

NiemanReports

July, 1961

The Press Lives by Disclosures

Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.

The Press in the Cuban Fiasco

Dom Bonafede

What About Weeklies?

John C. Obert

Collingwood Views the Press

Louis M. Lyons ✓

Newspapers Should Be for Highbrows

Roland E. Wolseley

No News Is Bad News (China Again)

Robert Karr McCabe

Are We the Best Informed Nation?

James W. Markham

The Press and Its Critics

Nathan B. Blumberg

Trial By Newspaper -

The Supreme Court Rebukes The Press

A Nieman Fellow at Harvard by Chanchal Sarkar—Nieman Fellows 1961-62; Nieman Notes; *What's in a Name?* Dorian J. Lester; *Disinterested Students vs. Interested Newspapers*, Patrick Huber; *William M. Tugman, Newspaperman*, Charles T. Duncan

NiemanReports

VOL. XV., NO. 3

JULY 1961

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

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.; William G. Lambert, Portland, Ore.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Joseph Loftus, Washington, D. C.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Philadelphia; Charlotte F. Robling, New Canaan, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, New York City; 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 1961-62

Harvard University's 24th annual award of Nieman Fellowships will bring 11 American and five foreign newsmen to the University in September for the academic year 1961-62.

The 11 American fellows include the first appointment to the Arthur D. Little Fellowship for a science writer, contributed by the ADL Foundation.

The five Associate Fellows from abroad are the first Canadian Fellow sponsored by the Reader's Digest Association of Canada, a South African sponsored by the African-American Institute, and three Asians, from India, Japan and Formosa, sponsored by the Asia Foundation.

The Nieman Fellowships provide a college year of study of the Fellows' own choice for their background for journalism. The Fellowships were established in 1938 by a gift to Harvard from Agnes Wahl Nieman, in honor of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*. Her will described the gift "to elevate standards of journalism in the United States and educate persons deemed especially qualified for journalism."

The Nieman Fellows for 1961-62 are:

PETER H. BINZEN, education reporter, Philadelphia *Bulletin*; to study educational problems of metropolitan cities.

He is 38, was born in Glen Ridge, N. J., graduated at Yale and began newspaper work in 1947 with the United Press in New York. He joined the *Bulletin* in 1951. After seven years of general reporting he began in 1958 to specialize on education, first with the city schools, then on education in the state, as well as the city.

JOHN O. EMMERICH, JR., managing editor of the McComb

(Miss.) *Enterprise-Journal*; to study American history, government and economics.

He is 31, a native of McComb, a graduate of the University of Mississippi. After serving in the Korean War he began work on his father's paper in McComb in 1954, then worked two years on the Minneapolis *Tribune*, and returned to McComb as managing editor in 1957. In 1959 his paper received the State Press Association award as the most improved paper, and the next year won first award for general excellence.

JOHN A. HAMILTON, associate editor, Lynchburg (Va.) *News*; to study U. S. history, government and literature.

He is 31, was born in Richmond, graduated at the University of Richmond, and Columbia School of Journalism. He served in the U. S. Army, began news work in Lynchburg in 1955 as reporter, and after three years on other Virginia papers, returned in 1958 as associate editor. His editorials have won him Virginia Press Association awards.

JOHN HUGHES, *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent in South Africa; to study world communism and other international problems.

He is 31, was born in England. He began newspaper work in Durban, South Africa, in 1946 and worked on London newspapers and agencies until he joined the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1954. He has been their South African correspondent the past five and a half years. His book *The New Face of Africa* will be published in September by Longmans Green & Co.

DAVID J. KRASLOW, Washington correspondent for the Knight Newspapers; to study Latin America and U. S. history and government.

He is 35, a native of New York City. He served in the Air Force two years in World War II, then graduated from the University of Miami in Florida in 1948. After varied reporting for the Miami *Herald* and winning news awards, he was assigned to the Washington bureau of the Knight papers in 1956. Besides national news, he has covered Latin American affairs and recently the Cuba story.

JAMES V. MATHIS, Washington bureau chief for the Houston *Post*; to study government and international relations.

He is 37, was born in Louisiana, studied two years at Louisiana Polytechnic Institute and went to work on his home town paper, in Monroe, La. He joined the Houston *Post* in 1950. After local and investigative reporting, he was assigned to the city hall and state capital, and in 1957 was named chief of the *Post's* Washington bureau.

JOHN H. NELSON, Atlanta *Constitution* reporter; to study public administration, state and local politics.

He is 31, a native of Alabama, has had 14 years of newspaper experience, the last nine on the *Constitution*, where

(Continued on page 11)

Trial by Newspaper

The Supreme Court Rebukes the Press

The United States Supreme Court on June 5 unanimously voided a murder conviction in Gibson County, Indiana, (*IRVIN vs DOWD*, No. 41) on the ground that a majority of the jurors had admitted prejudice before the trial. Justice Clark for the Court discussed in detail the inflam-

matory pre-trial newspaper publicity of the case that had drenched the community. Concurring, Justice Frankfurter discussed the dangers to justice of "trial by newspaper."

The Frankfurter statement is in full below, and following that the relevant part of the Clark decision.

"Inflammatory Newspaper Intrusion"—Justice Frankfurter

Of course I agree with the Court's opinion. But this is, unfortunately, not an isolated case that happened in Evansville, Indiana, nor an atypical miscarriage of justice due to anticipatory trial by newspapers instead of trial in court before a jury.

More than one student of society has expressed the view that not the least significant test of the quality of a civilization is its treatment of those charged with crime, particularly with offenses which arouse the passions of a community. One of the rightful boasts of Western civilization is that the State has the burden of establishing guilt solely on the basis of evidence produced in court and under circumstances assuring an accused all the safeguards of a fair procedure. These rudimentary conditions for determining guilt are inevitably wanting if the jury which is to sit in judgment of a fellow human being comes to its task with its mind ineradicably poisoned against him. How can fallible men and women reach a disinterested verdict based exclusively on what they heard in court when, before they entered the jury box, their minds were saturated by press and radio for months preceding by matter designed to establish the guilt of the accused. A conviction so secured obviously constitutes a denial of due process of law in its most rudimentary conception.

Not a Term passes without this Court being importuned to review convictions, had in States throughout the country, in which substantial claims are made that a jury trial has been distorted because of inflammatory newspaper accounts—too often, as in this case, with the prosecutor's collaboration—exerting pressures upon potential jurors before trial and even during the course of trial, thereby making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to secure a jury capable of taking in, free of prepossessions, evidence submitted in open court. Indeed such extraneous influences, in violation of the decencies guaranteed by our Constitution, are sometimes so powerful that an accused is forced, as a practical matter, to forego trial by jury. See *Maryland v. Baltimore Radio Show*, 338 U.S. 912, 915. For one rea-

son or another this Court does not undertake to review all such envenomed state prosecutions. But, again and again, such disregard of fundamental fairness is so flagrant that the Court is compelled, as it was only a week ago, to reverse a conviction in which prejudicial newspaper intrusion has poisoned the outcome. *Janko v. United States*, ante, p.—; see, e.g., *Marshall v. United States*, 360 U.S. 310. See also *Stroble v. California*, 343 U.S. 181, 198 (dissenting opinion); *Shepherd v. Florida*, 341 U.S. 50 (concurring opinion). This Court has not yet decided that the fair administration of criminal justice must be subordinated to another safeguard of our constitutional system—freedom of the press, properly conceived. The Court has not yet decided that, while convictions must be reversed and miscarriages of justice result because the minds of jurors or potential jurors were poisoned, the poisoner is constitutionally protected in plying his trade.

"The Force of Adverse Publicity"—Justice Clark

... Here the buildup of prejudice is clear and convincing. An examination of the then current community pattern of thought as indicated by the popular news media is singularly revealing. For example, petitioner's first motion for a change of venue from Gibson County alleged that the awaited trial of petitioner had become the *cause célèbre* of this small community—so much so that curbstone opinions, not only as to petitioner's guilt but even as to what punishment he should receive, were solicited and recorded on the public streets by a roving reporter, and later were broadcast over the local stations. A reading of the 46 exhibits which petitioner attached to his motion indicates that a barrage of newspaper headlines, articles, cartoons and pictures were unleashed against him during the six or seven months preceding his trial. The motion further alleged that the newspapers in which the stories appeared were de-

livered regularly to approximately 95 per cent of the dwellings in Gibson County and that, in addition, the Evansville radio and TV stations, which likewise blanketed that county, also carried extensive newscasts covering the same incidents. These stories revealed the details of his background, including a reference to crimes committed when a juvenile, his convictions for arson almost 20 years previously, for burglary and by a court-martial on AWOL charges during the war. He was accused of being a parole violator. The headlines announced his police line-up identification, that he faced a lie detector test, had been placed at the scene of the crime and that the six murders were solved but petitioner refused to confess. Finally, they announced his confession to the six murders and the fact of his indictment for four of them in Indiana. They reported petitioner's offer to plead guilty if promised a 99-year sentence, but also the determination, on the other hand, of the prosecutor to secure the death penalty, and that the petitioner had confessed to 24 burglaries (the *modus operandi* of these robberies was compared to that of the murders and the similarity noted). One story dramatically relayed the promise of a sheriff to devote his life to securing petitioner's execution by the State of Kentucky, where petitioner is alleged to have committed one of the six murders, if Indiana failed to do so. Another characterized petitioner as remorseless and without conscience but also as having been found sane by a court-appointed panel of doctors. In many of the stories petitioner was described as the "confessed slayer of six," a parole violator and fraudulent-check artist. Petitioner's court-appointed counsel was quoted as having received "much criticism over being Irvin's counsel" and it was pointed out, by way of excusing the attorney, that he would be subject to disbarment should he refuse to represent Irvin. On the day before the trial the newspapers carried the story that Irvin had orally admitted the murder of Kerr (the victim in this case) as well as "the robbery-murder of Mrs. Mary Holland; the murder of Mrs. Wilhemina Sailer in Posey County, and the slaughter of three members of the Duncan family in Henderson County, Ky."

It cannot be gainsaid that the force of this continued adverse publicity caused a sustained excitement and fostered a strong prejudice among the people of Gibson County. In fact, on the second day devoted to the selection of the jury, the newspapers reported that "strong feelings, often bitter and angry, rumbled to the surface," and that "the extent to which the multiple murders—three in one family—have aroused feelings throughout the area was emphasized Friday when 27 of the 35 prospective jurors questioned were excused for holding biased pretrial opinions. . . ." A few days later the feeling was described as "a pattern of deep and bitter prejudice against the former

pipe-fitter." Spectator comments, as printed by the newspapers, were "my mind is made up"; "I think he is guilty"; and "he should be hanged."

Finally, and with remarkable understatement, the headlines reported that "impartial jurors are hard to find." The panel consisted of 430 persons. The court itself excused 268 of those on challenges for cause as having fixed opinions as to the guilt of petitioner; 103 were excused because of conscientious objection to the imposition of the death penalty; 20, the maximum allowed, were peremptorily challenged by petitioner and 10 by the State; 12 persons and two alternates were selected as jurors and the rest were excused on personal grounds, *e. g.*, deafness, doctor's orders, etc. An examination of the 2,783-page *voir dire* record shows that 370 prospective jurors or almost 90 per cent of those examined on the point (10 members of the panel were never asked whether or not they had any opinion) entertained some opinion as to guilt—ranging in intensity from mere suspicion to absolute certainty. A number admitted that, if they were in the accused's place in the dock and he in their's on the jury with their opinions, they would not want him on a jury.

Here the "pattern of deep and bitter prejudice" shown to be present throughout the community, *cf. Stroble v. California*, 343 U. S. 181, was clearly reflected in the sum total of the *voir dire* examination of a majority of the jurors finally placed in the jury box. Eight out of the 12 thought petitioner was guilty. With such an opinion permeating their minds, it would be difficult to say that each could exclude this preconception of guilt from his deliberations. The influence that lurks in an opinion once formed is so persistent that it unconsciously fights detachment from the mental processes of the average man. See *Delaney v. United States*, 199 F. 2d 107. Where one's life is at stake—and accounting for the frailties of human nature—we can only say that under the light of the circumstances here the finding of impartiality does not meet constitutional standards. Two-thirds of the jurors had an opinion that petitioner was guilty and were familiar with the material facts and circumstances involved, including the fact that other murders were attributed to him, some going so far as to say that it would take evidence to overcome their belief. One said that he "could not . . . give the defendant the benefit of the doubt that he is innocent." Another stated that he had a "somewhat" certain fixed opinion as to petitioner's guilt. No doubt each juror was sincere when he said that he would be fair and impartial to petitioner, but the psychological impact requiring such a declaration before one's fellows is often its father. Where so many, so many times, admitted prejudice, such a statement of impartiality can be given little weight. As one of the jurors put it, "You can't forget what you hear and see." . . .

The Press in the Cuban Fiasco

By Dom Bonafede

The United States' involvement in the ill-conceived Cuban assault was a disastrous adventure diplomatically, militarily—and journalistically.

No banner story of recent times has been fumbled with less grace by the nation's dispensers of news.

The flaws, errors and sins of omission and commission are now coming back to haunt those of us who covered the story. In the colorful history of journalism the chapter dealing with the anti-Castro landing of April 17 may well be bordered in black.

But let it also record that the major burden of responsibility falls not to the press, but to the U. S. government, paradoxical as that may seem in the light of President Kennedy's plea to editors and publishers for self-censorship.

A skein of deceit employed in connection with the Cuban incident was woven in the upper levels of governments from Washington to Miami to several Latin American capitals. Caught in its web were scores of newsmen who tried to separate the kernels of truth from the chaff of rumor.

As a case in point, Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes maintained in a private interview last November that his country's military base at Retalhuleu was not being used as a training site for anti-Castro rebels. This, of course, was something other than the truth.

Following the Cuban raid, Nicaraguan President Luis Somoza denied that the Caribbean town of Puerto Cabezas had been used as a jumping off point for the assault force—though it had been confirmed by the handful of resistance fighters who survived the ordeal.

In a speech before the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson piously proclaimed that Washington was not involved directly in the anti-Castro attack. Stevenson later found out to his dismay that even he had not been fully informed as to what was going on.

And after U. S. spokesmen had conceded the U. S.'s role in the operation, Revolutionary Council President Jose Miro Cardona claimed in a post mortem press conference that Washington was not mixed up in the affair!

No wonder that a maneuver founded on a tangle of lies and distortions failed, as it did fail.

It is the contention of many newsmen, including the writer, that the operation was turned into a first class

disaster only because it had been blow up into a Normandy-type invasion when, in fact, it was not an invasion in the strict sense of the word. When the attempt flopped, the fall was that much greater.

Word of the so-called invasion was first leaked by the Miami office of the U. S. Information Service. For more than a week before D-Day, CBS and the *New York Times*, both of which had correspondents in Miami at the time, announced that a big invasion buildup was going on.

CBS reported that 4,000 to 5,000 men were scheduled to be in the first wave. That would have been a neat trick since there could not have been a second wave. The rebels never claimed to have much more than 5,000 fighters even in their most wild flights of rhetorical fancy.

The *Times* told of a hospital ship moored in the Florida Keys, of a mass exodus of men sent to staging areas and of minute preparations taking place prior to the expected invasion.

Then on April 10, the *Times* engaged in a bit of fancy editorial backtracking in its lead story.

"In a major strategy decision worked out in recent days, Cuban anti-Castro rebels were reported tonight to have agreed to concentrate on multiple guerrilla landings in Cuba instead of attempting a large-scale invasion," the *Times* said.

Actually, the *Miami Herald* in a copyright story of April 8 reported that the campaign would consist of a commando infiltration force.

Nevertheless, from the moment that CBS and the *New York Times* began chanting of an imminent Cuban invasion, all other newspapers joined in the refrain.

(Lest the reader assume that this reporter did not fall into similar traps, let me acknowledge that he most certainly did.)

Shortly after the attack on the morning of April 17, some 100 correspondents descended on Miami. Each had one thought uppermost: how to get to Cuba to the heart of the story?

They soon found there was no responsible person or agency to turn to for hard news. Second-string Cuban exile leaders still in Miami were willing to pass along frayed items. In New York the Lem Jones public relations firm had been picked by some omnipotent source to release communiques on the landing. Richard Osborne and Associates was selected as the Miami news outlet.

News released by the two firms was supposed to originate with the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Later it was revealed that the communiques were based more on fiction than accuracy and that the Revolutionary Council was in fact being held incommunicado by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Wild-haired stories bloomed like weeds: the Isle of Pines

Dom Bonafede has had extensive experience in reporting on Cuba, both under Batista and Castro, and on Cuban exile movements. He was a Nieman Fellow from the *Miami Herald* in 1959-60.

had been captured by the rebels and 15,000 prisoners released; Che Guevara had committed suicide; Castro had been seriously injured, perhaps killed, in a pre-invasion bombardment, etc.

In retrospect, we should have used greater discretion. But there was no way to check rumor against fact; no way to get to the scene of action or even communicate with someone there. Unfortunately, the unanimity of the press lent substance to the welter of sketchy reports. We were middlemen, perhaps even dupes, being used in a propaganda exercise. But no reporter wanted to be caught short on such a big story.

Many reporters, if not all, tried to skirt responsibility with such threadbare phrases as "it was reported" and "according to authoritative sources." Some attributed their dispatches to "high-ranking exile leaders in Miami"—a dubious attribution since all high-ranking exile leaders were being secretly held by the CIA or were out of town.

Spokesmen for the anti-Castro organizations answered all significant questions with the pat phrase, "Don't ask us: the U. S. is running the show."

Both U.S. wire services—which did as good a job as possible under the circumstances—released every floating rumor (usually with qualifications) rather than be beat by its competitor.

United Press International has made much of the fact that it was first, as it was, with the story of the rebels' dismal defeat. However, UPI was also first with many reports which proved unfounded.

Valid excuses can be found for the performance of the press before and during the anti-Castro landing. Yet, it is debatable whether the press improved upon that performance after the debacle. If not, that is cause for more serious indictment.

Two prominent figures emerging from the miasma of analytical and background pieces on the event of April 17 are obviously little understood and little known by most correspondents. The two figures are Manuel Artime, head of the Movement of Revolutionary Recovery and the chief civilian representative who participated in the assault, and Manuel Ray, exile leader of the Peoples Revolutionary Movement.

Artime represents the Catholic, right-wing element; Ray, the far left. Prior to Ray's acceptance by the Democratic Revolutionary Front, he was strenuously opposed by Artime because he (Ray) symbolized a political philosophy known among Cubans as "Fidelismo without Fidel." Many responsible Cubans, including the publishers of Havana newspapers printed in exile, maintained Ray was "more dangerous than Fidel."

Nevertheless, Ray was a favorite with many U.S. State Department officials and was eventually accepted by the

Front. Yet, the bitterness between Ray and Artime did not easily subside.

After the tragic setback at the Bay of Pigs it was reported that Artime had been killed by the Castro militia. Almost immediately a campaign was launched by Ray's backers blaming Artime for the failure.

Ray claimed he had not been informed of the details of the operation and as a result could not send word to his underground forces in Cuba.

In a cover article on the Cuban affair, *Time* magazine called Artime "chubby" (which he decidedly is not), and an "opportunist."

This promptly touched off a wave of indignation among Cuban exiles in Miami.

"Opportunist?" raged an Havana publisher in exile, "That's a hell of a thing to call a guy who was willing to risk his life and is now lying sick, almost dead, in a Cuban prison."

