

NiemanReports

September 1964

The Courts and the Press

Felix R. McKnight

Calvin Coolidge and the Press

Louis M. Lyons

Our Cities and the Press

Grady Clay

Life Line of Democracy, by Clark R. Mollenhoff; The Vital Function of a Free Press, by Alan Barth; Press-Created Prejudice in Criminal Trials — A Mirage? by Claude R. Sowle; George Ade Reports The World's Fair (1893 at Chicago), by J. H. McKee; Nieman Notes.

NiemanReports

VOL. XVIII, NO. 3

SEPTEMBER 1964

Published quarterly from 77 Dunster St., 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, Washington, D.C.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; John O. Emmerich, Jr., Baltimore; Saul Friedman, Houston; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, University Park, Pa.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; William G. Lambert, Los Angeles; Francis P. Locke, Riverside, Calif.; Joseph Loftus, Washington, D. C.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; James H. McCartney, Washington, D.C.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; Charlotte F. Robling, Evanston, Ill.; Kenneth Stewart, Berkeley, Calif.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Wagner, New York City; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Dwight E. Sargent, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

Life Line of Democracy

By Clark R. Mollenhoff

The future of the American democracy is contingent upon the performance of the American press. If the newsmen of today and tomorrow are diligent workers and balanced thinkers on problems of governing our society, then I have no doubt that the American democracy will survive and flourish as a symbol to the whole world.

If the press fails in its responsibility—if it flounders in a quagmire of superficiality, partisanship, laziness and incompetence—then our great experiment in democracy will fail. In 150, 100, 50 years—or even sooner—it will be replaced by a more efficient authoritarian form of government, and will be remembered as an interesting but impractical system.

Communication is the life line of democracy. It is a noble goal to seek to be an effective part of that communications system. It is little short of treason to knowingly contaminate that life line with political partisanship, propaganda or clever but superficial commentary.

It would be pleasant and reassuring if we could simply assume that our form of government has some divine blessing that will guarantee its survival and steady improvement. However, this is not the case. Travel in more than

40 countries has demonstrated to me how precious our democracy is. In the midst of revolution and threatened revolution in Africa and the Middle East, I observed the relatively short step from our freedom to the oppression of authoritarian rule.

Democracy is contingent upon an informed public with the means to learn what the government is doing, the right to criticize what the government is doing, and the mechanism for effectively expressing opposition by voting to oust our highest officials from office.

It would be impossible to overemphasize the importance of the newsmen's role in a democracy, for the public depends upon newsmen for both the facts upon which opinions are based and the balanced reporting of the criticism of government programs, policies and personnel.

I stress these points at this time because the press of the nation is failing in its responsibilities, and because there are disturbing signs that the press does not recognize its failures. There are many spectacular examples to demonstrate the press does not understand many stories of major importance. There is a growing accumulation of evidence indicating the press even fails to understand itself and its own self interest.

It is unfortunate, but there are only a handful of reporters and editors who comprehend the fine work the Government Operations Subcommittee (headed by Congressman John Moss) has been doing for the press. There are only a few with enough historic perspective and balance to really appreciate the significance of the freedom of information work done by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press Managing Editors or Sigma Delta Chi.

There is press resentment when Senator Wayne Morse presents a justified indictment of the journalists who are "the parrots of the 'line' from the executive branch" and who are "largely ignorant of the American system of government and the role of Congress in that system." There will be too little attention to the warnings by James McCartney in *Nieman Reports* of the distortions and propaganda that flow from "The Vested Interests of the (beat) Reporter."

The press is proud—usually too proud to accept criticism. There is an understandable pride in newspaper improvement in recent years—much needed mechanical developments and better educated personnel. But, it is folly to be so dazzled by such improvements that there is a blindness to failures of substance. Mechanical improvements are important, but only if enlightened people use them to make government problems more understandable and our democracy more effective. That is our real reason for being.

All expense is futile if it fails to develop a press that is independent and aggressive in serving as a watchdog over government.

(Continued on page 22)

The Courts and the Press

By Felix R. McKnight

Vice-President and Editor, Dallas *Times Herald*

In the sensitive moments since November 22, 1963, the press of the United States has indulged in reflective self-appraisal.

It has been a thoughtful, cleansing process. Not self flagellation, but an incisive and honest look at deficiencies. We seek new body, new purpose, new respect for the most vital voice in the world today—the free press.

I do not come today as an American editor to trade barbs with the bar. I do not even seek debate. I come in honest search of a means to preserve and strengthen constitutionally guaranteed processes designed, not for the bar and the press, but the people.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. Herbert Brucker of Hartford, put focus to the picture when he said:

"On one side stands that foundation stone of democracy, the public's full and free knowledge of what is being done in its name. On the other stands the demand of civilization that anyone accused of crime be treated with scrupulous fairness, especially if the crime has aroused emotions of the community."

No legislated law, no canons, no codes of principles or standards can quell the desire of free peoples for knowledge imperative to the retention of their freedoms.

So, we arrive at the simple point of behaviour on the part of the individuals and institutions involved.

Granted, as Mr. Brucker states, we must find ways of making certain that in no way will those who watch events in the name of the public interfere with justice or the public order.

But neither should we, as servants of the people, yield to a suppressing hand that would, in the name of justice, impair the function of an informative press given its first breath by those who fled the shrouds of secrecy and the stifling decree.

I suggest that we are confronted with the problem of human frailties—not the degeneration of the free press or the occasional failures of the bar and bench. Old fashioned as it might sound, we are dealing with the integrity, the principles and the judgment of individuals. Both our houses could stand microscopic self-examination.

Today, I suppose, I stand as "Exhibit A" . . . an editor from Dallas, Texas.

The President of the United States was assassinated in my city.

The violent, senseless end of John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought a sedative of sorrow that burdened most heavily

the shoulders of Dallas. Our city became the reluctant capital of sorrow. It became a symbol of evil because a single man committed in derangement an act of total horror. It became, merely by the click of a reporter's typewriter key or the spoken word of a broadcast commentator, a "city of hatred."

Now, in the early aftermath, it is labelled the city of "pride and prejudice."

Today, these ten months later, Dallas gropes, along with the rest of the world, for some answers.

Most urgently, as I told my colleagues of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April, the people want the answers to questions concerning the communications field and the bar of justice.

As a newspaperman, I stand in the midst of partial disillusionment seeking not answers, but reaffirmation of an old principle that reporters are observers—not participants.

I have lived these past months in the area of total participation—by the press, by the attorney, even by the court. First, the dissection of my own.

Men of science have created new tools of communication—from the magnetic tapes and computers of the newspaper to the bouncing beams of a satellite hung in the sky. But what of man himself? The editor, the reporter, the commentator?

No happening should give greater test to editorial skill than the violent death of a President. It transcends in emotion, in meaning, in significance, anything that could have happened to editor or commentator.

Yet, when the greatest degree of fidelity to purpose was demanded, some of the American press faltered. In waves of hundreds they came to our city—men, microphones and cameras. Three hundred of them to cover the death of a President and the indefensible loss of his accused assassin. And then 371, to report in varying degrees of accuracy, the trial of strip tease joint operator Jack Ruby.

The few came with pre-conceived distortion in mind. Others picked up Texas cliches worn thin on second rate nightclub circuits. The majority reported faithfully two sickening episodes of history.

We, in the communications field, know the problem we face in lumping hundreds of men, microphones and cameras on the significant stories of today. It is just another facet of the coverage dilemma that we are studying as an industry, and not to be discussed today.

But I mention it only to give assurance that the American

newspapers are putting their best journalistic minds to work to present objective, dignified and truthful products without jeopardizing the position or rights of any individual.

We were, indeed, an uninspiring sight on national television at the conclusion of the Jack Ruby trial in Dallas. Newspapers, radio and television reporters shouting inane questions in the courtroom; clambering over courtroom furniture, fighting for positions, shoving countless microphones into the face of that courtroom exhibitionist, Melvin Belli, to send his disgusting venom into millions of American homes.

We speak of the exaggerated case, wrapped in the backdrop of assassination, sorrow and emotion. The performance of press, bar and bench was subject to criticism. But it takes the violent jolt to bring back the senses that should constantly prevail.

It is not my intention to needle tender skins, but I would, at this point, suggest that we consider Canon 20 in our second dissection.

Copyrighted stories by the dozens have come from the sad Kennedy story. Step by step the story has been revealed to the public . . . the assassination, the Lee Harvey Oswald story, the explosive intrusion of Jack Ruby as the second assassin, the Warren Commission, the dribbles of information from investigative bodies, the endless conjectures, the premature release of expert testimony in the Ruby trial, the ceaseless degradation of a city from backdoor gossip.

Where does it all come from? Leaks, gentlemen, and rather official leaks. It is a problem as old as government itself. Not defensively, but realistically, I can tell you that you have a housekeeping problem that is just as urgent as the concern about pre-trial publicity.

Editor Benjamin McKelway of The Washington *Star* states clearly the position of the American press when he emphasizes that what is published in the newspapers or is broadcast may *at times* obscure or even destroy a presumption of innocence by the public at large—if not the jurors sitting on a law case—concerning someone under accusation of wrongdoing.

But, the source of such prejudicial information in the press may be a privileged Congressional investigation. It may be an utterance by a President of The United States, accompanied by finger-shaking and the elaborate window dressing of a televised press conference. It may be the indictment of an individual which sets in motion a tidal wave of speculation as to how many others may be involved, and quickly passes from a legal issue into a political issue before anybody has been tried or found guilty of anything.

The source of such prejudicial information may be a statement by an Attorney General or other Cabinet officer or member of Congress. It may be a calculated leak to the press, sometimes from highly authoritative and responsible officers of the court, of information not yet proved or even

admitted as evidence in court but definitely prejudicial to the rights of an accused if he ever gets into court.

This being the case, an indictment for contributing to an erosion of justice in this country should include our society, along with merely *one* of its elements, the free press.

Of course there are available illustrations of that condition known as "trial by newspaper" in which newspapers have employed every device of inflammatory sensationalism, rationalizing their unfairness and their defiance of other rights by proclaiming the people's right to know while reaping the benefits of increased circulation in serving that right.

That, of course, is irresponsible journalism. It exists among the few culprits of our journalistic profession, but my observation convinces me it is on the wane; near extinction.

