

NiemanReports

July, 1960

The Public Trial and the Free Press

Justice William O. Douglas

Newspapermen and Lawyers

Anthony Lewis

The Divided Press of South Africa

Adam Clymer

Taiwan and Its Press

Shen Shan

Objective Coverage of Campaigns

James W. Markham

Constitutional Right of Information

Robert J. Steamer

Twenty-one Years of Nieman Fellowships

Lindsay Hoben

The Nieman Newspaper and the Foundation

Arthur M. Schlesinger

Nieman Fellows for 1960-61

Education for Electronic Journalism by Robert Lindsay; *Why Can't Johnny Read?* by Joshua Whatmough; *The Dejays' Revenge*, by Karl F. Zeisler.

Reviews — Nieman Notes — Scrapbook

NiemanReports

VOL. XIV., NO.3

JULY 1960

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.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown Providence, R. I.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; 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, New Canaan, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, London; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

Nieman Fellows for 1960-61

The Nieman Foundation announces the award of twelve Nieman Fellowships to Harvard University for the next college year, and the first award of the new Louis Stark Memorial Fellowship in labor reporting. Five associate fellowships are announced, to foreign newspapermen, supported by other foundations, three from Asian countries, two from South Africa.

This is the 22d annual award of Nieman Fellowships since they were set up in 1938 under a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius Nieman, the founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*.

Joseph A. Loftus of the New York *Times* Washington Bureau will hold the first Louis Stark Fellowship established under a gift of the Louis Stark Memorial Fund, to study in the field of labor relations.

Veteran labor reporter, Loftus is a graduate of Scranton College and Columbia School of Journalism. He began newspaper work with the Scranton *Tribune*, in his home town. He served the International News Service and the Associated Press before joining the Washington Bureau of the New York *Times* in 1944.

The other twelve new Nieman Fellows, to start their Harvard studies in September, are:

Lowell S. Brandle, 37, reporter, St. Petersburg *Times*. Native of Cushing, Okla., Mr. Brandle began newspaper work there after five war years in the U. S. Marines. He has been on the St. Petersburg *Times* staff since 1954, won the paper the National Headliners Award for 1957

for outstanding public service with a series on the needs of mentally retarded children.

He plans to study labor and race relations and social-economic problems of his area.

Donald G. Brazier, 39, reporter, Seattle *Times*. Graduate of the University of Washington, he has been on the *Times* since 1942, except for war service with the Navy, and has served on the city desk, as roto editor and on major reporting assignments.

He plans to study history and economics.

Robert P. Clark, 38, science reporter, Louisville *Courier-Journal*. Native of Vermont, Clark is a graduate of Tufts University and the University of Missouri Journalism School. He began newspaper work on the Owensboro, Ky., *Messenger*. In 1949 he joined the *Courier-Journal*, where he specializes in medical science and public health news.

He plans to study science.

Peter L. Goldman, 27, reporter, St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*. Graduate of Williams College and Columbia Journalism School, he has been on the *Globe-Democrat* five years as reporter and rewrite man.

He plans to study history and government and urban problems.

John N. Herbers, Jr., 36, state manager, United Press International at Jackson, Miss. Graduate of Emory University, he began newspaper work in Greenwood, Miss., in 1949, has served the UP since 1952, covering the intense segregation issue for most Mississippi papers.

He plans to study history and government.

Thomas H. Joyce, 33, reporter, Detroit *News*. Graduate of Michigan State, he has worked on Michigan papers for nine years, the last six with the *News*, where his major assignment has been labor.

He plans to study economics and government.

Robert L. McCary, 36, telegraph editor, San Francisco *Chronicle*. After four war years in the Air Force, he joined the *Chronicle* in 1946 as a copyboy. He left the *Chronicle* in 1953 to be editor of the Florence, Ala., *Times*, then served as assistant editor of *Stars & Stripes* in Tokyo, returning to the *Chronicle* news desk in 1956.

He plans to study government and international relations.

John D. Pomfret, 32, labor reporter, Milwaukee *Journal*. Graduate of Princeton, he joined the *Journal* staff in 1949 and has specialized in labor news since 1953, and has developed both local and national labor coverage for his paper.

He plans to study economics and labor.

J. Thomas Pugh, 30, assistant city editor, Peoria *Journal-Star*. Graduate of Bradley University in Peoria, he has been with the *Star* since 1955, as sports writer, copy editor,

(Continued on page 21)

The Public Trial and the Free Press

By Justice William O. Douglas

There is pressure these days on courts all over the land to put trials and hearings on radio and television. In one state the radio and TV industry leveled its guns at a court which had banned those broadcasts. At fifteen minute intervals there were spot announcements over the air reminding the people that "the courts do not belong to the lawyers" and urging the listeners to get busy and write the members of the court to change the rule.

Others have maintained that the "right to know" is basic in our liberties and therefore the courtrooms, investigative hearings and all like sessions should be photographed and broadcast. Trials and investigations, it is said have educational values to the general public; and it is contended the general public should be admitted so that they better understand the operations of their government. The Sixth Amendment guarantees the accused a "public trial." And so the argument goes, everyone who can be reached by pictures or by radio or television is included in "the public" about which the Constitution speaks.

The Supreme Court of Colorado in 1956 adopted a report of a referee recommending that trials may be televised or broadcast in the discretion of the trial judge, provided it would not in his judgment "detract from the dignity thereof, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court or otherwise materially interfere with the achievement of a fair trial." *In re Hearings Concerning Canon 35*, 296 P. 2d 465, 472.

Photographing or broadcasting of trials in my view imperils the fair trial of which we boast. It is not dangerous because it is new. It is dangerous because of the insidious influences which it puts to work in the administration of justice.

Newspapers, radio, and television are often in the hands of men who have their own political philosophy and their own ideas as to what justice is and how it should be administered. Some newspapers dominate a community. When ownership of the paper is combined with ownership of the radio and television station, the community may become saturated with one point of view. We have had publishers who were tyrants and sought to impose

their will on the courts as well as on the people. This pressure can be serious when judges are elected—as they are in about three-quarters of our states. Even federal judges who have life tenure may feel the lash of editorials demanding that cases be decided this way or that.

In Great Britain and in countries like Pakistan, India, and Australia that follow British legal procedures, an editor will be hauled up before the court for contempt if he attempts to indicate how a case should be decided, if he dramatizes the trial, or if, pending appeal, he editorializes the case. See *Rex v. Bolam*, 93 Sol. J. 220; *King v. Parke* (1903). 2 K. B. 432; *Rex v. Davies* (1945). K. B. 435. Sparse comment is indeed all that is tolerated.

That kind of issue has consumed many pages in American law reports. We, too, have advocates of the view that the editor who comments on pending litigation risks contempt. We have, however, resolved the question differently from England. We have a written Constitution which includes, in terms that are absolute, a guarantee of freedom of speech and of press. The First Amendment was once applicable only to the Federal Government. But the Fourteenth Amendment made it applicable to the states as well. As the Fourteenth Amendment provides that no state shall deprive a person of "liberty" without "due process of law," the Court eventually held that it incorporates the conception of the freedoms embraced in the First Amendment.

If, as in India, our written Constitution permitted "reasonable" regulation of the press, we might well say that the judicial power includes the punishment of editors who through their papers tried to influence decisions. But since our freedom of the press includes no such qualification, we have concluded that a free press has the same dignity as an independent judiciary. *Pennekamp v. Florida*, 328 U. S. 331. Judges must be sturdy characters. *Craig v. Harney*, 331 U. S. 367, 376. This exposes them to the rough and tumble of American life. The alternative of putting the press under the thumb of judges would be a break with the First Amendment rights. *Bridges v. California*, 314 U. S. 252. We have made our choice, refusing to sacrifice freedom of press to the whims of judges. We know that judges as well as editors can be tyrants. See *Nye v. United States*, 313 U.S. 33, 48-52.

This is not to say that the influence of newspapers on trials should go unnoticed. At times the papers can help arouse passions in a community so that no trial can be a

This was the annual John E. Coen Lecture, delivered by Justice Douglas at the University of Colorado Law School, May 10. Several of the indented quotations have been cut for space.

fair one. The courtroom by our traditions is a quiet place where the search for truth by earnest, dedicated men goes on in a dignified atmosphere. The trials recently held in Cuba at a stadium filled with hooting people are the very antithesis of our conception of fair trials. When the famous Communist trial was being held in New York City, a motion was made to the District Court to transfer it from the Federal Building to Madison Square Garden so that the crowds could pack in. That motion was denied. Those who sponsored it apparently were interested in making the trial a spectacle. Spectacles, however, do not comport with the quiet dignity and dispassionate search for truth which we associate with judicial proceedings. As John M. Harrison of the *Toledo Blade* put it, "... it never was intended that freedom of the press should give newspapers license to cripple the right of every man to a fair trial." *The Press v. The Courts*, *Saturday Review*, Oct. 15, 1955, pp. 9, 35.

Passion and public outcry, aided and abetted by the press, have at times so possessed a community and its courthouse as to make the trial a mere mockery of justice. When that has happened, a new trial has been granted. *Moore v. Dempsey*, 261 U. S. 86. A mistrial was recently declared for that reason in a widely publicized prosecution of Americans charged with attempting to cause insubordination in our Armed Forces in Korea. *United States v. Powell*, 171 F. Supp. 202.

At other times the press has been the vehicle for getting to the jury evidence against the accused which no judge would admit at the trial. Then a new trial has also been granted. *Marshall v. United States*, 360 U. S. 310. As the court in *Coppedge v. United States*, 272 F. 2d 504, recently noted, a newspaper may properly print what jurors should not know. A defendant, however, is on trial for a specific crime, and is not to be condemned, imprisoned, or executed for what laymen would call his bad character or reputation. See *Michelson v. United States*, 335 U. S. 469, 475-476. Rules of evidence are designed to narrow the issues and protect an accused against prejudice. Judges, not newspaper reporters, fashion and supervise those rules.

At other times the papers may so beat the drums of prejudice and passion as to make it doubtful whether a trial in the local courthouse can be fair to a particular defendant. See *Shepherd v. Florida*, 341 U. S. 50; *Stroble v. California*, 343 U. S. 181, 191-195. Local feelings may run so high as to necessitate a change in venue or a continuance to allow emotions to subside.

The point is that our remedy for excessive comment by the press is not the punishment of editors, but the granting of new trials, changes in venue, or continuances to parties who are prejudiced.

There are, however, activities in which the press should

not indulge, lest the intrinsic nature of the trial itself be changed.

The matter of the public trial assumes new proportions these days. To what extent should modern inventions be used to report a trial? Modern inventions can often help in improving the administration of justice. Alaska, for example, has recently substituted electronic recording machines for court reporters at all trials in the state courts. When a tape recording is made of a trial, a record is preserved that has more warmth and emphasis than the cold notes of a reporter. A taped record is indeed a more faithful account of what went on than transcribed notes. Few storms gather around that type of problem. A great controversy, however, concerns the publicity which should be given a trial. Should it be covered by the camera? Should it be transferred to radio or television?

Canon 35 of the American Bar Association's Canons of Judicial Ethics places its weight on the side of the quiet dignity of the courtroom. It reads in part as follows:

The taking of photographs in the court room, during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting or televising of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court, and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted.

Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure was written in the same tradition:

The taking of photographs in the court room during the progress of judicial proceedings or radio broadcasting of judicial proceedings from the court room shall not be permitted by the court."

In 1952 a Special Committee of the American Bar Association, headed by the late John W. Davis, reported on the issue of broadcasting or televising trials or legislative investigations:

The intrusion into the courtroom of mechanisms which require the participants in a trial consciously to adapt themselves to the demands of recording and reproducing devices, and to measure their time accordingly, distracts attention from the single object of promoting justice. The attention of the court, the jury, lawyers and witnesses should be concentrated upon the trial itself and ought not to be divided with the television or broadcast audience who for the most part have merely the interest of curiosity in the proceedings. It is not difficult to conceive that all participants may become over-concerned with the impression their actions, rulings or testimony will make on the absent multi-

tude." (77 A. B. A. Rep. (1952) 607, 610.)

There is mounting opposition to that recommendation. The opponents maintain that the concept of a public trial is an expanding one to be kept in tune with the times, that trials should be broadcast or televised unless unfairness would result.

It is a "public trial" that the Sixth Amendment guarantees. It is a "public trial" that is guaranteed by some state statutes. But this guarantee is for the benefit of the accused, not the press. In *United Press v. Valente*, 308 N.Y. 71, Judge Stanley H. Fuld wrote, "As long as the defendant is assured the right to invoke the guarantees provided for his protection, the public interest is safe and secure, and there is neither need nor reason for outsiders to interject themselves into the conduct of the trial." *Id.*, at 81. The concept of the public trial is not that every member of the community should be able to see or hear it. A public trial means one that is open rather than closed—a trial that people other than officials can attend. The public trial exists because of the aversion which liberty-loving people had toward secret trials and proceedings. See *In re Oliver*, 333 U. S. 257, 268. That is the reason our courts are open to the public, not because the Framers wanted to provide the public with recreation or with instruction in the ways of government.

With all deference to the Supreme Court of Colorado, I feel that trial on radio or television is quite a different affair than a trial before the few people who can find seats in the conventional courtroom. The already great tensions on the witnesses are increased when they know that millions of people watch their every expression, follow each word. The trial is as much of a spectacle as if it were held in the Yankee Stadium or the Roman Coliseum. When televised, it is held in every home across the land. No civilization ever witnessed such a spectacle. The presence and participation of a vast unseen audience creates a strained and tense atmosphere that will not be conducive to the quiet search for truth.

Photographing a trial with ordinary cameras does not entail those evils. But it spawns evils of its own—evils that have sometimes been summarized under the heading "trial by newsphoto." Picture-taking in the courtroom is more than disconcerting. It does not comport with traditional notions of a fair trial. A man on trial for his life or liberty needs protection from the mob. Mobs are not interested in the administration of justice. They have base appetites to satisfy. Even still pictures may distort a trial, inflame a proceeding by depicting an unimportant miniscule of the whole, or lower the judicial process in public eyes by portraying only the sensational moments.

A state court rule that barred the broadcasting or photographing of trials was sustained when challenged in a federal court. Judge Wallace S. Gourley stating:

The very thought of members of the press and/or amateur photographers and others employing cameras, no matter how silent and concealed, to photograph different parties and witnesses to a court proceeding while the parties and the court are engrossed in the determination of matters of tremendous moment to the parties involved, is repugnant to the high standard of judicial decorum to which our courts are accustomed, and, indeed, may prove an opening wedge to a gradual deterioration of the judicial process.

[T]he greatest danger to freedom may well stem from those who seek the license and luxury of increased liberties at the expense of the processes which feed life blood to our free institutions. *Tribune Review Pub. Co. v. Thomas*, 153 F. Supp. 486, 494.

And Judge Herbert F. Goodrich, 3rd Circuit Court in affirming this judgment, wrote:

We suppose it would not be contended that a newspaper reporter or any other citizen could insist upon entering another's land without permission to find out something he wanted to know. In the same way merely because someone's private letters might be interesting as gossip or as models of English composition it would hardly be argued that one could open another's desk and read through what he finds there. We think that this question of getting at what one wants to know, either to inform the public or to satisfy one's individual curiosity is a far cry from the type of freedom of expression, comment, criticism so fully protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution." 254 F. 2d 883, 885.

No spectacle is conducive to the search for truth which every trial involves. The opportunities for men to exploit the situation are greatly multiplied. Prosecutors usually run for office. And nowadays about three-fourths of our states provide for the election of judges as I have said. Prosecutors and judges—as well as defense counsel—are human; and the temptation to play to the galleries will be stronger than many can resist.

Caleb Foote of the University of Pennsylvania Law School recently reported on a study he made of vagrancy in Philadelphia. 104 U. Pa. L. Rev. 603. He relates that movies were taken of some of the trials:

At one of the hearings floodlights were mounted behind the bench and as the defendants were called up one by one, a photographer, crouching just behind the magistrate, took motion pictures of the proceed-

ings. The lights were arranged in such a way that they must have blinded those standing in front of the magistrate; the effect was much like that of a police line-up. *Id.*, at 607.

His account of these details—held when the newspapers were conducting a clean-up campaign—makes very clear that some judges make big plays to the grandstands. A trial that is broadcast or televised creates the opportunity to show the voters how magnanimous the prosecutor is, how just the judge.

While witnesses may be intimidated by the presence of the microphone, others seeking publicity, may exaggerate or clown or make the proceeding a vehicle for getting public attention.

As one trial lawyer recently said: "It is the fact of photography, the fact that the intrusion is present, the fact that all the principals to the trial—judge, witness, lawyer, jury—are 'on stage' which is inescapably distracting from the task at hand. It is the fact that these participants are made actors which is dangerous and disturbing. If unwilling actors, then their essential dignity as human beings is being violated. If willing actors, then they may be far more dangerous to the life, liberty and property of the litigants because their principal concern will not be compliance with their oath, but with the question of their effectiveness as actors. The manner or method of making them actors is beside the point." Epton, *Controversial Canon* 35, *Sooner Magazine*, Feb. 1960, pp. 16, 30.

Back in 1934 the United States Board of Steamboat Inspectors held public hearings over the *Morro Castle* disaster. Those hearings were broadcast on the radio. One witness, putting his lips to the microphone and addressing himself to the unseen audience of the radio world, shouted, "Mom—how am I doing?" Another witness, speaking to the same audience, said, "I hope the red-headed girl and all the other girls and those I met on shipboard will remember me and the pleasant times we had and send me some postal cards." The New York County Lawyers' Association, to its great credit, denounced the broadcast of that investigation and urged that all broadcasts or movies of judicial proceedings or administrative hearings be discontinued "in the interest of justice."

Televising and broadcasting of Congressional hearings have been more and more frequent. Then the hearing often becomes a trial in which the entire nation sits as a jury. The people do not, of course, render a verdict; they do not pronounce the witness guilty or not guilty in so many words. Yet the television jury often condemns men. The television trial may produce evidence to convict the witness; and it may so saturate the country with prejudice

against an accused that a fair trial may be next to impossible. As stated by Harry W. Jones in 37 A. B. A. J., 392:

If several million television viewers see and hear a politician a businessman or a movie actor subjected to searching interrogation, without ever having an opportunity to cross-examine his accusers or offer evidence in his own support, that man will stand convicted, or at least seriously compromised, in the public mind, whatever the later formal findings may be.

This use of television in their inquisitorial procedures puts in jeopardy some of our basic tenets. As stated in the Temp. L. Q., 70, 73: "The entire concept of our criminal law, that a man is innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, is in jeopardy of being replaced by a new concept of guilt based on inquisitorial devices. What is important is that many such witnesses were convicted even though they had not been tried through any judicial processes. There was no way of testing the truth of the statements made or of reasonable implications drawn from the questions asked."

Moreover, commercial sponsorship of such broadcasts can only cheapen or vulgarize processes of government that should be sacrosanct.

In addition, as one lawyer has said, one evil of televising investigations or trials is the tendency to give an "incomplete presentation"—to "carry only the sensational parts of a hearing," or selected portions that "may distort" the presentation or slant it one way or the other. Taylor, *The Issue is Not TV, But Fair Play*, 12 Fed. Com. B. J. 10, 14. And see Maslow, *Fair Procedures in Congressional Investigations: A Proposed Code*, 54 Col. L. Rev. 839, 876-877.