The publisher noted that Artime was the only top-echelon anti-Castro leader to take part in the mission. Why Ray, who is only about 30 years old and is frequently labeled by U. S. newspapers as the leader of the "foremost underground group in Cuba," did not participate in the raid himself has never been explained.

For the most part the U.S. press went along and belabored Artime as the scapegoat. It is not ironic that since it has been learned that Artime is alive, he is no longer being condemned.

There are cogent lessons to be learned by the U. S. government and press from the Cuban incident. These do not include self-censorship, for the fact is that many newspapers close to the Cuban situation have practiced self-denial.

The *Miami Herald*, and probably the *Miami News* as well, long ago refrained from publishing many of the activities of the Cuban exiles, including the mysterious departures of unmarked planes from the abandoned Marine air base in nearby Opa-Locka. It was known that the planes were taking rebel recruits to Guatemala—but the papers remained silent for the good of the cause.

I believe that if the U. S. had displayed greater trust towards the press and had frankly announced in a background briefing session that the Cuban operation was to be a commando-type mission (which it was) and not a massive invasion, the defeat would not have been interpreted as a humiliating fiasco for Washington.

If the U. S. wanted to maintain the charade of not being directly involved in the operation, the Cubans themselves could have conducted the press briefing.

Instead, once again we are confronted with a clear case wherein it is proven that deceit and distortions are no substitute for frankness, trustworthiness and truthfulness.

The Press Lives by Disclosures

By Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.

A century ago when an external threat to the survival of the nation was undreamed of, Wilbur Fisk Storey, editor of the *Chicago Times*, declared: "It is a newspaper's duty to print the news and raise hell." This incisive judgment on one journalistic purpose was questioned recently by President Kennedy when he expounded before an audience of American publishers the problems of a free press in the cold war. Mr. Kennedy proposed a voluntary censorship of news on matters involving the national security. He called for more self-restraint or self-discipline in such matters by the press. At the same time the President recognized the responsibility of newspapers to inform the public, in his words, "to arouse, to reflect, to state our dangers and our opportunities, to indicate our crises and our choices, to lead, mold, educate and sometimes even anger public opinion." The dilemma, as he defined it, concerns "a free and open society in a cold and secret war." Speaking of the monolithic and ruthless conspiracy which confronts the free world, Mr. Kennedy said:

Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not lionized. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. It conducts the cold war, in short, with a wartime discipline no democracy would ever hope or wish to match. Nevertheless, every democracy recognizes the necessary restraints of national security—and the question remains whether those restraints need to be more strictly observed if we are to oppose this kind of attack as well as outright invasion.

The occasion for suggesting consideration of voluntary censorship was the ill-fated Cuban invasion, in which operation some newspapers, as you know, disclosed active participation by the Central Intelligence Agency. While one may sympathize with the busy public servants who were harassed by newspaper reports of CIA activity, one must weigh against such inconvenience or interference the traditional safeguard of press freedom, protected by the Constitution as a fundamental bulwark of our free society. One may respectfully assert that the editor in Chicago uttered a cogent and wise maxim when he declared that "it is a newspaper's duty to print the news and raise hell."

Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., editor and publisher of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, presented this discussion of the President's proposal of voluntary censorship, in a panel on the press, as part of the 25th reunion of his Harvard class, June 14.

Admitting the roughness of the language, this is not a frivolous conception of a newspaper's responsibility to the public it serves. On the contrary, the statement implies the essence of a free, inquiring, critical press. It recognizes, I suggest, a newspaper's obligation to print a full and accurate account of the news, to interpret its significance or meaning in the broader context of the issues of the day, and to comment on events with vigor, sound reasoning and moral purpose irrespective of the popularity of the views expressed or any denunciations that might thunder from high places of authority.

Before commenting on the conflict between censorship and this obligation of the press, let us recall several eloquent statements on the value of the press to a free society. Thomas Jefferson wrote:

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

James Mill concluded:

Without the knowledge of what is done by their representatives, in the use of the powers entrusted to them, the people cannot profit by the power of choosing them, and the advantages of good government are unattainable. It will not surely cost many words to satisfy all classes of readers that, without the free and unrestrained use of the press, the requisite knowledge cannot be obtained.

C. P. Scott, editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, stated:

At the peril of its soul (the newspaper) must see that the supply (of news) is not tainted. Neither in what it gives, nor in what it does not give, nor in the mode of presentation, must the unclouded face of truth suffer wrong. Comment is free but facts are sacred.

James Bryce wrote:

Democratic government rests upon and requires the exercise of a well-informed and sensible opinion by the great bulk of the citizens.

Justice William O. Douglas wrote:

The command that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press" has behind it a long history. It expresses the confidence that the safety of society depends on the tolerance of government for hostile as well as friendly criticism, that in a community where men's minds are free, there must

be room for the unorthodox as well as the orthodox views.

"The press lives by disclosures," as the London *Times* observed in a wise assessment of the role of the press. More than a century ago, 1851, British officials were agitating for censorship after Lord Palmerston had been disclosed as backing a clandestine operation by Louis Napoleon to become emperor of France. In reply, the *Times* disagreed that the purpose of a newspaper is:

... to share the labors of statesmanship, or that it is bound by the same duties, the same liabilities as Ministers of the Crown. The purposes and duties of the two powers are constantly separate, generally independent, sometimes diametrically opposite. The dignity and freedom of the press are trammelled from the moment it accepts an ancillary position . . . The press can enter into no close or binding alliances with the statesmen of the day, nor can it surrender its permanent interests to the convenience of the ephemeral power of any Government. The first duty of the press is to obtain the earliest and most correct intelligence of the events of the time, and instantly, by disclosing them, to make them the common property of the nation . . . The Press lives by disclosures.

If the foregoing consensus means that the press must serve no master but the public interest, and that the disclosure of the truth is indispensable to an informed public opinion on which rest sound public policies, it is my view that editors can best contribute to the public welfare by the exercise of each individual conscience in covering the news and commenting on it. If the editorial opinions of a newspaper are to be sound, meaningful and influential, in shaping the great potentialities of American life in a free society, those declarations of opinion must rely on the most complete, unrestrained, accurate account of the consequential events of the day. Self-imposed censorship, voluntarily agreed to—conformity to a code of suppression designed to protect the general welfare—would warp the integrity of the news on which sound opinions rely.

Voluntary censorship has been accepted during periods of war as a temporary abridgment of a protected right in order to safeguard American lives engaged on the fighting fronts. But wars have involved a controlled press for only a limited duration. The competitive challenge of the Communist world, it is widely accepted, may threaten the nation for decades. Not with open war but with covert means, our opponents may be expected to test the foundations of freedom.

An ever-widening circle of news suppression over an extended period would merit the people's loss of confidence in the press, deepening as the suppressions or distortions inevitably came to light. Could we accept the decline of an

informed public opinion after editorial debate had become an empty ceremonial dependent on a pale replica of the facts? Voluntary censorship in the cold war under government tutelage would, in time, I suggest, stifle the initiative, the curiosity, the skepticism which goad responsible editors to ferret out the facts of important news situations. Valid interpretations and informed discussion of the issues would falter. Enlightened public opinion would languish in a twilight of half-truths. The "collision of adverse opinions," in John Stuart Mill's phrase, would no longer supply the "remainder of the truth" which men must share with their government in insure that sound decisions are taken and constructive policies are supported.

The press is a tribune to defend the undefended, a chronicle to record its times, an examiner of controversies; it monitors the economy and the social progress of its age, it is a journal of man's successes and failures, a fighter for progress and reform; it is a herald of events, an observer of the tides of change, a commentator on the great issues confronting the nation, a reporter of happenings in public life, a review of the policies—good and bad—of its leaders; the newspaper is a challenge to the policy-makers, a guardian of man's liberties; it is a mirror of man's aspirations; a sentinel to protect the public. If the press is all these things—if it offers enlightenment to guide a free society toward a more noble destiny—could it serve unimpaired for long under the restraints of even self-imposed censorship? Would not the honored institution become enfeebled and decline in its capacity to support the nation's struggle against tyranny or, conversely, to challenge decisions which, in a climate of moderation, might be recognized as inimical to America's best interests? A free institution would slowly lose its character and abandon its tradition. If "the press lives by disclosures," a muted journalism would debase the truth and be undeserving of the trust imposed in it by the writers of the Constitution.

Surely nothing involving human judgment is absolute or perfect. Flaws of character, errors by prejudice, weakness, unconscious bias, any of these would prevent perfection in the exercise of sound news and editorial judgment in deciding what facts an editor who is also a patriotic citizen should suppress in the interest of military security. If we can agree that no responsible editor would deliberately injure the nation's security, would it not be wise to accept the damage, caused by a mistaken judgment rather than acquiesce in a code of censorship administered by men of good will but no less fallible? Mr. Kennedy recognized the need for vitality in public discussion of national affairs when he told the publishers, "Without debate, without criticism, no administration can succeed—and no republic can survive . . . that is why our press was protected by the First Amendment."

In May the President conferred with a group of news-

paper executives at the White House. It was reported that the Government and the press will continue to study the objective of protecting security without censorship and will meet again in several months.

In conclusion may I quote from an editorial carried in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* which summarizes the problem we have been examining:

... In the case of the Cuban affair, many newspapers of Florida agreed among themselves to say nothing about the training of refugees for the invasion. The New York *Times*, on the other hand, sent Latin American experts to Miami to obtain and publish as much information as they could obtain from refugee leaders.

Obviously, the editors of the New York and Florida papers differed in their judgment, as was their right. But it seems also obvious that if all of the newspapers had agreed to conform to a code, in cooperation with a government agency, the American people would be less able to evaluate the Cuban adventure and use its lessons to decide their future course. They might never have learned of the failure; they might not be in a position to demand an accounting.

What's In A Name (Of A Paper)?

By Dorian J. Lester

Seldom do you see a newspaper named the *Tiller & Toiler* or *Boomerang* unless you live near Larned, Kansas, or Laramie, Wyoming.

Chances are, though, that you see a paper named the *News* or *Times* just about as often as you pass a newsstand because the *News* is the name of 370 newspapers and the *Times* of more than 200 others. In fact, more than two-thirds of all newspapers printed today bear one of only fifteen names: *News*, *Times*, *Herald*, *Journal*, *Tribune*, *Press*, *Star*, *Record(er)*, *Gazette*, *Sun*, *Democrat*, *Courier*, *Post*, *Leader* or *Republican* in that order.

Many newspaper names have special significances. Some people think that even such a commonplace name as *News* means more than the obvious. They say that *News* is the symbol for North, East, West and South to indicate the universality of the newspaper's coverage. *Tribune* is derived from the Latin *tribunus*, a Roman administrative officer who was protector of the rights of the people and a

The most appropriate name ever given a newspaper, *Publick Occurrences*, lasted only one issue, in Boston, in 1690. Another apt name for its revolutionary era, the Worcester *Spy*, failed to survive in peace time. But founders of newspapers have been both fertile and esoteric in digging up names for their inky children, as Dorian Lester has found in researches at Ohio State.

There is no doubt that the existence of an aggressive and inquiring press is and will be an inhibiting factor in the sort of operation the CIA attempted in Cuba. But it would be better to conclude that maneuvers of this sort should not be undertaken by an open society than that our society should become less open. Perhaps a choice need not be made. This much, however, is quite clear: a free, aggressive, inquiring and above all pluralistic press is indispensable to a free society. In full knowledge that some newspapers may abuse their trust, the free society must rely upon the discretion and sense of responsibility of individual editors and publishers instead of trying to impose upon them all a monolithic uniformity like that of the totalitarian press.

Mr. Kennedy himself gave a partial answer to his own argument for considering press restraints. He said: "Even today, there is little value in opposing the threat of a closed society by imitating its arbitrary restrictions. Even today, there is little value in insuring the survival of our nation if our traditions do not survive with it."

With that we fully agree.

popular leader. An Italian *gazetta* was the coin paid for the first Venice paper in 1550, hence the name *Gazette*.

The first newspapers published in the United States furnish a wealth of uninhibited names. *Give 'Em Jessie!* published in Massachusetts in 1856 supported the Republican party and had wide circulation. The name was the party war-cry stemming from the elopement 15 years before of the Republican candidate Fremont with Jessie Benton, daughter of Senator Thomas Hart Benton. The runaway match caught the fancy of Fremont's followers and was used to indicate the manner in which Republicans looked for their candidate to run away with the election.

A rash of *Telegraphs*, *Telegrams* and *Telephones* broke out among the early papers. The first *Telegraphe* appeared in 1792 and meant that the news was "written from afar." There are still several *Telegrams* and *Telegraphs* but only one *Telephone*, the *Herald Telephone* of Bloomington, Indiana.

Newspapers which are now extinct had names that would bring a double-take on any newsstand. In the 19th century Boston published the *Free State Rally* and *Texas Chain Breaker*, the *Boston Pearl* and *Galaxy*, and the *Woman's Voice*.

Washington, D. C., has-beens include the *Busy Body*, *Loafer's Weekly Gazette*, and *National Graft*—strange titles for the nation's capital. Another paper published there

changed its name from *Paul Pry* to *The Huntress* because its woman editor said the grocery boy had named the *Paul Pry* and it wasn't dignified enough for its news content. *The Flying Roll* got its unusual name from Zechariah V: 1, 2, 3, 4 which designates the flying roll as the nemesis of dishonest men and prevaricators. The flying roll was a 30' x 15' sheet of papyrus inscribed with the words of a curse. The fact that the curse was written meant that its contents were beyond escape or appeal. The *flying* shows that the message was ready to greet transgressors swiftly.

The Salt Lake City *Deseret News* gets its name from history. The Book of Mormon signifies "Deseret" as the "land of the honey bee." Deseret was the name given to what is now Utah in 1849 at the Mormon convention. A constitution was adopted and a state proposed but Congress refused recognition and created the Territory of Utah the following year.

The state of Nebraska provided a fertile ground for imaginative newspaper names. Town papers of the past were named *The Knocker—A Journal for Cranks*, the *Ozone*, *Prickly Pear*, *Daily Snort*, *Nebraska Razoo*, *Wahoo Wasp*, *Phunny Phellow* and a healthy contender for the longest newspaper title, *Lauren Jones' Indian News, Western Exchange, Scientific Collecting, Curiosity, and Temperance Journal*.

Not all unusually named newspapers came out of the past, however. The aspiring *Palladium-Item* of Richmond, Indiana, named itself after the statue of Pallas Athena in Troy on which the safety of the city was supposed to depend.

Many newspapers have unique names. Claimed by no other daily papers are the *Hub*, *Optic*, *Picayune*, *Gleaner & Journal*, *Vindicator*, *Spirit*, *Grit Scimitar*, *Echo*, *Favorite*, *Avalanche* and *Nonpareil*. Uncommon but not unique are the *Home*, *Facts*, *Outlook*, *Pajaronian*, *Argus*, *Breeze*, *Eagle* and *Bee*.

If today's editors were to be judged by the newspapers listed in the 1961 *Editor & Publisher Yearbook*, they

would have to possess a multitude of virtues and capacities. The composite editor would be a *Chief* and *Pioneer*; an *Advertiser* and *Intelligencer*; a *Herald*, *Messenger*, *Courier* and *Clarion*; a *Republican*, *Democrat*, *Independent* and *Whig*; an *American*, *Patriot*, *Freeman* and *Citizen*; a *Defender*, *Guard*, *Sentinel* and *Vanguard*; a *Tribune*, *Statesman* and *Leader*; a *Reporter*, *Examiner*, *Observer*, and *Enquirer*; an *Advocate*, *Vindicator* and *Plain Dealer*; a *Pilot*, *Driller*, and *Miner*; and above all be descended from a *Ranger*, *Texan*, *Idahonian*, *Iowegian*, *Californian*, *South-ern Illinoisian*, *Highlander* and *Floridan*.

The newspaper business and newspapers themselves have been called many things, but even they can't come to a final decision. There are such varied synonyms as *Press*, *News*, *Register*, *Journal*, *Review*, *Records*, *Bulletin*, *Ledger*, *Transcript* and *Chronicle*.

Competing with the United States postal service for titles are the *Mail*, *Post*, *Dispatch*, *Express* and *Telegram*.

Astronomy claims its share of newspaper names with the *Star*, *Sun*, *World* and *Globe* and the *Light*, *Mirror*, *Reflector* and *Signal*. Man-made lights are the *Beacon*, *Searchlight* and *Headlight*.

The "fourth dimension" has produced the *Day*, *Hour* and *Time* all in Connecticut, the *Daily, New Era* and *Valley Times Today*.

Politics comes in for its share of names with the *Log Cabin Democrat*, *Herald-Whig* and *Ravalli Republican*. Although newspapers are generally thought to favor the Republican party, the name *Democrat* outnumbers *Republican* 44-31 with *Independent* totalling 20.

Newspaper mergers have created several unexpected names. These are the *Post-Gazette Sun Telegraph*, *Post-Herald & Raleigh Register*, *Sun and News-Searchlight*, *Independent Press Telegram*, and *Record-Courier-Tribune* among others. In the future it is possible we may find such a merger monstrosity as the *Daily Republican World-Telegram News & Iowegian Democrat Vindicator-Bee*.

Disinterested Students vs. Interested Newspapers?

By Patrick Huber

"It is extremely surprising that (out of 437 undergraduates at five New York City colleges) 1 per cent failed to identify our President and Vice-President, 2 per cent our capital and 15 per cent our Secretary of State." Dr. Josef E. Garal of Staten Island Community College made this statement at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in New York in December. The American college student's interest in the world beyond his campus has often been called shallow in comparison with the political awareness of his European and Asian counterparts.

"... One cannot help getting the impression that politics means little to most young intellectuals," Christopher Jenks wrote in the *New Republic* last October.

A discussion of student interest in current happenings raises the question of what campus newspapers are and should be doing in regard to extra-campus events. The newspapers at half of the small liberal arts and teachers' colleges in the country devote approximately 5 per cent of their news space to state, national and international news, it was reported in a survey taken by this writer in January.

The survey, which included half of the nation's colleges between 800 and 1600, showed that 13 per cent of the papers devote no space to non-campus happenings. On the other hand, one out of four use 10 per cent of the column inches for dealing with state, national and international news. Ten per cent of the papers use 20-40 per cent of their space for non-campus events.

Student interest in national and international affairs is increasing if their interest in them is reflected in the amount of space their campus newspapers devote to them. Of the papers polled, 35 per cent have changed this year the amount of emphasis placed on non-campus news, and in 34 out of 38 cases this change was an increase in the percentage of non-campus news. Furthermore, 34 per cent of the editors favored additional coverage of national and international news. The one editor who wanted to devote less space to extra-campus events said he felt that "straight national and international news can be read in dailies easily available to students." This is the position taken by many of those editors who wished to maintain their off-campus coverage at its present rate.

Those who favored increased emphasis of non-campus happenings often said that students did not read anything except their campus newspapers and so if they were to be made aware of outside events the campus newspaper had to do the job. Another reason given for broadened coverage was that "students' feelings tend to crave more student opinion and facts on state, national and international affairs." Increased realization of the importance of world affairs was often given as a reason for greater coverage of them. "The older you get, the more you realize that troubled Laos is more important than a Home Economics Tea," commented Evelyn Berk, editor of the *Skidmore News*, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

There are many obstacles hindering a campus newspaper from dealing with national and international affairs, even if it is assumed that professional newspapers do not make such coverage unnecessary. Space shortages were mentioned by one out of three of those editors who said they did not think their papers should increase their off-campus coverage. The fact that most small college newspapers are published only once a week complicates any attempt to write about current events. Several editors explained that a lack of competent personnel prohibited them from having reports and commentary on world events. The *Grinnell Scarlet and Black*, Grinnell, Iowa, attempted to avoid this problem last fall by featuring interviews with faculty members who were well informed about particular aspects of the election issues.