Irresponsible journalism might be consigned to a category that also includes incompetent, corrupt or politically motivated judges and unethical lawyers who also contribute to erosion of justice.

But our most relevant considerations should have to do with responsible journalism and responsible justice.

It is important, in fluoroscoping the general problem of the public's right to know and the citizen's right to a fair trial, that we *not* build barriers between the press, the bar, and the courts.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, enumerates the dangers of a statute that would specify what cannot be published, or *when* it can be. In rather remarkable consistency we seem to have made the identical points in discussions before a subcommittee of the State Bar of Texas and a conference of New York judges.

Dr. Stanton, with more eloquency, commented:

"A (restrictive) statute, even if its constitutionality were upheld, would guarantee far more serious and less isolated problems than it would cure. Not the least of these would be imposing upon judges the explosive job of sitting in virtually continuous judgment over the press.

"The costs of the constant surveillance, and the trials and appeals of erring media, would far outpace the costs of appeals in the occasional cases now involving judicial publicity.

"More importantly, a wedge would be driven between the courts and the communications media so wide and so deep that the entire judicial system would be gravely, continuously, possibly irreparably weakened."

I just cannot believe that the judiciary of this country would welcome opening up any such prospect as policing the press, subjecting to scrutiny, possibly leading to arrest and punishment, what every newspaper, magazine, radio and television station publishes or broadcasts, relating not only to trials but to pre-trial information divulged by the police or private citizens.

It would be a monumental task. And for what?

I concur with Dr. Stanton's conclusion—how could lines

be drawn between the publishable and what is punishable—except after the fact? In June, I made the identical point before the State Bar of Texas: Just when do we establish the “safe” time to publish temporarily proscribed materials?

The lengthy processes of the appellate courts would be involved. Do we sit forever on our hands, silenced because of the minuteness of interpretation of law that many times goes to exasperating extreme?

My newspaper has editorially castigated a Texas appellate court for reversing and remanding in certain criminal cases. I will cite a notable example and leave it to your judgment, even your conscience, as to whether we should serve the people and the peace of our state, or bow to the hair-splitting whim of a court.

In this instance, a jury’s verdict of death in a murder case was reversed because the indictment failed to state that the victim was drowned in water. We editorially asked, in reviewing the evidence that proved to the jury that a man had deliberately thrown his wife from a boat into a lake: Did the majority of the appeals court *really* think she drowned in an ink well, or some other fluid?

I have total respect for protective rights of the individual, but in this, and other instances, I submit that the press had an obligation to deal with such extreme judicial stupidity. Retrial of the case again brought a death sentence with the same evidence.

It occurs to me, gentlemen, that we are debating the exception, rather than the rule. We flail this subject in many symposiums and panels; we charge and we defend. But do we ever get to the bone of the subject?

Just how many defendants receive an unfair trial because of so-called pre-trial publicity? In our business one of the great rarities that would infuriate a reader and bring down critical storm to engulf us would be publicity which would send an innocent person to doom or prison because the press, or anyone else, pre-judged him into guilt.

In the total fairness that we would expect from the bar, I would ask that you name one person who has been convicted because of pre-trial publicity. How does anyone know whether it was the pre-trial thoroughness of the press in reporting events that places a defendant in jeopardy?

Now I return to my first thoughts in summarizing—the responsible behavior and conduct by individuals and institutions on both sides of this fence.

We, of the press, have sound purpose in resisting the shackles of censorship. Editor Brucker speaks for all when he says that we are not without sin. The American newspaper’s reporting and editorial judgment are not perfect.

We are just as fallible as the Dallas judge who allowed the Ruby trial to end in a television nightmare. But the remedy is not to return to prohibitions against publishing, to printing only by license from the court.

Rather, it is to deepen and carry forward the tradition of newspaper responsibility. In April, Justice Goldberg of the

Supreme Court told the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

“The first and primary responsibility of the press is therefore as protector and promoter of all the rights and liberties of Americans. The entire Bill of Rights is in the press’ charge—not only the free speech clause of the First Amendment. A newspaper which fails to exercise its right of free expression in protest against the invasion by any branch of government—the executive, the legislative or the judicial—of freedom of thought, of conscience, of assembly and of the person, defaults in its most elementary duty and responsibility.”

And then he proposed the establishment of a code of newspaper ethics setting “specific standards of crime reporting which, while preserving complete freedom of the press, will also adequately safeguard the rights of an accused.”

In our ranks are many editors of many stripes. Most, I would venture, oppose the thought of codes, legal restrictions backed by sanctions or any other harnessing device. We prefer to exercise our own sense of responsibility.

I remind again—our derelictions in prejudicial pre-trial reporting have been few. We strive to reduce to the minimum the errors of editorial judgment.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors has delegated a committee to deep study of all our problems—including the one we discuss today. It will be a faithful committee and it will give ear to the proposed Brookings Institution study the counsel of our friends of the bar and any device designed to lessen the conflict between the rights of individuals and the interests of society—as they occur in the press coverage of crimes and trial courts.

Faith is sometimes a slender reed. But faith in continuing development of the responsibility that *must* accompany freedom of the press, and faith in the progress of our whole society toward a more sophisticated civilization, is a better reed to lean on than a return by the courts to use of summary contempt in punishing newspapers.

I join with Editor Brucker, who led our newspaper group, in saying:

Let us both continue to grow in responsibility and maturity. If you do not censor us, we can learn to accept our responsibilities more perfectly than we yet do. But we cannot learn if you are going to make us fight again against the darkness of secrecy.

You must fight as hard for a press free to report the world as it is, courts and all, as we must fight for the most astringent purity of fair trial *within* our courts.

If both of us do this, we shall have both a free press and a fair trial. If we limit either, we shall have neither.

These remarks were made by **Mr. McKnight** before the American Bar Association in New York on August 11. He is a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Calvin Coolidge and the Press

By Louis M. Lyons

THE TALKATIVE PRESIDENT: The Off-the-Record Press Conferences of Calvin Coolidge. Edited by Howard H. Quint and Robert H. Ferrell. University of Massachusetts Press. 276 pp. \$6.

Two political scientists at the University of Massachusetts discovered in the Forbes Library in Northampton the transcript of all Calvin Coolidge's press conferences. They have published selections of them which make a quaint episode in the transition of the Presidential press conference.

The press conference as an organized biweekly meeting was instituted by Woodrow Wilson, fell into disrepair under Harding and was reinstituted in a very limited form by Mr. Coolidge. Press relations of earlier Presidents had been individual, informal, uninstitutionalized, down through Theodore Roosevelt and Taft. Mr. Wilson, with his concern for open covenants, wanted to maintain a public dialogue through the press. But the World War closed in on him and cut it off, not before he was glad to be rid of it.

Warren Harding's flamboyant vocabulary of "normalcy" did not lend itself to clear channels of communication and he seldom bothered to be informed. So Secretary of State Hughes had at times to take a hand to straighten things out the day after a press conference. After one gaff that stirred international complications, Harding restricted the conference to written questions submitted in advance. Harding's skin, also, was too thin to take press criticism; when scandal mounted in the unhappy later part of his administration, he let the press conference wither away.

Mr. Coolidge further restricted the limited form that Harding tolerated. The President could not be quoted. There would be no oral questions, nothing spontaneous. Correspondents would submit written questions in advance and use such replies as the President vouchsafed, only as background information. "There ought not to be any reference to the fact that there is a news conference here," he admonished the correspondents.

The editors say there were only a dozen or so correspondents then. I would have said more like three dozen, but perhaps the occasions that took me down swelled the number. Anyway an intimate group compared to the 300 and more who now attend in an auditorium with every word televised.

On the authority of Lyle Wilson of the United Press, who was there through the whole period, the editors say Mr. Coolidge approached these conferences relaxed, with no preparation. When he picked up the little pile of questions he was seeing them for the first time. Incredible as this seems, internal evidence bears it out. Often enough his answer was that he had no information on the subject, and this was announced without the slightest intimation that he meant to find out. None of this: "We'll have that for you next time, make a note of it, Pierre." No, the President was making himself available to the reporters, insofar as convenient, to satisfy their curiosity about such matters as had fallen to his attention.

It was always a matter of intense curiosity what was on the little slips he let flutter down on the desk as he shuffled through to find one he chose to answer.

"I haven't any information about the action of the Federal Reserve Board in lowering the re-discount rate" or "We have got so many regulatory laws already that I feel we would be just as well off if we didn't have any more."

The slips had already had a cautious screening by his secretary, C. Bascomb Slemph, who was the kind of Republican who could survive as a congressman from Virginia. His relations with the press were built on mutual suspicion. Slemph went on to be chairman of the Republican National Committee.

It never happened when I was there, but Lyle Wilson says that on occasion Mr. Coolidge would go through the whole pile of questions and find none to his liking, then blandly announce, "I have no questions today," and the press corps would troop out, newsless.

This was a different era. Correspondents were a different breed. Mr. Coolidge refers frequently to his desire to be helpful to the press. He wants to give them all the information he can. He always talks as though this was a personal favor he was doing them.

"I haven't seen the Muscle Shoals Bill and know little about it. . . . There is nothing I can say in relation to a new arms conference. It has no relation, as far as I can see, to any discussion about our debts. . . . I am a good deal disturbed at the number of proposals that are being made about the expenditure of money. . . ."

These arid comments might be lightened by bits of humor or wry needling of the reporters.

"The Secretary of War has not resigned. I don't expect he is going to and I hope that for the sake of his peace of mind that his resignation will not be reported in the future oftener than once in two weeks. I don't want to restrict the reporting but I think that would be often enough."

"I don't recall any candidate for President who ever injured himself very much by not talking."

"I haven't any specific reports about any States (in the campaign of 1924). My reports indicate that I shall probably carry Northampton (his home town). That is based more on experience."

Asked about a book which he hadn't read, he was reminded of a reviewer who said he never read a book before he reviewed it, because it might prejudice him.

Asked about a General Hines, he said he wondered if it didn't refer to a Major Hines. But in that case he was in the position of a man who was asked by a stranger for the location of a macaroni factory. The man asked if it might not be rather the noodles factory. The stranger agreed it could be. "Well, I don't know where that is either."

These nuggets could not be quoted or ascribed. He kept reminding them of that. "It seems that it is necessary to have eternal vigilance to keep that from being done."

