spearman

AMERICA AS A CIVILIZATION: Life and Thought in the United States Today. By Max Lerner. Simon and Schuster. 1,036 pp. \$10.

"America is a civilization" Max Lerner concludes in his mammoth, fact-and-opinion packed book, *America As A Civilization*. Marx and Toynbee considered Europe the center of Western power, with America as the rim, but Lerner insists that "the America they saw as the rim turned out to be the center." It is also "the only great nation of modern times whose history is also the history of three shaping forces of the modern world—industrialism and democracy."

If there are keys to the success of American civilization one is the remarkable "mixture of idealism and material power" and the other is its "open society," which has permitted a diverse population to pursue happiness freely, although the means to this happiness have been success, money, power and security rather than religion or culture.

Mr. Lerner has been concerned with American civilization for years and has devoted the past ten to writing this book, while teaching courses in American civilization at Brandeis University and elsewhere. He has been editorial director of the newspaper *PM*, editor of the *Nation*, managing editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Special Sciences* and a daily newspaper columnist.

Not only did he try out his book material on classes at Brandeis, but he sent the various chapters around to experts in their different fields for criticism and suggestions. *America As A Civilization* is a thorough job. In spite of its over-size and encyclopedic information, it is also immensely readable, though marred, perhaps, by the inclusion of too much psychological jargon and a refusal to edit down to a more manageable length.

The author has culled from De Tocqueville, Thomas Jefferson, Toynbee, Marx, Henry Adams, Myrdal, William Dean Howells, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Henry and William James, Robert Lynd, Lewis Mumford, Parrington, Santayana, both the Roosevelts, both the Schlesingers, Robert Hutchins and dozens of

other perceptive commentators on the American scene.

Perhaps his greatest contribution is to have gathered these diverse ideas together into one volume sifted through his own acutely critical but warmly affectionate eye. "I love my country and my culture," he says, "but it is no service to them, nor to the creed of democracy, to gloss over the rough facts of American life."

Among these "rough facts" he includes the Negro problem ("ugliest scar on the American conscience"), robber barons in industry and the cult of property, McCarthyism, the craze for comic books and television, over-indulgence of children and neglect of the old, too many pressures and mental breakdowns, frightening juvenile delinquency, overvaluing of "romantic love," Babbitt-joiners, frustrated women, spectator sports, fear of solitude and death.

Nor is he sure that American civilization is mature enough to accept its world responsibilities wisely. It has never faced national failure or disaster and it operates in the field of foreign policy on a day-to-day basis rather than on the extended time schedule of Russia and China. However, the great mobility, capacity for change within the democratic framework, optimism and creative resources of the nation make Lerner believe that "there is still in the American potential the plastic strength that has shaped a great civilization." His final verdict is an agreement with Emerson, who said: "We think our civilization is near its meridian, but we are yet only at the cockcrow and the morning star."

Like a great department store at Christmas-time there is something in *America As A Civilization* for everybody. Mr. Lerner discusses America's heritage, its ethical diversity, its devotion to the ideal of liberty and of individual freedoms. He examines the capitalist system, the rise of machine industry and the industrial worker, American politics and laws, the growth of the city and the decline of the farmer. He sketches the character and personality of the individual American, the status of the family, customs of courtship, marriage and child-raising, education and religion. And he has an excellent chapter on the arts and

popular culture, including literature, amateur sports, radio, television and movies, jazz, art and architecture.

In a provocative section called "Profile of the Press" Mr. Lerner charges that most newspapers are so intent upon giving their readers "the facts" and emphasizing "violent conflict" on the one hand and "home-town news and gossip" on the other that there is a serious lack of intelligent interpretation of the news. "As a result," he says, "the process of history becomes for the newspaper reader a series of raging meaningless and impenetrable battles." The reporter, in turn, is guided by two drives: "Never to be scooped and rarely to let a conviction take hold of him." Mr. Lerner is deeply concerned at the newspaper's "abdication of the critical function," its surrender of crusading fervor, and the alarming number of cities (11 out of 12) which have no competing daily papers.

"Uneasy stirrings of the conscience of newspaper craftsmanship," says Mr. Lerner, have been indicated by the critical articles on the press of A. J. Liebling in the *New Yorker*, by the establishment of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard and by the report of the Hutchins Commission. Another interesting suggestion he makes for the future is the creation of a revolving fund, perhaps contributed by foundations, "to help competent newspapermen set up newspapers in areas where competition is most badly needed."

While there are no new and spectacular discoveries of what American civilization is really like, there is a broad picture of our civilization that places it in world perspective for the reader and incites him to further study in the particular fields which interest him. One of the features of the volume is a 43-page section called "Notes for Further Reading," which should serve as an incentive for additional study.

*America As A Civilization* is strongly recommended for vacation reading. It may be too heavy for holding comfortably in a hammock, but it's fine for a rocky seacoast or the shade of a mountain pine. When your vacation—and the Lerner book—are completed, you should have not only a fund of information but a prideful sense of time well spent. And certainly you will understand your America better than ever before.



## Dean Brelis' Novel

By Charles L. Whipple

THE MISSION, by Dean Brelis. Random House, \$3.50.

Here is a little jewel of a book, written in prose that has been whittled down clean as a whistle, and with enough action to satisfy the most adventurous.

Only 180 pages long, it tells the story of a parachute drop behind Japanese lines into Burma during World War II by a young OSS sergeant and his companion, Pohm, son of the headman of a Kachin tribe.

Their mission is to organize the natives and prevent Japanese troops from using the Irrawaddy River, as part of the battle for Myitkyina. The story comes to a climax with the ambush of a Japanese steamer loaded with troops and tanks.

But it is not only the action and the suspense, exciting though it is, that makes *The Mission* a truly great book. Rather, it is the beautifully expressed feeling of brotherhood with these dark-skinned people of the jungle, a spirit which surely must have meaning for us all in this world of today and tomorrow.

In this novelette, Dean Brelis, who once worked for the *Globe* Summers and as correspondent while a student at Harvard, is retelling his own experiences in World War II.

There is no didactic preaching here, only the bare bones of a thrilling action story and some beautiful descriptions of life in the jungle. But the lesson of brotherhood comes through as an inescapable deduction on the reader's part. It takes good writing to do that.

It reminded this reviewer, in fact, of Hemingway's *Old Man of the Sea*. The style, clean prose, and story are there—as well as the meaning.

For the past year, Brelis has been at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow. Typically enough, after reading the headlines, he dashed off a few days ago to Paris to report on de Gaulle and the French military mind. One hopes for many more books like his first, *The Mission*.

Boston *Globe*, June 8

## A Lawyers' Plan for Waging Peace

By Hiroshi Ishihara

WORLD PEACE THROUGH WORLD LAW. By Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. Harvard University Press. 540 pp. \$7.50.

A few years ago I read an article by an eminent jurist discussing what protective legal measures for private leases, mortgages, wills and trusts should be taken to meet an atomic attack. I was amused and impressed by his concern for what I felt hopefully was a most unlikely contingency.

A few weeks ago I read a book by two distinguished lawyers detailing how to secure peace through disarmament and the revision of the United Nations Charter. I was so impressed by their careful plan for what I hope is a most likely contingency that I felt an urge to call attention to the book, in spite of my ignorance of both international law and English composition.