The non-campus news or background information most frequently supplied by the papers in the poll was about "issues which are directly related to a campus speaker,

an international affairs conference on campus or similar event." Seventy-two per cent dealt with activities affecting higher education and 51 per cent handled extra-campus information relating to activities of Young Democrats, Young Republicans or other campus political groups.

State, national and international news may be dealt with as news copy, background information about it may be supplied or student reaction to it may be examined. Each of these three approaches were used by 60 per cent of those papers who dealt with non-campus news in any manner. The most popular way of dealing with non-campus events was in the form of editorial comment. Two of the papers polled have regular columns about current affairs.

The poll indicated that students are gradually becoming more interested in current affairs and are particularly interested in expressing their opinion about them. Whether it stimulates the student or is repetitious of commercial news coverage, there is a trend toward increased emphasis of national and international news in college newspapers. In spite of limitations on what they can do to overcome disinterest in current affairs, the majority of campus newspapers are apparently in the process of attempting to do something about it.

Patrick Huber contributes this analysis of undergraduate information from Grinnell College, Iowa.

NIEMAN FELLOWS

(Continued from page 2)

his investigational reporting has won him numerous awards, including the Pulitzer Prize for local reporting for 1959.

HENRY RAYMONT, Latin American correspondent for United Press International; to study Latin American affairs.

He is 35, was born in Germany, is a graduate of Indiana University. He has served the UPI in foreign posts since 1945, and for ten years has specialized in Latin America. He was Havana correspondent when the Cuban landings occurred in April and was jailed by the Castro government.

EUGENE L. ROBERTS, JR., state capital reporter, Raleigh *News and Observer*; to study economics and government.

He is 29, native of North Carolina, graduate of the University of North Carolina. He began reporting for the *Goldsboro News-Argus*; two years later became city hall reporter for the Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*, and in 1959 joined the *News and Observer* as state political reporter. He won State Press Association awards in 1957, 1958 and 1959.

MURRAY A. SEEGER, state capital correspondent, Cleveland

Plain Dealer; to study the American government and the Communist governments.

He is 32, was born in Lackawanna, N. Y., graduated at the State University of Iowa, and began newspaper work on the *Buffalo News* ten years ago. He has been on the *Plain Dealer* since 1952. He covered general assignments for five years, then covered city hall for two years and has been State House correspondent the past two years.

IAN MENZIES, science reporter for the *Boston Globe*, on the first Arthur D. Little Fellowship in science writing, will study science. Born in Scotland in 1920, he began newspaper work on the *Glasgow Herald* in 1937. He served in the British Navy from 1939-46, the last year as British Naval Information Officer in New York. In 1947 he joined the *Globe* as reporter and has specialized in medical and science reporting the past four years.

Associate Fellows

MARTIN W. GOODMAN, 26-year-old reporter of the *Toronto Daily Star*, holds the new Canadian Fellowship. A graduate of McGill and Columbia Universities, he began news work in 1957 on the *Calgary Herald*, then served the Canadian Press briefly and joined the *Star* in 1958. He plans to study economics and government.

S. J. KLEU, financial editor of *Die Burger*, Afrikaans newspaper of Cape Town, is sponsored by the African-American Institute. He is 34, a graduate of the University of Pretoria, and was a lecturer there for two years. He has been with *Die Burger* a dozen years, as reporter, foreign correspondent, Parliamentary correspondent and since 1955 financial editor. He will study international economic problems.

Associate Fellows sponsored by the Asia Foundation are:

CHIANG TE-CHENG, 36, managing editor, *Ta Hua Evening News*, Taipei, Taiwan. A graduate of the National University, Nanking, he served as U. S. Army interpreter 1944-45; later in the U. S. Information Service in Taipei 1949-52. After ten years with the *Central Daily News* of Taipei, he joined *Ta Hua* as managing editor in 1957. He spent three months on the New Bedford (Mass.) *Times* in 1955 on a State Department Exchange Program. He translated Gunther's *Inside Asia* into Chinese. He will study economics and international relations.

YUKIO ICHINOSE, science reporter, Kyodo News Service, 37, graduate of Tokyo College of Foreign Languages, has been 11 years with Kyodo, much of the time specializing on science assignments, the Bikini story, and the International Geophysical Year. He will study nuclear physics and space science.

K. R. MALKANI, editor of the *Organiser*, Delhi, for the past 12 years. He is 39, a graduate of Bombay University. He will study economics and government.

What About Weeklies?

By John C. Obert

Senator Lister Hill, in a panegyric on the weekly paper, says: "The importance of the country weekly in the life of our nation can hardly be over-estimated. . . . Close to the people, this last great stronghold of personal journalism in the United States is the pulse and voice of the community."

I am one country editor who strongly suspects that in today's context the importance of the country weekly indeed *is* over-estimated, that the foundations of this last great stronghold of personal journalism may be crumbling all the while we talk about it and that the pulse of the country press grows faint as its voice ever more assumes a monotonous stridency to which the American public is no longer attuned.

My suspicions were not aroused, incidentally, by Carl Lindstrom's recent compendium of press mis-mal-and non-feasance, *The Fading American Newspaper*, for I loosed my first shafts at the country press more than two years ago—and I've been dodging outraged slings and arrows ever since.

Moreover, Lindstrom's book was directed to the daily newspaper, with considerable emphasis upon news content, whereas my self-conscious little critique concerned itself almost entirely with the attitudes and opinions expressed by the non-daily press through its editorial page utterances.

I would like to limit my remarks to this specific aspect of the country press, for *if*, as Senator Hill suggests, the country press *is* the last great stronghold of personal journalism, then the inner bastion of this stronghold must certainly be the editorial column.

I feel constrained to point out that while what I have to say is not political as such, it will be uttered from a particular point of view. Without this relationship, much of my argument would have little significance.

Journalism as we practice it is inextricably tied to politics; yet country editors, I've discovered, are noticeably reluctant to concede, much less discuss, this very real relationship. It is significant, I think, that the weekly editors who reacted most violently against my "Whatever Happened to the Country Press?" article several years ago were more incensed over its political undertones than they were over the specific criticisms included in it. I suspect Carl Lindstrom is experiencing on a magnified scale the same frustrations I experienced as he sees certain critics misinterpret his intentions and distort his premises and conclusions.

Be that as it may, I am still convinced self-criticism is good for the journalistic soul, to paraphrase Adlai Stevenson, and that the press's very survival may be contingent upon

acceptance, sincere consideration and positive utilization of the criticism leveled against it by the people who know, respect and love it most.

I am a liberal who edits a proudly liberal newspaper in a proudly conservative community. And the very fact that my newspaper has prospered, both professionally and financially, through most of its 71-year history offers ample proof to me that such a seemingly paradoxical situation can be more than tolerable—it can be of benefit to both newspaper and community. And I want to speak out for the development of more and more such paradoxical press-community situations throughout this nation.

Why? For two reasons. First, for the benefit of the public. Second, for the benefit of the press. And neither to the exclusion of the other.

I hesitate to bring up what some consider the “red herring” one-party press argument. But I hesitate for but a moment because it is not red herring and because I believe it in the public interest not only to face up to the one-party press situation but to take positive steps to change it.

The statistics should be dreadfully familiar, I’m sure, but for the record let’s review them briefly.

Both dailies and weeklies supported the Republican candidate for President by a ratio of better than two to one in 1960, and were even more emphatic in their support of the Republican ticket in 1956 and 1952. Even these figures do not tell the whole story, for when one considers the high percentage of Republican “leaners” among the so-called independent or uncommitted newspapers and the circulation ratio so heavily in favor of Republican candidates, the disparity becomes even more pronounced.

Now I contend that this situation is intolerable in a two-party system, for it has cheated the American public of its right to read editorial championing of the other side of the Great Political Debate—and because it has preempted the press’s role as the prime medium for the airing of the Great Debate.

But even more than that. It has weakened the press itself, for in its virtually unchallenged insularity, the one-party press has lost touch with the public, and, indeed, often with reality.

Need I go further than to point out that both weekly and daily editors and publishers polled before the 1960 election confidently predicted, by a margin of better than two to one, as a matter of fact, that Richard Nixon would be elected President by a near landslide?

This bit of never-never land wishful prognostication was

John C. Obert is editor of the *Park Region Echo*, Alexandria, Minnesota. This is from a talk he gave at Newspaper Week at the University of Colorado, April 14. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1957.

made in the face of every evidence that the election would be extremely close. Remember, all three major news magazines and virtually all of the polls were predicting a close Kennedy victory.

Am I gloating over my conservative colleagues’ faulty assessment of the mood of the electorate? Of course not. Only a man who never made a wrong guess could afford that luxury. But what I am saying is this. The one-party press obviously has been listening too long to its own unchallenged echoes—and this is good neither for the press nor for the public.

Consider for a moment the fact that while the political viewpoint disparity apparent in newspaperdom may well be present in other media, it is no where nearly so blatantly evident.

Take the magazines, for instance. Are not *Human Events* and *The National Review* more than offset by *The New Republic* and *The Reporter*? Is not the vast circulation edge of the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Reader’s Digest*, *Life*, *Time* and *Fortune* overcome to some extent by the quality and influence edge of *Harper’s*, the *Atlantic* and the *Saturday Review*?

And now that controlling interest in *Newsweek* has changed hands, will the once-solidly conservative front of the big three news magazines be quite so solid?

Look at television (and unfortunately too many of us do little else these days). While the newest of the media more often than not eschews the responsibility of voicing editorial comment, nonetheless it has had the great good sense to call upon the Murrows, the Severeids, the Huntleys and Brinkleys and the Howard K. Smiths for its straight and interpretive news reporting instead of relying solely on the John Cameron Swayzes to butter up its big business customers.

And, at least in my part of the country, radio conscientiously balances off the George Sokolskys and the Paul Harveys with the Quincy Howes and the Edward P. Morgans.

No, only in the nation’s newspapers does “The Other Side” get such short shrift, and I contend that not only are the people wise to it—more than half must be resentful.

But now may I back up a bit to bring my case into proper perspective?

First, I should like to make it absolutely clear that I am *not* holding the Republican Party or conservative publishers and editors responsible for inequities I find inherent in the one-party press situation. On the contrary, I am blaming my fellow liberals for allowing the situation to develop and for doing little or nothing about it once it did develop.

For who can blame conservative publishers for publishing conservative newspapers or conservative editors for writing conservative editorials?

This is their privilege, and, presuming integrity and sin-

cerity on their part, their duty. For conservatism is both ancient and honorable, and though we liberals wish it were not quite so overwhelming, conservatism has every right to a voice.

Second, may I make it clear that I am not terribly concerned with one-party press prejudices showing through in slanted news content, calculated story positioning and misleading heads. I think this disenchanting practice died, to all intents and purposes, after the scandals of 1952. And, incidentally, the studies I've seen of such meddling with the presumed sacrosanct indicted several of the few liberal newspapers as emphatically as conservative.

No, my prime concern is the paucity of editorial support for "The Other Side"—and what can be done about it.

I believe something can be done about it, and I say this with more than a little certainty because I have just been intimately involved in doing something about it with my own newspaper.

In the United States today there are some 9,000 home town newspapers with a not inconsequential total circulation of 75,000,000. A good many of these newspapers, weeklies, bi-weeklies, small dailies, are for sale for a price.

And, despite the political myth to the contrary, there are liberals who have money, money which conceivably could be used to purchase or to finance purchase of erstwhile conservative newspapers.

Why haven't liberals purchased newspapers as conservatives have? I would suspect a combination of factors. In the first place, of course, there is the overriding fact that there are simply fewer liberals with money than conservatives with money. In the second place, it would seem to me that liberal money, if we choose to call it that, is located primarily in metropolitan centers, and the purchase of a metropolitan daily is a far different matter than the purchase of a country weekly. Fortunes and families are tied up in a great many metropolitan newspapers and any change in ownership involves a monumental convulsion.

It is my belief that liberals with available money simply have not been alerted to the possibilities inherent in the ownership or control of small newspapers.

Now I don't mean that one can easily persuade the well-to-do liberal to invest in a newspaper simply to increase his fortune. Those of us in the business know there are infinitely more and easier ways to make money. But we also know that newspaper publishing is an infinitely more rewarding enterprise than a good many others—in a good many ways other than cash return.

Furthermore, with good judgment, the right location, competent personnel and enterprise, there is no reason I can think of why newspaper publishing need be just a labor of love.

Example: Five years ago a classmate of mine bought a

2,800 circulation weekly in my part of Minnesota. He bought it on the proverbial shoestring and for the first three months sweated out a chronically overdrawn checking account.

Last month I visited him and immediately noticed, in the frigid heart of a Minnesota winter, that my friend's healthy head of skin was suspiciously sunburned.

"How?" I asked. "Easy," he answered. "Three weeks in New Orleans." "How?" I persisted. "Easy," he answered, "This year I grossed \$80,000 and netted \$21,000."

Luck? I should say not. Hard work, good judgment, enterprise, the right town—and a darned good newspaper which already has won more than its share of state and national awards.

I need not remind my fellow newspapermen that it takes a long time to earn \$21,000 a year working for someone else.

And this brings up another key point in my case. How does one persuade a man of liberal convictions and adequate financial resources to invest in a business he knows little or nothing about?

I wish I could say it is easy. It is not. But a liberal considering investing in a newspaper or financing someone else's purchase of a newspaper has one big thing going for him that a conservative investor does not. He has a great pool of trained, competent newspaper people to draw from to produce his newspaper or to whom he would consider offering financing.

The conservative investor is not so fortunate, for the great paradox of our business is this: While the overwhelming majority of newspaper ownership is conservative, an equally overwhelming majority of the working press is liberal. And I suspect that the majority of working newspapermen would give their collective eye teeth to own or to work for a newspaper which espouses those principles and supports those causes which they espouse.

Upon whom, then, does the responsibility for righting the wrongs of the one-party press fall? In my opinion, it falls equally upon those liberals who have dedication to their cause and the money to activate such dedication, and upon those working newspapermen and journalism graduates who want to work for a liberal newspaper or want financing to purchase their own liberal newspaper. Somehow the two elements must be brought together. It can be done.

For 71 years the newspaper I edit has been a liberal newspaper. Two months ago the historical skein suddenly unravelled and seemed about to snap. Owners of controlling interest had grown old, a heavy capital improvements program had wiped out the firm's bank balance, plunged it into debt for the first time in decades, and temporarily eliminated the fat semi-annual dividends paid to the more than 200 stockholders.

Now it is difficult to explain the advantages of capital

gains over dividends to stockholders three score years and ten, and when someone punched the panic button the stampede was on.

Out of nowhere instantly appeared no less than five non-liberal buyers with the required \$100,000 in hand. There is no dearth of conservative money to buy profitable newspapers.

Well, to abbreviate the story, the newspaper was not sold to conservatives. The sale was stopped by a district court restraining order we had served on the sellers by the sheriff. This gave us less than three weeks to raise the required capital. We did. With less than 12 hours to spare.

How? By borrowing what we could, mortgaging what we could, cashing in insurance policies and pension fund investments—and seeking out liberals whom we knew and in whom we had confidence, to buy the balance of the stock or finance our purchase of it.

Now I contend that if we could do it in our frenzied circumstances, others can do it and do it much more easily with adequate forethought and without the hectic pressure of a deadline.

There are, after all, people in every state of the Union who willingly contribute their money to advertise their cause and their candidates election year after election year. I would not for one moment discourage such contributions. They're hard enough to come by, as any office-seeker will tell you. But I do believe there are among these campaign contributors some who would seriously consider an investment in their cause which would have more consistency and persistency than biennial crash programs of a few weeks duration.

I have pointedly refrained from suggesting political party financing of newspapers, and for good reason.

The era of the party press is long gone—and to the good. No legitimate newspaper ever should be a party organ. I feel very strongly about this. So strongly, in fact, that in principle I oppose the holding of political office, even organizational office, by editors and publishers.

Perhaps this will explain why: I am a loyal and fervent Democrat. I believe in my party, and most of the time I am in wholehearted agreement with its programs and principles. *But* not all the time. . . .

As an individual member of the party, I can shut up and swallow what I don't like as long as I do like most of what the party stands for and attempts to do. As a newspaper editor, I cannot remain mute. Nor can I swallow what I don't like. For I have an obligation to the reading public which transcends my fealty to the political party, and if I am worth my salt as an editor I must honor my obligation by criticizing liberal as well as conservative causes and candidates whenever I feel criticism is warranted. If the Democratic Party owned my newspaper, the situation

would be chronically uncomfortable for both the party and the editor.

It has always been a source of somewhat perverse satisfaction that the editorial which won the 1959 National Editorial Association contest for our newspaper was an editorial which broke with the liberal position on a specific issue in our state. The satisfaction is not derived from breaking with the liberals, for this is never pleasant. Rather it was drawn from the knowledge that the views expressed in that editorial were honest and sincere . . . and that expression of them once again indicated to all our readers that our newspaper was a legitimate newspaper, with professional integrity, and was not simply a rubber stamp for the party or an apologist for a cause.

All of which brings me to my final point.

I hope I have placed the blame for the one-sidedness of the country press where it legitimately belongs—not on the conservatives, but rather on the liberals.

I hope I have indicated there is reason to believe the situation can be changed, that liberal money can be found for liberal newspapers. And while I am unalterably opposed to political party ownership of newspapers or even the financing of newspaper purchase, I can see no reason why the party cannot serve as an informal broker or why prominent party figures cannot serve as the catalyst to bring together liberal money and liberal newspapermen who want to own or operate liberal newspapers.

But I hope I have not indicated that the battle is won with the purchase of a paper and the publishing of that first ringing editorial of principle and purpose. The struggle is just beginning.

For small cities and small towns are the same the nation over. Main Street is conservative—make no mistake about that. And a liberal newspaper doing business with a conservative Main Street has one more hurdle to clear. It must first gain an automatically suspicious Main Street's confidence. And this is no easy task.

A liberal newspaper in this situation must be scrupulously fair, painfully honest and disgustingly good humored. No hint of political favoritism dare manifest itself in the news columns, and conservative political activity must have, as it rightly deserves, full, fair and complete news coverage.

But even more is required. As has any newspaper, the liberal newspaper has a primary obligation to the community itself. It must concern itself with local issues, not, of course, to the exclusion of state, national and international issues, for we all must smart under the valid charge that ours is the most parochial press in the world, but concerned with local issues because their resolution so intimately affects the village or the city in which we, and many others, live and work. We all want ours to be the best city, the best town, and there should be nothing em-

barrassing or unsophisticated about unabashed boosterism motivated in the public interest.

Furthermore, as an impressive study recently completed in Washington revealed, efforts toward civic improvement, trade promotion and community cultural endeavors on the part of a newspaper require more than the printed word—they require the active, physical presence of publishers, editors and reporters.

For be he conservative or liberal, the ivory tower editor and his newspaper will find community admiration, acceptance and respect more difficult to come by than the editor who mingles socially, civically and culturally (however joyless that pursuit may be on occasion) with the leaders of the community and the people who do business with his newspaper.