He often makes little jokes about the assiduous correspondents and their hard work. He suggests they ought to be paid more. He quips one day about "a great many questions today, but I find that many are duplicates or triplicates or other cates." He is pleased to find his chore thus lightened. But he is insistent on his anonymity. Stuck with this, the correspondents soon invented a "White House spokesman" as authority for what they gleaned from Mr. Coolidge. But Mr. Coolidge got on to that and scotched it.

"Of course it is a violation of the understanding to say that the spokesman said so and so and put in quotations on that. I think it would be a good plan to drop that reference to these conferences. It never was authorized . . . one might as well say that the President said so and so . . . it is perfectly apparent that when the word [spokesman] is used it means the President."

He then refused to let them use anything about his objection to the spokesman. "It was just said for the information of the conference. That part of the conference we will consider carried on in executive session." Thus he puts off the record even a reference to being off the record.

When he caught someone taking down his remarks in shorthand, he objected. "What I say here is not to be taken down in shorthand. Otherwise it interferes with my

freedom of expression."

He objected at times to the way press conference information was used. ". . . They are not in any sense interviews to be given out by the press, or statements, . . . but simply information that I give to the press in order that it may intelligently write reports and comments about the subjects that I dwell on. . . ."

He resolutely refused even such an occasional request of an exception as to quote his views on baseball, which must have struck the correspondents as unique.

(Here is Mr. Coolidge on baseball. This is August 29, 1924, an exceptional season, for the Washington Senators are in contention as the pennant race comes down toward the wire.)

President—I suppose the Washington baseball team is the one that represents the whole nation. The others have some local claims. That which comes from the city of Washington, I suppose, represents the nation in its entirety more than any other team. If it should be so fortunate as to secure first place, in that respect I suppose it would be more agreeable to the whole nation than that which could be secured by having any local team win the pennant. I don't know as I can make any statement about the present condition of our team that hasn't been made by someone else. I am not an expert on baseball, though I enjoy the game. I haven't made any plans yet about attending the world series, but should that be the case I assume that it goes without saying that I would want to see the opening game.

Press—Mr. President, would it be permissible to quote that remark about baseball?

President—No, I don't think so.

Withal, he claimed to enjoy these press sessions, and one can imagine it was a welcome change of pace, a chance to talk to people who weren't after something, who were certainly a brighter and livelier crowd than the political hacks left to him by the Harding administration. And they might just happen to hit upon some question a President ought to be hep to.

Sometimes he even solicited their opinion, once when he was looking for a new secretary of the Navy in place of Mr. Denby, whom he refused to fire for ceding the naval oil reserves to private interests but was certainly relieved to have resign. He told the reporters he wanted a good administrator, out of business. If they knew of one, he'd be glad of any suggestion. The ensuing appointment of Ray Lyman Wilbur was a press conference suggestion, according to the editors.

When he had to go to Gettysburg, he asked the correspondents' judgment whether by train or car. Told the railroad was a rocky prospect, Coolidge opined that if they knew they had the press on board, the railroad

would be apt to be solicitous in its service. As to what he was going to put into his inaugural address: "I don't know. If any of you think of anything that ought to be covered, I should be obliged if you would suggest it."

Unlike Mr. Wilson, who had fiercely resisted press attention to his family or personal affairs, Mr. Coolidge was always ready to discuss his plans for travel, vacation, hobbies, his feelings about baseball or why he wasn't going home to vote. (It was an expense to the government and inconvenienced a lot of people.)

Much of the conference content has to do with his personal activities. Was he considering this or that offer of a summer vacation spot? Well, he supposed all these places needed to be advertised. Was he going to make a speech at the national exposition? No, he was just going as an exhibit. Was he going to answer the Democratic candidate, John W. Davis? Well, he'd found that if not answered, such things often took care of themselves. Was he going to the Army-Navy game? No. It takes too much time; and last time it rained all the time.

All these personals ring true to Mr. Coolidge to those who knew him, especially his suspicion of real estate promotion behind the invitations for summer vacation. I remember sitting on Mr. Coolidge's porch in Plymouth for an interview one summer afternoon, when a fruit peddler came by. Mrs. Coolidge came out to say the fruit man would like to be paid with a check. No, Mr. Coolidge said, he wants to show it around to get business. Of course the poor fellow doubtless wanted to frame it.

The title, *Talkative President*, is of course a provocative contrast to the legend of "Silent Cal." There were more anecdotes about Coolidge's terseness than there were Ford jokes in that Model-T era. Like the one about the woman beside him at dinner who told him she had made a bet she could get him to say more than two words. "You lose," said Coolidge. This rudeness was also a characteristic at times, though sometimes it was his special sense of humor, which escaped many. Those who had experience of him when relaxed knew he could talk and enjoyed having some one to talk at. The White House correspondents made a captive audience. I once had to boil down an interview with Mr. Coolidge to an eight-column Sunday feature page.

Unfortunately the editors have so completely classified Mr. Coolidge's talks by subject that all his efforts at humor are in one place and you can't tell how he may have salted them over the biweekly sessions. The effect is to leave the rest of the book unrelievedly dreary.

The editors say that his disquisitions on affairs show his comprehensive grasp of public issues. They sound banal enough at the time. The editors show a shrewder observation when they note what is left out of these talks—anything on the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Ku Klux Klan that ran Indiana as well as Georgia in this period, the

Florida real estate boom and bust, labor unions, bank failures, and the rampaging Bull Market, so soon to bust.

Mr. Coolidge's discourses on this and that topic were often a whole page long. And as the questions were evidently destroyed after he had sifted them, the reader has no idea what prompted these monologues. The effect in print of these uninterrupted homilies, with no relation to each other or to any visible cause, unbroken by either queries or responses, is bleak indeed.

The editors have labored under handicaps to lump them under topical headings, which sounds rational, but serves to break up any continuity there may have been to begin with and destroys any chance to recapture the range of public interest that each of these conferences brought to focus.

There's a consistently negative tone to Mr. Coolidge's approach to public issues, foreign or domestic, except on business. Business conditions are always good and he is glad to say so at length.

But Mr. Coolidge would sometimes take a breather from negatives to discuss extensively the European problems of German reparations or an arms conference to explain why the time wasn't ready for American participation.

One of Mr. Coolidge's ventures in helping the press is pure Coolidgianna and needs to be taken full strength. (May 1, 1925, the mid-point of the Coolidge decade.)

"Now that Congress isn't in session, I am rather aware of the quality of news, though of course there are a lot of small things that are always developing in relation to our government. . . . I want to be helpful in any way I can to guide the press in their efforts for news items. My own thought is that I would like it if the country would think as little as possible about the government and give their time and attention more undividedly about the conduct of the private business of our country. If that is a thought you can develop in any way, I think it would be helpful. . . . The country may be relieved from having to look to Washington every day or two to see what is going to be done, and given an opportunity to feel things are as settled as they can be and the uncertainties removed as much as they can be, and there is a foundation on which they can make commitments for the carrying on of their business without being in jeopardy of a change of law or something of that kind, that might change conditions in such a way that their investments would become uncertain."

The wordage here is also typical of the press conference homilies. Its redundancy creates the "talkative" impression. Sometimes I think he was filibustering. One question was always better than two.

Coolidge knew nothing about business except what he imbibed from the industrial spokesman for the Coolidge

prosperity. If they applauded his views, he was nothing short of reverential of American business success.

He had "an agreeable call" from Charles M. Schwab and couldn't help thinking how well he represented America. "Beginning as he did with no property and with meager opportunities, he has developed a great manufacturing plant for the service of the people of America. . . . He told me that he started the Bethlehem Steel Works with \$12,000,000 capital and it now represents \$800,000,000."

Yet Coolidge was by no means unwarned of the rising danger of a new form of corporate exploitation that was running hog wild. Professor W. Z. Ripley of Harvard was earnestly warning in the *Atlantic Monthly* of the mushrooming of holding companies, so organized that a few insiders controlled with voting stock, while the public was sold nonvoting stock to provide the capital. These holding companies were especially rife in the electric power industry. They bought control of operating companies and contracted to provide innumerable "management services" to these companies for which they levied charges unregulated by anybody. The operating companies came under State utility board regulation. But these boards could not go behind the structure of the operating companies to examine into the effects of the outside control. As the rates allowed the operating companies were based on their costs and earnings, the milking off of earnings by the holding companies was paid for by the local electric light customer. This flagrant abuse continued until the New Deal holding company act intervened.

But Coolidge knew all about it. He not only read Professor Ripley's articles but had the professor down to the White House to see whether there was anything the Federal government should do about it. The answer was: No. These were State corporations so the responsibility was on the States. (Of course many were incorporated

under the lenient laws of Delaware, which was like getting a divorce in Nevada.)

Mr. Coolidge discussed this fully with his press conference. He was wholly sympathetic to Professor Ripley's crusade for reform. Only it wasn't his responsibility.

"Any remedial legislation would have to be done keeping clearly in mind that these are not national concerns, they are state concerns. They get their authority by charters granted by the various states, not at all from the laws of the United States. So that the United States doesn't have very complete jurisdiction over them. So I would conclude that the best protection that security holders would have would have to be brought about by the passage of state laws rather than the passage of laws by Congress or the actions of any Federal agencies."

Yet, in the same press conference, Mr. Coolidge would say, "I am very keenly alive to the fact that we have in this country now about 20,000,000 security holders who have made investments in the business concerns and I want everything done that can be done to safeguard their interests." Many of them were selling apples on street corners a few seasons later and the brokers who had sold them the inflated voteless stock were jumping out of windows. This was the period of the famous cartoon "Where are the customers' yachts?"

But Mr. Coolidge was in character on his sign-off at his last press conference.

"Perhaps one of the most important actions of my administration has been minding my own business."

Mr. Lyons retired in June after serving as Curator of Nieman Fellowships for twenty-five years. As a reporter for the *Boston Globe* he covered Mr. Coolidge for many years.

Our Cities and the Press

Evaluating the Changing Urban Environment

By Grady Clay

When the first Nieman Fellows made their way to Harvard in 1938 it was still possible for an effective American journalist to have little or nothing to do with a big city. It was possible to maintain, as many people still did in 1938, that the future of America lay in the traditional small town or its larger replica, the small city.