The co-authors of *World Peace through World Law* are Lawyers Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. Mr. Clark, the initiator of the Selective Service Act of 1940, consultant to Secretary of War Stimson in 1940-44, has been studying the question of world order for some eighteen years. Mr. Sohn, a native of Poland, received his LL.B. from Harvard in 1940, was a legal officer in the U.N. Secretariat and in 1951 joined the faculty of the Harvard Law School, where he conducts seminars on "United Nations Law" and "Problems in the Development of World Law." The book under review is the result of their joint research for the past seven years, during which they submitted manuscripts to some 3,000 carefully selected persons throughout the world, both in 1953 and 1956, for comments.

As I came to this book, it seemed to me that the major approaches to peace I had previously read tended to be, among others, a) the Utopian World Government, b) prophetic unilateral nuclear disarmament, or c) the reluctant advocacy of the so-called first-stage agreement. Hence there appears to be little clear notion either what the shape of a disarmament agreement would be or how an international authority could enforce peace.

The authors of *World Peace through World Law*, present a different approach, detailed and specific. Its thesis is that there is no genuine peace until there is put into effect a working system of enforceable world law in the limited field of war prevention. The proposals of Messrs. Clark and Sohn are roughly as follows:

1) A carefully-phased and detailed plan for the elimination of all national armaments over a period of thirteen years (the strength of the internal police forces shall not exceed two for each 1,000 of a country's population, and in no case may exceed 500,000.)

2) Creation of an internationally-recruited and well-trained and equipped U. N. Inspection Service and U. N. Peace Forces (200,000-600,000 strong plus the Reserve Forces of 600,000-1,200,000).

3) Almost universal membership in the United Nations.

4) Representation in a new General Assembly should be on the basis of population, with a maximum of thirty representatives for any one nation and one representative for even the smallest nation, totalling 625 representatives.

5) Substitution of a veto-less Executive Council for the Security Council.

6) Creation of a U.N. Nuclear Energy Authority, World Equity Tribunal, and World Conciliation Board, while strengthening the International Court of Justice for settlement of disputes at high and low levels.

Creation of a World Development Agency for elimination of economic warfare and poverty as causes of war.

8) A well-established revenue system to keep the machinery going.

*World Peace through World Law* is primarily a legal book, with precise wording and concise sentences, in which the present Charter of the United Nations is presented alongside and in contrast to the proposed revisions. The detailed comments after almost every article are relevant, illuminating and ready to meet criticism. The book, I think, is a landmark in the study of peace proposals in

view of its clarity and comprehensiveness. Those who are looking for new tactics or strategy in disarmament negotiations may criticize this book as being marred by a total unconcern for diplomatic realities. (In fact, I myself put off reading the book for several weeks in anticipation of this fault.) But despite this, the legal approach as presented in this work gives one a real sense of the directions we might follow in order to achieve world peace.

We are entering an era when we have to modify the conception of national sovereignty if we are to survive. The

book tries to show, and succeeds I think, the need of establishing firmly an international authority—the need to strengthen the U.N. by every means. It presents the various aspects of the most pressing and complicated problem in the world—disarmament. The co-authors hope “the book will contribute material for the world-wide discussion which must precede the establishment of truly effective institutions for the prevention of war.” I found the book a heavy yet rewarding reading experience, absorbing and thought-provoking. So will other readers.

## Illiteracy: A Grim Picture

By James W. Carty Jr.

WORLD ILLITERACY AT MID-CENTURY. PARIS: UNESCO. 1957. 200 pp., \$2.00.

There are approximately 3,000,000 adult illiterates in the United States and apparently the situation will get worse. This UNESCO monograph on fundamental education indicates that the per cent of school children in the 5 to 14 year group is declining. Some 91 out of 100 boys and girls were enrolled in U.S. schools in 1930; by 1950, the figure dropped to 85.

These and other figures, related to the world scene, and their implications should be considered by editors, journalism teachers and students. An overview of 102 countries reveals that the battle to teach men and women to read—a prelude to winning their minds—is not being won. In some 40 nations with high illiteracy rates, fewer than 40 out of 100 children in the 5 to 14 age group are enrolled in schools.

“Unless the primary enrollment ratio is rapidly increased,” this book affirms pessimistically, “the fight against illiteracy will not be won in the foreseeable future.”

This statistical study reportedly is the “first attempt to present estimates on the extent of illiteracy in every country and territory of the world.” Even considering the minimum and therefore most optimistic definitions of literacy, there are an estimated 700,000,000 adult illiterates in the world. This represents 44 per cent of the

total population of people 15 years and older. Actually, more conservative definitions would place the per cent at 65 to 70.

The largest number of illiterates are in Africa, with 100,000,000, and in Asia (the Southeastern and Southwestern sections have another 100,000,000). There are some 40,000,000 non-literate adults in Middle and South America and one-half that number in Southern Europe. One country in the Western hemisphere, Brazil, has 15.3 million illiterates (this was in 1950 in comparison with 6.3 million in 1900). In fact at least 14 countries have 5 million or more adult illiterates.

Literacy is tied in with the development of the economy, with geo-political and cultural development of a nation. It would be well for mass media leaders to get this book—largely statistical but with brief chapters and tentative conclusions on such matters as the relation of literacy to education and urban industrialization—and think through the implications of the problems. The press has a responsibility to see what it can do to help raise literacy levels. This invaluable book provides insight into the complicated problem of defining and estimating illiterates and related problems.

---

Mr. Carty is religious news editor of the Nashville *Tennessean*. He has taken part in literacy-literature projects in Egypt and Tanganyika.

## Off-Shore Novel

By Walter Spearman

THE NEW ENGLAND STORY. By Henry Beetle Hough. Random House. 346 pp. \$3.95.

In the old whaling port of Edgartown on Martha's Vineyard off Cape Cod lives Henry Beetle Hough, who has edited the *Vineyard Gazette* since 1920, taking time off to write such popular books as *Country Editor*, *Thoreau of Walden* and *Whaling Wives*. His newest novel, *The New England Story*, is a sly dig at the Melville cult, a salty picture of life in a New England town, and a neat piece of literary detection.

His somewhat callow hero, young Edgecomb Hartwell, comes to the little town of Dinton Port to uncover what he can about three generations of the Adams family. For old Enoch Adams, one of the great whaling captains of his day, was supposed to be the model for the captain in Archer Templeton's great classic of the sea, *Bildad's Locker*.

Tipped off by letters from Adams' daughter, Charity, Hartwell searches for the true story of Enoch Adams, which he hopes to write as *the New England story*. He finds two Adams granddaughters: stodgy, grasping, cranky Miriam, who had been raised as a lady, and pretty, fiery, unconventional Nancy, raised as an illegitimate waif. He also discovers in his landlady the most delightful character in the book, Harriet Graddock, once a servant girl in the Adams household, now possessor of many of the Adams' secrets.

Bit by bit the real character of Enoch Adams emerges—from his journal entries, from revelations by the family, from letters written by Archer Templeton, and from Hartwell's sympathetic recreation of a character who fascinates him. The captain's three wives, his domineering daughter Charity, his ne'er-do-well son Argalis, and their complicated relationships with each other gradually take shape as new evidence is found and fitted together. And as the story is told, so is the life of the New England town skillfully rendered, with a tang of humor, layers of gossip, and perceptive revelation of character.