Publishing and editing a liberal newspaper in a conservative community is difficult, yes, but it is also challenging, exciting and immensely rewarding. It has been done. It is being done. And, if liberal working newspapermen and liberal journalism graduates can be brought together with liberal money, perhaps it can be done with ever more frequency in ever more communities.

Then, and only then, in my judgment, will the country weekly regain its vigor and virility, its rapport with its readers, its significance and influence.

Then, and only then, can it claim the encomium of "the last great stronghold of personal journalism," for with a strengthened voice for "The Other Side," today's one-party country press will have to meet an ideological challenge by sharpening its brains and its pencils and, in some instances, pulling itself out of never-never land and into the Twentieth Century.

Then, and only then, will more than a figurative handful of the nation's 75,000,000 hometown newspaper readers be able to read that Walter Reuther and George Meany are of a different stripe than Jimmy Hoffa, that the overwhelming majority of union-management contracts are negotiated honorably and peaceably, that more than alleged concern for worker autonomy motivates "Right To Work" legislation proponents. . . .

To read that isolationism is dead, that the concept of survival through Fortress America is suicidal, that our free world alliances must be continually shored up, that as a nation we are not all that we should be, that some nations do some things better than we do, have admirable democratic systems of freedoms and rights and representation for their people and have sound economies, while other nations need our material assistance, our moral support and our military protection—and that foreign aid is not necessarily money poured down a rat hole.

To read that the absurdities of the John Birch Society make a mockery of its expressed purpose, that a delicate but precious line must exist between maintaining absolute internal security and suppressing Constitutionally guaranteed civil rights and liberties, that even such sacred cows as the American Legion, the House Un-American Activities Committee and, yes, the FBI, from time to time should get, and can benefit from, a rap on the fingers for their overzealous excesses.

To read that the farmer is not the only recipient of federal subsidy, that an economic as well as a sociological case can be made for preservation of the family-sized farm, that acquisition of new industry, even if it brings with it the foolishly feared bogey of organized labor, may be the only salvation for small cities and towns which heretofore relied heavily on farm trade.

To read that legislative reapportionment and Congressional redistricting must be carried out, even at the apparent expense of the rural community, because such action is morally as well as legally justified and required.

To read that politics is the art of the possible, and a great art, indeed; that not all the practitioners of the art nor the holders of public office are scoundrels or shysters, but very often are more honorable and able than an apathetic public deserves.

And, finally, to read that government is not all waste and extravagance; that government must do what individual initiative and private enterprise cannot or will not do—build highways, schools, public institutions, remove slums and rebuild decaying cities, regulate commerce and industry in the public interest, create a military establishment for our common defense; that federal intervention and assistance is not always to be feared, but is sometimes to be welcomed in those areas where local and state governments have defaulted in their obligations; that, Barry Goldwater to the contrary, the least government is not necessarily the best government in today's complex and treacherous world; that, Orval Faubus notwithstanding, the Supreme Court's rulings are the law of the land; and that, obsessed country editors notwithstanding, the coins making up the towering national debt do have two sides, after all, and one side represents the federal government's continuing concern for the public weal.

Thus there is an "Other Side," and though it may not always be right, we cannot be certain it is always wrong. And as long as the possibility exists that it may be right, it deserves a chance to be heard and to be read—heard *and* read by many more than are hearing and reading it today.

Collingwood Views the Press

By Louis M. Lyons

About ten years ago CBS launched a weekly review of the New York newspapers by Don Hollenbeck, entitled *CBS Views the Press*. It ran for a year or so and stopped, without other explanation than that Mr. Hollenbeck had been promoted to an executive post. One might have assumed other reasons for stopping it. CBS had been getting in the hair of some newspapers and vice versa, for it was a pungent and penetrating analysis of the treatment of major news in different papers. The accent was on the difference in treatment. It was a period of high controversy and the differences in news handling described a good deal about the differences in newspapers.

On April 23d, CBS resurrected its old program under the same title, with Charles Collingwood appraising the press of New York City. Taking Collingwood's first six weeks, the two series do not lend themselves to exact comparison. Hollenbeck operated in radio and had thirty minutes of that more leisurely medium. The more costly TV cuts Collingwood to 15 minutes. But his impact is doubtless greater through the dramatic visual treatment TV provides. That means that his scripts are only part of his performance, but the rest is irrecoverable for review.

Both wisely limited their scope to New York City. Any wider compass in a short period would be self defeating. But Collingwood's method, in his first six weeks, has been quite different from Hollenbeck's. It may be partly the difference in the media, partly the difference in the times. Certainly these first six weeks presented issues which focused attention on the press to an extraordinary degree. Collingwood has been able each week to pick a theme of very large interest that applies to the press in quite general terms. Instead of pin-pointing individual newspaper treatment, he has dealt with the issue as it applies to the press generally, and used New York newspapers chiefly for convenience of illustration. New York provided him with ready reference, but for the most part he could have been operating anywhere.

An exception was his fourth piece, on the *Herald Tribune*, under its new magazine-trained editor, visibly changing to a magazine-looking paper. But even this individual instance was treated as an example of what is beginning to happen to the American newspaper in its response to the age of television.

Collingwood couldn't have started under more attention-getting auspices. Cuba was his first story, and the discussion of the press handling of the Cuban venture is

still going on. The next week the President was discussing the press with its publishers in the light of the reporting on Cuba. Then came the space flight with its mammoth coverage, and that gave Collingwood a chance to talk about the press conference as an institution.

Then the *Herald Tribune* metamorphosis and next week the Freedom Riders' saga.

So far these broadcasts have been informed and urbane essays on the press which reveal Charles Collingwood as an observant, informed critic, and it has seemed to me a very fair one. He views the press from a competing medium, which will be unacceptable to some, whenever he has anything sharp to say. But this seems so far the only way we are going to get any continuing criticism of press performance. It is too strategic an institution to go uncriticized. CBS is fortunate in its selection of Collingwood, who at 44 has had 22 years of reporting to draw on. The first four were with the United Press, in London, Washington and the UN. In broadcasting he has covered nearly all the big stories of his times. He twice won Headliners Awards as a press reporter, and has won the Peabody Award in broadcasting, also the Alexander Award for promoting world understanding. He knows his subject.

In his first broadcast, April 23d, Collingwood traced the development of the news about the Cuban venture. This was his biggest story and his most informing report:

As far as the public is concerned, last week's explosion in Cuba took place in a sort of vacuum of information and for this vacuum the press as the principal purveyor of information in this country must bear a large share of the responsibility. We now know that we were badly informed about most aspects of the Cuban situation, because no one told us we did not know about Castro's strength in his own country or about the limited power of the underground in Cuba. We had not been led to estimate the consequence of failure but only of victory. Above all, we did not know the extent to which the United States Government had aided and abetted, financed and planned this operation. Now, after the horse is gone and the barn door shut, some of this information is beginning to appear in the press. . . .

That story has been in the public domain since last October, 1960. It was certainly available to Castro. It was not available to the American people until much later, and thereby hangs an interesting journalistic detective story.

As far as can be learned, the first person to break the story of an American financed training installation and air base in Guatemala wasn't a reporter at all. He was a college professor, Dr. Ronald Hilton of Stanford University's Institute of Hispanic-American & Luzo-Brazilian studies at Palo Alto. After a trip to Guatemala he described in the October, 1960, issue of the Institute's scholarly journal, *Hispanic-American Reports*, his discovery that the CIA had acquired and developed at a cost of over a million dollars a large tract of land at Retalhuleu, Guatemala. There they were training anti-Castro recruits. This startling and highly important intelligence went unnoticed by all the major newspapers and press services. It was left to *The Nation*, a small left of center weekly, to give the story wider circulation in its issue of November 19, 1960. That is, five months ago:

The New York *Times* and the Associated Press did make a perfunctory check at this time, but got a predictable denial in Guatemala which they accepted and there it rested until by sheerest accident, Don Dwiggins, the aviation reporter for the Los Angeles *Mirror*, turned up in Guatemala on a junket. He had noticed *The Nation's* story too and decided to check it out. . . . The Los Angeles *Mirror* ran Dwiggins' story on December 22, 1960. As a matter of routine the Associated Press sent an abbreviated version to its customers all over the country. . . .

The Nation got hold of Dwiggins on the telephone, got him to amplify his piece for the January 7th issue. *Time* magazine was the first of really national circulation that picked it up and they had a story on Dwiggins' findings in their issue of January 6th; and finally on January 10th, the New York *Times* had their man Kennedy check again and they carried on the front page:

"U.S. helps train an anti-Castro force at secret Guatemalan air ground base."

. . . That *Times* story of January 10th set off a whole spate of accounts of the CIA and the Cuban rebels and it became public knowledge. But this was January and the story had been available since October. The *Times* itself had had a crack at it in November. It was on the AP wires on December 22nd.

As Dr. Hilton himself, the man who broke the story, says in the issue of *The Nation* that comes out tomorrow,

"Why were we kept uninformed and why did an academic journal like the *Hispanic-American Report* have to perform tasks which should have been carried out by the daily press and the news agencies?"

This was not the only matter on which we were left

in the dark about Cuba. This episode was in a way typical of the coverage of the whole Cuban story, from the beginning of Castro's revolution. . . .

The result is that the great debate now underway over Cuba, is taking place in a sort of vacuum of the kind of information on which we might be expected to make judgments, but informed or not, the discussion, of course, goes on. . . .

As the reassessment of the Cuban operation continues, we are going to have to depend upon the press for a lot of the information that will go into the making up of our minds. That is the job of a free press in a democracy, a job which was not performed with conspicuous success in the events leading up to the Cuban affair.

Someone is bound to ask as to the performance of Mr. Collingwood's own medium. But that is another story. It is a hazard of his assignment that this question will recur.

In his April 30th broadcast on the President and the publishers, Collingwood devoted about half his time to the dilemma of information vs. security that the President raised, and quoted a number of editorial comments. Then he took off on the question, how adequate is our foreign coverage? This was to the point. Again a penetrating critique:

. . . Every crisis abroad seems to come upon us as an unpleasant surprise. There was Laos, and the Congo. Tomorrow it may be Viet Nam or Angola. Last week it was the revolt of the French generals in Algiers. That came right out of the blue. . . .

But one can't help wondering whether the American press was alert to the possibilities inherent in the explosive Algerian situation. At the time the rebellious paratroopers seized Algiers, there does not seem to have been a single American correspondent in Algiers. The Associated Press did have two men there but they were both French nationals, and it's sometimes difficult for a national to report about his own country for a foreign press. United Press International had one man in Algiers, Alain Raymond, also French. And that, apparently was all. The New York *Times* man, Tom Brady, *had* been in Algeria but had gone to Tunis to cover the rebel Algerian government whose impending negotiations with the French seemed the major North African story. *Time* magazine's Edward Behr had also been in Algeria recently, but went to Paris shortly before the insurrection. All the other American correspondents who cover Algeria with any regularity were also out of the country when the balloon went up. Now, coming events are supposed to cast their shadow before, and for months there *had* been indications of trouble

between deGaulle and the right wing elements of the French Army, but when the crisis came, a crisis which threatened to rock the Western alliance to its very foundations, it came as a total surprise to the American press and, therefore, to the American public.

The fact is that American foreign correspondents are awfully thin on the ground. In all, the Associated Press has about 80 American correspondents and 200 full time foreign nationals. The United Press International has about the same number, the New York *Times* has 45 full time men outside the country. These are the biggest news gathering services abroad. Now, compare those figures with the fact that there are now 99 United Nations countries.

In the long run, occasional breaches of security in the American press may be less important than the fact that in a world where almost anything can happen almost anywhere at almost any time, the American press is woefully shorthanded in the far corners of the world.

Commander Shepard's space flight had priority in Collingwood's May 7th report. "The whole story was remarkably well covered." He quotes the *Herald Tribune* and *Journal American* stories before the event, which held that publicity was being over-done. This leads him into President Kennedy's press conference statement, a few hours after the successful flight, that in an open society we have to take the risks of full publicity and that is as it should be. But the President also said:

"For people to suggest it is a publicity circus when they are very insistent on their reporters being there does seem to me to be unfair."

Collingwood observes that this bypasses the question whether the over-enthusiastic build-up, with so much irrelevant detail, tarnishes a great scientific undertaking.

In this report Collingwood also reviews the extensive press discussion of what Presidential advisers were to be blamed for the Cuban affair, to show the contradictory finger pointings pretty well cancelling each other out.

Sequel to Cuba was the appointment of James Killian to oversee the CIA. The *Times* had a beat on this and Collingwood notes the unusual action of the rival *Herald Tribune*, that reported it as "an administration leak to the New York *Times*."

The May 14th report was largely devoted to the large attention the press gave Commander Shepard. Collingwood tuned in on the massive press conference.

"Why must reporters at press conferences ask such foolish questions?" he asks, and cites several pages of the most inane.

"The inadequacy of press conference questioning might not be particularly important if it weren't that a lot of the information we get in the press depends on it. If the

right questions aren't asked, the subject may never be raised in public at all."

He notes that with all the vast coverage of Commander Shepard's exploit, the names of the men who managed the project, which the President made a special point of mentioning, were not carried in the AP dispatch at all or in any paper but the *Times*. "A case in which names didn't seem to make news."

On May 14, he noted also the way different papers handled two different cases of flouting the law.

One was the government seizure of three horses from an Amish farmer who had refused to pay his income tax. The other was of 61 arrests of persons who refused to respond to a civil defense drill.

Collingwood notes that the Amish farmer's case was particularly played up in papers which sympathized with his antipathy to Federal taxation, and instanced the *Herald Tribune* story and editorials in the *News* and *Wall Street Journal*.

But the *Post*, which gave no special play to the Amish farmer, took up editorial cudgels for the civil defense objectors, and even ran a transcript of their trial, which brought them jail sentences.

"A small object lesson for the proposition that what a paper thinks is news depends on its prejudices."

Collingwood focused his May 21st review on the changing identity of the *Herald Tribune*, looking more like a magazine every day under its new editor from the magazine field. He had some fun with the *Tribune's* new habit of using questions for headlines and was able to peg this on an amusing letter to the editor from a lady who protested that she took the paper to get answers, not questions. He notes that the letter appeared in the first edition, then vanished from later editions.

The new shape of the *Trib* goes beyond a change in headlines, as Collingwood notes. More news is left out to make way for the display of what is featured. The tendency is increasingly to pass judgment on the news in the story, and this slant may go counter to the *Trib's* own editorial page. The weirdest instance of this came a few days after Collingwood's piece. On May 26 the *Trib* imported and featured on page one an Australian writer's brutal ridicule of the American committee to ransom Castro's prisoners with tractors. Editorially the *Trib* was defending the committee.

Collingwood notes the brightened effect on the paper and signs of more enterprise in its writing, though he feels it strains too hard for novelty.

A more important criticism is that there often appears to be less news in the *Herald Tribune* these days. Some stories are missed entirely.

But the *Tribune's* circulation in April was up 40,000 over April of 1960.

Meantime the *Trib's* efforts to find a new identity are worth watching. How often do you get a chance to watch a major newspaper change its skin?

May 28 comes to the Freedom Riders' story. Collingwood notes that the *Herald Tribune* was the only New York paper to anticipate more trouble after the bus burning in Anniston, Ala. Its Stuart Loory tailed the bus from Birmingham to Montgomery and was two stories ahead of the opposition on the mob violence.

In marked contrast to the meager coverage of the Freedom Riders' arrival, the busses leaving Montgomery for Jackson carried more reporters and photographers than Freedom Riders.

It was another instance of the tendency of the press to miss the climaxes but to be on hand in strength for the anti-climaxes. Indeed, the press produces its own anti-climaxes by the very intensity of its coverage when it does arrive on the scene. . . .

By their very presence, two thousand newsmen [in Vienna] create an appetite for news. The stories they are obliged to write to justify their presence increase that appetite. . . .

In contrast there are a number of places in the world where news is being made which haven't seen an American correspondent in weeks. One such place is Portugal's African colony of Angola where there is constant

and bloody fighting between black and white. . . .

The Angola story hasn't really attracted widespread public attention.

Why not? Well, the *Christian Science Monitor* addressed itself to that question on Wednesday. "World-wide official and popular reaction to the violent racial warfare in Angola contrasts strangely," says the *Monitor*, "with the much greater attention given previous clashes elsewhere in Africa. This," says the *Monitor*, "is easily explained on grounds of strict Portuguese censorship."

And that, indeed, would seem to be a large part of the answer. It's a good example of the role that the press plays, almost without our realizing it, in providing the ingredients for an informed public opinion.

. . . Every important news gathering organization in the world has been trying to get reporters in, but Portugal hasn't given any visas for the past six weeks. . . .

In general, Portugal has been highly successful in keeping the press out of its African possession. They've done their best to keep the bloody Angola fighting a secret. They haven't completely succeeded, but in the absence of independent and objective reporting, they have succeeded in keeping Angola in the rear rank of those problems which might be expected to engage the attention and the concern of informed people. This very success is a telling demonstration of the difference that free and untrammelled access to the news by the press makes to our understanding of what's going on in our world.

Newspapers Should Be For Highbrows

By Roland E. Wolseley

The complaint we hear so often these days that newspaper standards are too low is almost as old as journalism itself. Listen to John Ward Fenno sound off in *The Gazette of the United States* in 1799:

The American newspapers are the most base, false, servile and venal publications that ever polluted the fountains of society—their editors are the most ignorant, mercenary automatons that ever were moved by the continually rustling wires of sordid mercantile avarice.

Others, before and since, have attacked and evaluated the media of mass communication and have borne down especially hard on newspapers: Lambert Wilmer, Max Eastman, Upton Sinclair, Harold Ickes, Oswald Garrison Villard, George Seldes, T. S. Matthews, Carl Lindstrom, and many more.

Since the common complaint has been, essentially, that newspaper standards are inadequate, what are adequate standards that newspapers should attempt to meet? If we can agree that there is a gap between performance and perfection in the American newspaper, we can proceed to ask why the gap exists and what can be done to narrow it.

What are the origins of the present standards? What are the conditions that create these standards? Here are some origins and conditions that might be considered most general and important.

The newspaper of general distribution must be economically successful. In our American type of economy, if it is not, it becomes a creature of its subsidizers: the government, political parties, a special-pleading business, the church.

The newspaper holds to the ethical standards of private business. It is itself a business, no better and no worse, perhaps, than private business in general. But it is as guilty as any business of the weaknesses associated with that area of life.

The newspaper is not respected by the intelligent. Having in most instances catered to the lowest common denominator, the newspapers never have had, and certainly do not have today, the respect of those persons Marya Mannes called the highly intelligent and talented, when she addressed the nation's editors last year in Washington.

Specialists in politics, geography, history, religion, public affairs, the arts, and the sciences still are often contemptuous of the newspaper as a reliable and informed

medium. Most are unaware of the improvement that has taken place in the past few decades but they are right to be cautious about rank-and-file papers.

Discriminating citizens do not insist upon higher standards for newspapers as they do with foods and household equipment through consumers' groups. They either ignore the press or read it chiefly for the television log, the weather, and the stock reports. The ordinary citizen, furthermore, rarely complains if a newspaper distorts the news, is inaccurate, or emphasizes the trivial. He is not, for one thing, in a position to recognize faults; he continues to allow himself to be conditioned by the paper he reads.