The death of this illusion is a measure of distance between 1938 and 1964. The world moved away from the small-town journalist, just as it moved away from the small town. Cities still occupy less than one per cent of the nation's area, but they house three-quarters of its people, produce four-fifths of its economic output, generate most of its news and opinions.

The first Nieman Fellows came from eight cities with a population of some 6,900,000. Now all but one of those—Paducah, Kentucky—are sizable metropolitan areas having a population in 1960 of 15,600,000. The nation's population then was 139 million; today it has gained 40 million, and 70 per cent of the total live in urban areas. Then, 30 million Americans lived on 6 million farms; today half as many farms, half as many farmers. Then, new public and private construction was valued at about \$10 billion a year; today, over \$75 billion. Their year had 32 million car registrations, ours today about 80 million; their government 1 million civilian employees, ours 2½ million. Any Nieman babies born that year had a life expectancy at birth of 60.8 years; today's Nieman babies can expect 66.5 years.

They had no competition from television, little from suburban newspapers. Paperbacks and pocketbooks were oddities from England or from Haldeman-Julius. The production of handouts was a minor preoccupation, not a major industry.

Just because 25 years have gone by is no occasion to read a revolution into every statistic than can be dredged up out of the office almanac. I hope you will forgive me then, for trying to put a news lead on what will be nothing more than a Monday morning editorial. It will contain five fat generalizations, and one flat assertion, or thesis.

(1) The major changes taking place in cities are the changes of a large industrialized society, no longer "purely local" affairs.

(2) The size of the typical unit which we deal with is getting bigger.

(3) More of the decisions that shape cities are formal decisions, made according to rational rules, by institutions and organizations.

(4) The historic power of the city center is diminishing.

(5) The increasing density of people requires greater attention to the quality of their physical environment.

My thesis is that newspapers should apply the same standards of evaluation to this environment as they now apply to sports, theater, the fine arts, books, television and the more traditional objects of professional critical review and appraisal.

Point No. 1: Changes in cities are changes of a large-scale, industrialized society, and can no longer be considered "purely local" affairs.

Most urban problems are local reflections of world-wide industrialization; they come from changes in markets, from the concentration of affluence in certain regions, the growth of poverty in others. Consequently, to look for "strictly local" solutions is often a waste of time. Newspapers which continue to assume that their city would improve if you just get rid of that fellow in City Hall should spend more time digging into the causes.

Point No. 2: The size of the typical unit which we must deal with is getting bigger.

And the bigger the unit (the company, the project, the organization) the more powerful are the non-local influences at work on it.

The larger new physical changes tend to spread outside the city, on the fringes where there is plenty of land. "The infiltration of international elements really starts at the outskirts of the city," observes Constantinos Doxiadis.

Oscar Handlin has written in fascinating detail of the historical tension between the Establishment and the pioneer fringe. The history of the city is one of constant struggle between settled communities, and the un-settlers. In ages past, the cry was the same, even when the first cave-man non-conformist took his tools and moved beyond the tribal limits to find his own cave. Then, as now, he

was probably criticized by the local Establishment for setting up a "premature subdivision" and dissipating community resources. The difference today is in size and quantity, though the arguments remain the same.

Point 3: Decision-making: A larger percentage of decisions that shape the city are being made formally, rationally, by institutions and organizations.

There is an old truism among real estate appraisers that the three most important factors used in appraising a piece of property are: "Location, Location, and Location." I submit that the three most important new words in shaping the course of cities are "Decisions, Decisions, Decisions." Hundreds of processes once left up to the individual, to the marketplace, to Nature, or to God, are now managed, rationalized, made the subject of votes, resolutions, meetings, minutes and other procedures.

Decision-making and information-handling are more formal. This means votes are taken, minutes kept. There's a record, more-or-less available to the press. Matters once thought to be purely a matter of one man's opinion versus another are now subject to measuring, to objective comparisons.

This all means that responsibility is more formal, too. All politicians are familiar with "fiscal responsibility," which is freely translated to mean "Don't get caught with your hand in the cash box." But in many cities there is a new thing called "aesthetic responsibility," whereby appointed persons are responsible for the final appearance of projects, streets, highways or whole neighborhoods.

Point No. 4: The historic power of the city center is diminishing.

One of the recurring theories about news and where it is to be found is the centrality theory. This says that the center of any place is its most productive generator of news. On this theory has been built a dozen traditional beats—city hall, the courts, financial district, downtown business, the civic circuit, etc. Modern newspapers grew and prospered because of one fact about the 19th century city: all power was at the center.

Even as late as 1938 it was still possible for a City Hall reporter to feel he was master of the situation, in a journalistic sense. He could stay on top of a story by staying in one central geographic place, equipped with a telephone. He sat close to the seat of power. He could tap all who "counted" as they came and went.

But almost as soon as this theory of centrality was accepted the facts began to depart from it. The edge of the city or metropolis has become the place of conflict. Here one finds the push-pull of suburb against suburb, new settler against old exurbanite. Here there is constant change, friction, controversy, news and opinion. Here are new sub-centers competing with the old center. No one can

stay in the center of a contemporary city and honestly say that he has it "covered."

The traditional city of traditional journalism is changing faster than our mental habits or practices of coverage. With a few dynamic exceptions, City Hall is dead as *the* major metropolitan news generator. The situation varies enormously from one city to another, but the most impressive change is the decentralization of control to new sub-centers, to regional councils, satellite towns, the State capitol, interstate authorities, and to the Federal capitol. An obsession with "saving downtown" can easily blind publishers and reporters alike to what may be happening.

Point No 5: The relationship of people to their physical environment is changing.

I like cities personally because they are complex, and are growing more so. To the journalist they offer a wealth of pegs or points of departure from which to gain understanding, by which to enlist reader interest.

As cities expand, they grow still more complex. Fantastic sums are spent just to keep people out of each other's way. Density is increasing, space more crowded. In 1850, the ratio of people to space in the U. S. was one person to 82.6 acres. By 1976, at the present population growth rate, it will be down to 8.4.

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover says:

When space around a man contracts, more rules are needed to discipline his behavior toward others. The restraints that knowing one's neighbors imposes are lost in the anonymity of city life. It takes a bureaucracy merely to maintain peace among the multitudes and keep their cars circulating, not to mention supplying them with pure water, public health services, sewage disposal facilities and so on.

(AP May 31/64)

Many of our institutions are based on the social lubrication theory of space: "If you don't like it here, Mac, go west." In Los Angeles, the social lubrication theory is that "Most social problems can be solved by moving people farther apart." Los Angeles has more cars than South America; it has invented that new phenomenon, the underprivileged two-car family. But the facts no longer fit the theory: Los Angeles is running out of space, along with clean air, and has turned significantly to building apartments, so as to put people closer together. The tide has turned.

People react to this tightening up by using public space and other people's space (the highways, the National and State parks) by traveling through it, looking at it, and photographing it. They also move: about 20 per cent of the population changes its residence every year.

The old rootedness to place led men to accept their environment as fated by birth, family or the gods. Today,

place-loyalty is an affliction if a man itches to get ahead through job mobility.

A Harvard geographer, Edward Ullman, was the first to trace the shift of American population to the so-called "amenity areas"—those magnetic waterfront counties, places of good climate, high visibility, active water and other accoutrements of the good life. This magnetism has now become a major force for moving people around inside the United States, and for inducing travel abroad.

So much for my five introductory points: (1) Few changes are "purely local;" (2) the size of the units is getting larger; (3) more decisions are formal; (4) the power of the center is diminishing; (5) increased density is changing the relationship of people to their physical environment.

This brings me to my main point: that there is a great new interest in the *quality* of that environment, an interest not yet recognized by most of the metropolitan press.

We are so much addicted to reporting the process by which cities are built that we seldom take time or space, to going back and evaluating the product—finding out how the thing works, how it looks, what happened after the public began to use it.

My purpose is to suggest that newspapers which fail to evaluate the changing quality of their visual environment deprive their readers—many of them newcomers to the city—of a chance to learn to be good citizens.

To be concerned about the quality of one's environment is to believe that the physical form, shape, appearance and functional physical reality of the city will greatly influence the kind of society we produce.

If we fail to evaluate and report adequately this physical reality, if we do not properly warn the public of what lies ahead, if we do not sufficiently explain the choices and alternatives, then we will have thwarted the potential of those who will be born in, or move into our metropolitan cities. If we succeed, we will have helped to create cities that will broaden a man's opportunities, expand his mind and spirit, turn his hand to new tools, his mind to higher standards, and convert his myopian or bucolic prejudices into utopian hopes. This is in the great tradition of journalistic reform. Barbara Ward said recently in the *New York Times Magazine* (April 19):

A city, after all, is not just a collection of buildings and services. It is, or should be, a community in which human beings are civilized and enriched. "Civility" and "urbanity" were once the words used to express the manners by which men could be raised above crude self-concern and the blind clash of competitive instinct. Throughout most of Western Civilization in time and space the city has been the school of the nation in the sense that Athens claimed to be "the education of Hellas."

Most journalists are still living with a 19th century

stance. Our specialty is the daily practice of a peculiar aspect of the egalitarian ideal. "One man's just as good as another" we say, and follow it up by asserting "One man's opinion is just as good as another." This usually translates into "I know what I like, and no damn expert is going to tell me whether that's an ugly building or not."

Our journalist-heroes have championed the "little man," have been proud of the common touch, protectors of the people, suspicious of the intellectual or aesthetic minority. But, if we accept the notion that an important function of the city is to civilize those who live in it, then we should accept an interest in the criteria of *art* as being important to the quality of civilized life.

My thesis includes the words "visual environment" because this environment we see is inescapable and pervasive, always there, visible, identifiable, measurable, even if not quotable. It is what we have in common with our readers, especially on a local scale.

Its buildings, its landscape, unlike the paintings of the artist, are not stuck away in galleries. They line our streets, surround our working hours, fix the way we spend our leisure, influence the way we make friends over the back fence. Unlike Broadway shows or TV spectacles, you can't stay away or switch it off. They're always there, polluting or improving the view, and the neighborhood.

If you describe this kind of pollution, you run into the same kind of opposition which once objected to journalistic exposure of water pollution. Many owners or developers of this new environment will tell you that evaluative reporting of *their* projects is "not in the public interest."