These are some of the reasons behind the observation in *Life Magazine* after the Army-McCarthy hearings on television in 1954, "If the hearings have proved anything to date it is that courtroom procedure, with its strict rules on conduct and introducing evidence, is a most marvelous human invention." "The Men McCarthy Made Famous," *Life*, May 17, 1954, p. 47.

One shudders to think what could be the result in trials having a political cast—where the accused is unpopular, or where the charge is inflammatory. Think, too, of the times when a community is thoroughly aroused about some heinous crime—so aroused as to generate an atmosphere in which a fair trial cannot be had. *E. g.*, *People v. McKay*, 37 Cal. 2d 792; *State v. Weldon*, 91 So. Car. 29; *Moore v. Dempsey*, 261 U. S. 86. Imagine what could happen if the latent local passions were loosened in the channels provided by radio and television. Then there might be no place to which the trial could be transferred to protect the accused.

Was it not Juvenal who wrote "Two things only the people anxiously desire—bread and circuses"? This January in Baghdad the government gave the mob a circus in the form of a televised trial of some 70 defendants. The court was the People's Court; the charge was a plot to assassinate Premier Karim el-Kassem. The accused were herded handcuffed into a pen ablaze with kleig lights. A hand-picked studio audience jammed the room. The trial began at 7 p.m. to accommodate the television audience. The judge and the prosecutor vied for star billing while the studio audience, true to the clues, shouted and applauded.

It has recently been observed with great discernment that "[m]ass opinion has acquired mounting power in this country. It has shown itself to be a dangerous master of decisions when the stakes are life and death." Lippmann, *The Public Philosophy*, p. 20. That was written about public issues on which the vote of the people is final and conclusive. Mass opinion can be even more dangerous in the operation of our legal system. It has no business there. It is anathema to the very conception of a fair trial. It applies standards that have no place in determining the awful decision of guilt or innocence. The courtroom at these times is as sacrosanct as the cathedral, to be guarded against all raucous, impassioned, and foreign influences. The matter was succinctly put by Judge George H. Boldt in 41 A. B. A. J. 55. "Ordeal by publicity is the legitimate great-grandchild of ordeal by fire, water and battle."

It seems to me no answer to say that the trial judge can keep full control of the situation by denying permission to photograph or broadcast or televise the proceedings where an unfair trial might result. Imagine the pressure

that judges standing for election would be under in communities where the dominant paper owns the radio and television station.

In all cases where the trial promised glamour or excitement the pressure for photography and broadcasting would be enormous. Where judges are elected, the temptation to show the electorate how a trial can be masterfully handled would be great. Our judges are honorable people and I do not attribute base motives to them. Yet they are human; and the unconscious influences would press heavily on them to open their courtrooms so that the masses could have ringside seats to a spectacle made possible by modern science. And when exceptions are made and the trial opened up to broadcasting and television, the damage done may be too subtle to measure accurately. Cf. *Baltimore Radio Show v. Maryland*, 193 Md. 300, 67 A. 2d 497. Since defendants' rights are the interests protected by the public trial the end is best served by banning all photography, broadcasting, and televising. The camel should be kept out of the tent, lest he take it over completely.

I can still see in my mind's eye the beard of Chief Justice Hughes bristle as he reported to the Conference a proposal to broadcast the proceedings before the Court. His reaction was not that of the stodgy conservative opposed to change. His opposition welled up from a deep instinctive impulse to make the courtroom sacrosanct—to keep it a place of dignity where the quest for truth goes on quietly and without fanfare and where utmost precautions are taken to keep all extraneous influences from making themselves felt. Hughes knew from broad experience that procedural safeguards—control of the means used to reach a result—are often as important as the ends themselves.

The First Thomas L. Stokes Award

By Louis M. Lyons

It is my privilege to represent the Nieman Fellows who judged the first Thomas L. Stokes Award.

They had hard work because they had such a pile of excellent writing in the field of conservation. The best of the lot had to be very good, as indeed it is.

It should be of the highest order to merit association with Tom Stokes, great as a reporter and great as a human being.

The late chairman of the Tom Stokes Award Committee, Lowell Mellett, knew Tom Stokes longer and closer than I. Lowell Mellett died, I believe, the day I received his invitation to come down here today.

He was a Scripps-Howard editor in Washington when Tom Stokes was a Scripps-Howard correspondent here.

They were close. They both saw journalism as old man Scripps had, as a job to tell people what they needed to know, to dig out the facts that mattered, to keep an eye on the kind of people who were apt to try to steal the public domain; to show people what they needed to do to hang onto their rights, their American heritage.

Lowell Mellett was the kind of editor who has a right to direct the work of reporters like Tom Stokes, and who makes it possible for the public to be served by reporters like Tom Stokes.

Tom Stokes was a rugged, dogged reporter. But he was a modest man, a quiet, soft-spoken, friendly and helpful man. He was a reporter in this town for more than 20 years and then a columnist for another 13 or 14 years. But

you can't divide these two periods, except that his column reached more papers. He went right on being a reporter. He had more scope, more choice of subject. He chose the things that were not much reported because they were hard to come by. He dug them out. He would dig out the things that might be slipped over if nobody was looking, and he made it harder to put them over—things that had to do with the rates people pay, with the way the public interest was being managed, with threats to the public domain from greedy interests who might have inside connections that were as good as the key to the safe. He was a watchdog kind of reporter. He worked harder at it and more effectively than some papers cared for. Often many of the papers that took his column would leave it out. He was too close on a hot scent that might embarrass important people. A book of the Tom Stokes columns that were left out of leading papers would be interesting reading. But he made it hard for them to leave things out, and he made it easier for other reporters to get things in, by persistently digging for pay dirt and bringing up real ore.

The importance of Tom Stokes' quality of reporting was never more important than now, when it is evidently against public policy to have consumers represented on the most vital public regulating bodies, when the policy of the government on regulation is to avoid or evade the responsibility to regulate.

Our times urgently demand the most thorough and conscientious reporting of our public affairs. It was never so important for the citizen to be informed, and certainly never more difficult, when the issues back of the news grow ever more complex, and the difficulties of reporting are compounded by censorship, security, secrecy, and the glibness of public relations is exercised to make things look better than they are. The role of the hard-digging reporter was never more strategic to all of us.

He needs to struggle also against the tendency to complacency in his own office. The Pulitzer Committee has just announced no cartoon award for last year. I suppose they grew tired of giving it to Herblock, and Fitzpatrick has retired. The rest of the field evidently looks thin. But I think this is chiefly a confession of the blandness of most newspapers. A paper must take a position and stand for something if its cartoonist is to have a target to lampoon and a cutting edge to his caricaturing. Nast or Oppen would have found little nourishment for great cartooning in the bland pabulum of most editorial pages today.

There are never enough Tom Stokeses in any occupation. They bring distinction to their whole craft. We share

vicariously in their standards, their labors, their conscience and courage. They are the indispensable men.

So, to the credit of our sense and sensibilities we glory in their memories and burnish their achievement, to make the grail for our own best strivings. We cannot do less.

The choice of conservation as the field for the Tom Stokes Award, I think was wise and significant. It was a field that commanded much of Tom Stokes' attention and his constant interest. It is fundamental. The land, the water, the waterpower, the forests, the soil fertility, the seed-bed, the nesting ground, the open space, the chance like Antaeus to restore our strength by contact with the land, the springs of life, essential to the full man and the good life. To keep and cherish and develop and distribute these goods to all our people. This underlies all other dimensions of our common life, our common humanity.

I remember an appealing ad of a fertilizer company when I was a boy on a farm—"For the Land's Sake" was their trademark.

My old neighbor, Robert Frost, has written:

"The land was ours before we were the land's."

This possession we are privileged to share and privileged to keep.

This common possession is not only the land, but also the air, in which a Tom Stokes would now find occasion to assert our commonalty against those who act as though they owned it.

So it has for us meaning and pleasure that our colleague, Leonard Hall of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, is deemed to have dealt with especial distinction with this field of conservation.

Those who selected Leonard Hall for the Tom Stokes Award felt that his writing most closely paralleled that of Tom Stokes himself.

As I reported to the committee:

"Hall writes in the great tradition of the naturalist, expressing in all his pieces his great love of his Ozark country, and with homely, simple eloquence, appealing to his readers to preserve this heritage. His writing ranges over the whole area of conservation—on the necessity of saving the soil and developing the watersheds, of reforesting the hills and keeping the natural wet lands for breeding birds. He has a scientist's equipment for his work and the natural style of a man at home in his chosen environment."

The Thomas L. Stokes Award was made at a luncheon at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, May 3.

Newspapermen and Lawyers

By Anthony Lewis

I propose to speak tonight on a moderately pretentious topic, the public responsibilities of newspapermen and lawyers. It may seem surprising that my profession and yours are in any way comparable. It seems to me that the members of the two professions—if profession is not too high-flung a term for my business—share at least the basic attribute of being generalists. One of the great joys of my brief experience at the Harvard Law School was the discovery that teachers were, on the whole, not trying to drill particular facts into reluctant student memories. In the first-year course I took, Procedure, much of the year seemed to be taken up with persuading the class that there were no absolute facts to be learned. Of course the aim of the Law School is to awake a process, a way of thinking that can be applied to any situation in life. Although many lawyers do become specialists, the essential quality of the lawyer to me is that he is a non-expert, a generalist, a *whole man* in a world made up increasingly of half-men or quarter-men—experts on narrow, specialized problems whose immersion in their own field makes it hard for them to see its relation to life outside.

Now something of the same requirements of broadness, of adaptability, exist for newspapermen—or ought ideally to exist, at any rate. The reporter is constantly being thrown into new situations. He is expected to write knowingly one day about interest rates and the next day about the humane slaughter of animals. As life becomes more complicated, there is a tendency on newspapers as in law offices to create more experts—science writers and legal writers and so forth. But at heart the real newspaperman, even while he ponders whether a maritime tort for jurisdictional purposes arises under Federal law, is ready—eager, I should say—to cover the Presidential campaign.

I do not want to leave the impression that I overrate the similarity in approach of lawyers and newspapermen. They may both be generalists, but the lawyer has to dig deeper into any problem he is handling. There will be published next month a book of reminiscences by Justice Frankfurter, and in it he recalls working on a financial manipulation case for months while an Assistant United States Attorney in 1907. He writes: "When I think of what I then knew about brokerage accounts! But I know

nothing now. A lawyer becomes an expert in so many fields for so short a time."

The newspaper tradition is very much against becoming even a short-term expert on anything. In the past, at least, the reporter was expected to be the jack of all trades and master of none. One reason for this may be the well-founded fear that the more one learns about a subject, the harder it is to write a good simple story about it. Every sentence you put down cries out for qualification—and there is no space for a qualification. I am sure you all know how much easier it is for the visiting correspondent to write the complete story of Soviet Russia today in 1,000 words after he has been there a week than it would be if he stayed a year. In the same way, newspapers tend to present all issues in blacks and whites. A lawyer's training is to see how many sides there really are to a question, but the newspaper may feel it does not want to see all the possibilities because it can't afford to; that might just confuse it and its readers. I think the two qualities of the legal profession which I mention—the drive to master each subject as it comes along, and the ability to see problems in all their complexities, not in black and white—are needed on newspapers, and I think, hopefully, that the trend is in that direction.

As my concern is public responsibility in our professions, I want to focus especially on Washington. In that city, I think, lawyers and newspapermen do share a basic motivation and joy in life. Charles A. Horsky, in his book, *The Washington Lawyer*, called it "an intimate sense of participation in significant affairs." Douglass Cater, in a book which referred to the press in Washington as "The Fourth Branch of Government," spoke of correspondents having a "heady sensation of power and participation."

Turning first to the press, I have no doubt that a feeling of participation in great events is the life force of many Washington correspondents. Perhaps a heady sense of power, Mr. Cater's phrase, is more accurate. I really hate to see the press taking itself so seriously that it begins writing books about itself as a fourth branch of government. But that the press in Washington has an influence on public affairs, that it is to some degree a participant, is surely true.

A former president of the *Harvard Law Review* said to me last night that reporters are different from lawyers because they are not, or need not be, men of judgment. They are accountable to no one, he suggested, and so they are without responsibility. I agree that the reporter ordinarily does not bear the lawyer's responsibility for de-

Anthony Lewis is in the Washington Bureau of the New York Times where the Supreme Court is his special area of reporting. He devoted a Nieman Fellowship in 1956-57 to studies in the Harvard Law School. This is from a talk to the *Harvard Law Review* dinner, April 23.

cision; he writes for an anonymous and remote audience, while the lawyer determines the course of action to be taken by human beings immediately present. I agree also that I would trust the judgment of the best lawyer over that of the best newspaperman to decide the fate of the nation, or my own fate. But the suggestion last night was that reporters really make no judgments at all, that they just write and the editors make the decisions.

If that is anyone's impression, it is incorrect. I start with the proposition that news stories are much more significant in shaping public opinion than editorials. Even editors will admit this, perhaps because readership surveys show that only a small portion of the subscribers ever reads the editorial page. And in my experience the reporter has very much more to do with the shape of the news story than any editor does. For the Washington correspondent, editors are a group of anonymous people at the other end of a telegraph wire. Of course they retain their power to cut the point out of a story. But usually this is done by inadvertence, because of the demands of space, rather than by design. The real decisions—what facts to report, and in what light to report them—are made by reporters, in my opinion.

As an example consider a recent story. William R. Connole is a member of the Federal Power Commission whose term expires on June 22d. On April 19th Senator Prescott Bush of Connecticut disclosed that the White House had told him Connole would not be reappointed. I wrote a story in which the bare fact of Senator Bush's disclosure was the lead. There followed the statement that Connole has been regarded as the one member of the Power Commission concerned about the consumer and determined to hold down natural gas rates, and that his being dropped therefore was causing a political fuss. Then the story noted that a month ago it had been learned that Mr. Connole and two other Power Commissioners had had private visits from a lawyer in a pending case at the F.P.C. Mr. Connole was to explain this to a Congressional committee on May 2d. But the story concluded that this possible impropriety on Mr. Connole's part had nothing to do with his failure to win reappointment, since Senator Bush had been informed of the White House decision before this question of impropriety had arisen. I am sorry to go on at such length about that story. I do it simply to contrast the version of the same events written by the Associated Press. Its lead went something like this: "William R. Connole, who has admitted to off-the-record contacts in a controversial natural gas case, will not be reappointed to the Federal Power Commission."

I need not belabor the point that the two stories gave a very different impression of the significance of the reported White House decision on Mr. Connole. And it

was the reporter who determined the shape of the story. Many, perhaps most, Washington events are not simple facts about which only one objective account can be written. The facts can be given more than one interpretation, and the "truth" depends on one's point of view. I do not suggest that newspapermen live like characters in a Pirandello play, chasing elusive and changing truths. I say only that judgments are involved in writing even what purport to be straight newspaper stories.

There are many examples that could be given, but the most telling is probably the whole McCarthy situation. During much of Senator McCarthy's career the Associated Press as a matter of high-level policy kept all interpretation out of its stories about the Senator. The stories were supposedly objective, factual, dead-pan presentations of the Senator's activities. But after a while some of the more sophisticated members of the A.P. began realizing that objectivity may be a little more complicated. Was it objective to report a speech by Senator McCarthy without pointing out his own internal contradictions? Was it objective to report his account of the spies uncovered at a closed session of his investigating committee without checking others who had been in the committee hearing and had seen no spies unveiled? The McCarthy issue deeply troubled American newspapers because, I think, it drove home to them the necessity of interpretive reporting. The idea of reporters exercising judgment worries many editors, just as some judges prefer to find absolute commands in the texts of statutes and constitutions because, they say, it is inappropriate for judges to weigh these things in the balance. I am not going to get into the judges' disagreement, but it seems to me that there is no way for newspapermen to escape making judgments.

I have been talking about the process of deciding what goes into a story—setting the facts in the necessary framework of interpretation. There is also the simple question of what is news. It is said, I think correctly, that the most important decision made within the *New York Times* is what to put on page one. Although these are much more editors' decisions, reporters have a hand here, too. When the Supreme Court hands down a half dozen or a dozen decisions on a Monday, our editors rely to some extent on my advice as to which cases are significant. When Lyndon Johnson makes a speech, our political writers are likely to be asked: "Is there anything new in this, or is it more of the same?" To a surprisingly large extent, what the Washington Bureau of the *New York Times* files over the wire to New York each day depends on the judgment of the staff members. Of course certain stories obviously must be covered; we would hardly ignore General De Gaulle's visit. But if you read the *Times* Washington cov-

erage carefully, you will observe that much of it is not so obviously big news. How prominently we play an anti-trust suit, for example, depends in part on the significance seen in it by the man covering the beat. The *Times* may ignore a week of testimony by scientists on nuclear testing, and then carry a prominent story because a member of the Washington Bureau thinks certain threads in the testimony add up to a significant shift in scientific thinking.

To some extent the newspapers themselves create news. Let me go back to the story about the Power Commission and Mr. Connole. Mr. Connole's reputation as a protector of the consumer, I said, was causing some political fuss to be raised about his reappointment. But it could fairly be said that the newspapers were at least an instrument in raising that fuss. I had written a story saying that the heads of seven state utility regulating commissions had urged Mr. Connole's reappointment. A columnist had written two pieces purporting to disclose how the "gas lobby" had blocked his nomination. Until these and other stories were written, there may well have been no public issue over the appointment at all. Mr. Connole could have been quietly dropped with almost no one noticing.

The other day Senator Kennedy accused the press of creating the religious issue in the Presidential nominating campaign. He argued that hordes of reporters combing through Wisconsin and West Virginia, asking the citizenry whether it would support a Catholic for President and then reporting the existence of religious bloc-voting, had in effect made the citizens think of religion for the first time as a factor in politics. I believe there is some accuracy in the picture; the press has at least sharpened the religious issue. But given history and the political realities in this country, could the press really have failed to wonder whether primary voters would cast ballots along religious lines? Was it not appropriate to remind the readers of Senator Kennedy's speech, as my bureau chief, James Reston, did, that the Senator had argued to the professionals in 1956 that he should be nominated for Vice President because his religion would win more votes than it would lose?

My examples should suggest that these newspaper judgments may involve moral considerations. Nothing raises more acute problems here than the leak. The leak is the great weapon of the Washington politician. Most of the stories that are called scoops probably result from a calculation by some official that publication of the material at this time will be advantageous to him and the interests he supports. The idea may be, for example, to start building public support for a program which has not yet won approval within the Administration. Or it may be a leak designed to frighten Congress out of heavy spending by, say, painting a horrifying picture of the gold outflow from

this country. Sometimes the reporter's initiative is vital; many good stories are obtained by asking the right question at the right time. But other stories are presented on a silver platter. In both cases there may be ethical concerns. When a law professor frustrated with the limitations on his role as a Congressional committee investigator of the regulatory agencies offers a newspaper his memorandum making sweeping and unconfirmed charges against many persons, should the paper print it? Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury returns from a European trip, calls in a reporter and tells him of deep concern in European financial circles about possible weakening of the dollar as a currency if a Democrat devoted to easy money is elected President. The reporter is not allowed to identify the Secretary by name as the source of the story; he *can* use a disguise such as "high financial circles in the Administration. . . ." Should he write the story? Or go back to Mr. Connole and the Power Commission. Would it affect the validity of the story about the seven state utility regulation chairmen supporting his reappointment if the reporter had actually obtained copies of those seven men's letters from Mr. Connole? (I should say, parenthetically, that reporters at the Supreme Court are spared *this* moral issue anyway. There are no leaks at the Supreme Court.)