The newspaper tries to have something for everybody. Consequently, it has too little of all except a few types of content (far too much sports, for example). Realization of this led Briton Hadden and Henry Luce to establish *Time*, but the task is too much for newsmagazines alone.

Here is the great editorial dilemma; how much to print?

This point is a vital factor in determining the standards of American newspapers. Those in charge of selecting newspaper content (ranging from an editor-in-chief rushing to a Rotary Club speaking engagement to a copy editor allowed to do more than has ability to do) appear to choose and play up text and illustration for one or more of these reasons: to sell newspapers, to publish news that is important to society, to publish what is of personal interest to them, to meet the owners' desires, and to conform to established policy or habit.

This can be illustrated by a comparison of the *New York Enquirer* and the *Christian Science Monitor*. Exchange the staffs, including management, and each paper would alter personality completely. It seems that each would fail at once with its readers, for it would take too long for the original loyal group of readers and advertisers to make its way across the chasm. It seems logical, also, to conclude that newspaper standards are the personal moral and professional ones of the persons who run the papers and not only a response to reader demand.

The newspaper staff is not well enough trained. Although U. S. newspapermen and women are far better educated than those in most countries, their preparation for their responsibilities is still inadequate. Let me come right out and say it: not enough of them are graduates of first-class, university schools of journalism.

If the man on the street is insular and ignorant sometimes, so sometimes is the man on the beat getting the news and the man on the desk pushing a copy pencil over it. The multiplicity of subjects almost guarantees this. Only the

Roland E. Wolseley is professor of journalism at Syracuse University and author of many books in his field.

richer and more responsible papers, such as the New York *Times*, the New York *Herald Tribune*, the Denver *Post*, the *Monitor*, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, and the Minneapolis *Tribune* and *Star* have much defense against the inadequacies of general assignment staff members, and that defense lies in specialists. Even the weaknesses of the specialists have been brought out by the televising of President Kennedy's press conferences, for many of the men who ask questions reveal a lamentable lack of a sense of history.

The newspaper is produced in too much of a hurry. This is true, but there is less excuse for it than ever. Poor results are inevitable. The rush of production, however, has long been used as a rationalization for weakness. It is cited to excuse the enormous number of errors of many types, particularly in early editions. It is a specious argument, tending to condone faults that should not occur. By now mechanical problems, impracticable union regulations, and other excuses could have been overcome by adherence to high standards.

Because of the haste of getting out the paper, then, the desk is forgiven the headline, CUBA BLAMES BLAST ON U. S., although there is nothing in the story below to support that statement. Such sloppy work can be explained, but concern for high standards would not tolerate it.

The newspaper has to say something new. At least, so it seems to editors competing with radio and television, to which they have lost spot news coverage. They want to sound different, either from each other or the competing media. This desire may produce a headline reading: MEG WEDS PALACE FOTOG. Or it may mean rewriting by an afternoon paper of a story from a morning one, without verification, to give it a new slant, one that may not be justified by the facts.

The newspaper has a phobia for the local angle. Some 9,000 weeklies and the majority of our approximately 1,800 dailies are dedicated to this angle. Without it, most papers would go out of existence. But they overdo this dedication. Even the big ones sometimes see only their own noses in the news. When the Chicago *Tribune* announced the death of Chester Campbell, its publisher, it did so by running a big black streamer across page one. On that same day the battling in the Congo was on, Americans were being removed from the areas (there's a local angle for you), oil refineries were being confiscated by the Cuban government, and other important events were occurring, all minor from the *Tribune's* viewpoint.

The newspaper is cautious. It is characterized by a timidity that may be the result of close involvement with the economic order. In the days of Pulitzer and Bennett, not all crusading was socially useful but there were memorable campaigns then, and a bit later under Fremont Older, Thomas Rockhill Nelson, and Don Mellett. What is

probably more important, there was more disposition by rank and file management to stand for something high in the community. The modern paper is essentially a business operation. Taking forthright positions on dangerous subjects—if it ever occurs to many editors to do so—loses readers; lost readers are lost advertisers.

A Minneapolis journalist, now a trade paper executive, said to me recently this about the dailies in his city: "In the old days of Murphy, the papers here had opinions. You knew then where a paper stood. Today papers have opinions only on the obvious. And St. Paul's are just the same."

The newspaper has lost personal leadership. Personal journalism has passed from the editors to the columnists and other special contributors, often outsiders. More than a century ago the man on the street commonly said: "Did you see what Greeley said this morning?" Today, however, readers usually do not know who edits their papers. One of my pet tests of this is to ask audiences of non-journalists if anyone can name the editor of the New York *Times*, our most famous daily. No one ever knows; even the journalists rarely know. Personal journalists did set standards, although not always high ones, to be sure. But we did receive a measure of leadership.

Aggravating the present situation is the fact that the low standards of today's papers are spread evenly across the nation's press. The standards—through syndication of news and features, through similar production methods, through the organizations of owners and editors—have themselves become standardized. The evidence is familiar: the same errors and bad judgments are repeated in paper after paper that buys from the same syndicate, for example.

What can be done to raise standards?

Certain stock answers are useful. A useless one is that government must step in. No one in America except an authoritarian takes this seriously any longer because of the obvious dangers of interference with freedom of expression.

Another is that educational and religious leaders must do more to bring about a change in public morals and taste. True. They might begin by altering their own reading habits, which are too much like those of the general public and not worthy of persons in influential positions. The ideal newspaper of teachers and preachers, as groups, appears to be about the same as that evidently desired by the public as a whole: seven pages of sports, five of women's features (including an entire page for Ann Landers or Abigail Van Buren), four of comics, and two of classified ads. This may seem cynical, but circulation figures are circulation figures and these ingredients dominate some of our largest and worst newspapers as well as small ones galore.

Another frequent prescription for raising standards is that the schools of journalism must change the calibre of

newspapermen available. Gradually they are helping to do so, but, as A. J. Liebling, *The New Yorker's* Wayward Pressman, once put it, what we need is a school for publishers. The persons who set the policies must set the higher standards as well. Can anyone imagine *Chicago's American* (correct) carrying on page one a picture, a half-column story, and a three-column jump about the reasons for the attitude of the Cuban government toward the U. S.? But this is the usual practice on the *New York Times*. And the *Monitor*. But not the ordinary city daily. Why? Because the owner or publisher or some other executive believes the public is not interested. Perhaps *he* is not interested and it goes no further than that.

But publishers will not undergo a revulsion against any of the present standards unless they believe a receptive public is out there ready to buy papers that emphasize what is important rather than what sells. And it must be a public big enough to keep circulations going. And rising.

Is there hope for this? I believe there is. Improved public taste is manifesting itself in various ways. Evidence appears for increased support for serious magazines. The public is buying significant paperback books in large quantities. Circulation and advertising volumes are rising for socially responsible papers. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the *Tulsa Tribune*, recently pointed out in an editorial that between 1940 and 1960, when the national population went up 38 per cent, public taste changed in ways measured by magazine circulations. Detectives went up 1.8 per cent; confessions, 23 per cent; home and hobby, 108 per cent; business, 120 per cent, newsmagazines, 257 per cent. He added:

From these figures this editor, and many of his colleagues on other newspapers, have concluded that the thirst for information and the hunger for solutions to the problems of modern living are of far more significance in modern journalism than scandalmongering, sensationalism, or the purveyance of trivialities.

With such encouragement other steps might be taken. Schools and colleges could offer far more general education in the use of the mass media than they do now. Moreover, the press itself might engage in more severe self criticism, through the American Society of Newspaper Editors, American Newspaper Publishers Association, American Newspaper Guild, Sigma Delta Chi, Theta Sigma Phi, the scores of state and regional press associations, and other such groups. It is high time that the Guild add to its valuable work in raising salaries and improving working conditions an accelerated program to help staff members do better technical jobs and, more important, to show a greater sense of social responsibility.

Schools of journalism and mass communications already are contributing to this effort through preparation of personnel and a limited amount of criticism. But much more

could be done if they received greater financial assistance from their administrations.

Of most importance is what we might learn from the British, whose example could help us quicken progress considerably. We started on such an idea in the 1940s, when the Commission on the Freedom of the Press made its report. Denounced as it was then by an unsportsmanlike press, the commission nevertheless did valuable service by pointing out existing weaknesses. In a less dramatic way the American Press Institute at Columbia University also has helped to raise standards.

But we need a General Council of the Press, like that of Britain. A voluntary body established in 1953 on recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Press, to hear complaints of newspaper practices, it serves as a sort of conscience for the British papers. Like all consciences, it has provoked dissatisfaction and unhappiness.

Consisting of fifteen editorial and managerial representatives from the papers, it investigates complaints brought before it, such as invasion of privacy, over-emphasis on sex and crime news, tie-ins with advertising matter, and tampering with a writer's copy. Although its reports are no more than a censuring (not censoring) of the offender, they help to develop a conscience and a consciousness of the need for higher standards.

Workable as this pattern might be, it could be improved upon. The U.S.A., because of its size, might need regional councils also. On such sub-councils could be representatives not only of the papers but also of the public and possibly of journalism education. Such councils could be financed by one or more of the educational foundations, universities, learned societies, and the newspaper publishing companies.

A national council and its subdivisions might monitor and analyze news reporting and writing, hear complaints and investigate them, conduct research in press problems, and issue reports to press organizations, schools of journalism, public libraries, and other outlets that would make them available to the general public. A publication of its own might do what the present periodicals, with a few small exceptions, do not do since most are commercial ventures dependent upon the industry.

Too many papers are following a formula that was useful before radio and television gave news coverage, when there were no news magazines with their condensations, when few mass circulation periodicals interpreted the news, and when the general public had far less interest in important news and views than it has today. The old formula is proving to be less effective for our time as the years go on. The steady decreases in circulation of several large, low-quality papers and the loss of newspapers every year by merger and consolidation are signs that alert publishers will take seriously.

No News Is Bad News

The Ban on American Reporting from Communist China

By Robert Karr McCabe

What we don't know about Communist China would fill a book, and that's exactly what a good many China experts have to do these days. They can't be condemned for it. After all, Communist China does exist, although the content of most American newspapers would lead you to believe otherwise. The problem is basic: no first-hand information.

The American ban on travel to Communist China has existed since late 1949, when United States diplomatic representatives were withdrawn. Since 1957, the State Department has tried to arrange for admission of American newsmen to Communist China, without success. Both Washington and Peking are for the idea, just as they are for motherhood, but both have a way of attaching riders to their plans which preclude agreement. The March 1961 meeting in Warsaw is a case in point. Peking, replying to an American proposal for an exchange of newsmen, insisted that consideration of an American pullout from Taiwan must accompany discussion of any exchange. Previously, an agreement on an exchange had been stalemated by American refusal to sign an agreement on reciprocity.

Officially, of course, the United States does not recognize the existence of the 12-year-old Peking regime. Yet since the regime was established in 1949, contacts have been made by government officials, journalists and others. Edgar Snow visited Communist China for five months in 1960, on assignment for *Look* magazine. He is the most recent journalist in a group which includes John Strohm of Newspaper Enterprise Association in 1958 and, a year earlier, William Worthy of the Baltimore *Afro-American*, Edmund Stevens of *Look* and Philip Harrington of the same publication. (The latter three, it should be noted, did not have State Department permission to make the trip.) From time to time, the Department has allowed visits by relatives of Americans imprisoned there, and a lawyer has gone to China on behalf of a client.

On an official level, contact has been maintained in the regularly irregular meetings in Warsaw of United States Ambassador Jacob Beam and Chinese Ambassador Wang Ping-nan. These talks began in Geneva in 1955, after the

summit conference. At that time they involved Wang and U. Alexis Johnson, then Ambassador to Czechoslovakia and now the newly appointed Deputy Undersecretary for Political Affairs. Other contacts have been made during the truce talks at Panmunjon.

The policy thus is not one of complete dissociation but rather one of degree. The stance of isolation by the State Department after the Communists seized power has been tacitly abandoned. Today, the State Department stands ready to issue 34 passports, valid for travel to Communist China, to news organizations which have indicated willingness to send a reporter to the mainland for six months. Peking, however, says it will not admit American journalists unless the United States abandons its support of Chiang Kai-shek and agrees to admit an equal number of Chinese reporters to the United States.

The State Department has all but cleared the way for admission of Chinese reporters. It has so far barred strict reciprocity on the basis of a signed agreement, but it has hinted broadly and often that individual applications may well be approved.

The Chinese seem to be flexible on the question of reciprocity. Both Mr. Snow and Mr. Strohm went to China with the blessings of the State Department, and no demand for equal treatment was forthcoming from Peking. There were odd twists in each case, however. Mr. Snow was not admitted in his capacity as a *Look* journalist, but rather as a writer. In addition, his acquaintance with Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai dates back to the mid-Thirties. Mr. Strohm represented NEA, also on the State Department's "approved" list. Evidently, he was given a visa by the Communists because they had not realized this. (It seems likely that Peking will grant visas to any reporter willing to defy the State Department ban. No reporter has been able to bring himself to test this point, however, since the difficulties endured by Mr. Worthy.)

Mr. Stevens, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Worthy all visited Communist China in defiance of the United States ban. They remained for a comparatively short time; Mr. Worthy from December 25, 1956 to February 3, 1957 and the two *Look* representatives from December 27, 1956 to January 23, 1957. The State Department, after deploring the visits, did nothing to punish the latter two. Mr. Worthy, first to transgress, was made an object lesson; he was denied a new passport after refusing to promise never to break reg-

Robert McCabe is on leave from his desk as assistant news editor of the New York *World-Telegram*, now studying Chinese at Yale after a year of Asian studies at Harvard. He has been a correspondent in Germany and Japan.

ulations again. Subsequent appeals, all the way up to the Supreme Court, were of no avail.

These too-brief visits produced nothing of startling value, but they do point up the need for comprehensive, *full-time* reporting on Communist China by as many correspondents as possible. Communist China is, after all, the world's most populous nation: its present population of 670 million probably will reach 1 billion by 1968. Agitation for its admission to the United Nations is loud and continuous, and this fall's session of the General Assembly is likely to produce the bitterest clash yet on this point. A veto by the United States will do little to increase our prestige in Asia in particular, in the rest of the world in general. Any disarmament pact will be of little value without the Communist Chinese. Their status as Asia's most dangerous military power makes this obvious. And when Red China joins the "Nuclear Club" as seems likely within the next two years, it will become many times more menacing than today.

There is, on the other hand, a sizable body of sentiment in the United States against having anything at all to do with the Chinese Communists, or with the Soviet Union, for that matter. The Committee of One Million, perhaps still the leading spokesman for these feelings, has so far succeeded in preventing much open discussion of a change in policy. The Committee remains firm in its belief that Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist army are awaiting only the strategic moment to reconquer the mainland.

Even if we accept this notion, would the presence of American reporters in Communist China deter Chiang from launching his attack? Probably not. As it now stands, we know little about Communist China. A regular flow of news from the mainland would tend to alleviate this unhappy situation. And the presence of Chinese reporters in a United States which so far has survived the presence of journalists from the Soviet Union surely would not bring us down in ruins.

Except for occasional reports from the few British, French, and Canadian reporters in Peking, the American newspaper-reading public has been without news from the mainland since 1949. One of the new regime's first acts was to deny United States correspondents the right to pursue their duties until the United States recognized the Communist regime. And the State Department was loud in its protests of this transgression on the freedom of the press. With only a few exceptions, American reporters left China. For all practical purposes, the flow of news from China was cut off.

Six years later, in August 1956, Peking invited 15 American journalists to visit the mainland, expenses paid. These included C. L. Sulzburger, Henry R. Lieberman and Tillman and Peggy Durdin of the *New York Times*, John

Roderick of the Associated Press, Seymour Freidin of the *New York Post*, and Harrison Forman and Walter Kerr. It was theorized that the invitations were timed to coincide with the eighth Chinese Communist Party Congress, scheduled to open September 15, 1956.

The State Department promptly refused to validate passports of any of the 15 for travel to the Chinese mainland. A spokesman said the Department "has taken this occasion to review carefully its policy with respect to the non-issuance of passports validated for travel to Communist China. It continues to be policy not to issue such passports. The United States welcomes the free exchange of information between countries, but Communist China has taken American citizens into captivity and in effect holds them as political hostages. It continues to do so despite promises to release them made in September 1955. Under these conditions, it is not considered to be in the best interests of the United States that Americans should accept the invitation." The Department also pointed out that the United States had no relations with Communist China, and warned that the law provides a maximum five year prison term and \$2000 fine for violating passport restrictions. In addition, relevant provisions of the Trading With The Enemy Act were cited which make currency transactions with the Peking government punishable by up to ten years in prison and fines up to \$10,000.

The press was quick to attack the decision. Arthur Krock led off for the *N. Y. Times* August 7, accusing the Department of limiting the flow of information by refusing reporters permission to visit China. In the following days, Arthur H. Sulzberger of the *Times*, Frank Starzel of Associated Press and Frank Bartholomew of United Press, and representatives of the National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting System sent protests to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Herbert Brucker, editor of the Hartford (Conn.) *Courant* and chairman of the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, declared the "United States now stands guilty of the very obscurantism we denounce when Communist countries practice it." And the *N. Y. Times* said editorially: "We do not think anything but good could come out of the honest reporting we presume these reporters would do."

The Department's stand gave the Chinese Communists a splendid propaganda opportunity. *Kuang Ming Jih Pao*, the organ of the so-called "democratic" parties of Communist China, said the American government's refusal showed how much "it feared the truth. The State Department knows its slanders and rumors about China will not stand the acid test. It is afraid that Americans visiting China would see the real conditions and learn that the Chinese people love peace. . ."

President Eisenhower, at an August 21 press conference, made it clear that he supported the State Department policy. Newspapermen who had planned to defy the ban now began to back down. Mr. Brucker, returning to the fray, said "the State Department was erecting an Iron Curtain of our own." And, in an editorial, the *Times* raised another issue: "There is a serious Constitutional issue involved as to whether the State Department has the right to deny to the public the right to read about certain subjects. . . The whole truth may sometimes be strong meant, but it is not for the government to decide how much of the whole truth we are to have."

Any remaining plans to defy the ban died abruptly on August 24 when Peking declared American reporters would have to bring along their passports. Previously, some newsmen had considered entering China sans passport and thus circumventing the Department's order.

Criticism of the policy continued during the fall and early winter, but the State Department showed no signs of yielding. Then, on Christmas Day in 1956, the Department found a highly unpleasant present under its tree. William Worthy, at the time a Nieman Fellow at Harvard on leave from the *Afro-American*, had crossed into Communist China at Hong Kong, bound for Peking. The Department "deplored" the trip as against the expressed policy of the United States. Unheeding, Mr. Stevens and Mr. Harrington flew into Peking from Moscow two days later.

On December 28, the Department noted that the three had entered despite the fact that their passports had not been properly validated. "As a result of this misuse," a spokesman said, "their passports will be valid only for return to the United States." After reporting that the cases were being called to the attention of the Treasury Department in view of the Trading With The Enemy Act, the Department added, nervously, that "it should be clearly understood that the United States is not attempting to deny to the American public information about China."

The New York *Times* kept up its editorial fire in 1957. In January, commenting on the Department's stand on the three transgressors, it said: "To deprive the American people of the right to know at first hand what goes on in Communist China is a poor way to exert pressure on the Chinese to free our unjustly held citizens." And Morris L. Ernst, in a legal opinion sought by the Overseas Press Club, accused the Department of violating the freedom of the press. "The crux . . . is the right of our public to read, to hear and to see. This philosophy is based on the theory that the truth has a better chance of emerging in a free and fair market-place of thought than by any other process known to man."