But the public does this all day, every day. It may not be well-informed (and cannot be, if newspapers do not lead the way). But it reacts, and always has.

Ever since the first cave man tried to pile two stones upon the third, there has always been somebody to suggest that one stone balances better upon two or three, rather than the other way around. As surely as the citizens of Babel raised a great Tower toward the sun, there were others ready to assert that it was built in the wrong place, of materials unfitted for their function; that it should have been built sooner, later, or not at all; certainly by somebody else (of a different political faith); and that it was prompted by the wrong motives to begin with. And who are we to say they were wrong?

We are addicted to reporting the process without evaluating the product. We emphasize how things are built, what they cost, who gets the credit and the contract, how many people are displaced (and of what color, political faith and national origin). We comment endlessly on legality, feasibility, and taxability. But we have little time or space to devote to suitability, livability, visibility, quality—to those visible ingredients of the city which determine whether its citizens will be happy or discontented.

I think more and more of our urban readers are looking

for something better than what we've been giving them—environmental critiques, architectural criticism, technical review of subdivision plans, readable analysis of urban plans and their unfinished products, understanding evaluation of the large-scale environment. Somebody ought to be taking the measure of the whole metropolis and if newspapers don't, they are missing an opportunity and obligation.

Good evaluative reporting, done with great zest, cannot make up for bad urban design. It can only identify it. But to identify it, journalists must be aware of standards of looking and evaluating one's own environment which are not taught in journalism school, or in the colleges of hard knocks run by opinionated city editors.

The supreme task is the ancient one of learning to see. We should be as concerned with accurate description as with correct quotation. This is a return to eyewitness journalism, away from the easy "that's what-the-man-said" style of reporting. We must look and look again; penetrate to the heart of a scene by inspecting it at every level possible. We cannot treat the urban scene as a painting, to be understood on only one level of visual perception. A project, a city, a metropolitan area, is too complex. It must be reported evaluatively and in the context of local traditions, architectural history, economic conditions, building practices, changing social needs, and aesthetic standards. Each of these offers a peg on which this type of evaluative reporting can begin.

This is an immensely broadening device for journalists: it increases one's scope, it gives new "handles" for understanding the so-called metropolitan chaos. (I submit there is no such thing as true metropolitan chaos; it exists only in the minds of people unwilling or unable to perceive what is happening.) This sort of evaluative reporting is an effort to see with new insight and to make sense out of what we see; and in making sense, we must organize, classify, find patterns wherever they exist. Raymond Vernon, when he summarized the New York Metropolitan Regional Study, said he spent the equivalent of ten days hovering in a helicopter over New York City. Just looking, piecing together and, finally, understanding.

This is the classic function of the journalist, as Louis Lyons said in the May *Atlantic Monthly* . . . "to do the homework the reader doesn't do for himself, to add up the score, to discover meaning in what is happening." And, I might add, to discover meaning in what he *sees*, the meaningful story behind the changing scenery.

Mr. Clay is real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and editor of *Landscape Quarterly*. This is a talk to the 25th reunion of Nieman Fellows at Harvard University, June 3.

The Kennebunk Star

The Nieman Fellows this Spring as for some years past were asked to judge newspapers entered in the annual contest of the New England Weekly Press Association. On completing their chore, they added a comment about one newspaper.

This is it:

To the New England Weekly Press Association

The Nieman Fellows, as judges of the annual newspaper contest of the New England Weekly Press Association, have no authority to confer awards. They can only select newspapers to receive awards. We, the Nieman Fellows of 1963-64, have done that. We have chosen winners for all the assigned categories, and now, having paid our respects to solemn professionalism and to what we are pleased to call progress, we find that we still have not dealt to our satisfaction with one newspaper. Therefore, we wish (through this letter) to call special attention to the Kennebunk *Star* (and its alter-edition, the Wells-Ogunquit *Star*). We commend its peculiar excellence to all who love weekly newspapers.

The *Star* is unique in the New England journalism submitted to our judgment. It does not fit comfortably into any of the contest categories. After severe contemplation, we have concluded that the trouble with the *Star* is that it is more than a newspaper. It does not merely offer a selection of current events, in the manner of respected journalism, permitting the reader to pick and choose as he would in his super market. The *Star* demands to be read entirely. It does not accept a 10-minute allotment between *Newsweek* and the *Christian Science Monitor*, and it declines to be skimmed. How does a reader skim a newspaper that may begin its lead story, "On Saturday at about a quarter to six in the afternoon . . .?" What can be said of a newspaper whose Christmas editorial is so thoughtless of the season's prejudice that it describes not the star over Bethlehem but the moon over the coast of Maine, and a lost dream of youth?

The Kennebunk *Star* is published by a person who loves good writing, and it is produced for people who have the time and taste to read it. It is possible that the *Star*, like an amber sherry glass, would have been more at home in an earlier century. We are glad that it lives in this one, and we wish it well.

The Nieman Fellows of 1963-64

The Vital Function of a Free Press

By Alan Barth

The anonymity of editorial writing is sometimes irksome. But it is by no means without its compensations. When anyone asks me how to identify the pieces I contribute to the *Post's* editorial page, I blush as prettily as possible and say, "It's really very simple; mine are the superb ones that seem to hit the nail right on the head." All of us on the editorial page get blamed at times for one another's shortcomings; we need suffer very few qualms, therefore, if we take what credit we can get for one another's successes.

But credit for an editorial page belongs to the newspaper as a collectivity, an institution. I could not, in good conscience, fail to point out what is, undoubtedly, altogether evident, that editorial writers can be no better than their newspapers want them to be. If the *Washington Post* has good editorials, it is because it wants them and demands them from its editorial writers.

I am immensely glad of an occasion to say publicly something about the pride and gratification I have enjoyed over a period of 20 years as a member of the *Post's* editorial staff. There are no more than a few newspapers left in the United States which want their editorial pages to serve as vital forces in the community. Happily, the *Post* is one of them.

The *Post's* editor is J. R. Wiggins, and I want to say something about him. The non-committal "on-the-other-hand" type of editorial is not much in his line. On the contrary, he tends to exhort us not to spare the horses. As a result, he sometimes gets good, strong pieces from us; and quite often he writes them himself.

Russ Wiggins presides over a little collection of prima donnas ineffectually disguised as editorial writers. Somehow, he manages to keep our matutinal editorial conferences from becoming actually riotous. Indeed, he makes them, as a rule, exciting intellectual exercises from which, by some alchemy, a consensus is at last distilled. It is one of the happy aspects of my job that I have a part in this process.

It is important for a newspaper to be right in its editorial judgments—as often as mortal men can manage to be so. But it is perhaps even more important for a newspaper to be willing to run the risk of being wrong. We are not law-givers, nor even law-makers; what we say is entitled to whatever weight may be deserved by the arguments ad-

duced in support of it—no more, no less. But it is our obligation, I think, to question, to challenge and to protest.

In Washington, the arguments offered by the *Post* are often contradicted—and very ably, too—by the *Evening Star* and the *Daily News*; so that those who read may run in whichever way they choose. The community benefits, I think, from this conflict of opinion.

Unhappily, however, in most American communities today this kind of conflict no longer exists. And in most American newspapers, the editorial page serves no more than a ceremonial function. It is there because it was once recognized as the heart and soul of a newspaper. But too often it has become a mere adornment, perpetuated long after its purpose has been forgotten, as men continue to wear on the sleeves of their jackets buttons which do not open and which have become altogether devoid of utility.

The press in the United States is, in many respects, the most privileged of Americans institutions. Although newspapers are big business enterprises operated for private profit, and although they are subsidized by the government in some degree through second-class mail benefits, they are shielded by the First Amendment to the Constitution from any official interference or regulation.

Moreover, this privileged position is no mere legalism or abstraction. It has been strengthened by time and buttressed by popular reverence. Freedom of the press is an American shibboleth. And although the phrase, like freedom of religion, is not precisely understood by everyone who uses it, most Americans would probably fight for it and, perhaps, even die for it.

The reason for this extraordinary grant of freedom to newspapers lies in the fact that the founders of the American Republic desired them to serve as one of those safeguards designed to keep governmental authority within prescribed bounds. Far from wanting censorship of the press by the government, they sought censorship of the government by the press.

Jefferson spoke of the press explicitly as a censor of the government. "No government ought to be without censors," he wrote to Washington in 1792, "and while the press is free, no one will." And although the Federalist journals of his day treated him with malicious cruelty, he was still able to write to a French correspondent in 1823: "This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning

them at the tribunal of public opinion, produces reform peaceably which must otherwise be done by revolution."

Well, a press which enjoys such independence of the government is almost bound to be, by definition, in some degree irresponsible. A measure of irresponsibility was the price which had to be paid—which the founders of the Republic were prepared to pay—in order to enable the press to discharge its censorial function.

For my own part, I do not look upon this irresponsibility as the gravest of dangers. I do not mean to make light of the threats which reckless journalism may pose to rights of privacy, to the right to a fair trial and to other individual rights. These are serious problems. I am more concerned, however, with a different danger—with the danger that the press in the United States today has become excessively responsible—has become, in fact, to an alarming degree, a spokesman and partner of the government, rather than a censor.

In a time when international tension seems a normal condition of existence, newspaper support of the government, especially in its foreign relations, tends to be considered a requisite of patriotism. But when men hold in their hands such malevolent instruments of destruction that official error may mean universal annihilation, criticism and challenge may be far more useful, far more genuinely patriotic—may contribute far more to true national security—than uncritical acquiescence or than any amount of flag-waving.

My country right or wrong is a dangerous sort of sentimentality for individuals; for newspapers, it represents a total abdication of responsibility. For the responsibility of a newspaper is not to governments; it is to values, to ideas, to human beings.

In international affairs more than in any other area—because here are posed the great questions of life and death—a newspaper needs to probe and challenge—to ask whether the policies said to serve the interests of a nation can be said also to serve the interests of mankind.

A captious, even an irresponsible, press is to be preferred, I think, to a supine or complacent press. And, although constant and perhaps carping criticism may irritate Presidents or police chiefs or directors of the United States Information Agency or other conscientious public officials, it operates also to keep them up to the mark, to make them justify and scrutinize all that they do; and thus it raises the caliber and quality of government. And it may well be that in the long-continuing struggle between totalitarianism on the one hand and government by the consent of the governed on the other, press censorship of the government may give the latter just the mechanism for correcting error, just the margin of fitness and efficiency it needs for survival.