It is evident that there are dangers in the power of the Washington press to create public images of men and events. There is a strong temptation on some correspondents to play God. After all, it is so much easier to determine foreign policy without going through all the trouble of becoming Secretary of State and without being subject to the limitations that the political system puts on him. Newspapermen are not responsible to a constituency, or even to a client. They are used to haste and superficiality, not to reflection; depth is a quality not normally found among them. For all these reasons irresponsible journalism is a serious concern.

I am as critical of newspapers as anyone, but I do not think the Washington press corps is predominantly irresponsible. Individually, and collectively with his editors, the reporter does tend to impose on himself the restraint, the responsibility of concern for the public interest.

Mr. Cater, in his book, quotes a well-known Washington correspondent on the difference between reporters and officials. The reporter, he says, decides whether to print something he learns on the basis of only two considerations: Is it news? Is it fit to print? The official, weighing disclosure, must also consider the effects of publication on policy—on the interest of the country.

I think that distinction is overdrawn. Certainly officials and newspapermen approach differently the question of whether something should be published. But no

responsible reporter ignores the possible effects of publication. One of my colleagues has said to me that he thinks a newspaperman's ability to achieve rapport with an official depends on the official's confidence that the reporter is interested as he is in the good of the country. The reporter interested only in tomorrow's headline is not likely to keep the respect of those in government—a respect he needs to do his job properly.

Finally let me raise the most difficult question of all for Washington newspapermen, the extent to which they can properly become participants in events—doers instead of observers. Reporters, like lawyers, have opinions. They are naturally interested in public affairs. They are not eunuchs. Almost inevitably they find themselves rooting for one side or another. Along with this comes the frustrating feeling that they could do things so much better than those who are the participants. Every reporter who covers Congressional committee hearings finds himself full of questions that the Congressmen don't have the sense to ask.

But there are limitations on newspapermen. I do not know precisely what they are, and so I shall simply raise some questions. One of my newspaper colleagues in Washington, a lady, was much concerned two years ago about the effects of what I can refer to here in shorthand as the McNabb-Mallory doctrine—the Supreme Court's rule that unnecessary delay in arraignment of a Federal prisoner voids any confession made during the delay. This lady thought the doctrine was filling the streets of Washington with criminals, and she wrote a great many tales of horror designed to encourage Congress to overrule the McNabb and Mallory cases. I sat next to her in the Senate the day a bill to accomplish that purpose was defeated by two votes. Her eyes filled with tears, and she rushed downstairs to talk to some Senators and see if she could rally her forces. I have been a little sarcastic in describing the episode, but is that justified? If *she* was wrong, what are the proprieties of a newspaperman calling to the attention of some Senators a little-noticed bill that would have restricted an important area of Federal court jurisdiction?

What about a reporter who was praised by the Senate Rackets Committee for bringing in adverse information on Jimmy Hoffa? How does his position compare with that of the reporters who fed tidbits to Senator McCarthy? If they were wrong, what about the reporters who opposed Senator McCarthy, discussed strategy with his enemies and, I think, had a good deal to do with bringing him down?

There is no sure guide for all situations, but I think it is clear that the reporter must not become entirely committed—an obvious special pleader. His instinct should be all the other way. If he has a concern for the public

good, as I think most Washington reporters do, he must reconcile himself to satisfying that urge by uncommitted reporting. Justice Frankfurter has put it that the reporter is an educator, not a reformer. I accept that definition, with the proviso that the educator be allowed to harbor within him just a little of the spirit of reform.

Which brings me, at long last, to the public responsibility of lawyers. A little over a year ago I heard Judge Wyzanski say in a memorable speech that the bar does not live up to its responsibility for public service. I am afraid I agree.

How many law offices encourage their younger men to devote time to public matters? I fear the number is not large. How much have the practicing lawyers of America done during the last dozen years to bring reason and fairness into loyalty and security proceedings? A few have done a great deal, but the record of the bar as a whole does not seem to me adequate. What has been the reaction of the country's lawyers to the barbarian attacks made on the Supreme Court in recent years? On the whole, I think, silence.

A few years ago Dean Acheson wrote to a friend about the reasons for going into public service. He spoke of the *exhilaration* of public life, of the scope it gives a man that private affairs cannot. A newspaper reporter can sense this exhilaration, but he can never really be a participant. Perhaps the fact that he must remain an outsider makes the newspaperman believe that lawyers should seize the opportunities for public service given them by their training and status. If there is one thing the legal profession might borrow from journalism, it is a touch of the romantic and impetuous. Newspaper reporters are becoming stodgier all the time, but they are not yet as stodgy as lawyers. Perhaps lawyers need a bit more Don Quixote in them to fulfill the public responsibility I think they have. If you would borrow that from us, I hope we might borrow from you the thoughtfulness of lawyers, the concern for longer-range values, the sense of accountability and responsibility.

In his book of reminiscences that I have mentioned, Justice Frankfurter says he has almost a religious feeling about the Harvard Law School. He says it is the most "democratic" institution he knows—meaning by democratic "regard for the intrinsic and nothing else, * * * dedication to the pursuit of truth, * * * complete indifference to all the shoddiness, pettiness and silliness that occupies the concern of most people who are deemed to be important or big." My own respect for the Harvard Law School is no less. If I close with an exhortation, it is only that the graduates of the Harvard Law School translate its great tradition into a greatness and a public responsibility of their own.

The Divided Press of South Africa

By Adam Clymer

In March a revolution the outside world had casually expected struck and shocked South Africa. The oppressed decided that patience and pious non-violence were not going to get them anywhere, and followed leaders who would knowingly court jail and loss of life. While a few foreign experts had predicted the timing of the uprising, and many outsiders had accepted its inevitability, within South Africa the riots came as a sudden shock. The white South African had not been prepared to think of disorder as something imminent, but mainly as a subject of election propaganda.

Possibly the situation has always been hopeless, and very likely nothing short of the death toll, strikes, and disorder could have brought home to the comfortable white South African the real uncertainty of his position. One must doubt whether he has learned. But any student of the press must note that the South African press did nothing to prepare its readers for the holocaust. Probably white South Africans could not have been enlightened; the press did not even try.

Instead of describing and interpreting the realities of African discontent, South African newspapers were content to reinforce the traditional clichés and assumptions of white politics in South Africa.

The first of these, in its importance to most politicians and to the press, is the question of relations between the Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking segments of the white population. While the Afrikaners were losers at arms in the Anglo-Boer War, they have never really conceded defeat. For the last twelve years an all-Afrikaner government, the National Party Government of Malan, Strijdom, and now Verwoerd, has been seeking to redress both the real and the imagined grievances of the Afrikaner people, the descendants of the Dutch settlers from whom the English took control in the last century.

The Nationalists have achieved overwhelming parliamentary control on slightly less than half the votes cast, through weighted representation that would make even American farmers envious. Afrikaners make up three-fifths of the whites, but some of them support the Opposition, the United Party, which also is the home of all the

English-speaking. The greatest heat and concern of these parties is reserved not for black-white questions, but for such issues as relations with the Royal Family, Great Britain, and the Commonwealth, questions of the use of one or another of the two official languages, and disputes about South Africa's participation in World War II, which the Nationalists opposed.

The papers printed in each language have supported unhesitatingly the corresponding parties and make little attempt at fairness or balance. Typical is the vast space devoted to any minor criticism of the other side from within, i.e., lead stories in the English press created out of resignations of minor National Party functionaries. (The English press is now working for some political objectivity because the Opposition split last August and a Progressive Party was formed, advocating considerable liberalization of race policies.)

This preoccupation would be more amusing if only it did not reinforce the other main blind spot of South African politics: the idea that the country's race problems can be settled by the wisdom of the whites without reference to the other four-fifths of the population. Neither the Government nor the Opposition envisages any honest non-white political participation, though they say they do, and the press, particularly the Afrikaans press, takes them at their word. Stanley Uys of the *Sunday Times*, a brilliant reporter and commentator, is a rare exception. In November he wrote of "the great South African delusion: that because a majority, perhaps even an overwhelming majority of the White electorate is opposed to radical change, there will be no change." But while his colleagues respect Uys and may agree with him personally, they perpetuate the delusion.

They do so not only by taking white politicians completely seriously; indeed the most important way in which they keep the blinkers in place is by failing to pay any significant attention to political developments among the non-whites. The Pan-Africanist Congress, which called the campaign that led to the state of emergency now in force, was virtually unknown to white South Africans throughout 1959, when it was formed and when it developed and showed an attitude distinctly more militant than the older African National Congress.

This neglect is all the more tragic because the half-dozen newspapermen who do know non-white politics thoroughly were among the maximum of two-score persons in the country who did. The *Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg) is the only paper which approached adequacy in this field,

Adam Clymer is a reporter on the Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*. He spent last year in South Africa on a Frank Knox Memorial Fellowship awarded by Harvard College, where he was president of the *Harvard Crimson* in the class of 1958.

and its Benjamin Pogrund is probably the country's best writer on the subject. The *Sunday Times* has Uys concentrating on white politics. Typical of the press' attitude is the action of the *Cape Argus* in sending its able specialist on non-white politics, Patrick Arton, to New York for a year last December. And the Afrikaans papers are even more derelict, having no one on the subject regularly.

These are the most substantial general impressions I drew from a year's close reading of the South African press. Beyond these points, the newspaper press breaks down into the English press and the Afrikaans press, and the differences are more notable and interesting than the similarities.

The English press is decidedly more important, despite the three-fifths preponderance of Afrikaners among the three million whites who buy nearly all the newspapers sold. The English papers are usually better produced, bigger, more accurate and thorough, and far more widely read. The largest circulation of any Afrikaans daily is the 47,571 (January-June, 1959) of Johannesburg's *Die Vaderland*, a figure exceeded on the English side by the Johannesburg *Star* (170,894), the *Rand Daily Mail* (114,142), Cape Town's *Cape Argus* (95,353), and *Cape Times* (66,522) and Durban's *Natal Daily News* (65,903) and *Natal Mercury* (55,967). These are followed by *Die Vaderland*, Cape Town's *Die Burger* (42,754), and Johannesburg's *Die Transvaler* (40,811) among the Afrikaans dailies.

The pattern is slightly less pronounced among the national weeklies, as the *Sunday Times*' 309,289 and the *Sunday Express*' 150,347 exceed *Die Landstem*'s 148,170 and *Dagbreek en Sondagnuus*' 123,534. The *Sunday Tribune* sells 101,885. The character of these weeklies, except *Dagbreek*, is basically cheap and amusing, though the *Sunday Times* has its Uys and a few other excellent reporters. *Die Landstem*, moreover, is a peculiarity in the South African press, since it is earnestly non-political and almost all fluff. (There is also the sensational, pro-African *Golden City Post*, with a nearly exclusive African readership, which sold 81,096.)

The general impression of the Afrikaans press is that it is more somber than the English, in ironic contrast to the character of the population groups themselves. But it is probably a more difficult task to be light-hearted in defense of *apartheid* than in attacking it.

The ever-present political bias takes many forms. Only isolated smaller papers, like Pietermaritzburg's *Natal Witness* (11,872), one of the best in the country, and the Port Elizabeth papers, the *Eastern Province Herald* (25,124) and the *Evening Post* (21,624), make any effort to balance space between the parties or to rate stories on their actual importance. The *Rand Daily Mail* is probably

the worst offenders, having ignored completely Verwoerd's major speech of last October's election campaign; but in general the Afrikaans papers are more one-sided in their treatment of political news. They are more prone to slanted headlines, like *Die Burger's* "Debate Triumph for N.P." or *Die Transvaler's* "U.P.'s Scandalous Attack on Farmers in Assembly" after two particularly inept Government showings in the House.

The papers are not concerned only with boosting politicians for their speeches and proposals. They create stories either to inflate or deflate the Government, and prepare them rather uncritically. *Die Transvaler*, the Nationalists' most rabid organ, headlined a June 10 story, "Transkei Has No Unrest—Official." It gave much less prominence to a June 17 article saying "Bands Cause Alarm in Transkei." And *Die Vaderland* produced a series defending forced farm labor schemes just as the *Rand Daily Mail* and the *Star* were exposing them. (*Die Vaderland* broke off its series when public pressure led the Cabinet to suspend the system.) On the other side, the English papers are prepared to accept rather uncritically any attack on the Government; the *Star* and the *Pretoria News* (18,152) ran a story quoting a "senior spokesman" of a union that turned out to be non-existent as blaming the Government steel export policy for widespread unemployment in the building trades, which also proved imaginary. Neither paper gave much space to its correction, though the *Star* and the Afrikaans papers joined a heated editorial debate over the motives behind the story.

This abandon in criticism is at times refreshing in contrast to the studied politeness of American papers, but it usually runs to absurd lengths. The Afrikaans press has a singularly thin-skinned way of interpreting any object of English press criticism, such as farm labor or police brutality, as a veiled attack on "*die Afrikaner volk*" itself. There underlies this approach a real difference in the idea of the purpose of a press, for the Afrikaans press identifies itself with the strength of the Afrikaner people, and seeks to protect that group, for what it doubtless believes to be the good of the whole country. The English press believes itself to be striving for impartiality and the "general good," and though it almost always falls short, the aim is still important.

Whatever the motive, the partisanship is so steady that any diversionism is worthy of interest. The *Sunday Times* printed criticisms of the Government by three Afrikaner professors from dour Potchefstroom University in April and May, and the trio were censured by their university, by their students, and by the Afrikaans press. One of their charges was that there was no room for their other criticisms in the Afrikaans press. Considerable editorial soul-search-

ing followed, and *Die Transvaler*, *Die Vaderland*, and *Dagbreek* all agreed to print "constructive" criticism. However, one *Vaderland* columnist was skeptical about how well this would be carried through, and in fact no criticism ever appeared. The Afrikaans papers are much less willing to print even critical letters to the editor than are the English papers.

But if the press is strongly partisan, this does not mean that it is not able. Afrikaans journalists probably enjoy higher social standing and education than their English counterparts, but most papers can do a good job with a story when they decide to. Spot news, like the Cato Manor riot, or floods that hit Natal in March, brought out excellent coverage, and under the immediate stimulus of a big, unexpected story, political allegiances faded. Outside of Durban itself, which adjoins the Cato Manor riot scene, probably the ablest riot coverage appeared in *Die Vaderland*, whose photo coverage was especially fine.

Parliamentary debates are covered extensively, though mainly in indirect discourse. But most papers have their own correspondents as well, men like Anthony Delius of the *Cape Times*, a satiric poet in odd hours, whose "Notes on the House" takes no party or person too seriously but hammers at issues and attacks clichés. And *Die Vaderland's* gallery columnist also has a good sense of news, which frequently interests him more than propaganda.

The *Cape Times'* David Marais is a fine cartoonist, the best in the country, and, if his subject matter were not exclusively day-to-day South African news, he might achieve world stature. The Afrikaans press lacks skillful cartoonists, but there are other talented men on other English papers. A few years ago the Government tried to prosecute one of them, charging that he was stirring racial unrest by a bitter attack on the Government.

A few papers (the *Witness*, *Die Burger*, the *Star*, the *Eastern Province Herald*, and the *Evening Post* particularly) give considerable prominence to reports of foreign affairs; the *Star's* bulk enables it to print more of anything than anyone else does. But most of the papers lean heavily on a parochial Reuters service, and what foreign news does appear falls into these categories, in this order of prominence:

1. Activities, especially romantic, of the Royal Family. (Except for *Die Burger* and *Die Volksblad* [Bloemfontein, 27,465], which play them down, the Afrikaans press ignores these stories.)
2. Race troubles anywhere, especially in Britain or the United States. If there is a sex angle, so much the better.
3. Foreign comments on South Africa.
4. Major East-West meetings and statements.

5. Events in the neighboring Rhodesias.
6. Developments elsewhere in Africa.

The UN suffers a general exaggeration in the eyes of the white South African and his press (which still calls it UNO), and is regarded as a dangerous interfering monster. The Afrikaans press is unreserved on this point; the English press says it is just as firmly opposed to interference, but maintains that no one would want to interfere if it were not for the Nationalists.

In dealing with the race question, few of the English papers and none of the Afrikaans papers regard Africans as human beings on the same level with Europeans. Mr. is almost never applied to blacks. In the Afrikaans papers they are Bantu; in most English papers, Natives. "Africans," the term they themselves prefer, is rarely used. The issue of labeling is a complicated one, and it can be argued that in South Africa race is always relevant. Yet in Port Elizabeth even court reporting is done scrupulously without reference to race except where it becomes vital to the story. (The Port Elizabeth papers, like the *Star*, regard African circulation as significant.) And surely the implied surprise of *Die Burger* in this news article is excessive:

White Woman Is Attacked in Bed

A white woman from Tamboerskloof was attacked early Saturday morning in her bed. The attacker was a white.

Another indicator of standards in covering non-whites is court reporting of interracial cases. In their general zeal for defending the white man, the press, especially the Afrikaans press, underplays or ignores cases where whites are found culpable, and exaggerates decisions which blame non-whites. Thus a remarkable magistrates' fine of £100 for a cold-blooded beating that killed an African farm laborer was noted only by *Die Transvaler*, which headlined "Father and Son Innocent of Murder Charge." Because of rather stringent contempt of court rules, cases that are *sub judice* are not discussed editorially under any circumstances, but it is rare for any paper but the *Cape Times* to discuss some of the more incredible ones afterwards. This one passed unnoticed.

Invective seems to be the primary skill for an editorial writer, and at this the *Cape Times* and *Die Transvaler* excel. *Die Burger's* comments on foreign affairs are a notable exception to the general insularity of the press. But for solid, steady analysis, the *Natal Witness*, edited by Mark Prestwich, is probably the best South Africa has. Commenting on the October election, it described the United Party, supported by most of its readers as "superbly

well-organized, but which has nothing meaningful whatever to say on any of the great issues which face the country."

The two presses are distinct in organization as well as language and point of view. The only important ties between the English and Afrikaans paper are the Audit Bureau of Circulation and the South African Press Association, which furnishes accounts of parliamentary debates and a few other major news events to all the papers in the country. (Most papers rely on "own correspondents," as they are labeled in the anonymous South African press, for out of town news.) The division is so strong the Afrikaans journalists do not join the English newspaper union.

The Afrikaans papers are tied closely to the National Party, whose leaders sit on the boards of directors of the papers. (The allegiance shows in odd ways, as when a *Burger* columnist gave pointed advice to the National Party on how to keep details of secret caucus meetings from enterprising Stanley Uys.) There are two main groups of English papers, the Argus group and South African Associated Newspapers, along with a few independents. Each group pools some facilities, like overseas correspondents, but individual editors have great freedom. The overall control insures that there is almost no direct competition of two papers published in the same city and language and at the same time. (The *Sunday Times* and *Sunday Express*, owned by the same firm, originate in Johannesburg for the only exception.) Indeed afternoon papers are sold only between noon and midnight and the first edition of a morning paper is not available until the a.m. hours, so even peripheral competition is averted.