Young Hartwell himself grows in understanding, not only from his love af-

fair with Nancy and his detective affair with Enoch Adams but in his realization of the New England character. He decides that the basic conflict in New England was not between passion and puritanism but "between romanticism and the inelegance of bodily things." And he discovers that Enoch was swayed at every important turn of his life by a woman. "That pattern is the most significant side of what I call the New England story," he tells Miss Craddock.

Mr. Hough has by no means written the definitive New England story. His ambition here was never on such a scale. But he has written a continuously interesting, readable novel that takes one small phase of the New England story and presents it compactly, humorously and sympathetically.

## Inside Conrad

By Thomas Wicker

THE THUNDER AND THE SUNSHINE, A Biography of Joseph Conrad. By Jerry Allen. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 239 pps. \$4.50.

The investigative reporter has a good deal to learn from this interesting book, whether he is a Joseph Conrad reader or not. For what Miss Allen has really written is not quite a biography: it is an account of a previously-clouded period in the life of the great novelist, put together from equal parts research and informed speculation.

Around this heart of her book, Miss Allen has molded just enough biographical flesh to justify her subtitle. There is virtually no critical appraisal of the man or his works; Miss Allen loves them both with an ardent heart, and with good reason.

In effect, she has written a whole book to disclose the fact that Conrad carried on a love affair in 1876 with the mistress of Don Carlos, Duke of Madrid, Pretender to the Spanish throne, and legitimate heir—in the line of Louis XIV—to the throne of France. She was Paula de Somogy, the model for the "woman of all time" of whom Conrad wrote so evocatively in *Arrow of Gold*. For her,

he apparently fought the duel he describes in that novel of passion, and on her account he became involved in the gun-smuggling episodes described in it and in *Mirror of the Sea*.

Yet, her identity has never been publicly disclosed before this book—partly because of the extreme reticence of Conrad, who made a fetish of burning his private papers, partly because of Paula de Somogy's perfect discretion, and partly because of the reverential attitude of Conrad acquaintances, critics and biographers who might have been expected either to know her identity or to seek it out.

The strength of Miss Allen's book lies in her pinning down of that identity—through the unpublished archives of a family in Madrid, through a photograph of Paula (this book's frontispiece) showing her wearing the "arrow of gold" pin Conrad was to remember so vividly more than 40 years later, and through such conclusive circumstantial bits as the fact that he finally started writing his novel about his early love affair in the months immediately following Paula's death in Paris in 1917.

Far less credible is Miss Allen's reconstruction of the events of the affair itself. It is substantially a retelling of the plot of *Arrow of Gold*, bolstered mainly by Miss Allen's contention that all Conrad's stories and characters were taken largely from life. That is certainly true, as one can learn from reading his own fascinating prefatory notes to his novels, but the reservation always has to be made—and Conrad never failed to make it—that he was an artist adapting his materials to his artistic purposes. No other novelist has ever used the events of his own life more successfully—but that is not to say that he simply set them down autobiographically. Miss Allen, herself, recounts actual events that led Conrad to write the magnificent *Lord Jim*—and in real life, it seems that the young officer did NOT jump from the supposedly sinking ship, as he does in that novel.

Miss Allen's account of Conrad's love affair and the subsequent duel—even her contention that his feeling of guilt over these events led him in later years to write so often and so movingly on that theme—may be correct. The point is that where she has established by proof Paula de Somogy's identity as the "woman of all

time," for that part she can only speculate that Conrad's novel about her is substantially true to life. Her astute investigations seem to be marred by that much, in the present critic's opinion.

*The Thunder and the Sunshine* is not helped, either, by a rather gossipy tone that equates events that were going on in the world at large with information about Joseph Conrad. Thus, in her account of his Polish father's exile in Siberia, we are given running accounts of what Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky were doing at the same time but in entirely different places and circumstances. Furthermore, Miss Allen writes frequently as though she knew what Conrad was *thinking* as well as what he was *doing*, or what he later *wrote* he was doing and thinking. And there are no footnotes at all to back up assertions of this kind.

These exceptions aside, *The Thunder and the Sunshine* is a well-written and often fascinating book. It cannot pretend to the stature of Jean-Aubry's full-scale Conrad biographies, but it has information that Jean-Aubry did not know or did not care to disclose. Its descriptions and the picture of Paula de Somogy, even Miss Allen's speculations as to her relationship with Conrad, cannot help adding to one's appreciation of this master novelist, this entirely unique interpreter of the human spirit.

## Awards to Nieman Fellows

Pulitzer, for editorial writing—Harry S. Ashmore.

Pulitzer, for national reporting—Clark Mollenhoff.

Peabody, for local news broadcasting—Louis M. Lyons.

Headliners, for domestic reporting—Donald J. Gonzales.

Hillman, for editorials—Harry S. Ashmore.

George Polk, for metropolitan reporting—Mitchel Levitas.

Sigma Delta Chi—Cowles papers for the work of Clark Mollenhoff.

Lauterbach—civil liberties—Louis M. Lyons.

Blakeslee—for medical article—Steven M. Spencer.



## A New Look at Economics

By Jack Jurey

**THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY.** By John Kenneth Galbraith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 356 pp.

Anyone who cares to look can find abundant evidence that America's economy, despite its glittering opulence, is somehow failing to meet several essential tests, including control of inflation and the proper allocation of human and material resources. It is to these problems that Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith addresses himself in *The Affluent Society*, certainly one of the most significant documents of its kind since the New Deal.

Professor Galbraith's central thesis is that the unremitting effort to increase the output of our industrial society has lost much of its importance in terms of the consumer goods created. Rather—completely contrary to “conventional wisdom”—the emphasis on boosting the total of all goods and services (Gross National Product) serves as a disguised device to keep people at work. In short, we are not nearly so much concerned with what the economic engine produces as we are with providing employment for those who tend it.

In support of this argument, Professor Galbraith cites the role of advertising, a 10-billion-dollar-a-year industry which seeks through persuasion to convince us consumers that we want things we never heard of before—an Edsel car, for example. Much of the demand thus stimulated does not reflect real need, but is the creature of what the author describes as the “dependence effect,” the marriage of advertising and production which is necessary to maintain full employment at all costs.

Such a system would, until recently, appear to have few serious drawbacks, unless one has a deep-seated moral objection to tail fins or tinted refrigerators. However, the last couple of years have produced deep misgivings, particularly about continuing inflation (which persists even in the midst of the present downturn), the growing inadequacy of public services and our annoying failure to keep pace with Russia in several strategic technological areas.

What is even more disturbing is that, in the Galbraith analysis, such shortcomings are essential ingredients of our obsession with production. Inflation, he asserts, is a normal condition in an economy operating at full capacity and, under present circumstances, cannot be checked save by fiscal measures which, however wise, are politically unlikely because of their effect on full employment. Meantime other dangers lurking in the wings include the consequences of an abuse of consumer credit and the frightful possibility that Madison Ave.'s pitchmen may lose their powers to persuade.

Equally foreboding is the possibility that Americans will continue to regard production, no matter what kind, as an adequate response to Russia's highly refined military challenge. Contrary to past experience, “it is not gross output but usable military output” which will be decisive in any nuclear war.