In February, Mr. Dulles brought up another reason for the ban. "We don't like to have U.S. citizens used as a

means of coercion against the United States government." He noted that for some time Communist China had been trying to get reporters, preferably those it had picked, to come into Communist China, and it had repeatedly tried to use the illegal detention of Americans as a means of pressure to accomplish its ends. He added that China was putting a price on the release of the prisoners, and implied that this price was the exchange of newsmen.

Mr. Dulles set off another uproar with these assertions. Newspapermen resented any insinuation that the reporters invited by Communist China might be sympathetic to Peking. And, when questioned on the "deal" to exchange the prisoners for the admission of newsmen, the Secretary could offer no substantiating evidence. The *Times* once again criticized Mr. Dulles. It said the principles of news freedom could not be part of a deal and the United States should refuse to recognize such a link: "The American press feels strongly on this and is not going to let up on its pressure."

Later in this press conference, reporter May Craig said she had been refused permission to go to Communist China in 1955 on the ground that the United States has no relations with Communist China. Whether or not the prisoners were released, she said, the fact would still be that relations do not exist and therefore no passports could be issued. Mr. Dulles evidently agreed. As long as the present state of semi-war prevails, he said, and we do not recognize Red China, we will not issue passports for Red China. The issuance of passports for visits to a country which is not recognized is never done. This statement contrasts oddly with the fact that American newsmen visited the Soviet Union before that regime was recognized.

Then, in what the *Times* described as a "change of mind," Mr. Dulles said on March 5, that while the Department had not altered its position, "We are continuing to study and explore the matter to see whether any way could be found to satisfy the demand for news coverage without seeming to drop the barriers generally and permitting what the Communist Chinese call 'cultural exchange'."

Late in April, the Secretary noted during a press conference a suggestion that the "newsgathering community" come up with a proposal for a limited number of correspondents to go to China. "We felt," he said, "that such a selective experiment could be made consistently with our general policy." Mr. Dulles added that the "newsgathering fraternity," though they had made the suggestion, had decided that such a pool arrangement would not work. Most important, as it turned out, was his statement on reciprocity: "We have no intention of inviting Communist Chinese newspaper people to come to this country. . . Since

any passport would have to be issued by a regime which we don't recognize, it would not be practical. . . ."

James Reston, summing it up in the *Times* the next day, said the Department seemed to believe that:

Then, after a summer of continued sniping, the Secretary gave way. "Dulles Gives Consent for 24 Newsmen to Go to China, Reverses Policy," chortled the August 22 *Times*. The State Department said: "During this period, new factors have come into the picture making it desirable that more information on Communist China be made available to Americans. . . . Therefore the Secretary of States has determined that travel by some newsmen to Communist China may prove consistent with United States foreign policy."

But the *Times'* chortling was premature. There was a catch in the decision. "It is to be understood," said the Department, "that the United States will not accord reciprocal visas to Chinese bearing passports issued by the Chinese Communist regime." This point has become a major barrier to any exchange of newsmen.

Thus, while seeming to yield, the Department had not vitally altered the situation. In addition, it had neatly ducked the problem of having to single out individual newsmen for the trip. Instead, it had allowed 24 news organizations to designate a representative. (Eleven organizations have been added to the list since 1957, and one of the original two dozen, International News Service, has gone out of existence.)

The appointed 24 rushed to Hong Kong, eager to pick up their visas. There was no indication of any difficulty. But on August 25, *Jen Min Jih Pao*, the organ of the Chinese Communist Party, declared in Peking that the "unilateral" American action had been rejected by the regime. The Communists, who had until this time been plugging freedom of the press, said that "United States only wants to collect intelligence in China through its correspondents, carry out subversive activities and exacerbate feelings between the Chinese and American people." The United States action was called a "typical imperialist move."

Two days later, the Department said it would consider "on its merits" any entry application by a Communist Chinese newsman. Absolute reciprocity was barred once more, but the statement did represent a change from the previous categorical "no." This was followed by broad hints that such applications would be approved. Peking ignored the hints.

And there, essentially, the problem stands. Since 1957, Washington has extended the previous passport validations, and added more organizations to the list. Passport references to "Communist-controlled portions of China," which some newsmen had thought might militate against receipt

of a Peking visa, have been removed. The Department has declared that "if the Chinese Communists were indeed interested in reciprocity, they would have an equal number of Chinese newsmen apply for visas." And it has reaffirmed that it is prepared to consider recommending to the Attorney General a waiver of laws preventing visits by Communist Chinese.

(It should be pointed out that the United States has no reciprocal agreement on the exchange of newsmen with any other country. Nor has Peking. Nor, for that matter, has Peking denied entry to newsmen from other countries which do not recognize it. Agence France Presse, for instance, has a full-time correspondent in Peking, although France does not recognize the mainland regime.)

The verbal fencing has continued. In May 1960 the Department answered a renewed demand for a formal agreement by again stating its willingness to admit newsmen on an individual basis. Last September the United States rejected a Communist Chinese offer to admit American journalists in return for withdrawal of American troops from Taiwan. The Department was "reluctantly compelled to conclude that Communist China has no serious interest either in reporting by its own newsmen from the United States or reporting by American newsmen from the China mainland."

Four days later, on September 13, 1960, Peking said it was a waste of time to try to settle minor questions before fundamental issues are resolved, thus appearing to close off further discussion in Warsaw on the exchange of correspondents and the return of American citizens now in mainland prisons.

But in March 1961 the new Administration ordered Ambassador Beam to resume negotiations on the two points. The initial Chinese response was discouraging. Wing, after rejecting an appeal for the release of the five (now four) Americans still imprisoned, said that an exchange of newsmen would be difficult to arrange as long as the United States continued to "occupy" Taiwan.

"Difficult" is not impossible, however. And the need for news from the mainland becomes clearer every day. Communist China is the greatest power in Asia. Tomorrow, in all probability, it will join the ranks of the superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union. In any sphere, ignorance is perilous. But ignorance of a power which is fast becoming the most dangerous on earth may be fatal.

No news is bad news. If our policy toward Communist China is to change, as change it must, the American public must be told why this is necessary, and it must know as well the dangers which lie ahead. Reporting from Communist China can spell this out. Competent, full-time reporting from the Chinese mainland is vital during the years ahead.

Are We The Best Informed Nation?

By James W. Markham

"Communication specialists" and working newspaper men sometimes glibly assert without a shred of proof that the American people are the best informed people in the world. This is a broad statement and one that requires support, because if true, it offers some assurance that the mass media of this country are doing a reasonably fair job. If this thesis is not true, it is time to rid ourselves of the false sense of complacency it engenders, and begin to work harder to make it true.

The trouble is no one knows how we rank with the rest of the world in this respect. The comparative study of mass communication has not thus far illuminated the question definitively. The evidence seems to indicate the contrary—that we as a people are not nearly as well informed as we think we are. Moreover, perhaps some other peoples have acquired a higher level of information about public affairs than we.

Perhaps we are understandably beguiled by the illusion of quantity. It is true that we own the largest share of the world's communication facilities. In sheer size of technical resources and in annual volume of output in the mass communications industry, no other nation can compare with ours. We possess the lion's share of the telegraph wires and cables, cinema seats, and radio and television broadcasting and receiving apparatus. Our newspaper and periodical enterprises command unmatched printing and publishing resources, capital, and mass production technology. Our proportion of telephones in the population makes us the marvel of other industrial nations.

We buy 58 million newspapers every day, 300-odd million general magazines and 959,595,000 books every year, not to mention thousands of trade, business, and technical publications. In combined daily newspaper circulation the U. S. is far ahead of its nearest global rival, Japan (36 millions), followed by the United Kingdom (29 millions) and then by the Soviet Union (21 millions). This nation's newspaper presses alone gobble up a whopping 80 per cent of the world's newsprint supply in order to produce the thickest, fattest newspapers the world has ever seen. These staggering totals give evidence of an unprecedented flow of symbols and easily lead us to assume that the American public, *ipso facto*, is better informed than other publics.

But looked at from the consumption rather than the production viewpoint, these same superlatives present a

different picture. For instance, in *per capita consumption* of daily newspapers, not we, but the British rank as the world's most voracious readers. Moreover, the inhabitants of eight other countries rank ahead of us in this respect. Britishers buy almost half again as many daily papers as we do. Every 1,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom buys 573 copies of daily newspapers, whereas the same number of U. S. consumers buys only 347 copies. Individual consumption of newspapers is also greater in Luxemburg, Finland, Japan, New Zealand, Australia, Denmark and Norway, than in the U. S. A.

Our bulky newspapers, ordained by a complex cycle of economic factors, actually discourage readers, with the result that a half-page automotive advertisement on page 49 is fortunate to attract four per cent. On the other hand, Western European papers are better read because they are smaller and better written. In per capita consumption of printed books we do not do so well either as the people of some other advanced nations. Only in the use of those dominantly entertaining media, radio and television, and in number of warm cinema seats do we surpass the people of other countries.

But at the very least one can confidently assert that the mass media are available in overwhelming proportions to the people of this republic. Never before in any other country have so many been subjected to so great a flow of words and pictures so rapidly and (in a physical sense) so efficiently. Moreover, if one is to judge by the apparent confidence with which advertising spends billions of dollars a year in the media, he must conclude that people in considerable numbers *are exposed* to media content. Messrs. Hooper, Nielson, Sindlinger, Politz, *et al* spew forth IBM-fuls of such proof, demonstrating to the space and time buyer that millions of Americans regularly sit and soak in audio-visual messages by the hour.

If we admit that the media are available in unequalled volume and that the people are exposed to vast quantities, does it necessarily follow that we become best informed, or for that matter, even well informed? Elementary school teachers know that availability and exposure do not necessarily insure reception and understanding.

Not even in the commercial area where sales volume is the major barometer of advertising effectiveness can one categorically claim that consumers generally are well informed about products and services. In other areas such as national or world affairs, if we take pride in the suggestion that the public levels of information are relatively high,

James W. Markham is professor of journalism at Pennsylvania State University.

we are immediately restored to the proper state of humility by the periodic revelations of Mr. Gallup. In 1944, for example, he found that 60 per cent of us had never heard of the Atlantic Charter and 95 per cent could not even name one of its provisions.

During the more recent McCarthy uproar a poll showed that at least one fourth didn't know who he was. A good many people couldn't identify Christian Herter, then the newly-appointed Secretary of State. An equally large number either didn't know where Formosa is, or had forgotten. The evidence seems to be ample and convincing of the sometimes appalling inability of the public to assimilate information from the media.

But we have been talking about incidental information of a routine news-coverage nature. Are the results any better when the information has been organized and directed? Herbert Brucker cites an example from the World War II period. Almost daily for three full months prior to the advent of price controls, four radio stations and three daily newspapers in a midwestern city drummed away with elementary "how-to-do-it" information setting forth the rudiments of how nationwide consumer price controls would operate. At the end of 90 days of concerted effort at public education via the major channels, a *Fortune* poll revealed that one in five adults still had never heard of price controls. Among housewives—those chief arbiters of the family budget and special targets of the publicity barrage—a larger proportion, one in four, knew nothing about it.

When an extended information campaign so motivated by implications of national survival meets with this kind of result, what can we expect of the fate of more ordinary kinds of intelligence, no less vital, but whose significance is less obvious?

Another supreme example of public apathy, or myopia, may be seen in the experiment of a West Coast paper—with news also fraught with survival overtones. It saved the type and reprinted verbatim the same Korean War story three days in succession. If any reader noticed, he didn't say so.

It is a strange irony that we are not able to understand and retain more of the rich volume and variety our media furnish. Our dilemma is that we fail to communicate in the midst of unparalleled communication potential, not unlike the dilemma of the depression, with its phenomenon of poverty in the midst of abundance. As Barry Bingham has stated it: "America is a paradise of public information. Yet the still, small voice of reason whispers a nagging question in our ear: Are we really well informed, or just well-stuffed with news?"

The reasons why we don't get through to the people are

diverse and complex. They are to be found at the heart of the communication process. Some theories blame the media; others blame the public. Still others find both media and public at fault. Some causes are as yet undiscovered: we suspect them, but can only speculate about them.

One theory (or perhaps it is no more than an educated guess) suggests that we are on the verge of becoming "news-drunk." Many of us, in the scramble to keep up, expose ourselves to more news than we can really hold. We become surfeited with excess verbalizations about mundane affairs. Like Wordsworth we find the world is too much with us. Indeed it is suspected that there may exist a saturation point in the human-news absorptive capacity beyond which we cease to seek, to participate, or actively to attend—beyond which we may even begin to build up resistance. At this point we engage in the practice of selective attention. We stop listening or focus attention elsewhere. Usually we seek more diverting fare. We turn slothfully to the comics and sports.

A Chicago editor one day in 1937—in a rare moment of skeptical insight—conceived an experiment which revealed the fickleness of reader habits. He scrapped his customary page one column of \$3-a-word Sino-Japanese War news. The sudden disappearance of the usual war news from the Orient evoked not a single peep of protest from his half-million readers. Next day, by way of diabolical emphasis our editor consigned "Little Orphan Annie" to the waste basket. He was deluged by more than 1,000 complaints in letters and phone calls.

Another theory, a logical outgrowth of the first, relates also to our communications participation behavior. This view holds that because so much of the news has a disturbing effect on us, a part of what seems to be public apathy may be a deliberate self-protective mechanism. We have come to associate our news participation with feelings of anxiety and insecurity. To shield ourselves we tend, perhaps subconsciously, to resist or avoid the news and the meaning behind it.

A third rationale has to do with the way information is presented in the media and its effect on audience habits. The average person's stock of information about foreign affairs, according to Erich Fromm in *Escape from Freedom*, consists of fragmented, newsreel-quality snippets of knowledge without context. The same indictment could be made, though to a lesser degree, of the average person's knowledge of domestic and local affairs.

This disjointed, segmented, kaleidoscopic impression may be due to two crucial weaknesses in traditional news presentation methods: The evanescent, isolated, one-dimensional quality of much of the news stream; and the way it is written and displayed (or broadcast in short flashes).

This kind of surface-of-the-news presentation, designed to save the busy audience time and effort, provides piece-meal exposure to mass-produced raw factual messages and has brought up a generation of dilettante scanners and page thumbers. Information served in this fashion has not only cultivated careless reading and listening habits but it has also failed largely to provide a framework to give it significance, at least for the mass audiences.

Furthermore, people with limited education (but not necessarily limited intelligence), as David Riesman has pointed out, seldom have a framework to locate such data as the media provide—especially that which does not appear directly relevant to their lives. Without such meaningful context, the facts don't come through; or if they do, they are soon forgotten. The Commission on Freedom of the Press 13 years ago declared that our society needs "a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning." By the term "society," the commission meant "every member" of the society—not just the better educated.

But what about the more educated person who can provide his own framework? A steady diet of sterile news (a notable exception must be made in the case of that provided by a few newspapers and broadcasters) has come near to alienating him entirely. Despairingly he turns from public affairs to other interests, after reluctantly concluding that keeping well informed isn't worth the effort of filtering out much of the "noise" from the channels of communication.

The media are faced with the unprecedented and overwhelmingly difficult task of relating isolated facts, of providing the framework of understanding, of making sense for the average reader out of the maddeningly complex, chaotic confusion of universal events. The processes of public education are extremely slow; it takes a long time to raise the information level of the masses.

The media might have more success in such an endeavor, if they stopped aiming at the great apathetic amorphous mass public at large, quit feeding it with the lowest-common-denominator-quality information, and started readjusting their sights gradually toward the more educated segments of the population. There are indications that if more of this were done, the average person would catch up faster. The mass media and their apologists should stop comforting themselves with the worn rationalization that the public

is well informed and realize how far short of this desirable goal they are falling. The challenge is great. To communicate understanding, as Bingham says, is an infinitely more difficult job than to communicate assorted facts, but a nobler one.

If this seems like an unrealistic adjustment to require of our media, how much greater is the adjustment that must be made by the people? The public is probably no more equal to the responsibilities of the jet age than are the media. At about the same time the communications revolution brought the world into our living room, we found ourselves thrown suddenly into a position of world leadership. Less than 50 years ago we were still thinking of ourselves as a nation apart from European entanglements.

The new position of world leadership, coming with rapid social and economic change at home, required a terrific adjustment in our conception of the responsibilities of democratic citizenship. It was too much for the citizen with a public conscience, who was expected to be cognizant of and concerned about affairs in far-away Korea or in remote points in Laos, a country his grandfather never heard of. He is called upon to have opinions about the struggle for power in the Congo when he comprehends few of the subtler ramifications of a tax issue before his local township board.

The times demand a greater degree of participation in the media and in public opinion processes than ever before. To be concerned we must learn to care about the course of affairs. It would seem that more people would interest themselves in what is going on out of selfish motives of survival and the desire to help make a better world. But it may be more comforting to one's faith in democracy and popular government "to believe that people care and are misinformed than to realize how little they care," Riesman concludes. On the other hand Dean Theodore Peterson puts it squarely up to the people: "... does the citizen in a democratic society have the right to be misinformed, ill-informed, or uninformed? While the press has begun to see its own responsibilities," he adds, "it has done precious little to make readers see theirs."

Whatever the extent of public apathy and indifference, the media are obliged to care. They cannot default in taking the initiative in the difficult task of making the average person *want* to be better informed.

The Press and Its Ineffective Critics

By Nathan B. Blumberg

If you are possessed with eyes that see and ears that hear, you must have noticed that the American press has been subjected to an unusual amount of astringent criticism in the past few months. Darts have been flying, needles have been dug into veins, cannons have been fired and occasionally a bit of shrapnel has struck at the heart of our newspapers. These have been interesting times. We always have had critics of the press—good and bad, qualified and unqualified, right and wrong—but rarely have we witnessed a steady barrage laid down in a frontal assault similar to that to which we recently have been subjected.

There has been Carl Lindstrom's book, *The Fading American Newspaper*, which lifted the rug to reveal a bit of dirt that had been swept under it; there was Harry Ashmore's bitter article on newspapers in the *Saturday Evening Post*; Gordon Gray subsequently spoke on the subject in much the same terms; the American Society of Newspaper Editors has been engaging in an extraordinary amount of navel-contemplating and hairshirt-wearing lately; the New York City outlet of the Columbia Broadcasting System has initiated a weekly television review of the press; and even Sigma Delta Chi has changed its official designation from "fraternity" to "society" and increased its annual dues to show that it means business.

All of this is quite a change. Eight years ago, when I looked around for someone to engage in a study of the press during the 1952 presidential campaign, you would have thought I was Jimmy Hoffa trying to sign up Bobby Kennedy. People ran like stags when I mentioned a critical, impartial study which would name newspapers and let the chips fall where they may. Now everybody wants to get into the act. All you need to be a critic nowadays is a newspaper subscription and an idea, and both requirements will be waived under certain circumstances.