Circulation gets little emphasis. The figures are tightly kept secret, and are never used for promotional purposes. (The ones I use were given me by an editor who thinks the restraints silly.) Most delivery of English papers is through the national Central News Agency, which is often exceedingly unreliable, but there is also a big street sale by newsboys.

Predicting anything about South Africa, except for the eventual certainty of African control, is an excessively risky business. If the information in the South African papers is slight, overseas coverage is usually even thinner, except during a storm of riots. A person reasonably well-informed in December finds himself out of touch in June. But censorship and control of the press do seem to lie ahead.

For several years a Government commission has been investigating the press, and its findings are feared by many editors, especially on English papers. Another commission, investigating obscenity (opposing, in passing, advertise-

ments showing women's underwear as provocative to the non-whites), urged boards of review with power to suppress publications. In the emergency, publication of names of prisoners was banned. Nationalist M.P.'s have urged censorship, and last year the Government expelled a television cameraman because of some of the things he covered. Police incompetence led to the arrest of Milton Bracker of the New York *Times* in South-West Africa, and his notes were searched for names of interviewees.

At the moment the press is quite free, as is the white man generally in South Africa, but before the current session of Parliament began there were widespread rumors that censorship legislation would be introduced. More likely the Government will wait for its Press Commission to report first, but some sort of action is very likely to come in order to buttress the totalitarian society. As the *Evening Post* noted sarcastically last October:

It's no use enforcing Bantustans and group areas and destroying university independence if you leave newspapers free to report the facts of what happened and allow people to say what they think about it.

As a general principle of government this is arguable, but it shows good insight into the Afrikaner Nationalist, whose bravery is always that of the group, not the individual, and who thinks of the critic from within much more as a heretic than as a man making a simple mistake.

Lauterbach Award to Ralph McGill

Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta *Constitution*, is the recipient of the 1960 Lauterbach Award "for distinguished service in the field of civil liberties."

The citation to Mr. McGill was:

"A dedicated journalist, undaunted against demagoguery, unflinching in patience, unstinting in constant striving for the basic rights of all Americans."

The presentation was made to Mr. McGill at a luncheon of the Nieman Fellows at Harvard, Monday, April 25.

The Lauterbach Award was established by friends of the late Richard E. Lauterbach, author and journalist, upon his death in 1950. They placed its custody with the Curator of the Nieman Fellowships in 1958.

Earlier recipients of the award have been Justice William Douglas, Elmer Davis, the Alsop brothers, Louis M. Lyons and Herbert L. Block.

The Committee on the award for 1960 were: Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Charles W. Morton, William M. Pinkerton and Louis M. Lyons.

Taiwan and Its Press

By Shen Shan

The little publicized meeting of the International Press Institute in Tokyo last April once again brought into focus a controversial question: Just how free is the press of Free China?

This question has been of long standing. The IPI, in the absence of a generally acceptable answer, has shown a marked reluctance to grant membership to the growing press in the Republic of China. Few systematic efforts, too, have been made to bring about all the facts helpful to a rational solution of the problem.

Two years ago, an important IPI official visited a number of Asian countries to find out and report on the conditions of the press in that part of the world. He did not go to Taipei, capital of Free China. Instead, he invited Mr. Stanway Cheng, director-editor of the *China News*, to Hong Kong for a talk. No word on the Free China press was contained in his initial report later made public.

When the IPI meeting was about to take place in Tokyo this year, Mr. Cheng and two other Chinese journalists—publisher James Wei of the *China News* and correspondent Li Chia of the Central News Agency—went to Tokyo and applied for individual membership.

The IPI executive council decided not to act on their applications. It further decided to dispatch an investigator to Taipei to make an on-the-spot survey plus recommendations. This investigative phase has by now been completed.

Until the findings are made known, the question still remains. This question is, at the same time, inexorably connected with a broader one: Are the political environments in Free China such as are conducive to the existence and prospering of a free press?

As a working newspaperman whose beat has been Taipei for the last ten years, I seek here to present a thumbnail sketch of both the press and political climate in Taiwan, the main base of Free China, in the hope that intelligent conclusions could be drawn from the accounts.

There are a little more than 30 daily newspapers throughout the island of Taiwan with 15 of them in Taipei. These 15 are the major ones with well-knit, island-wide circulation networks. They operate as national newspapers. The 16 or 17 newspapers outside of Taipei are more or less

Shen Shan, city editor of the *China News* of Taipei, has spent the past year at Harvard as an Associate Nieman Fellow. He describes himself as "a proud, though non-partisan Nationalist Chinese, a liberal diehard,—liberal to my Chinese friends and diehard to my American friends."

small town journals. There is also one newspaper on Quemoy and one on Matsu.

Thirteen Taipei newspapers are in the Chinese language and two, the *China Post* in the morning and *China News* in the evening, are in the English language. The Chinese language papers include seven morning dailies, three evening papers, one tabloid amusement sheet carrying some news, one serious paper devoted to the promotion of the mandarin tongue and one pictorial.

The combined circulation for all the newspapers in Free China can only be estimated, in the absence of an auditing system. Conservative estimates, apart from publishers' claims, tend to put the figure at 630,000. The Chinese habitually read only one newspaper and one paper is generally shared by five or six readers. Therefore, it has been assumed that roughly three and a half million people are newspaper readers. In other words, one-third of the total population has access to news and views.

All the papers publish seven days a week but only one edition a day. There is little tie-up between a morning and an evening paper. Their pages are constant—eight pages for a Taipei morning paper and four pages in the evening.

One distinct characteristic is their preoccupation with international news. In addition to subscriptions to wire services (AP, UPI, AFP, Reuter and Central News Agency), the bigger newspapers keep correspondents in the United States. The *Central Daily News*, so far the largest in circulation, also maintains a correspondent in West Europe. All papers have men in Hong Kong and staff or string correspondents in Southeast Asia. Besides news, special articles and regular supplements report and comment on almost all major international developments.

Another outstanding feature is their utter reliance on home subscriptions. The morning papers have almost written off street sales while evening papers assign a little more than 10 per cent of their copies to the news kiosks. This is in keeping with the Chinese reading habit.

With a few exceptions, the newspapers do not depend on advertisements as the major income. The Chinese have a native distaste for ads. Consequently, there has been a conspicuous dearth of ads from department stores, food producers, restaurants or hotels. The consistent advertisers are the airlines, automobile agents and theaters.

This makes it possible for the papers to fix the number of pages and yet have enough space for international, national and local news, all kinds of supplements and a great variety of feature articles.

Newspapers are widely used. Cartoons are relatively few. Comic strips are making a valiant effort to be a permanent feature. Columnists are yet to come since they cannot find an adequate market.

But good stories and novels in serial form often help push the sales. The case is especially true with the evening papers.

The papers run strictly on a competitive basis. Subscription war is heated. Circulation charts decide the fate of the business manager. As a result, the newspapers leave no stone unturned to bring out a better paper. Newer printing machineries, four-tone pictures, panel discussions, charity or public welfare projects, gift maps or special booklets are some of the promotion devices. All big papers keep a sizeable department to render personal services to readers, including conducted tours. But there is a tacit agreement that no paper should dangle cash in front of the reader's nose as a promotion method. The latest coup was scored by the *Great China Evening News* (*Ta Hua Wan Pao*) which is now sponsoring the Miss China beauty contest. The winner will be sent to Long Beach here for the Miss Universe title.

This feverish campaign for subscribers has brushed up writing, printing technique and delivery system. (One roadblock remaining unremoved is the fact that the Chinese language continues to defy the linotype machine.) It further requires newspapers with political affiliations to be less partisan but more businesslike. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the two biggest papers have different political status. The *Central Daily News* is a Kuomintang paper while the independent *United Daily News* is outspoken seven days a week. The readers choose their papers according to merit.

Free China is not the only place where political parties or the government get into the publishing business. In our case, however, political affiliation does not necessarily mean editorial control. The ruling Kuomintang has two newspapers in Taipei. The two opposition parties have one each although they sometimes deny it. Only one newspaper is owned directly by the government. These newspapers show their political inclinations only in their editorials. None of them have the intention to look or sound like the *Pravda*, or, at the other end of the scale, the *Roman Observer*. In fact, the party newspapers even lean backwards not to endorse candidates during elections.

These newspapers do not constitute the majority either in number or in circulation. The independent newspapers are thriving. The *Credit Daily News* (*Chen Hsin Hsin Wen*) which started as a market sheet is now the No. 3 paper while both English language papers guard their independent status with jealousy.

There are a number of healthy aspects in Free China's press.

First, the papers are on their own financially. There is no government subsidy even for the government paper or the Kuomintang papers. The *Central Daily News* in fact gives an annual check of roughly US\$5,000 to the Kuomintang as its contribution to the party. All the papers therefore must do a better job to survive and prosper. Consequently, quality has been improved.

In the second place, journalists enjoy a high social standing and their voice is respected. Everywhere, the ringside seat is reserved for them. Reporters are able to call on cabinet ministers any time of the day, and, for that matter, of the night. The maximum facilities are extended by the government and the public. There is a genuine and universal realization that the press is influential and should be treated accordingly.

The third healthy sign is the emergence of dedicated professional journalists. Starry eyed journalism students bring their idealistic yearnings into the city rooms. The papers are staffed by trained craftsmen from the managing editor on down. The reporters cross party lines in employment. Kuomintang papers do not demand to see their employee's party card as long as he is a good professional. Minority party papers find it profitable to hire first-rate Kuomintang members. The era when the quill was a stepping stone to political office is gone. Few journalists today want to go into politics. They enjoy being newspapermen. Comparatively speaking, they are adequately paid.

The most heartening trend in recent years is the steady and gradual victory won by the press, with only one setback, to have more freedom. In 1949 and 1950, the martial law for a moment curtailed press freedom. Since then, however, a complete free hand has been given the press. The newspapers are free to and do criticize policies and officials. They carry scoops which give diplomats or military men sleepless nights. My own paper, the *China News*, is noted for its fearless editorials as well as frank appraisals of current events. Its editorials last December hastened a neighboring government to protest to our foreign office, which could do nothing about it.

There is no censorship. Nobody breathes down the reporter's neck. But no reporter ever went to jail just because of what he wrote. It is true in 1958 two newspapermen were arrested and later sentenced to imprisonment. The case had nothing to do with their profession. In fact, they were given lighter terms than others, although the court found them to have been members of Communist front groups.

Chinese government officials, like their counterparts

elsewhere, often complain loudly to newspapers. They win very few retractions. They, however, still have to meet reporters from these papers since they cannot afford to be accused of discrimination.

On the other side of the ledger, the Chinese newspapers have their troubles and shortcomings.

One notable drawback is the fact that there are too many newspapers but too few readers. Less healthy papers somehow cling on. The market is limited. Thus, the circulation war is sometimes fought and won uneconomically. The low purchasing power makes the three-cent papers look expensive despite the high rate of literacy.

Another defect is the papers' penchant for exposés. Exposés, when carried too far and prematurely, generate more heat than light. The papers, because of their high standing and the low fines on libel, are well protected. I am happy to report that the conscientious efforts of the professionals have succeeded in keeping editorializing and character defamation out of their papers. However, string reporters from remote towns often hurt their papers by taking charges in an indictment as facts or reporting half-truths.

In this connection, the newspapers often are criticized as hitting too hard at one single story, so hard that it is usually blown out of its proper perspective. It is a sequel to the circulation war. If one paper carries one big story, the others often follow suit and try to outdo the first. It sometimes develops into an unsavory cycle.

The accusation of "trial by newspaper" is seldom made although it is not entirely absent.

Another defect is the existence in the law books of a statute called Publication Law, which has been harmlessly there for decades. The government tried to revise it two years ago and newspapermen vehemently fought the revision but lost. The revised law does not cripple the press as so sensationalized by some. It, however, gives the executive branch of government the right, under specific circumstances, to warn, suspend or stop altogether a publication. We newspapermen demanded a stricter libel law but seriously challenged the executive power.

Since its passage, the revised law has not been invoked. The tacit agreement finally reached between the government and the press is that it would be used only against magazines peddling filth. However, the press is not satisfied and is continuing the demand for repeal or revision. Chances for a change are bright.

There are also a large number of news agencies. The foremost one is the Central News Agency which has worldwide coverage. It also distributes UPI and AFP. It is described as an official agency but is run by professionals.

The China News and Publications Service handles AP and Reuter. The Military Information Service has a self-

explanatory role. Three news agencies specialize in news about Communist China. The Taiwan News Agency concerns itself with regional news only.

There are more than 300 magazines. Not a single day passes without a new one coming into the market and some others dying on the vine. The market has narrowed down the survival chances. Good and financially sound magazines number over 20, including scientific, industrial, journalistic, economic and literary journals.

The better known magazines dealing in news are the *China Weekly, Newsdom* (Taiwan edition), the newcomer *Times and Tides, Taiwan Pictorial* and the highly controversial *Free China* fortnightly. The last named is so fiery in its criticisms, sparing nobody including President Chiang Kai-shek, that its very name has become poison to most officials. Yet, it keeps on appearing on all newsstands, happily hurling charges left and right. There are other anti-government magazines but they are a far cry from the *Free China* either in prestige or in the presentation of arguments.

The situation of the press more or less reflects the general conditions in Free China. In other words, there are imperfections but the solid achievements far outweigh the defects.

The Republic of China was founded on the theory that democracy could be harmoniously married to Confucianism of China and socialism of Europe. Therefore, the founding fathers stressed nationalism, a democratic form of government, a socialistic economy as well as a preponderance on the role of the educated.

For the first 35 years, democracy did not go far enough, while nagging traditions and inept administration bottled up economic development. In 1947, the present constitution was written which represented an effort at total democratization. The mainland of China was lost to the Communists before the constitution even had a chance.

Since the retreat to Taiwan in 1948, the Chinese who defy communism have decided to start from scratch with the constitution. The purpose is to build up Taiwan as an example of good government and viable economy in contrast with the Communist-ruled mainland. The Nationalists have never denied that they intend to get back to the mainland. But they have announced that they will not use military force as long as the Chinese people at large have not paved the way for such action.

The situation has remained deadlocked for over 11 years. Taiwan, an island of 13,808 square miles, has become one of the world's news centers.

In quick passing, it may be mentioned that Free (Nationalist) China controls the main island of Taiwan (Formosa), the Penghu (Pescadores) archipelago between

Taiwan and the mainland, Quemoy (Chinmen) island within shelling distance of the mainland and of about 60 square miles, Matsu island group of about 10 square miles further north, and the Nansha (Spratley) Islands far down in South China Sea. Taiwan is 225 miles north of the Philippines and 665 miles southwest of Japan. It is only 90 to 120 miles from the nearest mainland point. The weather is typically subtropical. The Tropic of Cancer crosses the island in the south.

The total population of Taiwan the first of April, 1960, was 10,533,109. The figure does not include the military population and the people on offshore islands.

It is on these islands that much has been done without fanfare in the last 11 years. Much should have been done since it represented a stand with back to the wall, since so many talents had been transplanted into Taiwan and since it was realized the best method to stem communism is to get rid of poverty and inequity. Proud of the record, the Free Chinese still insist that more could have been done and should be done.

In the political field, democracy has been vigorously fostered. The residual handicaps have been removed. The people are given and do exercise the right to elect and dismiss officials. More efficiency has been brought into administration. Corruption has been curbed. Police powers have been so curtailed that the Law has been reduced to the direction of traffic and taking of census.

Property is protected. One may walk any time anywhere all over Taiwan without fear. Robberies are very few. They rate banner headlines just because of their scarcity.

Politics is a lively subject with the majority of the people. They discuss politics at home and in restaurants. The voting percentages are high (from 75 per cent to 86 per cent in May, 1960). No rigging of the ballots is possible. The Kuomintang is the ruling party because it wins most elections. Still, it does not expect and has been unable to win every election.

Such a political atmosphere is commendable, especially so when Free China still is in a shooting war, while the Chinese people are conditioned to acceptance of a centralized and paternal government. In addition, younger leaders trained in the West and intent on making Free China a better place for the Chinese people have come to the fore. China's hopes are with these young men of good caliber.

Quite a number of Westerners still insist that Free China is not free and is ruled by an authoritarian government. They have been careful enough not to use the word dictatorship. To cite one extreme example, Mr. James Morris wrote in the *Guardian* of Manchester that the government on Taiwan was a "semi-totalitarian machine pri-

marily concerned with its own survival and mastery. . . for all the pious pretense at democratic reforms." He found the people are afraid of expressing views unfavorable to the government.

All regimes and political parties are seriously concerned with their survival and winning of power. Whether they are totalitarian or democratic lies in the methods they adopt to realize their aims. On Taiwan, the polls decide which should be the ruling party. And they are the best answers to unbridled criticism. As for the alleged fear of expressing independent views, I have only to refer Mr. Morris to a copy of the *Free China* fortnightly, or the *United Daily News* or the *China News*. Incidentally, he may not like either of these publications, which are highly critical of British policies in the Far East.

I am not saying that Free China uses the British or American prototype of democracy. First of all, every country has to tailor its democratization program according to its specific conditions and its own interpretation of democracy. Secondly, there is room for further democratization in Free China and the Free Chinese are aware of it. They also are doing their best to bring about the changes without resorting to malice or holier-than-thou protestations.

To contrast the view expressed by Mr. Morris, I quote here the words of Mr. Charlton Culmsee in *Journalism Quarterly*: ". . . newspaper editorials and stories, the relaxed, usually cheerful attitude of the people, the boldness of reporters and photographers. . . do not suggest the rigors of a police state which uses terror as the chief instrument of control."

Free China should be judged by its desire for democratization, by the concrete expressions of such a desire and by the achievements made so far. And in Free China, no attempt has ever been made to qualify democracy or to stifle aspirations for better government.

One yardstick to determine the extent of democratization and economic justice is to look for smiles or their absence in the street. I should say the Free Chinese are a happy people. They do not live in the shadows of midnight arrests, robberies or street rows.

The Nationalist government is repressive and harsh only in one field, that is, in its dealings with Communists. This is understandable.

A look at the economic picture also bears out the fact that improvements have been remarkable. Free China has effected a bloodless and sane land reform program, giving the tenant farmers land of their own. The once socialistic idea of nationalization of key industries is being scrapped. The government has sold four large enterprises to the people and is on the record to sell more. Private

enterprises are encouraged through tax exemption and other incentives. With land limited in size, Taiwan is switching over to an industrialization program which does not found itself on sheer exploitation of manpower.

Consequently, Taiwan today has little unemployment. No one ever dies of starvation or cold weather. There are no beggars. Per capita income is the highest in the Far East, and the per acre farm yield is matching that of the United States. New products include automobiles, refrigerators and huge tankers.

These are all on the credit side and quite heartening. On the other hand, there are serious ailments and potential dangers.

The taxation system needs a complete revamping. The tax burden of 28.6 per cent is generally considered too high. Red tape should be wiped out. The payscale at large should be raised.