In yet another area, America has failed—again because of its preoccupation with consumer goods production—to keep necessary public expenditures abreast of those of the affluent private economy. The dismal result is social imbalance which, because of the shortage of schools and other vital public facilities, stands in the way of a well-rounded social and economic structure. It is hardly sensible “that we should satisfy our wants in private goods with reckless abundance, while in the case of public goods . . . we practice extreme self-denial.”

Professor Galbraith's principal remedy for the ills associated with our production mania is to arrive at economic security by another route—cyclically graduated unemployment compensation which would, in simplest terms, give laid-off workers a guarantee of substantial income in periods of serious unemployment. This method would, he argues, allow the federal government the fiscal flexibility it needs to counter inflation pressures and, at the same time, provide another built-in stabilizer against depression.

As for the problem of social imbalance, he makes the controversial proposal that state and local governments increase their funds for public projects by imposing sales taxes.

The foregoing is an inadequate outline of a closely reasoned argument which touches on many facets of American life. Fortunately readers will find the book comparatively easy going because of the author's facile literary style, which most economists—and most newspapermen, for that matter—can envy. Also those who regard the whole subject of economics with misgivings will find the opening chapters a valuable introduction to some of the basic tenets of classical economic thought.

Professor Galbraith is an original thinker who has had the foresight (and luck) to write a timely book, which may well prove to be of deep significance. Even the legions of those who will disagree with his views will concede that he challenges attitudes and ideas that sorely need re-examination.

## Team in Economics

**INFLATION OR RECESSION?** by Richard E. Mooney and Edwin L. Dale. Doubleday Headline Publications, N. Y. 96 pp. \$1.50.

These two New York *Times* reporters share the task of keeping the national government's economic policies and programs under daily review. This inevitably involves them in continuing analysis of the nation's economy as seen from the strategic location of their Washington bureau. They have brought together in a convenient anthology the views of a representative number of government officials, independent economists and spokesmen for business and labor. The most notable thing about these views is their wide divergence. This is probably the only time George Humphrey and J. K. Galbraith have been brought to speak from the same platform. The theme of inflation or recession concludes with the interesting combination title: “Inflationary Recession,” expressing a U. S. Chamber of Commerce view. More of the book and its authors are concerned about inflation than recession, which might or might not have changed had it been put together a little later. The emphasis on inflation has continued to dominate the Administration considerably more than it has the daily reporting of the two editors, or, one would imagine, the concern of their readers. The book is a useful access to the economic



thinking of specialists who can usually be got at only in formidable tomes. But the most significant and satisfying thing about this work is the obvious fact that these two young reporters in one news office have qualified themselves to join this company

of experts and to appraise their ideas. Dick Mooney was a Nieman Fellow in 1956. Ed Dale, as most reporters must, has found his university in his work, but with far greater effect than most.

L. M. L.

## The Cosmos of Harlow Shapley

OF STARS AND MEN, Human Response to an Expanding Universe. By Harlow Shapley. Beacon Press, Boston. 157 pp \$3.50.

As the satellites shoot off, it seems to Harlow Shapley an opportune time to incite further interest by his fellow men in this earthly existence and its place in the universe.

This he has been doing all his life, most of it as director of the astronomical observatory at Harvard. From this station he has taken his celestial bearings for the best part of 40 years. In this period few men have explored farther toward the infinite mystery of space, and none has reported his findings with more excitement and fascination to all who would listen.

Now in this book, Mr. Shapley is adding up the ultimates, thinking out loud about the meaning of what has been found out and what, with luck, may yet be learned, about the cosmos: how it began, what's happening to it, how life got started, and man's relation to everything else.

He has his own theories about these things. But his chief concern is that people should begin to realize how much is known about the universe and should begin to relate this to their own scheme of

things, so that their world will make more sense. Shapley approaches the vastness of his universal subject with humility and wonder. But he pins down every fact that can be handled and brings order, shape and continuity to the elusive materials of cosmography.

He once opened a course with the assurance that its only prerequisite was curiosity. The same assurance is given the lay reader in this book's chapter titles and his handling of their essays: "New Bottles for New Wine," "On Being Incidental," "An Inquiry Concerning Other Worlds," "On the Hazards of Primitive Life," "Rainbows and Cosmic Chemistry," "A Digression on Great Moments," "Nothing Merely Human," "Toward the Emergence of Organisms," and finally, the moral to the fable: "What Should be the Human Response."

It is the insatiable curiosity of the Elephant's Child that has kept Shapley always searching in the limitless frontiers of space. But it is his wise humanism that has kept him seeking meaning in the ever expanding knowledge of the universe. This modest little book is the essence of a great scientist's search for meaning in life and its environment.

L. M. L.

machine would note any hesitancy, any oaths directed at the candidates. After that, if the voter failed to elect the right ticket, the glad hand would deliver a fast right to the stomach. But if he chose the party line, the machine would emit a free cigar and a printed card. The card would say: "Congratulations! You are now postmaster of Kokomo at \$8,000 a year. Your weight is 169."

—New York *Herald Tribune*, April 23

## Reporter's Role

[Drew Middleton, in "A Correspondent Defines His Job" (March 16), observed that his long experience as a correspondent indicated that there is widespread ignorance on the part of the public of the nature of a reporter's job and of his true responsibility. Mr. Middleton held that the reporter's first obligation is to his readers, who are the people of the United States.—Editor.]

TO THE EDITOR:

Drew Middleton's stimulating article with its emphasis upon a reporter's obligation to his readers, recalls two rather similar anecdotes.

When Billy Sunday greeted the reporters who were to cover his revival meetings in New York, he fixed his eyes on one of them, Joseph Jefferson O'Neill of the *World*, and inquired: "Are you a Christian?"

"No, sir," O'Neill replied. "I'm a reporter."

A year later we were at war, and the *Sun* had exposed George Creel's vastly exaggerated story of an attack by German submarines "in force" on an American convoy. Creel was berating the *Sun* man whom he held responsible.

"Do you consider yourself an American?" he demanded.

The answer was the same.

JAMES HENLE, Hartsdale, N. Y.  
Letter to the N. Y. *Times Magazine*.

## Doctor Merk

At June commencement, Harvard conferred the honorary degree, Doctor of Letters, on Frederick Merk, professor-emeritus. The citation:

Generations of students and teachers have been given a sense of the restless sweep of our country's history by this sympathetic and exacting scholar.

## Scrapbook

### Who's Inside?

What is inside the American voting machine? Or rather, who is inside? The Russians want to know. Six of these machines have been installed in the United States pavilion at the World's Fair in Brussels, and thousands of visitors have already used them to vote for their favorite Americans in certain fields. Abraham Lincoln, Louis Armstrong and Kim Novak have an early lead in their various fields, by the way, but that's not the point. The point is that the American voting booth is a private place.

Still, the men from the Soviet pavilion

are not convinced. One skeptic said that it was not enough just to enter a booth, draw a curtain and pull a lever. What about the machine? Surely it had some way of tattling. Its manufacturer assured him that the machine merely adds up the totals and does not carry tales.

What did the Russians expect to find in the booth? Probably they thought that the machine would first offer a warm handshake, a shot of whiskey (such stimulants being unavailable on Election Day) and a brief campaign speech. Then, while the voter pondered his choice, the

## Sweden's Decorous Press

By Gerard Fay

In a symposium, "The World's Best Newspapers," published in 1952, a group of Swedish writers did not include any paper from their own country. But if it has not, even in the eyes of its own people, any single newspaper which can be put among "the best" of the whole world, the Swedish press is, at any rate, a solid, prosperous, creditable one. It is also an interesting study in voluntary self-discipline, backed by certain constitutional guarantees.