It seems to me that all the aspects of contemporary life are tending to produce a homogenization of society. International tension makes dissent seem dangerous. Urbanization—the compression of people into great cities and often into slum areas—makes diversity seem difficult. Automation and cybernetics and technology seem almost to eliminate individuality.

More and more, in the name of national security, in the name of public safety, in the name of religion, in the name of convenience masquerading as necessity, we are permitting constitutional short cuts which involve serious trespasses on those individual rights which the Founders of the Republic thought fundamental to a free and pluralistic society.

The vital function of a free press is to stand guard against such trespasses—to sound an alarm whenever governmental power threatens to invade areas from which the Constitution excluded its reach and range. It is essential to remember that the eternal vigilance which is so commonly referred to as the price of liberty has always meant eternal vigilance against duly constituted authority—against ourselves and our own extravagances and passions.

A free press is, of course, but one of the devices which free men have provided for the protection of their freedom. For the effective vindication of their basic rights free men must turn to that most characteristic of all American institutions, the voluntary association, the real motive force of American political life.

Among the multitudinous voluntary associations pushing and pulling for divers interests in this pluralistic society, the American Civil Liberties Union stands preeminently as the champion of freedom. For nearly half a century, it has ridden into battle, fearlessly and unflinchingly, to defend those inalienable rights which are the richest portion of the American inheritance. No other single body has contributed more to the liberty of Americans—or to their national security. Let us keep it armed and vigilant.

For me, an award from the Civil Liberties Union has special meaning and extraordinary value. There is no organization whose accolade could mean so much to me. And the significance of the award is immeasurably enhanced for me by the character of the judges who determined it. I can only say that though it is unearned, I shall try in the future to earn it.

Mr. Barth, editorial writer on the *Washington Post*, received the first Oliver Wendell Holmes Bill of Rights Award from the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union, May 6. This is from his response.

Press-Created Prejudice in Criminal Trials—A Mirage?

By Claude R. Sowle

The Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of the press in this country. This same Constitution also grants to every defendant in a criminal case the right to a fair trial before an impartial jury.

In recent years, there have been frequent charges that by virtue of its extensive coverage of criminal matters soon to be tried, the press is callously denying fair trials to many criminal defendants.

These miscarriages of justice occur, so the critics say, because the press continually poisons the minds of potential jurors in advance of trials by widely disseminating inflammatory and prejudicial information, much of which ultimately may not be usable against the defendants in court. Among other things, they point with alarm to the prevalence of pretrial press disclosures of confessions (which later may be found involuntary and hence inadmissible), of tangible evidence (which may have been illegally seized and hence subject to suppression at trial), and of details of defendants' prior criminal records (which rarely are admissible at trial).

These critics further contend that existing legal methods calculated to cure the ills supposedly created by the press—changes of venue, continuances, challenges to the competency of potential jurors who may be prejudiced, and cautionary instructions—simply do not provide defendants with adequate protection. They also are disturbed both by the reluctance of trial courts to use their contempt powers to punish the press when it appears to have interfered with trial processes and by the general unwillingness of most appellate courts—somewhat less pronounced of late—to reverse convictions where pretrial press coverage might have affected the jury's decision.

Because of their dissatisfaction with the current situation, some of these critics have advocated the enactment of legislation authorizing the courts to impose criminal penalties upon police officers, prosecutors, defense counsel, and others who disseminate to the press in advance of trial certain enumerated types of information which ultimately may prejudice a defendant's right to a fair trial. Some also have urged that these same criminal penalties—imprisonment, or fine, or both—likewise should be imposed upon the press should it publish such information.

These corrective measures proposed by those aroused by current press practices are—even to them, I expect—quite extreme. Has this supposed war between the concepts of free press and fair trial reached such proportions that it is now either necessary or desirable to take corrective steps of the magnitude proposed?

When I first became concerned with the problems of criminal law administration, I shared with many of my legal brethren the view that limitations upon pretrial press coverage were sorely needed and long overdue. With the passage of time, however, I have altered my opinions. Although there clearly have been some press transgressions and room for improvement doubtless remains, my original view that pretrial publicity is generally harmful to our system of justice has withered away. Moreover, during the same period my basic confidence in the wisdom, effectiveness, and good taste of a free press has grown considerably.

Against this background then, I should like to offer the following observations which I believe reflect a common sense view of the free press-fair trial situation in Chicago (and doubtless other metropolitan areas):

In any year in Chicago, one can probably count on the fingers of his two hands the cases in which the harms—either real or imagined—of pretrial press coverage can seriously be raised. Unless the nature and circumstances of a crime are highly unusual or the persons involved enjoy a very special status in the community, it is unlikely that the press will devote much, if any, attention to a particular case.

In those few cases each year where the problem of pretrial prejudice legitimately might be raised, most of the defendants involved probably are beyond the help of corrective measures of the type proposed. Men such as Anthony Accardo and James Hoffa have been in the headlines for years. Can anyone seriously contend that a brief, selective, legislatively-imposed pretrial news blackout in their cases would be meaningful?

Who can come forth with any satisfactory proof of harm to defendants resulting from pretrial publicity? I have yet to see such proof provided by the proponents of restrictions on the press in this area. In fact, to the extent that proof may be available, it seems if anything to go against the

press restrictionists. Many of the Chicago press critics are fond of pointing out numerous "abuses" in cases involving Barry Cook, Duncan Hansen, Anthony Accardo, and, most recently, the five accused crime syndicate loan sharks. And yet, in every one of the cases they cite, the defendants were acquitted. I happen to believe that when a juror takes the oath and states that he is capable of rendering a fair verdict, he will generally do everything within his power to follow the judge's instructions as to the law and return a verdict which is based on the evidence presented in court. Do the fair trial-oriented press restrictionists doubt this? If so, they would do well to forget about the press and turn their attention to the basic question of trial by jury, the foundation upon which our system of criminal justice rests.

In those cases where pretrial press abuse is claimed, what is the source of much of the information which is published? Some of the information, of course, is ferreted out by the press itself. The police also lend a helping hand. But much of the information, in my opinion, is provided by prosecutors and defense counsel. In many criminal cases, the men on both sides of the counsel table, in an attempt to gain either tactical advantages or personal publicity, have sought to try their cases in the press unfettered by evidentiary standards applicable in the courts. Such conduct by these officers of the courts is a clear breach of the existing canons of legal ethics. Yet the Bar has taken no direct, effective steps to curtail their activities. Why, then, attempt indirect sanctions by curtailing the press which, I assume, certainly owes no higher duty to the courts than the courts' own officers. If the Bar sincerely believes that changes must come, then let the Bar first put its own house in order.

The proponents of press restrictions sometimes state that even if the dangers of pretrial publicity cannot be clearly proved, restrictions nonetheless are desirable because the only purpose of such publicity is to pander to the baser interests of our citizens and thereby sell more newspapers. In my opinion, pretrial reporting can and often does serve a useful purpose. If, however, the press restrictionists could make a decent showing of prejudice to defendants, perhaps their "no useful purpose" argument would hold water in some cases. But in the absence of such proof of harm and indeed in light of some evidence to the contrary, I must recoil from these proposals of censorship. If harm cannot be established, why not give people the news they want? Some direct community good may accrue and, even if that is not the case, one ultimate result, I assume, will be a financially sound press. And a financially sound press is usually a strong press. And a strong and free press is, in my opinion, every bit as essential as a sound court system to the preservation of our way of life. As Herbert Brucker of the *Hartford Courant* said in a recent discussion at Northwestern dealing with this subject, "The history (of press restriction) is not good. Once you limit the freedom to know what goes on and the right to report it, you have started down a dangerous path. The history of such things is that in the end you have not pure justice, but the big fix."

Mr. Sowle is Associate Dean and Professor of Law at Northwestern University School of Law, and editor of the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*. This is from a talk to the City Club of Chicago, June 29.

George Ade Reports The World's Fair (1893 at Chicago)

By J. H. McKee

Seventy-two years ago, when Chicago was preparing its World's Columbian Exposition, Charles H. Dennis, managing editor of the *News Record*, had a good man to do a feature column on the Fair—George Ade.

Long before the opening of the Fair, which was to be on May 1, 1893, Dennis had given a two-column space on the editorial page to Ade for a daily account of doings at the Fair Grounds. Dennis called the column "All Roads Lead to the World's Fair."

Out to Jackson Park, where things were in preparation, went Ade and his Purdue college friend and Chicago roommate, John T. McCutcheon. They saw in preparation what was to be one of the most successful of World's Fairs—in a time somewhat simpler than the time when reporters go to Flushing Meadow. Both had plenty of enthusiasm for the assignment. McCutcheon was to make pictures for the column.

In the pre-half-tone days of 1892-1893, the *News Record* (which was to be renamed the *Record* on March 13, 1893) had a staff of very competent artists. Will Schmedtgen, head of the staff, and other members, illuminated the paper with drawings of the Fair, front page and on, through months.

Exhibits were already being installed. Especially the horticulture people, properly, were early. Especially prominent, said Ade, were the primroses. Ade affectionately described seed planting and plant cultivation. "Thousands upon thousands of clustered petals give back the soft light of a winter afternoon, stretching away in lines of varying color until one can almost imagine it an endless procession of flowers marching to the unheard music of brownies' voices."

A big Sequoia came from California; a big cheese from Canada. Allotments in the Agricultural Building by states and foreign countries showed Missouri and Great Britain leading.

The U.S.S. *Constellation* was bringing 45 cases of bronzes from Naples, 26 cases of bronzes from Florence, and paintings. From Havre the *Constellation* would bring 225 cases of casts and 381 cases of French paintings.

"Close under the shadow of the plaster crabs, lobsters, eels and tadpoles that adorn the main hall of the fisheries building is a collection of boxes bearing Norway's label and the stamp of the customs officer."

Many people were expected at the Fair, and many mishaps, of course, were inevitable. "Coroner McHale is making arrangements to have inquests promptly, as many witnesses will be strangers who could not stay for delayed inquests."