False full employment, that is, dividing one man's job among three or four people, should be brought to an end. Job chances should be increased through industry. Individual initiative should be promoted through the provision of more incentives. The government's efforts at balancing the budget should not be permitted either to retard industrialization or to resort to tight money policies.

The most serious threat is the population growth, now at 3.4 per cent a year. The rate has been arrested somewhat but still it poses a great challenge. It threatens to nullify the results of industrialization and other worthwhile projects. The island is simply too small for so many people.

In addition, the slow tempo of the Chinese and their traditional egalitarian concept stand in the way of progress. Foresight and enlightened leadership is all the more in demand.

The previous paragraphs are only a shorthand depiction of the situation in general. The main purpose is to shed more light on the situation of Free China in general and its press in particular to foster more understanding. And to help find an answer to the question about freedom of the press in Free China.

My answer is that the press is free. Of course, it could be made freer. And the professional journalists are there, eager to protect what has been won and to win what has been so far out of reach.

Mr. Raymond Nixon, president of the International Association for Mass Communication Researches and vice president of the International Press Institute, gave the Free China press the I+ rating. Some other countries whose press has the same rating are IPI members. It is only logical to suggest that the press of Free China be granted IPI membership.

Mr. Stanway Cheng, reacting to the IPI executive council decision last month, deplored that the applications for

individual members had been put aside. He expressed the hope that the IPI should not let pre-conceived ideas stand in the way of a fair judgment. I am in full agreement with Mr. Cheng, not because he happens to be my boss but because he is right.

Nieman Fellows for 1960-61

(Continued from page 2)

general assignments reporter and city desk. He has handled major investigative stories for the *Star*.

He plans to study history, economics and urban problems.

Andrew M. Secrest, 36, graduate of Duke University, is editor and publisher of the *Cheraw Chronicle*, South Carolina weekly. After reporting on the *Charlotte News*, he bought the weekly in 1953 and has made it a forthright editorial voice in its region.

He plans to study the constitutional, social and economic issues that occupy his area.

Robert C. Smith, 33, associate editor, Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*. Graduate of the University of North Carolina, where he did his early newspaper work in New Bern and Greensboro, he has been with the *Virginian-Pilot* since 1953, as reporter, Sunday editor and editorial writer.

He plans to study history, economics and government.

Robert C. Toth, 31, science reporter, New York *Herald Tribune*. Graduate of Washington University and Columbia Journalism School, he worked as a chemical engineer in Army Ordnance, general reporter on the *Providence Journal*, industrial editor of "Rubber World," and associate editor of the American Rocket Society's publications before joining the *Herald Tribune* staff in 1957, reporting science, including space and defense developments.

He will study basic sciences.

The first Associate Fellows from South Africa are:

Lewis P. Nkosi, sponsored by the Farfield Foundation, and Aubrey Sussens, sponsored by the African-American Institute.

Nkosi is on the editorial staff of the African magazine, *Drum* in Johannesburg.

Sussens is assistant editor of the *Rand Daily Mail* in Johannesburg.

The three Associate Fellows sponsored by the Asia Foundation are:

Chanchal Sarkar, assistant editor of the *Statesman*, New Delhi, India;

Michinobu Shirakawa, science news editor of Kyodo News Service, Tokyo, Japan; and

Francis Wong, editor of the *Sunday Mail*, Singapore.

On Estimating Political Campaign News Objectivity

By James W. Markham

Barely six weeks of this Presidential election year had passed before the familiar cry of press bias was heard in the Wisconsin primary campaign. Such charges, if the experience of previous election years is not to be discounted, doubtless will be heard over and over again before and after election day. Moreover, the religious issue may complicate the coverage, heighten feelings, and thereby provide additional grounds for partisan press complaints.

Charges of press bias, which incidentally seem to have increased during the 1950's, have not been confined solely to election campaign news. They have been heard also in connection with the favorable (or lack of unfavorable) news treatment accorded the first years of the Eisenhower Administration. They have been heard in connection with one of the biggest continuing news stories in the decade, the integration question.

Such charges, whether related to treatment of race, class, religion, or politics, if ignored and left unanswered, cannot fail to reflect on the prestige of our press and to undermine reader confidence.

The best way to answer such charges, of course, is with the facts—facts that have been collected objectively and that provide the basis for unequivocally stating whether or not the press, or a specific part of it, has or has not been objective in its news treatment of parties, minorities, or labor unions.

Perhaps under our system of government it is in the field of politics that the public has the greatest dependence on a balanced news report, and in no area of political affairs is the need for objectivity greater than in an election campaign. The assumption that the people must be exposed to full information and to a wide variety of opinion carries with it the parallel obligation of the press to see that this is done. Charges that we have a one-party press reflect the conviction that somehow the press is not meeting this obligation in political matters. The problem is complicated by the fact that some critics base their charges on the editorial position, some on the news treatment, and some on both editorial and news content. Still others do not know whether they get the impression from the former or the latter.

Critics of editorial partisanship point with considerable accuracy to the trends of the past twenty years in which our press, with a few outstanding exceptions, has been Republican in its editorial sympathies. How does editorial support or lack of it affect a candidate's chance of winning? Since 1932 the majority of American newspapers (an estimated

80 per cent in some cases) has editorially supported only two of seven victorious candidates for the Presidency. Does this mean that the editorial page has lost its influence? Frank Luther Mott, noted journalism historian, has shown that of 41 successful candidates for the Presidency since 1796, only 20 had the support of the majority of those papers openly declaring themselves. Over the years, the editorial page has never played a consistently deciding role. But since 1952 critics point to the disappearance of an "opposition" press—a circumstance which has deprived the people of a diversity of opinion, critical even of the party whose beliefs a particular newspaper supports. It is this consistent Republican editorial stand that has evoked some of the one-party press criticism. Although this view misunderstands the traditional right of a newspaper to express its opinions as it sees fit, it has nonetheless raised serious questions about basic editorial page uses.

The main concern is with complaints of slanting in the news columns, the place where we have a right to expect that candidates, regardless of party, will be treated fairly. The news, moreover, has gained new importance and influence. Thus, despite editorial convictions to the contrary, the papers gave full coverage to Franklin D. Roosevelt and helped elect him time after time. But news objectivity was challenged in the 1952 campaign when it appeared to some that some newspapers were not reporting the Democratic side of the story. When full information is lacking, the processes of democracy are crippled. When readers believe their papers are failing to present all sides, they question the sincerity of a press that talks about the "right of the people to know," and "responsibility" to the public.

Have the majority of the country's news columns been less than objective during election campaigns? Perhaps a score of reasonably accurate and objective examinations of press performance have attempted to answer this question, at least in part. At best they suggest only fragmentary, inconclusive answers.

On the unfavorable side, evidence of favoritism toward one of the major political parties and its candidates has been found to exist in (1) picture coverage, (2) news story treatment and display, and (3) relationship of news treatment slant to editorial support. Although the news columns of some papers have been found to lean toward the Democrats, in most papers examined they have favored the Republicans.

On the other hand, there has been some favorable evidence: (1) Only a few newspapers were found to contain partisan coverage; (2) there has been a marked decline in

James Markham teaches journalism at Pennsylvania State University.

the amount of political slanting since 1896; (3) political writing was largely objective; (4) only slight indications of non-reporting of significant events have been found (although in some cases the publication of such events was delayed); (5) some papers have made special efforts to be fair.

Generalizations from these studies about the press as a whole or any substantial segment of it was not possible. The studies either concentrated on the newspapers of a single city or state, or upon one or two areas of news performance instead of a substantial proportion of campaign coverage. Only a few were based on samples of content or samples of newspapers.

Studies, if made at all, should provide a description of performance that can serve as the basis of an estimate on a reasonably large scale of what kind of coverage the average reader-voter was exposed to. Having done this, they should then attempt to evaluate that performance in relative terms, which may either compare content patterns with accepted standards or assess their variability. A systematic audit of a sample of newspapers for a representative period of continuous campaign coverage would seem to be the base line or cornerstone of such an investigation. "Statement" or symbol analysis could provide an accurate measure of volume and direction of coverage relating to given candidates or parties. Coverage measured would include not only news stories, but also illustrations, headlines, and display position.

In addition to newspaper coverage, similar measures of wire copy and party headquarters releases, would help assess flow. Knowledge of make-up values, newspaper policy, and news-desk decisions would permit comparison of intent with performance. More knowledge of reader attitudes toward press treatment should shed light on how and to what extent the reader perceives and reacts to what he believes to be news bias. How candidates and party leaders, those people who are politically involved, see and evaluate newspaper performance is also an important field for investigation. In fact, the whole complex problem of bias needs more attention. From the standpoint of the newsman, in addition to purposeful slanting, there exists the very likely probability of unconscious, or inadvertent, bias.

"A lack of objectivity of which a given writer or reporter is not aware because of his own slant on affairs," says James R. Wiggins, executive editor of the *Washington Post and Times Herald*, "can be forgiven and corrected. The deliberate effort to insinuate bias in the news is another matter. Those guilty of this offense usually leave a great many finger marks about it. It does not take a very astute analyst to find that a partisan is at work." This is as true of newspapers as it is of reporters.

There is also a problem in the effect of the reader's bias on his impression of what he reads. Every editor has seen a carefully prepared story—one that leans over backwards to be fair—evoke complaints of partisanship from both camps. Readers can be more biased than anyone who handles news.

The need for appraising press objectivity is greater now than ever before. The press and public both stand to benefit from such an assessment. Yet there appears to be little or no interest in either conducting or supporting the kind of thorough-going appraisal needed. Conditions of newspaper publishing make an impartial news report increasingly more indispensable and place a greater responsibility upon the press. The trend toward one-newspaper cities, the prohibitive cost (for the average pocket-book) of entry into the field, the swelling circulations, and the declining number of dailies—these are all symptoms of a system in which a decreasing number of individuals enjoy an increasing ability to determine the kind of news more and more people have available to read. Those who read newspapers, moreover, are among the most politically active class of citizens. These conditions call for truly responsible news reporting.

But no comprehensive assessment of performance has been made. Editors and publishers who jealously guard their unquestioned right (and duty) to criticize all other American institutions have, by and large, opposed attempts to measure their own performance. Some studies have never seen the light of day; others, like the Sigma Delta Chi proposal of 1956, were abortive. Foundations do not find such studies "fit" their program or the purposes to which their funds can be committed. Could this attitude be explained by their desire to preserve good press and public relations?

In the meantime, editors maintain they treat political campaign news according to its news values, just like other kinds of news. They say they have no special ways of handling it. There is some evidence that coverage treated this way will in the case of a big campaign, in which much news is made, balance out over a period of a few weeks. In cases where candidates are extremely different in their news-making capacity, the most news-worthy candidate may get the better advantage. But this may be the way it ought to be. However, such a policy of news treatment takes into account neither the special nature of controversial news and political propaganda nor the paper's special duty in this respect. Such news ought to be marked for special handling and call for unusual efforts to be fair. As James Reston of the *New York Times* has stated: "The Challenge is to provide perspective without partisanship, background without bias. This is real objectivity—for it provides the reader with the necessary information on which to base an intelligent judgment."

Freedom of Information: a Constitutional Right

By Robert J. Steamer

In recent years the American press and American public officials have engaged in a continuous and sometimes acrimonious debate over the extent to which the government might withhold information from the public. Even Presidents have occasionally entered the discussion. President Truman once claimed that 95 per cent of our secret information has been published by newspapers and slick magazines, and President Eisenhower told a press conference that he had been plagued by inexplicable undiscovered leaks in the government and that technical military secrets of value to Russia had been made public. Just a few years ago an official in the Department of Defense expressed the sense of frustration he felt in attempting to preserve military secrets. He pointed out that each day, before leaving his office, he would lock his classified working papers in a safe; the locked safe would then be doublechecked by another official, and then triplechecked by a night security guard. He would then go home, pick up his evening newspaper, and find the same kind of information he had just locked away, printed there in detail. Probably two of the best stories on this point are told by Douglass Cater in his book, *The Fourth Branch of Government*. The first is known as "The Case of the Scholarly Spy" which allegedly came out of a Pentagon report. It seems that a German spy was sent to the United States in 1940, but instead of wearing a cloak and dagger, this modern espionage agent merely spent his days in the public library studying the *New York Times Index* and the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*. He collected several trunks full of data culled from America's major national publications, returned to Germany and prepared a report for his government which later fell into the hands of American intelligence agents. It turned out that he had predicted American military aircraft production for the years 1941-43 more accurately than had William S. Knudsen, the head of the United States War Production Board.

The most recent horror story concerns the American engineer who was hired to work on guided missiles. While awaiting his security clearance, he decided to learn what he could by reading in his public library. He compiled a forty-five page report explaining basic facts about our arsenal of missiles—name, model designation, manufacturer, guidance system, method of propulsion, length, diameter, range, and altitudes. When the engineer's super-

iors saw the report, they promptly classified it as secret. I am not, incidentally, in any sense implying that newspaper reporters are given access to classified government documents. Although this may happen, the vast majority of newspapers and magazine accounts of the inner workings of the government are obtained by astute reporters who follow hunches, intuition and use discerning judgment. They put a story together piece by piece. Senator Paul Douglas once compared this process to the explanation by the idiot boy of how he found the stray blind horse. "I shut my eyes, and asked myself where I'd go if I were a blind horse; I went and the horse was there."

Following hunches is generally not enough for even the best reporters to get a good story on the inner workings of the government. More often than not a reporter would have no story unless a government official had decided to provide him with some information. This means of providing a favorite reporter with an exclusive story, or "leaking information" as it is called, is probably inherent in the nature of the political system. Under the separation of powers doctrine there is a natural and constant conflict between the executive and legislative branches, and the congressman, senator or cabinet member is rare indeed who will not take the opportunity to best his constitutional and often, political, adversary. When there is disagreement over major public issues, as is often the case, the desire for publicity overcomes the need for secrecy. Another primary cause for the "leak" is the power struggle within the executive or legislative branches, whether it be among three or four senatorial aspirants for the Presidency or between the Air Force and the Navy. The great damage caused by this method of informing the public is that the printed story is often biased, partially true, or such a small part of the whole picture as to create a false impression. This is hardly the best way to produce an informed public, a fundamental requirement of popular government.

The free access to information about the policies, practices, and data of government under the conditions of modern constitutional democracy, has in recent years, aroused more than mild attention. Not since the nineteenth century battles of liberal constitutionalism in Europe, or, at any rate, since the more recent conflict over secret diplomacy has there been a comparable concern with these questions. The reasons for this concern are clear enough. For one thing we have lived for a generation, and more particularly since World War II, under international tensions of haunting intensity, known popularly as the "Cold War." In the second place the nature of our

Robert J. Steamer is associate professor of government at Louisiana State University. This is from a talk to the Southwestern Journalism Congress at Baton Rouge, March 11.

protagonists in this "Cold War" gives these tensions a peculiar character. We are confronted with a totalitarian dictatorship which thrives on a pattern of defensive secrecy and offensive penetration in order to obtain information from the other side. They wish to know everything about us but will tell us nothing about themselves. The situation is complicated further by the fact that the dictatorship is an ideological aggressor attempting to gain converts, and simple national loyalties are strained by a new pattern, which has been compared to the international religious-civil wars of the 16th and 17th centuries.

The third factor is the mounting size, complexity and pervasiveness of the governmental machinery which is engaged in more tasks and functions than at any time in the history of the world. One of the principal enlargements which we have witnessed is the military establishment with its vast apparatus of technological and industrial activities which encompass an ever widening area of operations in the pure and applied sciences. The present controversy thus occurs in the context of the general security problem with its vast military, scientific, political, legal, and human ramifications. The great question remains: to what extent and by what means are the American people entitled to know what their government is doing?

As the modern nation-state began to take form, secret government, as a practice and a doctrine, went hand in hand with monarchy and the gradual creation of a bureaucratic apparatus. And the principle of secrecy did not die easily. During the 16th and 17th centuries, with the burden of public business still mounting, the vigor of secret government remained undiminished, or at least not effectively challenged except in Britain. However, scattered pamphleteers and essayists in Europe beginning in the mid-sixteenth century were arguing against the personal and absolute authority of the monarchs, thus joining in the developing movement of constitutional liberalism. On the eve of the French and American Revolutions one bulwark after another of the secrecy doctrine had been severely battered as the awe of rulers and magistrates was everywhere receding. Although in both England and America, where representative assemblies were growing up, the aristocratic ruling class still tended to invoke for itself the secrecy which they had resented in the executive. The most striking example of this is our own Constitutional Convention which met in secret sessions in Philadelphia. But the new legislative bodies themselves then became targets of attack. The time was now ripe for a deliberate and coherent statement of the doctrine of government publicity. This was supplied by Jeremy Bentham, and his incisive analysis is yet to be improved upon. His position is basically this:

Without publicity on the entire governmental process, no good is permanent; under the auspices of publicity, no evil can continue. Publicity, therefore, is the best means of securing public confidence.

Bentham gives us three main reasons why the people ought to know what the government is doing. First, publicity keeps the governors honest and responsible. The public is a powerful tribunal, and even though it may be subject to error, it is always incorruptible. The enemies of publicity are those, who for one reason or another, wish to escape responsibility. The second reason for informing the people is to secure their confidence. Mystery elicits suspicion—an affectation of secrecy may suggest a crime. Innocence need not fear anything. Good policies need the light of day. From this comes confidence and security for the governors since open government is always stronger than secret government. Finally, publicity engenders reciprocal benefits. Just as the people are entitled to know the conduct of the rulers, so are rulers to know the wishes of the people; and under the guidance of publicity nothing is more easy. Without it, the people will not hesitate to judge everything anyway, but they will be forced to judge in ignorance. Public opinion then, not being founded on facts, will be worth very little.

The classic argument against freedom of information is that in view of the ignorance and passions of the majority, the public is an incompetent judge. While accepting this view in part, Bentham observes that the public will always make judgments, no matter how ignorant or incompetent, and the value of publicity can be best seen if we divide the public into its normal components. This division, incidentally, fits 20th century American society just as well as it did 18th century England. The first group is the largest and consists of those people who are virtually uninterested in public affairs. They have neither the time nor the inclination to read, observe and think. The second is composed of those who borrow their opinions from others. They form a sort of judgment, but they base it on what other people tell them because they will not do the necessary hard work required to form an opinion of their own. The third group is composed of those who judge for themselves, according to the information they are able to procure.

Obviously it is only this last group which would be directly affected by complete and free information from the government. But this group will be favorably affected, and being better informed and making better judgments, will furnish more correct opinions for those in the second group. Consequently the whole of society will have benefited, or as Bentham puts it, "by purifying the fountain, you will have purified the streams." If one agrees with this

analysis, it leaves those who believe in governmental secrecy in a feeble position. They say to the people in effect: "You are incapable of judging because you are ignorant; and you shall remain ignorant, that you may be incapable of judging." This is certainly the antithesis of constitutional democracy."