When I was last in Stockholm I spent some time trying to find out how it is that the Swedish press, in spite of surface resemblances, conducts its affairs on the whole with so much more decorum than some British newspapers. The Swedish reporter is not behind any in the world at getting his exclusive information and using it very often against the will of Government departments and other political or commercial pressure groups who would rather do their work in secrecy. Swedish reporters know what news is and how to get it, but because of the organization of their industry there is less violent competition in the "popular" papers. Jostling for circulation is not on the same scale because six out of every ten papers sold in cities and almost nine out of every ten in the provinces go to subscribers, which leaves very little casual sale to be competed for by circulation stunts. Of course there are magazines which make it worth a cameraman's while to get a good candid shot. I felt quite at home when I heard a complaint that the Crown Prince Karl Gustav, while performing his duties as a traffic warden outside his school had been hindered by photographers, but I could not help wondering what the spectacle would have been if it had happened to Prince Charles.

At the bottom of the Swedish press structure is a law brought up to date in 1949 whose 123 paragraphs have Constitutional censorship, even in war-time. It fixes the responsibility for the contents of a newspaper on a single person known as the "responsible publisher" (usually the editor-in-chief). The publisher and his staff are prohibited by this law from revealing the sources of their information

even in Court or to the police though there are exceptions in cases of treason, defamation, and a few other categories.

The Swedish newspapers, having their constitutional position much more clearly defined than in many other countries, have also built up a system of voluntary restraint. Its main plank is a document issued by the Publicistklubben, a professional organization of newspapermen. It is a code of conduct which is posted on the editorial bulletin board in every daily newspaper office. It begins by saying that apart from certain abuses of press freedom which can be dealt with by criminal law there should be other rules "... which prevent the publication of information that is incorrect or, through being incomplete, is injurious; and which protect the individual from unnecessary suffering." Paragraph one says that confidence in the press can be maintained only by "consistent efforts to give correct information"; there should be differentiation between news and comment; headlines should reflect the contents of the copy.

The legal paragraph on reporting police or district attorney investigations is headed "Judge no one unheard," and although its procedure is different it has roughly the same effect as the method normally used here of dealing with crime before a charge has been made. It goes on, however, to say that detailed description of crimes should be avoided and sex crimes should be reported "only if a public danger still remains or if other circumstances indicate that the public should know about them." "Protect the victims"—a rule badly needed over here. Suicides or attempted suicides should not be reported unless they have been made in connection with serious crimes or under particularly remarkable circumstances (which might be translated into more familiar terms as "judge them by their news-value").

For cases of dispute there is also a Press Fair Practices Commission, representing journalists and proprietors, with a judge as chairman. This is a court of honor which can hear complaints from anybody who believes he has been treated

by a newspaper in a way which, without breaking the press laws, is "in conflict with the demands of honor or else, in view of the good name of the press, should not remain unchallenged." The commission give an opinion, and tradition, not law, lays it down that the newspaper concerned should print the pronouncement without comment. Finally, there is a magazine called "Grönköpings Veckoblad" which parodies and pillories the handling of news events and journalistic sins.

The Fair Practices Commission might then be called the equivalent of the Press Council: the Publicistklubben the equivalent of the National Union of Journalists and the Institute of Journalists, both of which have codes of conduct: and "Grönköpings Veckoblad" as the equivalent of "Punch," which one way and another makes fun of the press regularly. But there are very great differences. For instance, although the Fair Practices Commission has only moral authority (like the Press Council) it has an independent non-journalist chairman; and although some of the P.K. rules are perfectly comparable to the general idea of journalistic ethics here some of them would make impossible the work of our popular papers as run at present. I need repeat only one of them; "Publicity that violates the sanctity of privacy must be avoided, unless it is imperatively in the public interest."

Is privacy sacred? Is it a constitutional, legal, or moral right? Can intrusion into privacy be stopped, and if so should it be? Questions like this are being asked just now. The Swedes have some of the answers; but they have a less sensational press than ours, without the same marked difference between "class" and "popular" papers. They have less competition, smaller circulations, and not as much national coverage. Still, perhaps they have some lessons to teach that part of the British press and that small minority of the journalistic profession which sometimes behaves so badly that it brings the whole name of journalism into disrepute.

The Manchester *Guardian Weekly*  
Feb. 27

## C. P. Scott on Journalism

*The Manchester Guardian, first a weekly, has been publishing daily for 101 years. On its centennial last Summer it reprinted an article by its late great editor, C. P. Scott, written 34 years earlier on the 100th anniversary of the first Guardian.*

A hundred years is a long time; it is a long time even in the life of a newspaper, and to look back on it is to take in not only a vast development in the thing itself, but a great slice in the life of the nation in the progress and adjustment of the world. In the general development the newspaper, as an institution, has played its part, and no small part, and the particular newspaper with which I personally am concerned has also played its part, it is to be hoped, not without some usefulness. I have had my share in it for a little more than fifty years; I have been its responsible editor for only a few months short of its last half-century; I remember vividly its fiftieth birthday; I now have the happiness to share in the celebration of its hundredth. I can therefore speak of it with a certain intimacy of acquaintance.

In all living things there must be a certain unity, a principle of vitality and growth. It is so with a newspaper, and the more complete and clear this unity the more vigorous and fruitful the growth. I ask myself what the paper stood for when first I knew it, what it has stood for since and stands for now. A newspaper has two sides to it. It is a business, like any other, and has to pay in the material sense in order to live. But it is much more than a business; it is an institution; it reflects and it influences the life of a whole community; it may affect even wider destinies. It is, in its way, an instrument of government: It plays on the minds and consciences of men. It may educate, stimulate, assist, or it may do the opposite. It has, therefore, a moral as well as a material existence, and its character and influence are in the main determined by the balance of these two forces. It may make profit or power its first object, or it may conceive itself as fulfilling a higher and more exacting function.

I think I may honestly say that, from the day of its foundation, there has not

been much doubt as to which way the balance tipped so far as regards the conduct of the paper whose fine tradition I inherited and which I have had the honor to serve through my working life. Had it not been so, personally, I could not have served it. Character is a subtle affair, and has many shades and sides to it. It is not a thing to be much talked about, but rather to be felt. It is the slow deposit of past actions and ideals. It is for each man his most precious possession, and so it is for that latest growth of time, the newspaper. Fundamentally it implies honesty, cleanness, courage, fairness, a sense of duty to the reader and the community. A newspaper is of necessity something of a monopoly, and its first duty is to shun the temptation of monopoly. Its primary office is the gathering of news. At the peril of its soul it must see that the supply is not tainted. Neither in what it gives, nor in what it does not give, nor in the mode of presentation must the unclouded face of truth suffer wrong. Comment is free, but facts are sacred. "Propaganda," so called, by this means is hateful. The voice of opponents no less than that of friends has a right to be heard. Comment also is justly subject to a self-imposed restraint. It is well to be frank; it is even better to be fair. This is an ideal. Achievement in such matters is hardly given to man. We can but try, ask pardon for shortcomings, and there leave the matter.