Probably Ade enjoyed writing the following: "Among other provisions for the entertainment of guests, the exposition has arranged a special bureau for the reception of visitors who make their living by stealing and picking pockets. The bureau is in charge of John Bonfield, who has a wide acquaintance among the men he is to receive and who knows how to make their presence as innocuous as possible."

An announcement of the bureau of public comfort was reported: "Colored citizens of the better class will be provided for separately, to the mutual pleasure and convenience, it is hoped, of all concerned; hence care should be taken in application for rooms by this estimable body of our people to distinctly state this controlling fact."

The Cigar Makers International Union had asked that none but union-made cigars be allowed on sale at the Fair. Directors of the Fair seemed to be opposed to the proposal. They debated two hours, while a delegation of the Union impatiently waited in the corridors. The request was refused. The delegation "... received the answer with emphatic disapproval."

On January 16, 1893, with the opening of the Fair still three and a half months away, Ade reported, "Gate receipts at Jackson park show the strong attraction of the Exposition under the most adverse conditions. The attendance for the last week has averaged over five hundred a day."

Ade became descriptive on January 12.

In a storm of snow that swirled and sung around the corners of the big buildings at Jackson park the work of the Fair went forward yesterday as though the winds were only incentives to energetic labor and cold a stimulus to activity. The electro-pneumatic paint machines were coloring the interiors of the great halls with their sleety jets; hammers and saws made accompaniment for old Boreas' obligato; tooting, puffing locomotives brought trains of goods sent from climes that know no winter, . . .

On the broad roadway leading to machinery hall the casual spectator might have noticed a procession of

muffled forms with bowed heads following the figure of a Greek goddess reposing on a crude sled drawn by two horses. One of the muffled men tenderly supported the woman's head with his arm as he walked beside the sled.

On December 17 Ade told of the manufacture of statuary for the Fair. He went inside the Forestry Building workshop: "Forty-four figures designed by Karl Bitter have grown or are growing here in this space." He told of the material: clay, glue, plaster, armatures, jute fiber, wooden braces inside "great bodies. Ten men might easily crouch inside one of the big cows now nearly completed."

Ade went to Machinery Hall and wrote: "Application and transmission of power offer fascinating problems to the mechanical engineer. Since the days of Archimedes these two subjects have ever dwelt in the brains of inventors, and every year some mechanism is devised which threatens to revolutionize the existing method."

There is description of the mechanical power plant—for 25,000 horsepower—which will be visible to visitors who "... will view the furnaces from the gallery above."

And, "During the Exposition the entire machinery plant may be viewed from electric cranes which are to be propelled across the building just above the machinery. This crane will pass just eight inches above the flywheel, and water will be kept aboard it for the purpose of reviving ladies who faint. Enough air-brakes are shown in the transportation building to stop a cyclone."

Of the Mines Building, "All of the north and half of the east side of the building have been assigned to the oil monopoly."

On November 26, 1892, Ade reported: "Seventy-five to one hundred thousand people are to be fed daily at the World's Fair under a concession awarded yesterday by the ways and means committee. The Gage Hotel company of Chicago secured the concession and will pay 25 per cent of its gross receipts for the grant. "... the concessionaries will be expected to establish twenty separate restaurants in the main buildings of the Exposition. In these restaurants seats are to be provided so that from 10,000 to 12,000 people may be served at the same time With foreign and domestic concessions already granted, 45,000 persons can be served at one time within the walls of the World's Fair."

By March 29, 1893, "Exhibits poured into the grounds at the rate of 200 carloads in twenty-four hours"

Again: "The executive committee decided to remedy an oversight in its opening-day ceremonies program by providing for an invocation. The plan of exercises as first formulated had omitted the prayer. Pastors of Chicago called attention to the omission and protested to the committee."

There was a "Board of Lady Managers," and Mrs. Potter Palmer was the chairman. There was, of course, a Women's Building.

From Massachusetts there was a "... bed quilt made of pieces of Lady Washington's dresses"

Ade venturesomely quoted an Englishwoman at an exhibit: "Two lovely cushions are also among the exhibits, ineffably soft and liberally large, the ground in satin embroidered with flowers, and the designs copied from Italian needlework. A sweet little footstool"

In the middle of the summer Ade reported: "Prettiest of all receptions held at the women's building was that given by the little maidens of Mrs. Rorer's cooking class. Twenty damsels who learned how to break eggs, turn omelets, broil steaks, bake bread, make angel's cake and numerous other delicacies fluttered around the room all the afternoon wearing bewitching long aprons and little caps"

"About fifty fathers, mothers, aunties, sisters and friends."

There was a Children's Building. In the Children's Building was a babies' room. Before the glass partitions, "... standing room is at such a premium that the *Record* man, who came late, could not get at the partition at all and was obliged to ask the matron if he could go inside.

"'Yes, you can if you will promise not to talk loud,' she said. 'We had a man in there the other day and he woke up all the babies.' The promise was given and the door was opened. Now this happened at about 11 o'clock in the forenoon. Experts in babyology declare that at that hour the loved despots of home are wont to raise up their voices and demand a second breakfast A political stump orator could not have heard his own voice in that room. It was filled with babies. They were in cribs and chairs, on the floor and in swinging seats Some demanded, some begged, some cried It was a crisis in babyland They demanded milk, luke-warm milk with a little sugar in it, and they got it."

On opening day, May 1, 1893: "Installation was practically finished at the government building yesterday. The last piece of exhibit work was finished when Gen. Schofield's head was screwed on a dummy's shoulders. It was a wax head shown by the war department. The dummy of the major general mounted on a horse stands at the front of a lot of other figures, and they represent the uniforms and accoutrements of a major-general and his staff."

Ade reported the dedication of Haiti's building: "... the representative of the West Indian republic stood, a colored man of colossal frame, his face bearing the traces of time, his white hair bespeaking age, his full, resonant voice trumpeting the triumph of intelligence over ignorance, the fall of slavery and the reign of freedom."

"It was Frederick Douglass, who had been commissioned by President Hippolyte to dedicate Haiti's headquarters."

In six months Ade and McCutcheon had seen about everything, including the exhibits of art. On June 16 Ade wrote: "It is almost a relief to enter the Holland section,

for, search ever so keenly, not a single 'nude' is seen. The walls are covered with canvasses depicting windmills, home scenes, chubby-faced children in wooden shoes and quaint costume, bits of canal scenery, cows feeding near peaceful streams, women knitting . . ."

One day Ade began:

College row in the gallery of the liberal arts building . . . Harvard . . . uncanny specimens of the dissecting rooms, . . . or a row of jars with their colonies of bacteria bearing names of horrible diseases . . . Princeton . . . the photographs of prominent men in foot-ball, base-ball and lacrosse teams occupy places of honor in the main section, while the portraits of the presidents are across the aisle in a much less conspicuous place, . . . Archaeology is the keynote to the most interesting part of the rooms occupied by the University of Pennsylvania.

John McCutcheon drew a picture of Purdue University's Locomotive in a large glass case.

George Ade was only twenty-six when he began reporting the Fair. His language in description is worth noting. On October 13, 1893, he wrote:

Having seen the World's Fair under the clear and steady sunshine . . . and then having seen it outlined in white and flame against the upper darkness of night, the spectator has caught the bolder beauties of the spectacle. He has missed something, however, unless he has seen the buildings and statues muffled in a fog like the one which came in from the lake yesterday. It blotted out all details except those within reach of the hand. The lights became simply blurs . . . marked by the dimmest outlines . . .

The gondola half way across the inky waters of the grand basin was a crescent shadow resting on the waves. The gondolier bending an oar had neither features nor proportions. He was simply the ghost-like suggestion of a man . . . Boats just as dim and shadowy came out of the depths of the white gloom in the most unexpected way . . .

And the Ferris wheel was comparatively higher than ever before, for it carried its passengers up into real clouds . . .

On October 19, Ade wrote:

Dusk is falling over the court of honor. The white arches toward the lake show through an uncertain light. A strange quiet seems to have settled upon the Exposition. For a brief space the crowds forbear to see and to marvel. This is the hour of rest and the only hour of rest. It is the waiting interval between the hard work of the day and the innocent delight of the night.

By day the World's Fair is a university where the tired and patient students keep at it with their textbooks and spectacles; and they seem to be whipped with a sense of duty to a tedious search after knowledge. They are good natured as they toil, but it is toil just the same, all the day through; and when the shades of evening descend they are glad of a brief rest in the quiet here before the carnival of the evening begins.

"Have you seen the big engine?" asks someone near you in the crowd.

"No," replies someone else. "We might as well get through with that now . . ."

The place to spend this hour is in the court of honor, especially if the night comes on as mildly as it did last evening. It is pleasant to be out of doors. The buildings, even though seen a hundred times before, take on a new beauty in the dimness. People are more given to admiring the white palaces than they . . . were before.

The arched door of the administration building has begun to glow from the lights within. At the side of the doorways are hundreds of people crowded into the chairs . . . the doorways, the stone steps toward the water have each a close row of dark figures. It resembles more than anything else an immense flock of birds seeking roost.

Eight days later, as the Fair neared its end, Ade wrote of the grounds after midnight and before morning.

A few hours ago the scene was a tumult, a few hours hence it will again be tumult. This is the bivouac of the forces of the day . . . The desolation of the scene has been repaired by the scavengers. The debris of the fireworks has been removed, the reminiscent lunch boxes and stains of the throng have been swept and washed away . . . Compared with this the sunset lull in the court of honor is as a rout. Compared with this the midnight with its rumbling carts and vigilant scavengers is a discord . . . The buildings are clothed with the grand repose which inheres in artistic masses.

The moon shines out from a rift in the clouds. As if by magic the administration building stands out in black relief, mass above mass to the coronet of the dome. Now one can appreciate the grandeur of the mass. There are no . . . details to allure the eyes from the sweeping curves which bound the building and knit it into a concrete entirety.

. . . the Illinois dome, shorn of its paltry gew-gaws . . . towers above all else with an unwonted dignity.

Shimmering in the dim light stands the crystal dome of horticulture crowning its somber pile.

. . . the great equestrian groups—the cowboy and the Indian, they, too, have been enhanced by the

strange revelations of darkness. Anatomical details have vanished . . . they stand there in great masses as if 'done' in white monochrome by the strokes of an artist's hand.

Daniel Chester French's "Republic" looks as if she were poised in mid air, for in the deeper gloom below . . . no pedestal appears.