Constitutional-democratic doctrine requires that policy be based on the rational consent of the community. Since rational decisions cannot be arrived at without an adequate understanding of all the pertinent facts, any substantial withholding of information (much of which must come from the government under present conditions) conflicts with the basic assumption of the system itself. There is no specific provision in the Constitution of the United States which guarantees the people the right to be informed by the government, but no democratic community can long remain democratic without free access of the governed to the governors. The right of the people to know, therefore, is a self-evident assumption inherent in the nature of the Constitution itself. In the modern condition of rapidly changing, infinitely complex situations which form the stuff of public policy, the community's right to know is greater than ever; yet in the midst of the cold war, our government finds it necessary to put up barriers to full disclosure of what is going on. Our public servants tell us that a little secret government is all right, but the fact is that the more a government becomes secret, the less it remains free, and if we continue to move in the direction of secrecy, we may pass the point of no return. We will then have abandoned our own institutions in favor of those of our chief adversary.

Our Constitution, then, in its broadest sense guarantees the right to be informed, but like all guarantees, it is not absolute. No one with any sense of proportion would argue, for example, that military information of decisive value to the enemy should not be kept secret, at least for a time. The government might also validly withhold information which will unnecessarily injure innocent persons. But secrecy must always be the exception, not the rule, for the lack of information mutilates the think process and produces an ill-informed judgment on the part of the nation.

If we are honest with ourselves, however, establishing the theoretical constitutional right of the people to be informed means nothing unless that right can be vindicated, and the chief means of vindication is, of course, the press. (I use the term, press, to include all modern mass media.) In this day of unbelievably complex public problems, the journalist is faced with an awesome responsibility. It is his task to translate the processes of government into intelligible terms with some objectivity and circumspection.

He must make some order out of the chaos. Unless he does his job well, the people end up with a mish-mash of misinformation which may create even greater dangers to democracy than no information at all. But the reporter who can report the news intelligently, and some of them can, must still overcome another almost insuperable obstacle—that of becoming a propagandist for a particular agency, a particular official, or a single point of view. There is always the great danger of the journalist becoming a public relations man for the government. This is especially true of reporters who cover the Pentagon where they get all kinds of assistance from the public relations officers, and where independent research seems almost futile. If the reporter succumbs to spoon feeding, he becomes a publicist for the Army, Navy or Air Force. This same type of thing can happen anywhere in the web of government—local, state or national—and when it does, a public trust is broken. The people are no longer being informed; they are merely being told what some official thinks they ought to know. This is little better than the secret government of absolute monarchy, and tends to become dangerously like the press of the Soviet Union.

One of the points in the code of ethics of the United Nations Commission on Freedom of Information says that reporters, editors, and commentators shall do their best to make sure that the information the public receives is factually accurate, with no fact willfully distorted and no essential fact deliberately suppressed. This raises the question of what is factual accuracy. Not merely what a man says, for he sometimes contradicts himself and sometimes says what is known to be false. Reporting what a man says may be factually accurate as far as it goes but it may be very far from the whole truth. Is not the truth of the matter essentially what the American people require of their newsmen? Yet in the complex news of today how many readers have enough personal knowledge to distinguish fact from fiction, ignorance from knowledge, interest from impartiality? Walter Lippmann once pointed out that the function of news is "to signalize an event," but that the function of truth is "to bring to light the hidden facts, to set them into relation with each other, and make a picture of reality on which men can act." For the most part, the press reports the news, but there are some newspapers, some journalists and commentators who report the truth. If the reader or listener can discriminate between a James Reston or an Eric Sevareid on the one hand and less responsible writers on the other, he can get to the heart of the matter. And it is conceivable that the right to be informed in theory will produce the informed citizen, in fact. We must ask the press to be better than its public, to educate demand, in short, to act responsibly.

U-Com, or the Dejays' Revenge

By Karl F. Zeisler

Editor's Note—We are indebted to Preston Elvis, Entertainment Editor of the Black Hills Express, Rapid City, South Dakota, for this simultaneous release copy of his column for October 2, 1964.

TODAY I'M FEELING LIKE Walter Winchell. Who wouldn't? I've got a secret, and like Walter, I'm bound in the public interest to share it with all my reader-watchers. (I'm taped on WQIT-TV at 11:30—Our Date on Channel Ate). The Secret? Well, nothing less spectacular than the new scientific gizmo that's bound to win the 1964 election for you know who—no less than my pall (sic) and favorite candidate, the Peoples Party nominee by acclaim and all the polls—Dwight Roosevelt Dixon.

Hold onto your hats! Some of you may remember that sneaky payola jazz back in the '50's, or was it the pre-vintage '60's? I disrecollect. Anyway after the pols had their sound-off Format Radio and pre-taped teevee brought the DJ's back with a gold rush, and how. Like myself, I consider I'm deejaying my column in the *Express*, LOOK-SEE, and Man, does it deluge me with feedback. Thank you, Mr., Mrs., and—especially—Miss, Public.

Now of course this cellophane-wrapped top-classified de-vise is going to have other repercussions, once it's operative. But the all-important thing right now is that this mystery gadget is controlled in the right hands for the public interest and is bound to bring victory to the Peoples Party in November.

Bound to? It's such a cinch that my classmate at South Dakota School of Mines and pal, Disc Jockey ——— there, I'm so shook I nearly spilled the name of my confidential source. Never mind the name—you all know him as the top DJ in the Mountain States—but he's in hock for every dollar he can raise with cold turkey bets on DRD.

It's an amazing story of the modern scientific team attack on problem-solving, with plenty of do-re-mi, as I get it from my friend the DJ. And the secret research was done right here in Rapid City's backyard—but I'm getting ahead of the story.

This arrived from Prof. Karl F. Zeisler of University of Michigan, Department of Journalism. He writes: "I found it in a bottle floating down the Huron River. It had once been a wry bottle. My previous appearance in *Nieman Reports* lamented the lost art of newspaper humor. This proves it."

Back in the spring of '58 the old NBC and CBS television loops started using seven-slot tape to record an entire video show. Both the audio and visual images registered simultaneously on the tape, which was instantaneously processed and used for duplicating New York shows for daylight-saving time re-telecasts on the West Coast. That was really the start.

But the scientists had a long, hard row to hoe. By 1960, home TV cameras were on sale: You remember you snapped a home kinescope of your kids and played it back, on the wide tape, audio and visual, on your new flat-screen color TV set. About the same time the National League, MGM and Chrysler introduced their new Ray-SV system with hi-fi binaural natural sound and 3-D color on the flat screen. Communication was beginning to grow up, but it had some way yet to travel.

Next, and this is tricky, a bunch of ornithologists—bird-brains to you—got together with the technicians who earlier developed the signal-selector radar, now used for electronic steering on all jetliners, monorails, expressway cargo carriers and even on some private cars. They figured out the wavelength measured by the distance between a pigeon's ears and developed a Y-brand radar beep the people-brained birds could pick up by ear—no earphones or receiving sets needed. This, of course, was the real break-through.

From pigeon ears to human ears wasn't easy, however. I don't quite dig the technical poop, but they combined signal-selector radar with FM somehow, using transistors and a wide, wide tape, 23 channels, I understand, wider than bathroom tissue. At this stage, though, all you could hear sounded like the night the skunk got in the hen-house.

Transmitting direct audio signals, as I say, was pretty crude. But that's exactly when the Senate Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce pricked up its hairy ears. You all remember the televised hearings, put on free as a public service by the Pay-TV loop, which by then covered Congress exclusively. You may even recall the star of the show, Prof. Hugo Grotznintz of MIT, the audio whiz who took over Cybernetics when Norbert Wiener retired and became the global expert on communication control.

On the stand three gruelling days, the prof tried with all kinds of visual and electronic aids, including printed-circuit plexi-glass blackboards, in five colors, to explain to the Senators his version of information theory—that if you can exclude all noise and transmit one perfect signal

long enough, you have reached the ultimate in communication control in an other-directed society. The Senators didn't quite catch it, but it scared hell out of them and they went to work like evicted beavers revising the Federal Communications Code and the Anti-Trust Laws just in case. That might have been fatal, but fortunately for DRD and the coming campaign, the Senate got tangled up in a filibuster over installing thermonuclear heating elements to keep the St. Lawrence Seaway open all year and the revisions got exactly nowhere.

Senator Franks of Alaska, about the last of the egg-heads in Congress, thanks to teevee, and the only member who registered what Grotznintz was spouting, is still plugging for adoption of the revisions, but he's a Liberal.

Here you may be interested in how I got my dope. Well, you have to know people—the right people—in this business. My friend the deejay happens to know an applause-and-laughter sound technician with the Pay-TV exclusive loop who works in the same crew with the cameraman who taped the Senate hearings. This lensman did a real favor for Prof. Grotznintz. It seems the world wizard on audio has to wear an egg-sized hearing aid. So the cameraman arranged all his shots from an angle that didn't show the prof's wiring for sound.

After that third blitz day on the stand, Old Grotznintz was pretty well dehydrated. He invited the lensman to his hotel room in Washington for a drink. And to return the favor of the shooting angle, Grotznintz told the cameraman what the Senators never found out at the hearing, not knowing the right questions. So now I'm telling you.

For three solid years, Herr Grotznintz directed a multi-billion dollar secret research project to develop and perfect the crude, pioneer audio wave sender to get it out of the gibberish class. He'd just quit, apparently after some kind of row with the sponsors. Anyway, he tipped the cameraman that the team of scientists *had* succeeded—they'd just come up with the perfect blanket audio signal transmitter.

And here's the big news—all this went on, without a soul hereabouts being aware, in the old abandoned B-36 SAC hangar out at the Ellsworth Air Force Base north of Rapid. I know—everyone tipped me, too—that the Air Force was supposed to be working on a supersecret target-seeking clean nuclear warhead missile there. It wasn't. Those "Air Police" securitizing the hangar were phonies—they were really plant guards hired by the sponsors and rigged out in uniforms you couldn't tell from a distance from Air Police outfits.

Anyway, prepare yourself for U-Com in the coming campaign—and after! That's the code name the scientists tagged it with, short for Universal Communicator.

And boy! Does it Universally Communicate. U-Com sends a voice or music message from a central transmitter audible to all humans in a 21-mile radius, without their having to have any receiving apparatus except two good ears. And the signal comes in loud enough at all times, day or night, indoors or out, in a car or on a horse, to blot out all other noise or interference up to 48 decibels.

Wow! Get it? All the sponsors have to do is play a tape with DRD speaking, 24 hours a day, from transmitters all over the country, from now to election and he's got it made. Wanna bet? I wish I had the dough to cover—like my friend the DJ.

I suppose you're interested in who the sponsors are. Well, it seems Old Grotznintz was a little hazy in this area—outside his field—but from what he told the cameraman, who told the sound technician, who told my pal the deejay, and what I've pieced together from my other confidential sources, I can tell you, within a pretty narrow margin of error. Putting up the billions that went into the research, and controlling the exclusive patents, and now building the secret transmitters, are the following. Of course there may be a few I didn't track down, and I may have included one or two that didn't make the grade, but as I say, this is pretty close:

Geritol; Peoples Party National Committee; B.B.D. & O.; G. E.; Miltown; G. M.; American Tobacco; General Foods; Revlon; National Distillers.

Time, Inc., as I understand it, was excluded at the last minute from the sponsoring syndicate because it operated competing media, as were A. T. & T. and R. C. A. Once DRD is in, American Tobacco is all set to introduce its new cancer-repellent smoke, incorporating both Geritol and Miltown, I understand, and National Distillers will promote a brand-new product through U-Com. It's called *Grumka*, supposed to combine the flavor and potency of gin, rum and vodka distilled from watermelon rinds and orange peel, with built-in hangover suppressive including vitamin B-12.

I suppose GE and GM have breakthrough household products to pitch on U-Com; my sources clammed at this point. But I can tip you on *Butthin*, which General Foods scientists have synthesized out of cornstalks and unsaturated fat, cholesterol-free, from pumpkin seeds. When you spread it on your breakfast toast, instead of butter, it not only protects you from coronaries, but slims you automatically to your correct poundage according to your height-weight chart. Diet will then be as obsolete as canasta. And Revlon is now stocking cosmetic counters secretly with *Busto*. I get the tip that biochemists have combined royal jelly with milkweed juice, and that regular applications of *Busto* will give any 150-pound girl a size 40 facade and a lifetime free from wrinkles.

The sponsoring syndicate are sharp as a dime store razor, I think you'll admit. To guarantee that U-Com will be used only in the public interest, they've established a Board of Governors. Again I can't be sure of all the names, but here's a rundown of some of the members representing the public, in addition, of course, to the heads of the sponsoring corporations:

Jimmy Hoffa, labor; Red Skelton, entertainment; Billy Graham, religion; President Jones of the International Correspondence School, education; Pulitzer Prize Winner Mickey Spillane, literature; Mickey Mantle, sports; Jane Mansfield, women; Publisher Bob Harrison of *Confidential*, press.

The Board determines policy and also issues permits to such public service groups as the Red Cross, Asiatic Flu Foundation, Lung Cancer League and the Society to Prevent Unnecessary Breaking of the Sound Barrier for spot announcements to plug their fund drives.

If anybody else gets a message sent over U-Com, you can see they'd have to be pretty important—like an

emergency appeal to help strontium 90 victims, where genuine public interest is at stake. And of course the Board has unanimously agreed that when U-Com is first unveiled, any day now, it will be confined exclusively in the public interest for the Dixon campaign. After it demonstrates what it can do in electing DRD, who can tell what it will do for products of the sponsors?

U-Com cost billions. But anyone who's sharp can cash in on the profits, which also should run in the billions. Like my deejay friend. He's mortgaged his 150-hp outboard catamaran houseboat, which he cruises on his own artificial lake, his quadruplex expandable dwelling machine, and hocked his unicopter—he's commuting now in a commuters' club car on the rocket monorail—to raise money to invest. It's the deejays, I always say, who get the economic breaks in these times. But don't get the idea he's so dumb as to wager all this dough on DRD, though he's got some pretty juicy odds. Most of it, I can say confidentially, he's plunked down for common stock in the sponsoring corporations.

I wish I was that smart, or had that kind of moola.

Why Can't Johnny Read? (A Scholar Protests the Influence of Television)

by Joshua Whatmough

It is generally conceded that both Johnny and Jenny are poor readers, certainly inferior to their parents at the same age. I should like to suggest a totally different answer to the question "Why . . . read?" from any of the answers hitherto proposed, in brief the influence of mass media. Of course centuries ago reading and writing too were rare accomplishments and during the late unpleasantness, the armed forces discovered that many young American adults, male and female, even though they had been to school, were nevertheless all but illiterate. Until the invention of printing, books were hard to come by in the first place; not only that but they presented hazards of handwriting, as anyone who is acquainted with late medieval manuscripts in their crabbied hands well knows.

Mass media are not strictly speaking new. Manuscripts were reproduced by hand as needed from ancient times. Public readings by a poet of his poetry, recitals, presenta-

tions on the stage, were essentially all of them media for the diffusion of the written word. The great difference in modern times is that our media are massive and also unfortunately cheap, nasty, and deafening. Johnny gets no opportunity to read. Whatever he does at school he does not learn to read there. He has no opportunity for practicing reading at home, and his practice at school is limited to a very few of his waking hours. Writing he voluntarily almost never does. And instead of reading, he listens to the spoken word on radio, or, more likely, combined with a visual presentation on television. With few exceptions all that he hears or sees, or both, is not only a bad influence on him, but makes him totally disinterested in reading anything, anywhere, at any time. No wonder he and his sister cannot read.

Language is symbolism; any particular language is also systematic, that is to say, it is symbolism presented within a particular linguistic system. Writing is also symbolism; in origin it was totally unconnected with talking; it was pictographic, not alphabetic or syllabic or even ideographic. The union of speaking and writing by which writing was made to pro-present the same things as talking: ideas, abstractions, the world of nature—indeed our total en-

Joshua Whatmough is professor of comparative philology and chairman of the Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, former president of the Linguistic Society of America, author of "Language" and other books in this field.

vironment—was a tremendous achievement. There has been nothing like this prehistoric invention until quite recent decades, when the science of electronics gave us a totally new method of telling a story either in words or in a combination of words and pictures. This also is a stupendous achievement. Radio and television travel at the speed of light, not of sound, which is very much slower. They travel around the world. They travel safely and surely, apart from occasional atmospheric and cosmic disturbances. Provided you have the proper receiving apparatus (and who has not?), anyone young or old, literate and illiterate, deaf and dumb (at least for television) the blind too (at least for radio) can receive it. Only to those few unfortunates who are blind, deaf, and dumb is this new “book” a book sealed with seven seals. But who among the younger generation is so virtuous, so wisely trained, or instinctively so aware of what is at stake that he will prefer to sit down to read a book, a hard book, rather than watch television, go to the “shorties” (so-called) movies? A budding mathematician or chemist, or physicist knows that he must read—if he can. A representation of England in the days of Oliver Cromwell, or of Colonial America, may teach him a bit of history but nowhere near so truthfully or completely as a full scale historic treatise. For to see the shape of Oliver Cromwell’s nose or of Governor Winthrop’s eyebrows (if anyone can be sure what these parts of Cromwell’s or Winthrop’s anatomies were like) tells me nothing about who Cromwell or Winthrop were, what they did, how they did it, or what the consequences of all this were. Moreover, what is seen and heard on the screens, goes in one ear and out the other, and in one eye out the back of one’s head, in less than five minutes.

But I return to my contention that so long as young people glue themselves unrestrainedly on our modern mass media of communication, so long will they be poor readers or utterly incapable at reading. There are other reasons, crackpot theories of teaching reading, poor standards of achievement and accomplishment, total misunderstanding of the nature of education. These are being argued back and forth by others, and I gladly leave it to them. But I warn all publishers of books, and other prints, that other matters are involved, that what is going on now is leading to its logical end; no books are going to be written, bought, sold; they will not even be printed.

One parting shot. I never look at the glossy paper magazines. They try to throw dust in my eyes (MY EYES if you please) by trying to snare me to look at advertise-

ments that I do not normally read at all—when I want a thing, I go and buy it. Worse still, like television, they have retreated to days before the invention of true writing, mere pictures, which say little and say it badly, for a picture is inarticulate.

Most news broadcasts last five minutes. Of necessity they must be incomplete, if not biased. Give me a decent article, in a decent newspaper, written by an unprejudiced reporter who knows how to write, and I can read two columns in five minutes, and be much closer to truth and fact. This is true also of half an hour of news presented and discussed by half a dozen people (in what is called, I am told, a panel discussion) unless it is done by really superior people—and when I say superior, I mean superior.

I am asked how can people be brought to read better books than they do and more of them? This is pre-eminently a case of *solvitur ambulando*; you do it by doing it, and you get your reward. The exhilaration, the delight, the edification, the stimulation that comes from mastering a fine piece of literature, making it your own, is your great reward. Those who will not read Shakespeare with feet in slippers, for pure delight, shouldn’t be allowed to read him at all; no Goethe or Tolstoy or Balzac and all the others.