This phenomenon is not necessarily bad. Some critics have something worthwhile to say and they say it well. But one cannot escape the conclusion that much of the criticism, lacking a proper forum, does not have very much effect either on our editors and publishers or on the consuming public. The most frightening thing in Carl Lindstrom's book actually is the title, and much of what Harry Ashmore had to say seemed to be after-effects suffered in the great battle of Little Rock, in which he acquitted himself magnificently under intense fire. As Vance Packard

said the other day, when the Madison Avenue agencies reads the ads for *The Waste Makers* they told their boys to read it, thinking it would give them some good tips. One of their organs even let a favorable review slip out before someone actually read the book and pressed the panic button. Nobody, especially the publishers of the daily newspapers in the United States, seems to be very worried about the newspaper critics, most of whom talk to themselves and to people who already pretty much agree with them. Newspaper critics, to put it briefly if uncharitably, have glutted the market.

Take, for instance, the April, 1961, issue of *Nieman Reports*, which remains the best periodical aimed at the practitioner and aspiring journalist despite the fact that it frequently looks as if it had been proofread by a myopic blacksmith's apprentice in the light of a forge.

What does one find?

John Harrison of the State University of Iowa calling on the nation's schools of journalism to make criticism and evaluation of the press a principal order of their business. Joseph Loftus of the New York *Times* indicting the nation's editors and reporters for their coverage of labor stories, especially the steel strikes. An editor urging the nation's small town newspapers to flex their muscles in serious journalistic effort and praising the Nieman Foundation for propagating the gospel of newspaper responsibility. A book editor issuing from his bed a blistering attack on blizzard coverage by a Boston newspaper. A Nieman Fellow asking "What's gone wrong with newspapers?" and then suggesting more extensive use of shorthand and tape recorders. Gene Cervi, of *Cervi's Journal*, calling attempts to evaluate press performance in the recent campaign "juvenile and superficial." These measurements, says Gene, "are for the gods. Are there gods among us?" Three paragraphs earlier he had answered his own question: If there are no gods, there is at least a God. "Tell me who or what owns a newspaper," vows Gene Cervi, "and I'll tell you with exactness, that surprises no informed person, what kind of newspaper it is and who it supported for president, governor, congress, the town council and dog catcher."

Gene or somebody forgot to tell Louis Lyons, however, because a few pages later in *Nieman Reports* there is Editor Lyons castigating the *Denver Post* as typical of "Republican resistance to doing anything about rising unemployment." This is all very well, except for the fact that the *Denver Post* supported the election of John F. Kennedy. Mr. Lyons goes on to give the *Denver Post* holy

Nathan Blumberg is dean of the School of Journalism at Montana State University. This is from an address to Kappa Tau Alpha at the University of Oregon, May 4.

ned because of its habit of running a daily front page story with a headline kicker—"Good News Today"—a habit it picked up during the Eisenhower administration without coming to the attention of Louis Lyons. Mr. Lyons also is sore at Mr. Hoyt's *Post* because a story he thought should be on page one was on page five. Ye gods!

In between Gene Cervi's popup and Louis Lyons's strike-out we were treated to some nifty pitching. There was Rebecca Gross and her opinion that there is too much "looking for sex angles" and not enough searching for "moral conflict"—the words, I assure you are hers. A reprint from the London *Observer*, which is still the best weekly newspaper in the world by a country mile, tells us that if things are bad in the U.S.A. they are worse in England where smaller and weaker newspapers are being gobbled up at a monstrous rate by the bigger and worse papers. John L. Hulteng of the University of Oregon, notes what has happened to the press during the last 25 years in this country, with special emphasis on the consolidation and merger, and makes some suggestions on what the newspapers can and should do in the years to come. Lester Markel, whom Louis Lyons calls the "editor of the Sunday New York Times" but who is really the Sunday editor of the New York Times, casts some sharp views on the newspaper's national and international role and concludes that "self-examination and self-analysis" are badly needed. A West Coast college professor who teaches a course on "Mass Media of Communication" in an English Department—that's what the man said—discusses the *re-enactment of reality* (the italics are his). He is against it. He calls it an "inexcusable fraud." He also has some other things to say about what is wrong with the press, concluding with two lines of a poem by Archibald MacLeish which, when taken out of context, means that every reporter in the world has a hopeless task and he ought to give it up as a bad job. And there are other items of a similar nature.

Thus does *Nieman Reports* provide a sounding board for observers and critics of the American press. Other publications also devote a part of their space and effort to critical analyses. The *Reporter* magazine, the *Saturday Review*, *Time*, the *American Editor*, the *ASNE Bulletin*, the *Nation*, *New Republic* and *National Review* all occasionally search for the jugular of our daily newspapers. One can only regret that it is impossible to include in this list *Editor & Publisher*, which has improved so tremendously in news content and makeup during the past few years, but which does not serve as a critical watchdog of the American press. It has assumed the role of a touchy, defensive protector of all American newspapers, regardless of the merits of individual cases, and its mother-hen cluckings sometimes verge on the ludicrous. This, it might be

humbly suggested, is not enough for the bible of the daily newspapers, just as it is not enough to say that a newspaper is a good one simply because it makes a lot of money. *Editor & Publisher* was not always thus. It is an instructive lesson to have journalism students go back through the files of the thirties and see how this magazine vigorously struck out at many things shoddy and meretricious in American journalism. No purpose is served, it seems to me, to suggest that the clothes of the king are without flaw, when any critical observer can see that the king frequently is naked.

It should be clear, therefore, that we suffer no lack of critics or no paucity of publications willing to take a critical posture toward the American press. The voices come from every side, and the babel is triumphantly loud and noisy, but the fact remains that nothing much ever really happens.

It should be noted, however, that there is one area—and quite honestly it is perhaps the only important area—in which the American press has notably improved its performance as the result of criticism and critical surveys. Make no mistake about it: the greatly improved impartiality of coverage of the 1960 Presidential campaign was due, in large part, to the fact that newspapers knew they were being closely watched. The cry of "one-party press" in 1952 paid a small dividend in the coverage of the 1956 campaign and a huge one in 1960. With the election turning out as close as it did, it is safe to assume that if John F. Kennedy had been treated by the press in 1960 as Adlai Stevenson was in 1952, he would have been defeated.

A distinguished new critic joined the ranks a few nights ago when American Newspaper Publishers Association were in convention assembled. They heard President Kennedy suggest that newspaper editors and publishers should temper their journalistic decisions with a greater measure of responsibility. In the context and the moment in which his words were uttered, it would seem unlikely that very many persons close to journalism would miss the significance of his remarks. And yet, judging from the comments on his speech, both by publishers and their editorial writers, it is clear that almost everyone has failed to grasp what Mr. Kennedy was really talking about. I intend to state here clearly and concisely exactly what the President undoubtedly had on his mind when he uttered those words.

He was talking primarily about the New York Times and its coverage of preparations of the invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro Cubans.

It was no secret in Washington and New York during those dark days following the failure of the abortive invasion that many persons, especially the anti-Castro Cubans in the United States, scathingly excoriated the *Times* for

its news reports on invasion preparations. It was said in no uncertain terms that Castro did not need any espionage agents in this country; all he required was a subscription to the New York *Times*. One cannot blame the President for refusing to be specific in this case, because he has little to gain from saying the words right out. One cannot blame some newspaper publishers or editorial writers for failing to come to terms directly with the issue. (The New York *Times*, incidentally, blandly agreed that the President might have a point, but did not for a moment choose to recognize that the President had the *Times* most specifically in mind.) One cannot even blame those persons who failed to realize what the President was talking about. One can blame, however, those editorial writers and commentators who knew full well what was going on in the mind of Mr. Kennedy and who refused to say the magic words—or the dirty words, as the case might be—that would bring into the full spotlight what is unquestionably the greatest newspaper in the United States. They were either unready or afraid to confront the pockmarked face of American journalism.

This is not necessarily to suggest that the *Times* was wrong. Nor that the *Nation* magazine or *Time* magazine or a few American newspapers which carried early accounts of the invasion preparations were wrong. It could be argued, and argued well, that the journalistic media did not adequately inform their readers of the extent of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in the ill-fated landing on the shores of Cuba. This is the kind of problem that is ever-present, indeed even inherent, in the press in a free society. The freedom to report—the obligation to report—sometimes can be damaging to a nation's policies and purposes; it was Bismarck who observed that every country inevitably must pay for the windows broken by its newspapers. Sometimes that is a small and necessary price to pay; it could, however, be too big a price if the stakes meant World War III. This is a grave problem, and Mr. Kennedy, it seems to me, was right to raise it. The difficulty—and this is pertinent to my central theme here—is that the debate inevitably will be conducted in a vacuum.

The American press necessarily must be an appraiser. It must be critical of many persons and ideas and aspects of our society. Historically, this is its responsibility and its obligation. In many ways it fulfills its traditional role ably and courageously. Yet it remains relatively immune itself to appraisal and to criticism. It is frequently tough and hard and unflinching when dishing it out, but remarkably tender and thin-skinned when someone strikes back. In the parlance of the ring, it has a good punch, but cuts easily.

Half of the problem seems inevitably to narrow down

to the fact that we have quite enough critics but we have no single place where they can assemble. The other half of the problem is that we are getting nowhere—or hardly anywhere—dealing in generalities about the press when we should be talking about specific newspapers and specific instances of responsibility and irresponsibility.

Where, then, are we going to find the answer to these two halves of the total problem?

We won't find it in the American Society of Newspaper Editors or the American Newspaper Publishers Association, both of which would no more consider appointing their own watchdog commissions than they would tolerate a suggestion that they abolish national advertising. We won't find it in existing publications, all of which remain just inside or just outside the periphery of effective evaluation of individual newspapers. We could not and should not consider finding it in the government, which would violate every tradition of our free press.

It has been suggested that the nation's schools of journalism take over the role of appraiser and critic. The answer to that one is simple: they do not have the time or the money to assume the job. This is a job which takes far more than the spare time of a professor or even a group of professors at various schools. Some professors and some schools have performed remarkably as a check on the excesses of some of the newspapers in their areas, but the fact remains that we require far more than these necessarily limited efforts to get the job done.

We come inevitably to the foundations. Everyone comes inevitably to the foundations. What we find there is not encouraging.

The foundations have never been willing to sponsor evaluations of press performance except in the most general terms. They seem to be scared to death of newspapers, especially if anybody starts getting specific about certain newspapers. This has always been a great mystery to some of us, but the record on this point is clear. The foundations will dole out millions for the questionable academic boondoggles of sociologists and behavioral scientists, but they have drawn the line at any worthwhile or—pardon one of their favorite expressions—"meaningful" studies of the press. I often have suspected that part of the reason is because the behavioral scientists rarely write in English, while almost everyone reads newspapers. The foundations thereby choose to play it safe with stuff no one will read rather than lend support to studies which might arouse considerable editorial opposition and—inevitably—trouble.

Take, for instance, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the remnant of the Fund for the Republic. Its publications are cogently assembled, oftentimes brilliantly written and typographically magnificent. They find their way to libraries, to colleges and universities, to the

desks of editors and publishers—in short, to everyone except the public. The unblinkable fact is that the Center, for all its good intentions and its good works, is throwing its money down a massive rathole. The clear lesson of history is that without information at the level of the general public, few campaigns succeed. What the Center should do is forget the splendid publishing venture in which it is engaged and get down to basics. If it wants to complain about the press in our society, let it name names and publish publishers. That's the only way we are going to get off the merry-go-round on which we are riding and begin appraising the appraisers and criticizing the critics.

The answer to the halves of our problem lies, ultimately, in the creation of a board of vigorous, competent critics who will examine and investigate the press on a national scale, independently, without fear or favor. These men cannot be beholden to state legislatures, to the federal government or to the newspapers themselves. They must be free to report what they find. They must report regularly, preferably weekly or twice a month. They must defend the press against uninformed or misinformed attacks as well as point out the shortcomings of individual newspapers. They must work together in a central office, but deal with the press on a national scale.

This National Board of the American Press—if it requires a title this might serve as a starting point—would be ready to receive information from journalists and educators and the general public throughout the United States. It would allow space in its reports for replies or for dissenting opinions. But most important, it would provide the central point for a continuing study of the American press, and the critics would know where their headquarters are located.

As a publishing venture capable of standing on its own

feet it has enormous virtues. The number of citizens who would be willing to subscribe to a publication of this kind probably is larger than most of us suspect. In the meantime, to get it started, perhaps one of the foundations might now be ready to get behind a fundamental and basic project with the singular merit of being highly practical. It would provide an unprecedented attempt to improve the quality and conscience of the American daily newspaper. Most of the accredited schools and departments of journalism, I believe, would be willing to cooperate with a National Board of the American Press.

If we had had a board of this kind during the past few days we would have had a focal point for the study of the role of a free press confronted by the problem of national security in the Cuban fiasco. Instead of operating in the fog in which we now find ourselves, we could have cut through the conflicting reports and come up with a valid assessment of the newspapers and our intelligence system. We would be much closer to knowing whether we need more self-censorship on the part of newspapers, as the President suggested, or whether we should improve our intelligence system to prevent another failure.

The good newspapers have little to fear. Our poor newspapers, the sensational and the shoddy, have much to fear. They are the ones which will scream most loudly against an undertaking of this kind, rising in righteous indignation and editorial vehemence to denounce these people who come to tell them how to run their business. But under this proposal no one would be trying to tell anyone else how to run his business; the board would simply report on how business is going. The facts have been locked in a safe for too many years. This is perhaps the best way to listen to the fall of the tumblers of the journalistic combination lock.

William M. Tugman: Newspaperman

By Charles T. Duncan

[William M. Tugman, publisher of the *Port Umpqua Courier* of Reedsport, Oregon, died May 9, aged 67. Graduate of Harvard in 1914, he began newspaper work on the old Springfield *Republic*, later reported for the Providence *Journal* and Cleveland *Plain Dealer*. In 1927 he became managing editor of the Eugene *Register-Guard* and for his 28 years in the university city his paper was both a model and an internship for Oregon journalism graduates.]

One of the all-time greats of Oregon journalism—and, mark you, Oregon has been uncommonly endowed with distinguished journalists down through the years—died on

May 9, 1961. Bill Tugman's death, like the falling of a tall tree, "left a lonesome place against the sky."

What a newspaperman this was! Cub reporter, big-time star reporter, small-city managing editor and editor par excellence, finally publisher of his own country weekly—Bill Tugman had done it all. He did it with a zest, a drive, a passion for accuracy, a flair for color—genuine color, not the phony kind—a vigor of style that was exhilarating, and a "news sense" that was almost uncanny.

These traits never left him; they scarcely even diminished as he grew older. They certainly didn't go

stale or dormant when, in 1954, he left Eugene, where for nearly 30 years his name had been synonymous with the *Register-Guard*, and took over the man-killing job of nursing a run-down little weekly back to health. He put as much of himself into the *Port Umpqua Courier* of Reedsport, with its few hundred subscribers, as he had put of himself into the *Register-Guard* with its 35,000, which is to say everything he had in him.

Many eulogizing editorials have been written in tribute to William M. Tugman—eloquent, moving testimonials from editors who knew that their councils would always be the richer because he had sat in them. The biographical details of his life have been prominently recorded. I can add little to the eulogies, even less to the actual chronicle.

It is fitting that we devote a few moments on this occasion to thoughts of Mr. Tugman, for he was a staunch friend of the School of Journalism, a frequent lecturer and adviser, a blunt critic when criticism was due but always an ally and a bulwark of strength.

Journalism students who remember his frequent classroom appearances will never forget Bill Tugman's low, rumbling drawl, his piercing eyes, his outthrust jaw, his habit of sitting on the table, drawing up his lean legs, clasping them around the ankles and rocking slowly back and forth as he talked.

The most important single fact about this man of many talents was his deep, dedicated, unflagging faith in the newspaper. Not his paper nor anybody else's paper, but *the newspaper*.

Bill Tugman had as sure a sense of the newspaper's place in this society of ours as any man I've ever known. It grew out of many years of observation, reflection and intimate familiarity with all aspects of the fascinating job of getting out a paper, including the business side of it. But this sense of his, this feel for the press as an institution, was also and to a large extent purely intuitive.

He was not romantic or sentimental about the newspaper. He knew, all too well, what most critics of the press forget—that the newspaper is the product of human beings, of men owning all the faults of men, including ignorance, stupidity (they are not the same), carelessness, fatigue, pig-headedness, vanity, sloth and bad manners. But he knew too that with all its shortcomings, the newspaper is the beating heart of a city. He

understood its relationship to government—local, state and national. No editor was ever more perceptive in appreciating the role of the newspaper in a political campaign, or more conscientious about trying to make it live up to its responsibilities in that connection. If any reader of the *Register-Guard* ever went to the polls uninformed about the men and measures on the ballot, it wasn't Bill Tugman's fault.

He had few illusions, this man. He had lifted up all the rocks, turned over all the old boards, looked into all the back rooms and alleys—not because he wanted to find the grubs and beetles, the dirt and disorder of life, but because he knew they existed and had to be dealt with. But for all his realism, his scorn for sham and pretty words, his withering ability to deflate a stuffed shirt or denounce a rascal, Bill Tugman was not a cynical man. A cynical man doesn't love children, growing things and woolly old dogs.

Mr. Tugman had his faults and shortcomings, his blind spots and his mean streaks along with the rest of us. Sometimes he talked when he should have been listening. Sometimes he wrote when he should have been reading. Sometimes he forgot that there are two sides to most arguments. But there was no self-righteousness in him, no arrogance.

He had, in generous measure, three qualities that are found in all good editors: a high order of intelligence, the kind of courage that doesn't shift with changes in heat and pressure, and talent for the work.

These three alone are not enough. Bill Tugman had one more quality, and in my opinion this is the one that marks the difference between the good editor and the great editor. He *believed* in his work. It was more than a job to him, more even than a job he liked. It was his life; it was what he was here for.

It's been said a hundred times since his death, if it's been said once, "There just aren't many of Bill Tugman's kind of newspaperman left any more." To this I say, "That's right, and there never were very many of his kind, ever."

Charles Duncan is dean of Oregon's School of Journalism. This tribute to William M. Tugman was given a week after his death, at the annual journalism awards dinner at the University.

A Nieman Fellow at Harvard

Chanchal Sarkar

Lucius W. Nieman was a solid, unstanding citizen of pioneer stock who worked his way up from small newspapers until he came to own and direct for 50 years the fine Milwaukee *Journal*. Upon his death in 1935 his wife Agnes donated \$1,500,000 to Harvard University in memory of her husband, with the instruction that the money should be used "to promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the United States."

In 1937 the Nieman Fellowships were established for ten or 12 promising young people in the newspaper field who are carefully chosen each year. The Fellows are free to select the courses which will be most useful in their work. They are to put in and get as much out of the university as they can. When the Fellowships were established one wise stipulation was made: no degrees would be awarded to Nieman Fellows. Most credit for the idea of the Nieman program probably should go to Dr. James Bryant Conant, even though he has modestly denied the sole fathering.

Today the Nieman Fellowship may not seem to be a revolutionary idea. Indeed it has been imitated and developed until universities now open their doors readily for mature people from almost all fields of study. However, at first there were doubts about the program among professors and among many leaders of the press. Now it is clear that they need not have doubted the new program. The prestige of the Nieman Foundation and Fellowship is a byword in the American newspaper world and its list of alumni contains names that are among the most distinguished in American journalism.