But, granted a sufficiency of grace, to what further conquests may we look, what purpose serve, what task envisage? It is a large question, and cannot be fully answered. We are faced with a new and enormous power and a growing one. Whither is the young giant tending? What gifts does he bring? How will he exercise his privilege and powers? What influence will he exercise on the minds of men and on our public life? It cannot be pretended that an assured and entirely satisfactory answer can be given to such questions. Experience is in some respects disquieting. The development has not been all in the direction which we should most desire.

One of the virtues, perhaps almost the chief virtue, of a newspaper is its independence. Whatever its position of char-

acter, at least it should have a soul of its own. But the tendency of newspapers, as of other businesses, in these days is toward amalgamation. In proportion, as the function of a newspaper has developed and its organization expanded, so have its costs increased. The smaller newspapers have had a hard struggle; many have disappeared. In their place we have great organizations controlling a whole series of publications of various kinds even of differing or opposing politics. The process may be inevitable, but clearly there are drawbacks. As organizations grow, personality may tend to disappear. It is much to control one newspaper well; it is perhaps beyond the reach of any man, or any body of men, to control half a dozen with equal success. It is possible to exaggerate the danger, for the public is not undiscerning. It recognizes the authentic voices of conscience and conviction when it finds them, and it has a shrewd intuition of what to accept and what to discount.

This is a matter which in the end must settle itself, and those who cherish the older ideal of a newspaper need not be dismayed. They have only to make their papers good enough in order to win, as well as to merit, success, and the resources of a newspaper are not wholly measured in pounds, shillings, and pence. Of course the thing can only be done by competence all around, and by that spirit of co-operation right through the working staff which only a common ideal can inspire. There are people who think you can run a newspaper about as easily as you can poke a fire, and that knowledge, training, and aptitude are superfluous endowments. There have even been experiments on this assumption, and they have not met with success. There must be competence, to start with, on the business side, just as there must be in any large undertaking, but it is a mistake to suppose that the business side of a paper should dominate, as sometimes happens, not without distressing consequences. A newspaper, to be of value, should be a unity, and every part of it should equally understand and respond to the purposes and ideals which animate it. Between its two sides there should be a happy marriage, and editor and business manager should march hand in hand, the first, be it



well understood, just an inch or two in advance. Of the staff much the same thing may be said. They should be a friendly company. They need not, of course, agree on every point, but they should share in the general purpose and inheritance. A paper is built up upon their common and successive labors, and their work should never be task work, never merely dictated. They should be like a racing boat's crew, pulling well together, each man doing his best because he likes it, and with a common and glorious goal.

That is the path of self-respect and pleasure; it is also the path of success. And what a work it is! How multiform, how responsive to every need and every incident of life! What illimitable possibilities of achievement and of excellence! People talk of "journalese" as though a journalist were of necessity a pretentious and sloppy writer; he may be, on the contrary, and very often is, one of the best in the world. At least he should not be content to do much less. And then the developments. Every year, almost every day, may see

growth and fresh accomplishment, and with a paper that is really alive, it not only may, but does. Let anyone take a file of this paper, or for that matter any one of half a dozen other papers, and compare its whole make-up and leading features today with what they were five years ago, ten years ago, twenty years ago, and he will realize how large has been the growth, how considerable the achievement. And this is what makes the work of a newspaper worthy and interesting. It has so many sides, it touches life at so many points, at every one there is such possibility of improvement and excellence. To the man, whatever his place on the paper, whether on the editorial or business, or even what may be regarded as the mechanical side—this also vitally important in its place—nothing should satisfy short of the best, and the best must always seem a little ahead of the actual. It is here that ability counts and that character counts, and it is on these that a newspaper, like every great undertaking, if it is to be worthy of its power and duty, must rely.

class Saga—of the new industrial and commercial Britain. These were still the lords of the English scene when I was born. They, too, in their respective spheres, the shires and the city and manufacturing districts, had enjoyed popular approval and honor, but their wealth and power quickly created jealousy in new classes which, gaining the ear of the nation, have since toppled them from their comfortable, self-assured thrones. And now it is the turn of others to enjoy wealth and power and, by doing so, to arouse envy in those whose support gave them that wealth and power. Like their predecessors in their heyday, they themselves do not see that there is any term set to their rule and prosperity. But I do not believe that time stands still or that the laws of history have ceased to operate. Far called our navies melt away

On dune and headland sinks the fire—  
Lo! all our pomp of yesterday

Is one with Nineveh and Tyre  
remains true, not only of nations, but of classes and professions and persons, of all mortal dust, that is.

Among the monopolists of wealth and power today are the proprietors, editors and managers of the national Press. With the Civil Service and Trades Union Chiefs they rank high among the "Nabobs" of our age. Their wealth and power are founded on popularity, and it probably never occurs to most of them—for they are by profession practical men with little time or inclination to consider historical processes—that that popularity can wane or there can be any term to it. It is still a comparatively new thing; within the lifetime of men and women still living, the popular national Press, as we know it today, did not exist. The circulations of their newspapers, in their own estimation their supreme glory, are based, the Press magnates would contend with reason, on popular choice and favor, and their circulations are measured in millions. How, then, they might ask, could they become objects of national jealousy and dislike, seeing that such multitudes of their fellow-countrymen daily, in the great cities, twice daily, shower their pennies—or, rather, twopenny-halfpennies—on them?

In one sense, like the eighteenth-century aristocrats and the nineteenth-century

## Power and Peril of the Press (in England)

By Arthur Bryant

That shrewd and understanding student of England and her institutions, Benjamin Disraeli, once remarked that in this country the possessor of power has always sooner or later become an object of popular jealousy and ultimately of hatred, and has so forfeited that power. Our history suggests that, by and large, this is true. Thus, in the Middle Ages the Church, which started by being immensely popular and became, as a result, immensely wealthy and powerful, gradually lost that popularity because of its very power and wealth, and so in the early fifteenth century suffered the destruction of these, too. The Crown, which principally succeeded to that power and wealth, suffered the same process 150 years later, when its high claims and exercises of powers formerly founded on Tudor popularity, were denied and attacked under the Stuarts by a House of Commons of country gentry and lawyers sustained by popular jealousy of the

Crown. Thereafter it became the turn of the greater landed aristocracy, who in the eighteenth century enjoyed, with popular assent, a wealth and power such as few aristocracies have ever known. For these proud nobles embarked on their era of glory and prosperity as the heroes of England, the popular champions who had brought about the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 and saved the country from wooden shoes, dragoons and cardinals. But by the early nineteenth century they, too, had become objects of popular jealousy. The Reform Bill of 1832 was the expression of that jealousy; its primary purpose, and of the riots that preceded it, was to end the control of the House of Commons by the greater territorial magnates. It succeeded and their place was taken by the general body of squirarchy—Disraeli's "gentlemen of England"—and, increasingly, of the manufacturers, merchants and bankers—the Forsytes of Galsworthy's upper middle