If reading is to survive, our schools must teach children to recognize words in units. The method of the old fashioned copy book, like “The fat cat sat on the mat eating fish out of a dish” was correct. This procedure used an essential fact in the structure of all languages, that is, the permutation and combination of something like thirty to forty speech sounds in such a way as to give hundreds of words. Then these hundreds of words could undergo permutations and combinations as to give thirty to forty speech sounds in such a way as to give thousands of sentences, paragraphs, the contents of tens of thousands of libraries—all the libraries in the world. To be sure, no one could read all of them; there are only twenty-four hours in the day, which is reason enough for reading only the best. But the phonemes, *f, c, s, m*, followed by *a, t*, give fat, cat, sat, mat; and the phonemes *d, f*, combined with the phonemes *i, s, h*, give fish, dish—what could be easier? Besides, most children have seen a fat cat sitting on a mat eating fish out of a dish. Any child of normal intelligence quickly learns that the words he is learning are pro-presenting what he has often seen with his own eyes. This is the way; there is no other—I did it myself, at an age I cannot remember, certainly before the advanced age of three years.

Education for Electronic Journalism

By Robert Lindsay

There is broadcasting, and there is journalism.

Broadcasting, the mass medium, is troubled—and, to the society it presumes to serve, it is troublesome.

Journalism, the craft, has enough troubles of its own without being subjected to double jeopardy via guilt by association.

But for better or for worse, journalists are responsible for a small—much too small—portion of broadcasting's bill of fare.

The journalists who happen to work in the radio and television stations and networks are not disk jockeys, time salesmen, announcers, pitchmen, producers, actors, directors, technicians. Well, most journalists are not these things. Certainly radio and television journalists, as a group, are not associated in the public mind with the socially malefic emanations of the medium in which they happen to work. The competence of these journalists, while obviously susceptible to and in need of improvement, is generally acknowledged to be reasonably adequate to the basic purpose of all journalists—to provide society with a free-flowing stream of news, information and opinion. Admittedly, the stream is frequently sluggish and often muddled.

Why is this so? Why, at a time when broadcasting's entrepreneurs and money-hungry camp followers are ducking and running for cover, should the medium's journalists enjoy this relative immunity to the intense crossfire of social criticism? In large measure, I think it is because they are newsmen first, and broadcasters almost incidentally. I say "almost" incidentally. For it is my premise that our best, which is to say our legitimate, radio-television journalists *never* think of themselves as broadcasters first, and as newsmen second. When the reverse is the case, there arises that clear and present danger as expressed by John Day of CBS News: that "television news (could) destroy itself in commercialism before it gets out of its swaddling clothes."

Believing as I do that electronic journalists are, within the broadcasting industry, a most special breed apart, I must stress that I see the reason for this as being a result, not of altruistic foresightedness on the part of the industry, but rather as a natural—and fortuitous—happenstance . . . to wit, that a newsman is a newsman is a newsman. True,

there are not nearly enough journalists preparing and delivering newscasts and writing interpretive pieces for microphone and camera. But there are some, and may their tribe increase.

I submit, then, the first of my general observations about the present status and future prospects of education for what is called, in lieu of something better, electronic journalism: I do not feel that those of us who purport to "teach" electronic journalism can lay claim to having instilled this high sense of professionalism among the shirtsleeved toilers in the station and network newsrooms. True, we have, in the last decade or so, given a sheepskin and a pat on the head to no small number of bright-eyed young men and women, some of whom have been accepted as bona fide members of the craft. But the fact is that we, the professors, are uncertain of what we are doing, or trying to do. Television news, for example, and the medium itself, is simply too new—too recent a social institution, if you will—for us to be able to draw upon a body of knowledge, a catalogue of insights, as our colleagues teaching in the more traditional areas of journalism can. We have been forced by this circumstance to rely too heavily upon our own experiences as broadcast journalists (when we have such experiences) and upon intuition—that most hazardous of points of departure for a teacher. And, most regrettably we have so far been virtually without expression of guidance from the practicing professionals. (Which, if regrettable, is at once understandable, since there are no clearly perceived principles and traditions upon which the practitioners themselves can guide.)

Now the instructors of electronic journalism are engaged in what comes close to being a Great Debate among themselves. The issues of this debate are not as clearly defined as they might be, nor is the argumentation as reasonably conceived as one might expect of professors. (And of course there are those who assert that a teacher of journalism is not a professor at all, but a mere impartor of mechanical techniques.)

There is, however, at least one identifiable issue in this debate. It is essentially this: Should schools of journalism teach "broadcasting," or should they teach journalism, of which an increasingly important part is its practice in radio and television? Indeed, I see this as the central issue. In a word, there is education for broadcasting, and there is education for journalism—electronic division.

It is the view of the School of Journalism of the University of Minnesota and of a number of other schools and

Robert Lindsay is instructor in journalism at the University of Minnesota. This is from a talk to the UPI Minnesota Broadcasters, April 2.

departments of journalism, that we should teach journalism as it relates to and is peculiar to the electronic media—*but no more than this*. The production, programming and technical aspects of radio and television, we hold, properly belong in the teaching province of the departments of broadcasting or theatre arts. This does not mean that some attention to the special techniques and tools of radio and television news gathering and presentation is not included in our courses in electronic journalism. But the emphasis, as in most of our School's courses, is on the what and why of the mass media as instruments of journalistic communication and as institutions in society. This emphasis includes both scientific and empirical attention to the social, economic and political implications and effects of such communication. Some instructors, and some news directors, seem to want students trained only, or primarily, in the mechanical techniques of radio-television news. The rationale for this approach is based on the premise that the electronic newsmen is a tape recording specialist or a film shooter or a camera personality. I deny this premise. I deny it because it is a teaching philosophy inimical to the best interests of the journalism craft and, most important, the best interests of a citizenry already dangerously ill-served by too great a portion of the individual and collective units of our system of mass communication.

Incidentally, CBS News has long since told us what its approach to this issue is. That esteemed electronic news organization put it this way:

We . . . can teach a promising young man the mechanics of our business in relatively less time than a journalism school can accomplish this. But we do not have the time to teach him an elementary devotion to the facts, to accuracy, to thoroughness, to fairness, to good taste, with which we think he should come equipped.

Now of course no school of journalism would suggest that its graduates go to their first jobs totally equipped with these attributes. But most of the professional schools do attempt to give their students an appreciation of the overriding importance of such devotion if, as journalists, they are to accomplish their public-serving mission. More than this, the school of journalism deserving of description as a truly professional school must ensure that its students—undergraduates as well as candidates for higher degrees—are exposed to and given an appreciation of the insights into the functions and effects of the media being gleaned by mass communications researchers and scholars in related disciplines. Here, indeed, we have the hallmark of the Minnesota approach to education for journalism. As we know, journalism's indebtedness for this approach belongs to our School of Journalism's Director-emeritus, Ralph D.

Casey. Dr. Casey once expressed in these words the essence of what I have been advocating much less adequately:

Journalism instruction can no longer depend alone on the intuitive guesses of former journalism craftsmen, who upon entering teaching ranks rely too heavily on past personal experience in the use of technical tools and skills. It is good sense to recognize that the instructor has an obligation to plow back into his teaching some synthesis of the important findings developed in the past decade from systematic and disciplined communications investigations.

Above and beyond this sketchily-described problem of the *how* and *what* in education for electronic journalism, it seems to me that the professors involved—and there are not many of us—must face up to their largely neglected duty to serve as critic. By this I mean nothing less than the serious undertaking on the part of journalism educators to offer journalism and journalists the kind of constructive criticism which, assuming its soundness and its acceptance by practitioners, can result in a heightened sense of responsibility on the part of the press—and therefore a more intelligently informed citizenry. The case for more adequate fulfillment of this role was discussed at length at the 1959 meetings of the Association for Education in Journalism. Dean Theodore Peterson of the University of Illinois College of Journalism and Communications observed that historically the schools of journalism have tended to avoid this role because of the fear, however unfounded, that the press, as an institution, would react adversely to criticism advanced by scholars dependent upon the press for support. Eugene Goodwin, director of the Pennsylvania State University School of Journalism, noted in the same connection that “even a newcomer to this field can appreciate the reasons why schools of journalism have been reluctant to don the sanctimonious robes of the critic. They have developed as training arms of the press, and more recently the other media. We have been their boot camp. And who has ever heard of boot camp commanders openly criticizing the chiefs of staff?” Professor Goodwin added:

We have been afraid that professional criticism would result in a withdrawal of the professional support we have worked so long and hard to achieve.

But I wonder if it really would? There is growing evidence that the media need the journalism schools more than the journalism schools need the media. Aren't we in a strong enough position to risk a little wrath in order to do the job we ought to do?

I, for one, am prepared to risk a little wrath. I think Prof. Goodwin has a good point. Surely it is a much more

desirable point than the one made some weeks ago by an official of the National Association of Broadcasters. The manager of the NAB's department of broadcast personnel and economics, Charles H. Tower, told a University of Georgia audience that there are "three worlds" of broadcasting—the educational world, the world of commercial broadcasting and the regulatory, or Washington, world of broadcasting. The NAB news release does not indicate that Mr. Tower made reference to another, somewhat important "world"—the one peopled by the owners of the airwaves—airwaves used by broadcasters as regulated in behalf of the owners by the "Washington world." But this is perhaps another issue. My concern is with what Mr. Tower had to say about the role or function of educators as critics, in this case of broadcasting. He spoke not long after a number of educators—professors of journalism among them—had suggested to the FCC and the Harris committee some ways and means of improving the broadcasting industry's servicing of the public interest, convenience and necessity. He said, in part:

Disheartening it is to find that some of the most fervent advocates of more regulation come from those who teach. They have apparently forgotten that historically in western civilization the teachers by and large have been in the forefront of those who have fought and even died for basic liberties, cardinal among which is the liberty of free expression without government control.

It might be appropriate to remind these teachers, and not by any means are all teachers in this category, that they have for years fought against federal control of the substance of education. Jealously have they guarded the principal (sic) that public education must be close to the people and free of the domination of the omnipotent state. If a high degree of local autonomy is important in so vital a matter as public education, is not freedom from regulatory control important in a great medium of mass communication?

I do not quarrel with Mr. Tower's opposition to undue regulation of broadcasting insofar as such regulation might be violative of the First Amendment. Indeed, I share his fears on this score. But I must say I resent what I take as

an implication that educators should not criticize broadcasting—either its products or its license-holders. I say that broadcasting, even as public education, must be close to the people—though not so close that we are smothered with inanities and fraud. And I submit that the owners of the airwaves have a right—a most fundamental right—to be free of the domination of an omnipotent broadcasting management. Educators have a duty, it seems to me, to maintain a vigilant, analytical watch on the performance of the mass media—in terms of both the whole and the particulars of that performance. I submit that the teachers of electronic journalism in our universities will be remiss in one of their basic responsibilities if they fail to keep such a watch. It is not enough for us to advocate a setting of high sights to our students; surely it is not enough for us merely to show the young men and women going forth from our halls of ivy into the newsrooms how to thread a tape recorder or motion picture camera.

I am convinced that we are now well advanced into the era of the socially responsible press. But the advance has barely begun, even so. In specific regard to journalism as practiced within the electronic media, I believe progress has been good. But it can be and should be much better. Realization of the idealized kind of goal which, as an educator, I am prone to postulate, may well be impossible of complete achievement, given the dynamic concept of society which is ours. I cannot believe, however, that the dedicated fraternity of radio and television newsmen would propose that this goal should be dismissed as the idle pontification of a cloistered academician. In fact, I know this is not the case. Anyone who attends the meetings or reads the proceedings of the Radio-Television News Directors Association, or of our own Northwest Radio-TV News Association, must be convinced of this. The professionals—the men we professors hold up as models to our students—are on the whole a singularly dedicated group of journalists. I wish that I, and my colleagues, might serve them better. I wish that we could serve our students better. I wish that we could serve the nation better.

If all of us could agree that education for electronic journalism can be improved through critical self-analysis, I may well realize an important wish-fulfillment.

Twenty-one Years of Nieman Fellowships

By Arthur M. Schlesinger

The Nieman Foundation, that strange institution at Harvard University, has now attained its majority. It is exactly twenty-one years ago since the Nieman Fellows burst like a meteor on the Cambridge academic community. We on the faculty had never known their like: students who did not have to meet the standard entrance requirements, who attended as few or as many courses as they wished or none at all, and who then disappeared after a single year. Their credentials for admission were not scholastic credits but demonstrated achievement in newspaper work. Surprisingly, however, in manner and appearance they were just like other students, belying the fictional stereotype of hard-boiled characters in casual dress who swore habitually and had their hats glued to their heads.

Their presence in the Yard indefinably changed the atmosphere. An early Nieman Fellow after a few weeks on the scene confessed his sense of awe and inferiority at the vast learning of his professors, which led me to confess on my part that they, too, experienced qualms at facing men who knew at first hand so many things that teachers could know only from books. It may be that incoming groups still feel that way, but the faculty, now fully adjusted to this unusual type of student, have gained continuing benefit from the association.

When Agnes Wahl Nieman made her bequest to Harvard, President Conant might have started another school of journalism, as many expected him to, but he wisely chose to do something unique: to free exceptionally promising newspapermen from headlines and deadlines for a year and afford them an opportunity for self-directed study in subjects that might prove useful to them. Archibald MacLeish, the first director or "curator" and more recently a professor at Harvard, added the feature of regular dinners at which distinguished editors, foreign correspondents, publishers and the like spoke, with members of the faculty joining the Nieman Fellows in the animated discussions that always followed.

When MacLeish left a year later to become Librarian of Congress in Washington, Louis M. Lyons, one of the original Nieman group from the Boston *Globe*, assumed charge, first on a part-time basis and then after a few years on full time. This "reticent and droll Yankee," as Kenneth Stewart has inadequately described him in a book touching

on his Nieman year, possessed all the qualifications, human and journalistic, that the position called for, and in his twenty years the program, with its 251 graduates, has become a major influence nationally in elevating the standards of newspaper ethics and practice.

President Conant throughout his period in office kept in close touch with the venture, and a signal event each year was the dinner in his home at which he engaged the Fellows in searching conversation. When the United States entered World War II, Conant's first reaction was to discontinue the fellowships for the duration as an unjustified diversion of the University's energies, but fortunately upon further consideration he changed his mind because of the dire need for well-informed newsmen and editors to cope both with the immediate crisis and postwar problems. Necessarily, however, the appointments in this interval were restricted to 4-F's and men beyond draft age. That is the only time the existence of the undertaking has been even temporarily threatened. A few years later he changed the eligibility rules by opening the awards to women, an action particularly fitting in view of the source of the Nieman endowment.

Louis Lyons in his two-score years has enriched the original program with many innovations, one of which is the weekly seminar on Tuesday afternoon with professors—really a species of press conference—designed to acquaint the Fellows with significant developments in fields of study other than their own. Another is the *Nieman Reports*, a quarterly magazine appraising the state of journalism in the country and containing contributions from every part of the United States. A third is the triennial reunion of Nieman alumni, who return not only to revisit old scenes but to talk shop and hear authoritative speakers discuss domestic and foreign affairs of current import. The most recent departure is the inclusion of selected newspapermen from other lands as Nieman Associates, a feature made possible through the generosity of several educational foundations. This year, for example, there are, in addition to twelve American journalists, three from Asia. Lyons' service as news commentator of WGBH and Channel 2 is a pure bonus to the Greater Boston community, beyond the call of duty.

It would be difficult today to conceive of Harvard without the Nieman Foundation, for it has become an integral and vital part of the institution, one which President Pusey cites with just pride in his current annual Report. And Louis Lyons, its tireless and imaginative director, deserves the primary credit for the place it has won in the University and the nation.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor emeritus of history at Harvard, served on the Nieman Committee through most of the period he describes, was friend and counsellor of Nieman Fellows through all of it.

The Nieman Newspaper and the Nieman Foundation

By Lindsay Hoben

We at the Milwaukee *Journal* feel very close to the whole Nieman Foundation and very proud of what is being done. And in a very few minutes I want to run over just a little bit of the origin of this thing.

Lucius Nieman, who was the founder of the *Journal*, owned 55% of the stock when he died. He left it in trust, to a niece and to his wife. His wife was to dispose of her share as she saw fit except that under Mr. Nieman's will it was to be sold within five years. Mrs. Nieman decided that the money raised by the sale of her stock was to go to Harvard and to be used to carry out the ideals and principles established and maintained by the Milwaukee *Journal*. It was not necessarily, under Mr. Nieman's will, to be sold to the highest bidder. And that was one of the saving things as far as we were concerned and one of the reasons why we are eternally grateful to Harvard for its co-operation in the settlement of this matter.

There was some litigation with people who questioned the terms of the will. The court, however, decided that the people best qualified to continue the *Journal* in the tradition which it had established, were the employees, according to a plan which had been worked out by Harry Grant, publisher.

In the name of the employees, Mr. Grant made an offer. It was not the highest offer. Many people wanted control of the Milwaukee *Journal*—Scripps-Howard, Hearst and a number of others. But the court ruled that we were best qualified and Harvard, as beneficiary, agreed. Harvard did not have to agree. Harvard could have had more money by holding out for a higher bid because Harvard's agreement was necessary to this settlement. But it did. And we are everlastingly grateful for this.

I want to give you just a small idea of what this has meant as far as the *Journal* is concerned.

More than 1,050 permanent employees now control the Milwaukee *Journal*. We now own 67½% of the stock and a few days ago we signed an agreement with the trustees representing the heirs of the original business manager for the purchase of 12½% so that in five and one half years we will have 80% of the stock.

Lindsay Hoben, editor of the Milwaukee *Journal*, gave this account of the relation of the Nieman Foundation to the Milwaukee *Journal* employee ownership plan, at a dinner to the curator of the Nieman Fellowships at the Harvard Club of Boston, April 30.

Just a few figures to show you what it means. The total cost to employees since 1937, when this plan started, (cost of stock purchased) has been \$9,267,000. The dividends paid have been \$12,600,000 and the value of the employee owned stock, as of March 31, was \$18,083,000.

But it means far more than that. It has enabled employees to purchase homes, to give college educations and do many worth while things too numerous to mention. Most important of all, I think, is the pride of ownership and security of ownership.

So many times in recent years we have seen papers sold down the river by an owner or a group of owners. Sometimes hundreds of employees who have given their lives to those papers have been thrown out of work due to merger or suspension. We at the *Journal* have a feeling of security that we will continue, that we will not be sold to anybody, that we are masters of our own fate.

So I want to say once again how grateful we all are to Harvard in its part of setting up the *Journal* employee ownership plan.

We are equally proud of what Harvard did with the money it got from the sale of 27½% of the *Journal* stock. We think it has been a great job, to "promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the United States." Those were the words in Mrs. Nieman's will. I remember years ago interviewing Dr. Conant before he had decided what was to be done and I was vastly relieved when I found there was no thought of a journalism school but of doing something completely different, which has been done.

And that's where we come to Louis Lyons. Because I think, whether you call him the curator or whether you call him the guiding hand, it has been Louis' good sense and dedication which has in very large degree contributed to the remarkable success of the Nieman Fellowship plan.

A few days ago I was coming back from Korea and Japan. I stopped in Honolulu and I called up George Chaplin of the *Advertiser* who was sorry he could not be here and asked me to bring regards to Louis. And he said spontaneously, just as we talked on the telephone: "I think probably some of the horizons would have been opened up to me in time but no year in my life was as important as the year at Harvard as a Nieman fellow. I learned things, I saw things, I understood things, that would have taken me a long time if I had ever understood them."

So we are very happy, both for what it has meant to the *Journal* and for what we think is being accomplished here at Harvard.