For its first curator, the Nieman Foundation was fortunate in getting a most creative person, Archibald MacLeish. Mr. MacLeish realized what the idea might mean as an emancipating force for journalists as well as for the university. He set

about establishing the foundations for that informal camaraderie which has linked the Nieman Fellows to the faculty and also to the world of publishers, editors and correspondents. What is important is that the relationship has been two-way. One of the first professors I met, when I arrived at Harvard in the fall of 1960, said that it had been stimulating for the university to have mature journalists on its campus. At first I thought he merely was being polite but later found the same attitude expressed in the special welcome and consideration which the Harvard faculty shows all Nieman Fellows and the readiness with which faculty members participate in Nieman occasions.

It is one thing to blow the bubble of an idea into the air; ideas, as Dr. Conant has said, can be a dime a dozen. Their shaping and execution is what matters. And here, one must speak of Louis Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Foundation for over 20 years. What would have happened, I wonder, if the Nieman Foundation had had as its curator for the last 20 years a man bursting at the seams with dynamism, eager to lead and direct, thrusting and organizing the annual groups to have specified common focuses of work and leisure and publicizing the work of the Foundation in the university and to the world outside? I shudder to think of the consequences. The Nieman year is essentially an experience shared by a Fellow and Harvard, an experience to be felt at the individual level—the working out of ideas and expectations of a relatively mature person. Louis Lyons' unobtrusive hand on the reins and his counsel, given only when asked, have meant a great deal to the Foundation and to the individual Nieman Fellow, and for the university, President Nathan M. Pusey has said, "Harvard is immensely proud of this curator."

The original idea for the Nieman Fellowships has, as I have said, since been developed in other fields until there are now several similar schemes at Harvard itself, like the John Hay Fellowships for secondary school teachers and the Fellowships at the Center for International Af-

fairs. But equally interesting has been the fellowship support from other foundations for journalists from the United States and from other parts of the world to be administered by the Nieman Foundation. Those chosen for such fellowships have been full members of the Nieman group.

Between 1951 and 1959, the Carnegie Corporation supported fellowships for persons from Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The Commonwealth Fund has sent its grantees who are journalists to the Nieman Foundation. The Louis Stark Fellowship in labor reporting, begun in 1960, is to be administered by the Nieman Foundation and so is a new fellowship for science writers awarded by the ADL Foundation. In 1960-61 two organizations supported a couple of journalists from South Africa, and I personally am grateful to the Asia Foundation for having sent to Harvard, every year since 1955, two or three journalists from the continent of Asia.

For eight years I have been a journalist on the same newspaper, first as a parliamentary correspondent and then as an editorial writer and occasional special correspondent at home and abroad. The work almost always has been interesting, but even under the most favorable circumstances a sense of staleness grows and, with it, a desire for the emancipating winds that blow in a great, contemplative university. One urgently feels the need to take stock, to rethink one's premises and deepen one's sense of background. Silent libraries, good conversation and all the ancillary events of a university beckon—the odd seminar, a concert maybe, a living lecturer, a quiet lunch. When I heard of the Nieman Fellowship it seemed a wonderful opportunity for refreshing myself, if I could get it. That is how I came to Harvard. Perhaps the path wasn't quite as simple as that but the pitfalls now are irrelevant.

The first important influence which a Fellow encounters is the Nieman group. We don't move around roped together—far from it—but there is an unobtrusive inner stream of association which is one of the precious parts of the year. Not only is there a weekly seminar over crackers and beer and approximately two dinners a month at the Signet Society (where at seminars and dinners publishers, editors,

Chanchal Sarkar has been at Harvard University as an Associate Nieman Fellow this year. He is an assistant editor of *The Statesman*, published in New Delhi and Calcutta, India.

correspondents, faculty members and politicians come to speak), but we visit each other's homes often and romp with the children, and our wives get to know each other.

In my year there was a poignant tragedy when one of the Fellows—among the very nicest—died within the first few months. Even his illness, sad though it was, brought the group together in looking after him and his wife and daughter.

Our associations in the group, not only at dinners and seminars and in occasional trips to the offices of newspapers like the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune* and the *Boston Globe*, but even more in talks among ourselves over coffee, have brought an awareness of a vigorous journalistic tradition in major papers as well as in state and local newspapers. Such awareness has meant an understanding of virtues and also of several drawbacks. The traditions which are part of my own environment might help others to understand the craft and objectives of journalism in other lands.

After the group the next step is the university with which individual Fellows come to terms in their own ways. I have been an undergraduate before in two great universities, Calcutta and Cambridge (England), and I never did get very much out of courses, preferring to follow my bent of interests and work in libraries on my own, except for attending an occasional lecture. As in the case of the other Fellows my years of work have in some sense sharpened my interests, limited them if you like, and I knew roughly what I wanted to pursue. Of course I have had ample time to follow various interests, including the pursuits of my colleagues. A university has always meant more to me than classrooms and lectures, more even than its libraries—and Harvard has splendid libraries.

It is fortunate that my first real contact with the United States has not only been a fairly extended one but also has been in a place like Cambridge. In many ways the United States is a spotty country, and occasionally someone like myself from a much older environment can feel exasperated at bluster and ignorance. Seen from this aspect, Harvard is perhaps not typical of America but it has been as

pleasant an introduction to the United States as can be, living among people with whom I have differences, of course, but with whom, in many ways, I share approaches and thoughts. I am particularly happy to be able to share my Harvard experience with my wife. She teaches law in a university at home and has used this year to do some academic work at the Harvard Law School. Through my wife's work we have made many friends at the Law School. After a certain age all experiences seem to lose much of their intensity unless they are shared, and the year at Harvard would have been infinitely less valuable had I been alone.

After several years of almost continuous work, with interludes abroad which were in the main professional, the Nieman year has been a wonderful sabbatical. I always have believed in the basic philosophy of the Nieman Fellowship—that universities and journalism have much to give each other and that the connection between them should be close, yet without the inhibiting influence of degrees and credits. It isn't entirely easy to assess such a year except to say that it has been splendidly worthwhile in friendships and in the widening of experience and understanding—all of which are certain to influence my perspective and judgment when I return to my work at home.

—*May News Bulletin* of the International Institute of Education.

A Slight Change

Dear Reader,

After nearly six months we have been reliably informed from Rabat that a new authorisation to publish is to be issued as soon as this authorisation is received.

The new newspaper will be entitled **MOROCCO MAIL**. It will be addressed to all English speaking residents in Morocco, to English speaking tourists in this country, and to those outside Morocco who desire to keep informed of what is going on here in this gateway to the African continent.

Former subscribers to the *Tangier Gazette* will receive the **MOROCCO MAIL** in its place. It will not be the same paper in all respects. In deference to the wishes of the Moroccan authorities

there will be no editorial comment, and the emphasis in the presentation of news will be on the development of Morocco as a haven for travelers.

It is our hope that the first **MOROCCO MAIL** will reach subscribers about March 1. We shall be very glad to have comments from readers, and will welcome suggestions.

THE EDITOR.

(Letter to readers of the *Tangier Gazette*, Morocco, Feb. 17.)

Letters

From Max Hall

To the Editor:

In your April issue I am mentioned as having been chief editor of "Reading, Writing, and Newspapers," the special issue of *Nieman Reports* written by the Fellows of 1950. Since I was only one of many participants, and can't claim to have taken the lead, I feel obligated to correct the record. As for the copy-editing, William German was in charge of that. As for initiating and organizing the project, Theodore Morrison of the English Department was responsible. He also criticized the essays and wrote the introduction.

MAX HALL

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Informed Readers

To the Editor:

In Mr. Markel's thought-provoking article on *The Newspaper*, I find his figures as to the enlightenment, actual or potential, of American citizens to be of particular interest, and pertinent to the recent statement of our Secretary of State that "the American people" (by implication the vast majority) were behind the Government in its policy on Cuba.

Taking Mr. Markel's estimate that "only 20 per cent are really informed," I would ask by what standard informedness has been judged. As an example I would cite the slogan of the *New York Times*: "All the News That's Fit to Print." "Fit?" one is prompted to ask. "By what standard, or in whose judgment?" We are all grateful to the *New York Times* for the columns, and even pages, allotted to the

major United Nations addresses and appreciate the necessity of their occasional curtailment. Yet that curtailment rests on human judgment; and that judgment, at times, may not be assumed to meet the approval of all readers or of other editors. For example, those portions of a recent speech by Dr. Roa deleted by the *Times* were subsequently supplied, at least in part—by *Stone's Weekly*. Stone and, doubtless, many of his readers found them to be of particular importance.

Mr. Markel includes in his 20 per cent of informed readers those who read the smaller weeklies on current political events. But the weeklies, like our daily press, are to be divided between, 1) those that echo, with appropriate editorials and special articles, the information as furnished by our daily papers and, 2) those weeklies whose news is drawn from other sources and evaluated by other minds. Unlike the daily press, however, many of the smaller weeklies publish facts about current affairs that, to put it gently, have been neglected by the daily press. An example of this is that *The Nation* in November, published a full report on the air base established by the United States in Guatemala to serve the Cuban rebels in their anticipated invasion of their homeland. Not until January 10th did the New York *Times* publish this news. The leftist weeklies do in fact publish much of news and comment that is of great importance and yet not to be found in our newspapers.

One would hardly be challenged who stated that to be truly informed one must know both sides of every question; and since the left side is scarcely reflected except in the pages of our leftist weeklies it would seem to me fair to limit the percentage of informed American readers to those who read both sides. A recently published estimate of the total circulation of the left of center publications is but 75,000. Let us, to be fair, assume that these papers are devoured by the families and friends of the subscribers. Let's give them ten apiece and grant the total number of their readers to be 750,000. To estimate the percentage of *these* readers would indeed require, as Mr. Markel suggests, a Gallup Poll or IBM machine.

If one bears in mind the extremely

NIEMAN NOTES

1939

Frank S. Hopkins, consul general at Melbourne, watched his consulate picketed by Communist groups after the Cuban landings. But he finds the Kennedy administration popular in Australia where he quickly got acquainted with two former Associate Fellows, E. W. Tipping, columnist of the Melbourne *Herald*, and Denis A. Warner whose work appears in Australian newspapers and American magazines.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, gave the commencement address at Marlboro College, Vermont, which awarded him an LL.D. degree.

1940

William B. Dickinson, managing editor of the Philadelphia *Bulletin*, served on the committee that selected the Nieman Fellows for 1961-2.

Carroll Kilpatrick of the Washington *Post* went with Vice President Lyndon Johnson on his tour of South Asian countries.

1941

Harry Montgomery was elected secretary of the Associated Press at its annual meeting April 25. He is assistant general manager.

1943

In May John F. Day Jr. became executive vice president of the Pacific Foundation and general manager of their broadcasting station, WBAI.

Frank K. Kelly, vice president of the Fund for the Republic, turned from fic-

small percentage of American citizens who, as readers of both sides, are *truly* informed, it is still to be questioned how many of this honorable category are to be numbered with the hordes our Secretary boasts about. My guess—and I am frankly partisan: damn few. "The American people?" Yes: counting hands, not hearts and heads, he may as of today be right.

ROCKWELL KENT

Ausable Forks, N.Y.

tion to history for his latest book, *The Fight for the White House*, the story of the three-cornered 1912 Presidential campaign. The Overseas Press Club made the book the topic of a discussion April 18 in which the author was joined by a panel that included two other former Nieman Fellows, John F. Day and Stephen E. Fitzgerald.

1946

Leon Svirsky's son, Peter, was married to Donna Vidal, May 13 at Woodbridge, Connecticut.

1947

Editor Ernest H. Linford of the Salt Lake *Tribune* reports his first grandchild, born April 13 to his daughter, Mrs. Arthur T. Wood.

1949

Peter Lisagor, Washington bureau chief of the Chicago *Daily News*, accompanied the President to Paris and Vienna.

Grady Clay, real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, was chairman of one of five panels in a two-day conference on urban development at Harvard April 14-15.

1950

John L. Hulteng was honored at the commencement exercises of the University of Oregon with the \$1,000 Ersted Award for distinguished teaching. The award was made from choices of students, faculty and alumni. Hulteng is associate professor of journalism. He joined the Oregon faculty in 1955, before that was chief editorial writer on the Providence *Journal*.

Clark Mollenhoff returned in May from his year abroad on his Eisenhower Fellowship. He and his wife, Georgia, visited 19 African countries besides most of Europe, in a study of labor conditions and policies. He is back on the job in the Washington Bureau of the Cowles publications.

Murrey Marder of the Washington *Post* covered a series of assignments in Europe this Spring, the NATO Conference in Oslo, the Geneva Conference of Laos and

the President's visits to deGaulle and Khrushchev.

John McCormally, associate editor of the *Hutchinson News*, Kansas, attended an American Press Institute Seminar at Columbia in May.

1951

Bill Lederer's book *A Nation of Sheep*, sequel to *The Ugly American*, became a best seller as soon as it was put out and Bill has been interviewed and reviewed in all the best book sections.

1952

John M. Harrison has been appointed assistant professor of journalism at Pennsylvania State University. He has been in the journalism school of Iowa State the last few years and earlier served as associate editor on the *Toledo Blade*. His Iowa students gave him a testimonial dinner after his last classes in June.

1953

Melvin Mencher, with his family, is spending the summer at the University of Costa Rica on a faculty exchange program with the University of Kansas. Prof. Mencher is faculty advisor of the *Daily Kansan*, whose staff won first place in the William Randolph Hearst National Journalism Contest this Spring.

Robert Nielson is leaving the editorial page of the *Toronto Star* this Summer to represent the paper in London for a two-year hitch.

1954

Richard Dudman spent three months in a tour of Latin American countries for the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* this Spring, later reported on the Cuban affair and went to Santa Domingo after the assassination of Trujillo.

1956

Edgar F. Seney returned to daily newspapering in June as editor of the *Pompano Beach Town News* in Florida. He had been running two Florida weeklies, the *South Miami Reporter* and the *Perrine Press*. Norman B. Mack is to be managing

editor of these weeklies. Seney's papers have won "best editorial" awards five times in the past seven years in the Florida Press Association contests. A play, his second, was produced on television in Miami's Studio M for three weeks in May.

1957

Gov. Brown of California has appointed **Hale Champion** California director of finance, reportedly the highest salaried post, at \$30,000, under the governorship. Champion left the *San Francisco Chronicle* in 1959 to become press secretary to the governor, later became executive secretary. Gov. Brown says he has been his chief liaison with the finance department in preparing three State budgets and budget messages.

The *Philadelphia Bulletin* started a new Sunday magazine this Spring and **Fred Pillsbury** moved over from the news side to be one of its first staff writers.

1958

Dean Brelis is the new managing editor of *Daedalus*, the quarterly journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Most issues of *Daedalus* later appear as books. Recent issues have covered such subjects as Arms Control, The Visual Arts, Science and the Modern Mind, Evidence and Inference, The Future Metropolis, The American Style. Dean also has another novel under way.

Simmons Fentress has been appointed to the Atlanta bureau of *Time*, Inc., a move from the *Charlotte Observer* where he has been chief editorial writer.

1959

Freida and **Phil Johnson** announce a son, John William, born May 17 in New Orleans, where Phil is promotion director of television station WWL.

Esquire Magazine has appointed **Harold Hayes** managing editor. He had been features editor, one of the small editorial group under Arnold Gingrich responsible for the transformation of *Esquire* in the last few years.

1960

Dom Bonafede of the *Miami Herald* received a citation for his reporting on Cuba at the Overseas Press Club's annual Awards Dinner, April 14.

On June 1 **Jack Samson** became news director of KOB, largest broadcasting station in New Mexico. He left the Associated Press in New York last year to go to New Mexico for the health of one of his sons. "I am glad to be back in the news business," he writes.

Charles S. Jennings 1915-1961

Charles S. Jennings died June 19th from injuries received in a fall while working on the roof of his home in Chevy Chase a few days earlier. He leaves his wife, Pauline, and three children. He had been for several years on the staff of *U. S. News and World Report*, a first class newspaperman who was highly regarded by his associates in the Washington press corps.

He started newspaper work while still in high school in Sioux Falls, South Dakota in 1933, in the worst of the farm crisis. A few years later he joined a federation of farm and labor groups and ran a paper in support of the farm-labor movement there till it broke up at the end of the '30's. He then worked on the *Evanston News-Index* until 1942 when he went to the *Chicago Daily News* as a copy desk editor. He came to Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship in 1944, then went to the Middle East for the Office of War Information. This led into Army Intelligence and he stayed abroad, chiefly in London, in intelligence work for nearly ten years. His home was 4706 Hunt Avenue, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Newspaper Makeup and Typography Contests

By Harold W. Wilson

Each year hundreds of newspaper publishers select well printed and folded copies of their publications and mail them hopefully to the various makeup and typography contests held throughout the United States. Of course only a few can win so the also-rans carefully peruse the winners, order similar typefaces, revamp their makeup and anticipate the next contest and, perhaps, a winning spot.

An award may or may not come after a year of expenditure and revision. After all the judges will change and a new trend may be taken.

As a result the sponsors of these contests get a lot of inexpensive publicity and recognition and the type matrix salesmen and suppliers profit from the sales of new type and equipment. But the publisher knows no more than he did before, only that he should copy what turns out to be the superficialities of makeup on the winning newspaper.

A decade of study of makeup and typography contests, participation in judging, critiquing makeup and suggesting typefaces point up these weaknesses in our system:

1. Judges are too often big names and know little or nothing about typography and makeup. But they have important titles and that is what counts.

2. Judging is often superficial. Hundreds of newspapers must be looked at in a few hours. This means that an excellent makeup may be overlooked. There can be no thorough-going inspection of pages point by point, but a quick judgment of hastily turned pages, if they are turned at all.

3. In an attempt to get the "big names," judges close to retirement age are often used. This means that the judging is dominated by individuals not likely to enjoy or understand the modern techniques of makeup and pictorial journalism. Certainly they should not dominate the committee.

4. There is definitely not enough recognition given to the new and experimental in typography and makeup. These newspapers may not have reached a place where award is justified, but there should be some kind of encouragement for efforts to change and improve makeup techniques.

5. There is danger that we bow to the "ten best" newspapers where selection is totally outside typography and

makeup. This is likely to be the consideration of the "big name" without experience in makeup and typography. He thinks, "We cannot go wrong if we give the prize to the *Daily Bugle* because everyone has such high regard for it editorially."

6. Simple announcement of awards on a take it or leave it basis without explanation hurts our makeup contests. Perhaps we should follow the pattern of awards presentation at the State fairs where the judge points out the strengths and weaknesses of the exhibit where all may see or hear. Thus the contest becomes an educational venture.

Some considerations for improvement of contests:

Judges should be selected from three categories. One should be strong in makeup and typography; one should be an artist or a photojournalist; the other should be a strong editor. This kind of balance of interest should bring more perceptive choices as contest winners. This will clearly challenge every newspaper large or small and avoid awards for superficial face lifting. Editors as judges can give much strength to the contests but they should not be in a position to dominate.

There should always be a place for the experimental approach to encourage new techniques for news presentation. Let's not give awards for tradition-ridden typography and makeup to the exclusion of the fresh, imaginative makeup which is entered for competition.

We might well consider turning over the makeup and typography contests to a highly qualified organization like the American Institute of Graphic Arts which has conducted contests in book design, magazine and advertising layout and makeup. Guided by its well trained and perceptive designers, it could well lead newspaper format into paths that will better match technological developments ahead and create a dynamic news presentation which can compete with the electronic media of news reporting and presentation.

Harold Wilson is associate professor of journalism at the University of Minnesota where for a dozen years he has given special attention to typefaces and makeup. He served on the Ayer Awards Committee last year and "had a wonderful time."