manufacturers who in turn preceded them, those who control our national newspapers can claim, and do claim, that they are the watchdogs of the Public against the tyrannical and unpopular monopolists of wealth and power they have helped to overthrow and whose tyranny the more flamboyant among them still make, partly out of habit and partly out of design, a show of challenging and defying. More than one of the great Press Groups that between them control the national newspapers—and not only on the so-called “Left”—are for ever beating up and holding to ridicule hereditary lords, Court officials, bank directors, generals, and such “huntin’, shootin’ and fishin’” squires and their tweed-skirted ladies as still survive in the Gaitskell age. But the “good old cause” they trumpet so loudly and monotonously is, in reality, an imposition on the Public, for the types they expose and denounce have for all practical purposes ceased to exist or, so far as they exist at all, are only the palest, flimsiest shadows of their rosy-faced, loud-voiced predecessors who, in the days of my youth, enjoyed the earth and the fullness thereof. The “Establishment” against which sanctimoniously egalitarian editors, “angry young men” and bright young reporters still gird is a figment of the imagination, something which survives only in the hallowed memories of elderly maiden aunts with dwindling unearned incomes living in the more moribund of the Welfare State’s seaside resorts. Another turn of the fiscal screw when reforming and levelling Mr. Wilson reaches the Exchequer and it will vanish altogether, and be as much a thing of the past as the stagecoaches and Indian braves of the Wild West and the imperial splendors of Lord Curzon’s Delhi. But though the Press is hallooing round a long-vacated earth when it castigates the likeness of the toffs and bosses of the early twentieth century, in another sense it still fulfils its original function in acting as the champion of private and public liberties against the rival monopolists of power and wealth, the panjandrum of the Civil Service and the Trades Unions, who, like the Press lords, though politicians come and go, themselves go on for ever. It is a general awareness of this that makes not only their function so valuable in a still freedom-loving community but their position so

firm. They stand, in an age when liberties are assailed on every side, for the liberties of Britain.

Yet, by a paradox that seems to attend all human activities in all climes and ages, they also stand for other things, one of which is an invasion of the very liberties they exist to defend. Just as the Civil Service, which used to be a champion of public rights against the untrammelled power and wealth of individuals, has now become an often conscienceless and arrogant oppressor of individuals and, through them of the public itself, so the popular Press increasingly invades the sphere of private liberty and subjects the individual, regardless of justice and decency, to a pillory of injurious and wounding publicity. In some cases this invasion is carried out for purely mercenary and competitive reasons, to swell circulation figures and outdistance rival sensation-mongers. In others it takes a more sinister form, of a deliberate denigration of individuals whose views are distasteful to the controllers of some popular newspaper or group of newspapers, and who are subjected to what is technically called “the full treatment,” consisting of a series of misrepresentations, smears, half-truths, insinuations and near-libels, occasionally inadvertently verging into actionable libels which, though no doubt vexatious to those who have to pay the consequent price of public apology and damages, have little real repercussion on the immense wealth and revenues of their perpetrators. Against such tyranny the individual has virtually no appeal. So far the number of those affected by these two forms of Press inquisition and dictatorship is small. Nor, it should be said, do all newspapers with great circulations and power indulge in prurient sensationalism or private persecution and vendetta, but exercise their trust with honor, conscience and justice. Some, however, show less restraint. And, though the reaction produced by their abuses of power is still small, it is growing, and may presently become much more formidable unless the popular Press learns to discipline itself. The danger to our polity is that if, through arrogance on the part of those whose wealth or position enables them to control these mighty organs, the present irresponsibility of certain great newspapers continues, the discipline that the ex-

ercise of all power sooner or later demands, not being self-imposed, may be imposed from outside. There are many, in this country, who do not love liberty and will take every opportunity to destroy it, and those whose business it is to defend liberty should never forget it.

(This is Arthur Bryant’s article in the Illustrated London News of March 1 in his department, “Our Notebook.”)

## Noisome Journalism

When the Los Angeles *Herald-Examiner* recently decided to spread before a drooling public the “love letters” of Lana Turner to the late, unlamented John Stompanato, it set off a splurge of disgraceful journalism that has rarely been matched in the annals of a press devoted to “giving the people what they want.” Stompanato was killed—as who doesn’t know by now?—by Lana Turner’s daughter, Cheryl Crane, in an effort, she claimed, to save her mother. The story alone was sordid enough, but there was no journalistic justification for the prominence given to the letters.

For a week the sensational press all over the country gave front-page coverage to the letters, to the exclusion of news about the recession, the debate on stopping the atom tests and other matters of crucial interest to the fate of the free world. To say nothing of the invasion of Miss Turner’s privacy, of which her checkered career by no means robs her, this kind of journalism has no other reason than to pander to degraded tastes and prurient curiosity.

The Associated Press, the United Press and other news-distributing agencies cannot be absolved from blame in making this repulsive story so readily available to the scandal-mongering section of the U. S. press. Each of these agencies has an “ethics committee.” We would be delighted, and not a little surprised, too, if a statement would soon appear admitting frankly that in this instance the freedom of the press has been grossly abused.

—America, April 26

# Nieman Notes

1939

Frank Hopkins, American consul at Martinique, reports one of his duties is scanning 15 to 18 papers a day of the 26 published (weekly to monthly) in Martinique and Guadeloupe. In extra-curricular activity, as agent of the William & Mary 1927 Class, Frank raised \$825 for the college library from 60 of his classmates.

Southern Illinois University conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters on Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, June 15.

1942

Don Burke of *Time-Life's* Athens bureau had four ribs cracked while motorboating with the king of Iraq. Recovered, he is covering the Beirut crisis.

A few weeks after his Pulitzer prize award, Harry Ashmore, editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, received an honorary degree at Oberlin College. The citation: "Patriot of the press, courageous champion of civil rights, prophet of the New South, voice of our new republic, with liberty and justice for all."

1943

Erwin W. Kieckhefer, on leave from the Louisville *Courier-Journal* for a year under a grant from the Fund for Adult Education, describes his project:

"A study of methods now being used to disseminate among consumers information concerning economic problems faced by farmers in the production and marketing of the nation's supply of food and fibers and looking for ways to improve that dissemination.

"The project is based largely on the fact that from now on the determination of farm policies will be made by people who are not in agriculture and have no personal contacts with farming."

1946

Ben Yablonky, professor of journalism at New York University, has completed a year of work with television on a grant from the Fund for Adult Education. NYU plans on Ben to introduce new TV instruction there. He has been working at the

University of Michigan, where Prof. Kenneth Stewart (1942) reports "It has been great having Ben around this year and he has made a big hit at the TV studio where he has done some fine work, including the press interview with Henry Steele Commager."

1947

Fletcher Martin reports he is now on the Federal assignment in Chicago for the *Sun-Times*.

The graduation address at Dixie College, Utah, was given by Ernest H. Linford, chief editorial writer on the Salt Lake *Tribune*. Bigger news to the Linfords is that son Gary was awarded a four year Alfred P. Sloan scholarship at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

1948

Walter Waggoner of the New York *Times* foreign staff, has a new assignment to London, after 3½ years at the Hague. On home leave he spoke to the Overseas Press Club June 19.

1950

John McCormally, associate editor of the Hutchinson *News*, Kansas, writes happily that after serving as Sunday editor and night managing editor, he persuaded the paper that writing is the most important thing in a newspaper, and has been released from editing to be a reporter again, but with an editor's rating. He still does editorials and a regular column and is editor of the editorial page and a member of the board of directors. The proper status of a reporter, John thinks.

"We're probably the only paper this size with a Reid Fellow and a Nieman Fellow in the two top editorial positions and I feel that is a symbol of a refreshing new dominance of the editorial in the newspaper's organization.