NIEMAN NOTES

1940

After six years as editor and publisher of the *Santa Rosa News*, a suburban weekly in California, **Oscar Buttedahl** and his wife and associate editor, Hazle, sold the paper in April. They then decided on five months of vacation travel.

Allegheny College, at its commencement, conferred the degree of Honorary Doctor of Laws (LLD) on **Hodding Carter**, publisher of the *Delta-Democrat-Times* of Greenville, Mississippi.

1944

Professor **Frederick W. Maguire** of Ohio State Journalism School is spending the summer on the copy desk of the *Boston Globe*. Address: 5 Coolidge Hill Road, Cambridge.

1945

Houstoun Waring, editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, received a Sigma Delta Chi fellowship award in Washington, May 18.

1947

A new television program, "Eye on the Press," opened in Chicago June 12. Its first broadcast cited a series in the *Chicago Sun-Times* by **Fletcher Martin** on the problems of Negroes in Chicago, as one of three examples of "performance in the highest journalistic tradition."

Clark Porteous of the Memphis *Press-Scimitar* was selected to represent Southwestern University alumni at the American Alumni Seminar for Public Responsibility, held on Dauphin Island, near Mobile, June 17-23.

1949

Robert de Roos is co-author with his old colleague, Stanton Delaplane, of a new book, *Delaplane in Mexico, a Short Happy Guide*, published by Coward McCann. Bob spent two months early this year in Central America on magazine assignments.

His daughter, Barbara, was married May 14 to Michael Francis Mitchell, 3d, at Burlingame, California.

1950

Robert Fleming is now Washington bureau chief of ABC News and Special Events. Also the new secretary of the

Nieman History

The two preceding articles that relate to the history of the Nieman Foundation, by Arthur M. Schlesinger and Lindsay Hoben, are a product of a dinner given in Boston, April 24, to mark the 20 years association with the Nieman fellowships of Louis M. Lyons, the curator.

Other talks, either more personal or without manuscripts, were by President-emeritus James B. Conant and President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard University, Archibald MacLeish, first curator of the Nieman Fellowships, James B. Reston, chief Washington Correspondent of the *New York Times*, Edwin A. Lahey, chief Washington correspondent of the *Knight papers*, and Harry S. Ashmore, of the Center for Democratic Institutions. The dinner was attended by about 300, former Nieman Fellows and wives, Harvard University colleagues and former associates of Mr. Lyons on the *Boston Globe*.

Radio and Television Correspondents Association.

He says of the bureau job he had thought it would be rather simple to handle a news crew of five. "Instead I find I have six engineers, three editors, and two TV discussion shows to supervise, plus such duties as helping to plan national emergency communications, broadcast facilities for the next inauguration and ways to get the French to let more Americans cover the Khrushchev trip to Paris."

Returned to the *Washington Post* this spring from his London post, **Murrey Marder** went to Latin America with the President, covered the President's talks with Prime Minister Macmillan and President de Gaulle, and went to Paris for the Summit.

June was a busy month for **Clark Molenhoff**. He received the honorary degree, LHD, from Cornell College, Iowa, and set out for London on the first leg of a ten months world tour, on an Eisenhower Fellowship. His wife, Georgia, went with him on the fellowship tour, that will take them to Russia, Scandinavia, through the Middle East and Africa.

1953

Beverly Britton has been appointed director of public relations for the Robertshaw-Fulton Controls Company in Richmond. Former Richmond newspaperman, he served more than 16 years with the Navy, chiefly in public relations, his last assignment as senior information officer for all U. S. forces in the Philippines. He is now a captain in the Naval Reserve.

John Strohmeier, editor of the Bethlehem (Pa.) *Globe-Times*, had the satisfaction of accepting for his paper the top award among Pennsylvania papers under 50,000, at the annual meeting of Pennsylvania editors. Six members of his staff

won individual awards which gave the paper the sweepstakes on total points.

1954

Richard Dudman drew the assignment to cover the President's Far Eastern trip for the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*.

1956

Robert H. Hansen, staff writer on the *Denver Post*, died March 31, of Hodgkin's Disease, which first hospitalized him in 1956. He had kept at work most of the time and continued to do distinguished work for the *Post*. His reporting had won many honors for his paper, among them the University of Colorado Parkhurst Award for Public Service, the Freedom Foundation Gold Medal and the Izaak Walton League National Conservation Award.

An editorial in the *Denver Post* of April 1 pays tribute to Hansen. It is reprinted in this issue.

Richard L. Harwood was cited by the American Political Science Association, May 25, for his reporting of public affairs in the *Louisville Times*. With 13 other political writers on Southern newspapers, he will attend a 10-day seminar on public issues in November. Plaques were presented to their papers.

Sharada Prasad is now editor of *Yojana*, the magazine of the Indian Planning Commission. He is also busy translating into Kanada, his mother tongue, the works of the Indian novelist, R. K. Narayan, who writes in English.

Ed Seney, publisher of three Florida weekly papers, wrote a two-act comedy, "Simon's Bounty" that was produced in Miami in March and later in other Florida cities.

1958

From Christchurch, New Zealand, **David Lawson** writes that he has left newspapering to become editor-in-chief of New Zealand's largest book publishing company, Whitcombe & Tombs, Ltd. "We

do fiction, history, biography—the lot. About 60 titles a year."

Wallace Turner is a featured news television commentator on Channel 12, Portland, Oregon, where he does a 6-6:30 news program, local, regional and feature news. With his Nieman colleague, **William Lambert '59**, Turner won a Pulitzer prize on the *Portland Oregonian* in 1958.

1959

Mr. and Mrs. **Philip J. Johnson** announced the birth of their first child, Thierry Ann, April 27.

1960

The Associated Press pulled **Jack Samson** into New York, from Albuquerque, to serve on the foreign desk—"something I have been hoping for for five years. No high school basketball boxes. No Little League baseball summaries. No winner of the State cherry pie baking contest. Wonderful."

Keyes Beech on Korea

The cover ad of *Editor & Publisher* for May 14 was taken by the *Chicago Daily News* foreign service to feature "Keyes Beech and Korea's 'Bloody Tuesday'."

The core of the ad was this letter:

April 25, 1960

Dear *Daily News* Editor:

What Keyes Beech warned for years from Korea would come has finally arrived.

Keyes Beech had been the lone voice in the past decade that repeatedly warned the American people of the explosive undercurrents of the Korean political situation. It took more than a hundred young Korean lives to arouse American indignation against Syngman Rhee's bloody rule.

If American readers had had 10 cor-

respondents like Beech covering Rhee's Korea in the past years, the "Bloody Tuesday" would never have happened. Uncle Sam's "stern rebuke" came some seven years too late.

There is the only one Keyes Beech. He is a courageous man, a hard-hitting and perceptive reporter and a compassionate human being. He is a good man. He loves and understands the Korean people more than some of their leaders claim they do.

Beech spoke up while few American correspondents dared. America's major news services utterly failed to convey the underlying urgency of the Korean situation behind the cold wall of objectivity. Last year, the Conlon Report on Asia, commissioned by the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned to that effect.

The Korean people owe him an eternal gratitude. I speak as one of many Koreans in exile in this country.

K. W. LEE

Staff Writer

The Charleston Gazette

Robert H. Hansen

If a newspaper is lucky, it has on its staff a reporter who is not only intelligent and fearless, but who also possesses an unquenchable thirst to get the whole story and is never willing to settle for anything less.

Such a man was Robert H. Hansen, who died Thursday morning of Hodgkin's disease at the age of 35.

Bob Hansen had all the attributes of a great reporter: The intuition by which to "smell out" a story; a healthy skepticism which led him to question every detail; a built-in antipathy toward dissembling and phonies, and an ability to convert dull subjects into powerful articles that brought results.

Without men like Bob Hansen, the people's right to know would be only a principle, not a living fact.

Denver Post, April 1

Letters

Rebuttal to Douglass Cater

To the Editor:

Douglass Cater's address to the American Historical Association (*Nieman Reports*, April), is in general a recital of truisms to which no one can take exception. But his somewhat pontifical approach to the weekly news magazine is unacceptable from even a "fortnightly historian" because Mr. Cater knows better, or should. Sad of heart and wiping a tear from his eye, he consigns the news magazine correspondent to a dismal fate of anonymity and abdicated responsibility. Though he tips his hat to their "high abilities," he finds the poor slob partners in a diabolical process of doctoring the news.

Mr. Cater should look again. Where else in recent weeks has he found not a sterile "digestion" of the week's news, but a rounded, focused, and meaningful accounting and appraisal. Whether it be the destruction of the U-2 over Sverdlovsk, thoroughly reported and committed to print in the short span of 24 hours, or a political primary in West Virginia, or a

summit conference, the news magazine has nothing for which to apologize to Mr. Cater or to anyone else. As for politics, where else but in a news magazine has Mr. Cater been able to read comprehensive yet colorful, timely yet focused, full-length treatment of Democratic presidential candidates Kennedy, Symington, Johnson, and Humphrey. We'll stop right there because Mr. Cater probably has renewed his subscription already and read the product for himself.

And honestly, men, it's not true that we news magazine correspondents are silly jerks who take only notes while some arty fellows in those "skyscraper workshops" give it all that style, polish, and "fiction." In the case of one news magazine at least, there is no sense of profligacy which permits the employment of almost one hundred correspondents from New York to Hong Kong for the purpose of improving the standards of journalism while their product is jettisoned into oblivion. Mr. Cater should drop around sometime and take a look. Even a "fortnightly historian" should do some research occasionally. Meanwhile, he'd best leave those full-time historians alone; they've got enough to do already in separating the good ore from the dross.

JOHN L. STEELE

Chief, Washington Bureau, *Time*, Inc.

Prof. Lindstrom, for instance

To the Editor:

I can not resist noting the possibly unconscious irony in the report (*NR*, Jan. '60) in which a committee of New England Society of Newspaper Editors recommended a pilot study of news performance by New England papers be undertaken.

The committee finds the first "main obstacles" or "principal weaknesses" in previous press performance study attempts were that "the work was not confined to trained news men, but involved also journalism professors . . ." The committee goes on to say this difficulty can be overcome—"first of all, such a study should be conducted by trained news men. . . . We are thinking of individuals like . . . Carl Lindstrom, formerly of the *Hartford Times*. . . ."

As a journalism professor who came into the class room from the news room and took his first journalism course after teaching for a semester, possibly I am overly sensitive to the implication that somehow the categories of journalism professor and trained news man are mutually exclusive. On the other hand, if Carl Lindstrom is still acceptable despite his now being a journalism professor at the University of Michigan, maybe the committee really doesn't mean journalism professors are automatically barred from the ranks of trained news men.

JOHN D. MITCHELL

Assistant Professor
College of Journalism
University of Colorado

Reviews

Classical Commerce

John W. Lyons

THE ANCIENT MARINERS: Seafarers and Sea Fighters of the Mediterranean in Ancient Times. By Lionel Casson, The Macmillan Company, New York, N.Y., 1959, 286pp., \$5.95.

As the title suggests, Dr. Casson, Professor of Classics at NYU, traces the evolution of man's struggle with the sea in the Mediterranean area. (The equally fascinating story of the early seafarers of the Pacific is purposely omitted.) This is not merely an outline of early vessel design and development of trade routes, but a complete, though condensed, history of the period from 2650 B.C.-200 A.D. from the maritime viewpoint. In this part of the ancient world, ringing the Mediterranean, the influence of the sea was necessarily great. Each successive conquering state found it necessary to control the sea. Dr. Casson neatly combines the development of naval transport, warfare, trade, and exploration with regard to this geographical fact. In addition, he adds some intriguing commentary on the Homeric legends.

For example, Agamemnon's adventures at Troy are considered as the first recorded amphibious operation in history, and Jason's famed journey in search of golden fleece is given solid foundations in fact. The people living on the east coast of the Black Sea had found a way to remove gold dust from streams by tying fleeces across the current. Hence rumors of a golden fleece reached Greece via the ancient grapevine. The remainder of the tale is similarly explained right down to the harpies and the "wandering rocks." Again, the author traces a high priest of Thebes on a journey to Byblus about 1100 B.C. to purchase lumber for a new ceremonial barge for the Nile. The tale is told in the first person from a priceless piece of papyrus. The narrative describes the adventures and hardships (as well as double-dealing) that went on in those days in international trade.

Two great civilizations—the Greek and the Roman—probably couldn't have survived without the efforts of these ancient mariners. Neither possessed sufficient cultivable land to produce grain for its people. Both therefore were forced to look to imports for the staple of life and it was necessarily to the sea that they turned. Land transport of the great ton-nages required would have been out of the question—then, as now, sea freight was the most economical way. For the enormous task of supplying the market-place from the Crimea and Egypt, great fleets of merchantmen were built, the likes of which were not seen again for over a thousand years. These huge freighters constituted the lifelines of the empires and many a military operation revolved about them. Philip of Macedon applied pressure to Athens, for example, by gaining control of the Bosphorus and hence the Crimean trade. The Romans, time and again, launched and sailed into battle great navies, a task not much to their liking, in order to protect their source of daily bread from such areas as Carthage and Greece. The book traces these developments and from this refreshingly different viewpoint relates anew the story of our ancient heritage.

There is little in the way of criticism. Occasionally one gets mixed up in chronology because of the necessary separation of geographical developments as well as the author's plan of tracing commercial, military, and ship design aspects in parallel courses rather than integrating them into one narrative. On balance, the author's way is probably the only way of handling the material.

There is considerable discussion of the evolution of ship design—based largely on pictures found on ancient pottery. The designs range from simple single-decked vessels to multi-decked affairs with several men pulling on each of a multitude of oars. A few simple diagrams of the author's conception of these ships would have been a welcome addition to the many fine plates in the book. The author's obvious familiarity with nautical terms does not always rub off on the reader.

The book is indexed and there are notes on each chapter—compiled at the end—for the researcher. In the foreword the

author indicates that most of the material covered has never been assembled in one place before. Thus the work should be much appreciated by classical scholars. For the casual reader, there is plenty of just plain good reading.

Book Notes

THE QUESTION OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING. By Francis M. Bator. Harper's. 165 pp. \$3.75.

This is the book Walter Lippmann said should be read to understand the debate between the public and private demands on our national income.

ROBERT FROST: THE TRIAL BY EXISTENCE. By Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant. Holt-Rinehart-Winston. N.Y. 451 pp. \$6.

This is the most about Frost, his life, work, thinking and prejudices. A great deal of his verse and his talk. With much help from the poet, the biographer has got as much as anybody is apt to get about Frost without getting inside him.

THE TWO CULTURES AND THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION. By C. P. Snow. Cambridge University Press. 58 pp. \$1.75.

Britain's distinguished novelist and scientist tries to bridge the gulf in communications between scientists and the rest of us. In the lucid shorthand of this 55-page lecture, he tells us that if we will understand science we can use it to solve the world problems of poverty and war.

1600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. By Walter Johnson. Little, Brown, Boston. 390 pp. \$6.

The Presidency and how Presidents handled it, from Hoover through Eisenhower. Lively and illuminating history by another of our historians who can write.

THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS. By Paul T. David, Ralph M. Goldman, Rich-

ard C. Bain. Brookings Institution, Paperback Edition. 274 pp. \$1.95.

Complete systematic study of the way we get Presidents from the politics of primaries and conventions.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AND POLLY BAKER: THE HISTORY OF A LITERARY DECEPTION. By Max Hall. Univ. of No. Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. 193 pp. \$5.

An extraordinary piece of literary detective work that develops into intellectual and literary history. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg.

THE VIEW FROM THE FORTIETH FLOOR. By Theodore H. White. William Sloane Associates. New York. 468 pp. \$4.95.

This is the novel that its author insists is *not* the story of the death of Collier's. He was in at the death of two other great publishing enterprises, he recalls. But it is no less realistic and gripping.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORLD ARENA. By W. W. Rostow. Harper's. 568 pp. \$8.75.

A searching analysis of the American capacity and prospects to keep ahead of Krushchev in shaping the world we'll have to live in. The brilliant M.I.T. economist examines the American "style" to judge its chances to adjust fast enough to a world of change.

THE STRATEGY OF CONFLICT. By Thomas C. Schelling. Harvard University Press. 309 pp. \$6.25.

A hard-headed analysis of the factors that need to be brought to international negotiations of arms control to improve the chances against war.

AMERICAN REPORTERS ON THE WESTERN FRONT, 1914-18. By Emmet Crozier. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. 299 pp.

A full and lively account of the war correspondents of the First World War by one of them. A strategic chapter of journalistic history.

JOHN PAUL JONES. By Samuel E. Morison. Atlantic, Little-Brown, Boston. 475 pp.

The modern maestro of naval history tells how John Paul Jones handled a square rigger to beat the British; and the anti-climax of the rest of his life.

THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN. By Charles A. H. Thomson and Frances M. Shattuck. Brookings Institution. 382 pp. \$5.

All about the last campaign, by two

political scientists of the Brookings Institution. Thorough account from pre-convention to election. Careful history, also interesting.

LEGACY OF SUPPRESSION: FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY. By Leonard W. Levy. 350 pp. \$6.50. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Why we have a First Amendment. Its authors knew what it was to *live* without one.

increases the tensions of witnesses, anything that tends to sensationalize trials, and anything that encourages judges to play to the gallery.

A lot of the trouble, as Mr. Douglas noted, comes from a misconception of the constitutional guarantee of a "public trial" in criminal cases. This guarantee is a sound one; but it was established for the benefit of the accused rather than for the benefit of the press. The idea was simply to protect individuals against secret, star-chamber proceedings. It was not designed as a device for entertaining, or even instructing, the general public.

Admittedly there is a question of degree. Many newspaper people who can see why trials should not be broadcast cannot understand the objection to unobtrusive picture-taking. But even if there were no other direct arguments against courtroom photography, there would still be the undeniable fact that it sets an evil precedent—specifically, that it inevitably opens the door to demands for broadcasting and televising as well. Once opened, the door can probably never be closed.

The communications media in this country have already gone too far in making trials into circuses. There has been too much publicizing of pre-trial confessions, too much prejudicial comment on trials in progress, and altogether too much disregard for the sanctity of the jury room. It is high time we accepted the fact that the public's right to know is no greater than the individual's right to impartial justice, and Canon 35 is an excellent place to draw the line.

Berkshire Eagle, May 16

Courtroom Is No Circus Ring

In recent years there has been an increasing hue and cry against the American Bar Association's controversial Canon 35, which condemns the use of cameras and microphones in courtrooms. Spokesmen for the newspaper and broadcasting industries claim that it is an undemocratic infringement of the public's right to know.

More often than not, this claim is patently hypocritical. Newspapermen who want trials photographed and broadcasters who want them televised are not, as a rule, greatly concerned with the democratic rights of the matter. Rather, they're concerned with the fact that if Canon 35 were not

generally adhered to by the courts they would be able to give their readers and listeners a good deal of dramatic fare which they are now denied.

Last week, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas had some pointed things to say on this subject in Colorado, the only state which regularly disregards Canon 35 by permitting broadcasting and televising of trials. Speaking at the University of Colorado Law School, Justice Douglas noted that freedom of the press, sacred though it may be, does not and should not permit incursions on the individual's right to a fair trial. And clearly that right is impaired by anything that