"Although business has been bad, as a result of our agricultural recession, which preceded the national one by two years, we're looking forward to a tremendous wheat harvest this year and a general upturn in the economy. We're completing our first year in a spanking, spacious new building which gives us both the room

and the stimulation for the growth we want."

"On the personal side, our fifth son, Thomas, arrived last November."

When Donald J. Gonzales left the State Department assignment for the United Press in May to be public relations director of Colonial Williamsburg, one of his Washington colleagues wrote us that Don has been the finest reporter that has operated at the State Department in the years that I have been in Washington. His going is a real loss." He had been with the UP in Washington 17 years. One of his final stories won the Headliner Award.

1951

A son, Jason Berney Meyer, was born March 8 to Anne and Sylvan Meyer in Gainesville, Ga., where Sylvan is editor of the Gainesville *Times*. Their second son and third child.

1952

John L. Steele has been covering Congress and national politics for *Time*, Inc. since returning from NATO and Paris. His earlier assignment was the White House. He serves every little while on televised press conference panels.

Kevin Wallace, a veteran of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, joined the *New Yorker* staff the past year and his name is now appearing in the same pages with Christopher Rand (1949) and Robert Shaplen (1948)

1953

Keyes Beech has been covering the war in Indonesia when he could find it, for the Chicago *Daily News*. At home, wife Linda accepted a spot on a Japanese television show which immediately became a hit—"Tokyo Blue Eyes Diary" Sunday nights at seven: "a sort of Japanese 'I Love Lucy' about the adventures of a young American correspondent and his wife in Japan. I'm rapidly becoming known as 'Mr. Linda Beech.'" Linda delivers all her lines in Japanese and also teaches English conversation over NHK, the BBC of Japan. Keyes says he travelled from one end of Sumatra to the other with Pepper Martin

(1952) of *U. S. News and World Report* "trying to find the war and never heard a shot fired. The most civil war in history." He has done three *Saturday Evening Post* pieces in recent months.

Calvin Mayne of the *Rochester Times-Union* is doing a column on municipal affairs for the Gannett papers, besides his local reporting and some editorial writing. His paper thought highly of a controversial series he did last Winter on the high cost of automobile injury claims, which stirred up the lawyers.

Robert F. Nielsen now has the assignment of foreign affairs specialist on the editorial page of the *Toronto Star*.

#### 1954

On April 13th, NBC did a production on the Washington press corps and focused on the bureau of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* where one of the busy correspondents was Richard Dudman.

#### 1955

On the question of hereditary traits, Sam Zagoria offers as evidence that his daughter Marjorie, aged seven, has just sold her first poem "and we are enjoying the \$5 check." Sam now confines himself to prose, mostly in the interest of his boss Sen. Clifford Case of New Jersey.

Mort Stern of the editorial page of the *Denver Post* sends a picture of a new daughter in their new home which they have been busy fixing up: 515 Dahlia, Denver 20, Colo.

Fred Flowers has been appointed manager of the two radio stations in Victoria, Australia, operated by the *Melbourne Herald* where he was a veteran reporter.

#### 1956

Donald J. Sterling was made assistant city editor of the *Oregon Journal* in March and started at the city desk with one leg in a cast from skiing. He reports that Malcolm Bauer (1950) associate editor of the *Oregonian*, had Hodding Carter (1940) as the speaker at the annual meeting of the Portland City Club.

John Dougherty, city editor of the *Rochester Times-Union*, attended the city editors' seminar at the American Press

Institute, where a colleague was Roy Fisher (1951) of the *Chicago Daily News*. Their guide on a tour of the *New York Times* was Dougherty's former Rochester colleague Harold Schmeck (1954) science writer on the *Times* and a seminar leader on training science writers.

John reports interestingly on the statement of a southern member of the seminar on the problem of coverage of the school issue in Little Rock:

"What struck me was his statement that the school board was very coy about discussing its plans for integration before the 'incident.' The board conducted a whole lot of meetings of PTA's and such attended by hundreds of people, but at board request the press laid off coverage. Very little on the details of the integration plan was published in advance. The board's theory was that publicity would stir up trouble. This in contrast to Louisville press attitude. The result seems to have been that all the so-called 'best people' were filled in on the situation, the rednecks weren't. The result, too, was that when the thing blew up, lots of people were able to shout a lot of questions the board hadn't answered fully in public—questions that sound silly to us but were dynamite when the mob got going—like interracial dances, sports events, etc.

"There's a good lesson in this for us up here, I think. Seems to me we have to give our own racial troubles the best possible coverage without sensationalism. We have reported fully, for example, some public debates on segregated housing which have taken place here (there's a bill in the Legislature on that subject)."

After covering the legislative session in Albany, Ed Hale is back in Buffalo for the *Evening News*.

Julius Duscha is joining the editorial staff of the *Washington Post* in August, to sit in on the editorial page for Alan Barth (1949) who is taking a leave of absence to lecture at the University of California. Duscha has been editorial writer for the Lindsay-Schwab papers in Illinois.

#### 1957

Besides his political writing on the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Hale Champion has been producer of a television program on

public issues on the educational television station in San Francisco. His show was good enough to induce a \$10,000 foundation grant which paid for an assistant and "redoubled the work."

Betty and Richard Mooney had a son, Stephen Emerson, born April 28 in Washington, where Mooney is in the *New York Times* bureau.

Lawson M. Wright, Jr., moved from the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* to the *Charlotte Observer* the first of April. His new address: 1719 Mimosa Ave., Charlotte, N. C.

The *Harvard Law Review* has now reprints of Anthony Lewis' article, "Legislative Apportionment and the Federal Courts," from its April issue. In it the *New York Times* Constitutional specialist argues that only the Supreme Court can correct the growing evil of inequitably apportioned legislative districts.

---

## Ernest J. Hill 1909-1958

Ernest J. Hill's sudden death of a heart attack in London was a shock to the American foreign correspondents corps, not only in London where he was stationed for the *Chicago Daily News*, but in the many other global spots where Ernie had worked and is affectionately remembered. He was 49. He had just returned from a trip to Russia, his second in the five years that he was London bureau chief for the Knight papers. Native of Missouri, he was graduated from the University of Oklahoma and for three years edited its alumni publications. Then he was five years with the *Oklahoma News*. He studied Latin American affairs at Harvard on his fellowship in 1943, and then went to South America for *Time*, Inc. Three years later he joined the Knight papers, first with the *Miami Herald*, later with the *Chicago Daily News*, whose assignments took him to every continent. He and his wife were in Shephard's Hotel in Cairo when a mob burned it down. Their escape was perhaps the closest call in an adventurous life. His wife, Terry, was with him when he died.

# The biggest magazine bargain in America!

NIEMAN REPORTS AT \$3 A YEAR.

*The best present for a newspaperman.*

---

THE MAGAZINE ABOUT NEWSPAPERING.

---

*Everything in it is For and By and About Newspapermen!*

Four Times a Year — Four Issues for \$3.00

250,000 words for \$3.00 and all of it good reading. No ads except this one.

No policy line except whatever interests newspapermen to write  
and to read about newspapers.

---

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, representing the 250 newspapermen who have held Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of matters common to their work.

*Start a subscription for a newspaper friend with this issue.*

Send subscription to:

NIEMAN REPORTS, 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

1 Yr. \$3.00

2 Yr. \$5.50

3 Yr. \$7.50