The Macmonnies fountain . . . is more impressive under such conditions than at any other time, for a section gains in unity as the detail loses in distinctness for . . . the person who braves the peril of being ejected by the secret-service men.

McCutcheon made some night time pictures.

Ade wrote about the visitors to the Fair. He told how they got there. He watched excursion trains arrive. He looked at one of the benches for the footsore on Columbia avenue, and, in twenty-eight words, not the rather fancy ones he used for buildings and lagoons, but simply and observantly, and sympathetically: "On the end are a tanned young farmer, his wife, just beginning to thin away and lose her red cheeks, and two hearty tow-headed boys dressed exactly alike."

As early as February 8, Ade considered costs at the Fair: "Allowing car-fare both ways, 50 cents admission to the grounds, a moderate lunch costing 50 cents more, a concert in the music hall, mineral water, car-fare on the electric railway inside the grounds, a ride on the electric launches, a glimpse of the Esquimaux and a catalogue of exhibits, the careful financier might see the whole show for only about \$15, if he dispensed with such luxuries as peanuts, pop-corn and soda-water."

Through the months Ade recorded small as well as big things. He noted the seeming millions of sparrows cheerfully inhabiting the Fair grounds. Then he looked at the eagle on the statue of the Republic, and: "The eagle . . . wears its customary cast-iron scream." He told his readers of the one hundred gondoliers who would be imported from Venice. Outlay for the dedication ceremonies was \$300,000. Miss Harriet Monroe received \$1,000 for an "Ode."

One day was devoted to the State of Washington. Ade told that: "For the purpose of showing what can be done in the way of raising watermelons the far-away state of Washington has engaged to send to Jackson park in September twenty carloads of melons in one consignment." They were to be given away.

Ade noted on August 18 that West Point cadets were in encampment on the grounds. On August 19 he said that an old southern still delighted a visitor from Kentucky. Maryland was dealt with on October 16—and most of 1300 words were given to oysters.

Ade and McCutcheon had very real enthusiasm for the Midway Plaisance. As early as December 7, 1892, "The

Midway Plaisance, pronounced with or without an interfering soft palate and the nasal intonation of a bad case of influenza, is beginning to look very much like a plaisance. Anybody who passes the great arch at the Cottage Grove avenue end of it would suspect it in a minute." He described the yellow gravel road.

This is the driveway on either side of which the architecture and life of the orient and the occident are to spring up with ephemeral cosmopolitanism.

In this eighty acres . . . the wilderness is undergoing the . . . process of blooming like the rose.

"That?" queried an Hibernian, in blue overalls, replying to a question. "That, they tell me," pointing to the structure, "is one of them Hungary restaurants."

. . . the Bernese Alps . . . the crater of Kilauea . . . Cairo's eccentric street . . .

Just across the way is the Moorish palace, which, in its present stage, very much resembles an Indian barn.

On June 2, Ade tells of the Austrian village. "The beer garden is unlike anything else in the Plaisance . . . The waitresses are all girls brought over from Vienna . . . There is great rivalry among the girls as to who can carry the most glasses in one hand. . . . Bepi . . . now holds the record. She takes twelve of the glasses and skips along as airily as though she were holding a fan."

There are twenty-four Laplanders in the Lapland village. The band is headed by King Bull . . . He is 112 years old . . .

King Bull has a very remarkable family. He is accompanied by his son, Bals Bull, aged 90 years, who has a son named Bals Hygd, aged 73, who has a daughter aged 59, who has a son aged 41, who has a son aged 29, who has a daughter aged 14 years, who has a daughter 2 years old When they are dressed in their reindeer-skin clothes it is, leaving out the baby, as difficult to tell one from the other as it is to name the dominoes upside down.

A Javanese orchestra is a thing to be wondered at . . . It consists of twenty-four pieces and the names by which some of them are called would tax the powers of a loquacious American commercial traveler from a musical instrument house. Here are some of them: Djlnglonglentik, bonangeled, sarorgpekinlentik and kuongpaninga.

After running the gauntlet of barbaric discord that passes for music in most of the Plaisance theaters, it is a pleasure to hear the harmony of the Javanese band with its suggestion of soft chimes.

The advent of the dancing girls was heralded by a long roll on the gong, which increased in tone until the center of the stage was reached. Then the music changed to a strain as graceful as a Strauss waltz. The

girls were barefooted and bareheaded and dressed in bright colors. . . ."

Of Egypt's temple:

At each corner of the front are . . . monolithic obelisks They are seventy-five feet high. On one is sculptured in hieroglyphic language a dedication to Rameses II and on the other to Grover Cleveland."

There are more kinds of etiquette in the Plaisance and around Jackson park than in any spot of its size in the world today.

All . . . have a reserved opinion of American customs and hospitality, and none . . . is willing to concede the superiority of the American courtesy as displayed in the Plaisance.

Cupid is beginning to make his presence known in the Plaisance. Within a week a Samoan has fallen heels over head in love with the Norwegian girl in the beauty show, the priest in Cairo street is languishing because an American cash-girl was sent away after he had given his heart to her,

On October 30 the Fair would be over in one more day.

Another twenty-four hours and the exhibit halls will be warehouses

When night comes 100,000 incandescent lights will shine for the last time in the park.

The thought becomes bearable when one is told that the line of fading friends includes the fiery catalogue man, with his coat of crimson and his brazen throat; that the pop corn man is to disturb concerts no longer with his calliope lungs; that the waiter who made life a task of patience and indigestion has made his last overcharge and resigns to the coming of dusk.

. . . .
 . . . these suffer figurative death with the Exposition and mitigate the woes of those who grieve that the Fair is over

All roads that so long led to the World's Fair have become avenues of departure.

Mr. McKee, professor-emeritus of English at Purdue, is working on George Ade's papers, including the humorist's columns in the old Chicago *Record*.

Life Line of Democracy

(Continued from page 2)

It is not my intention to view with alarm the deterioration of the press since the days of William Allen White. I do not believe there has been a deterioration. I do question whether the press has improved enough to meet the responsibility of a job that becomes more difficult each year. Despite the fact that there are hundreds of well-qualified reporters and editors, the performance is often mediocre or poor in Washington.

I think, strongly think, we need more tough self-criticism in regard to our most vital function—the coverage of federal government.

There *are* areas in which press performance *is* equal to or even superior to what it was 30 to 60 years ago.

There are works of highest merit, including the depth reporting jobs of the *Wall Street Journal*, and the periodic brilliant local investigative reporting in Chicago, St. Louis, Cleveland, Des Moines, Atlanta, Nashville and dozens of other places. The great financial resources of the news magazines result in consistent fine depth work by *U.S. News and World Report* and periodic flashes of greatness by *Time* and *Newsweek*.

But even the wealthiest news organization can become bogged down in the complexity of national and international problems that face us today.

William Allen White had limited financial resources and manpower, but he used them to capacity in seeking to understand the local, state, federal and international problems of his day. He judged and occasionally misjudged as all of us do from time to time, but he was independent of his friends as well as his enemies.

Most certainly, the governmental structures of the town of Emporia and the State of Kansas were more simple and more manageable than our national and international problems today. But it can require as much ability and a great deal more courage to report on local issues and local people than it does to ponder over outrages in Zanzibar or Leopoldville.

In the days when William Allen White was making his mark the federal government was small. The entire budget was less than a billion dollars until 1917. With the exception of 1918 and 1919, the federal spending did not exceed \$10 billion until 1941.

The major press problems of today can be linked directly to the size and complexity of the \$100 billion-a-year federal operation. Bright reporters and editors can still find ways to understand and police most city, county and state operations. But too often they are frustrated and then overwhelmed by the seemingly impossible job of serving as a watchdog on federal spending and policies.

There is some awareness of the problem, but no one really comes to grips with it. There has been a floundering by a press that has become more and more dependent upon handouts in Washington. Trapped in its own superficiality, the press is an easy victim of the Big Lie. Lacking understanding, the press follows the fads of the best Madison Avenue sloganeers.

Steps to deal with the problem of bigness have resulted in some unhealthy developments. Specialists have been assigned to governmental agencies to provide more knowledgeable coverage. In too many cases these specialists have been converted into propagandists for the agencies they cover—a type of kept press. The TFX story is an illustration of how many “watchdogs of democracy” were transformed into lap dogs of the Pentagon political appointees.

Certainly we need specialization, but there needs to be constant examination to assure that the specialists are not seduced by their sources. How much objectivity can one expect from a Pentagon reporter who shows up to cover a hearing accompanied by his wife and the wife of the Defense official who is under a critical investigation. Some social contact with high public figures is inevitable, but reporters and editors have an obligation to ask themselves if they have sacrificed independence for a White House dinner or a Scuba diving party with the Secretary of Defense.

The press would have protested violently at the suggestion of creation of a federal propaganda office. Yet, the government press specialists in many agencies have become propaganda officers. Instead of serving as a press contact for a quick guide to information about an agency, many of these men have become propaganda officers, seeking to build the image of political figures by policing and controlling press contacts with all agency personnel.

Not content with central information control in an agency and some departments, there are continuing periodic efforts to establish more coordinated information operations between the agencies. The explanation is always that it is for more efficiency and to avoid confusion or conflicting stories. If effective, the result would be creation of a federal propaganda office.

A few weeks ago, I received an irate call from a government press officer who objected to my direct call to a cabinet officer for an appointment. I was told it was improper for me to by-pass the press office.

In the following conversation, I informed him I had no obligation to make contact through a public relations office.

I told him I would make my contacts without consulting him, and that when I wanted help I would let him know. He bristled when I referred to him as “a public relations man” for the department, and he insisted he is a “professional newsman” with the duty of giving the public a truthful and objective picture.

I have no doubt he regards himself as an objective newsman, and I am also certain that in most cases he tries to give reporters a balanced picture of activities in his department.

However, he is hired by a Democratic administration to serve one of its cabinet officers. I am certain he would be somewhat less aggressive than an independent reporter in penetrating the excuses and half-truths that are so often tossed out to explain away mistakes, mismanagement and corruption.

While most reporters do not accept the tight policing and discipline that some press officers would impose, there are a good many who find it more convenient and even essential to retain a cooperative working relationship with the agencies' propaganda centers.

A Defense Department order to police press contacts at the Pentagon is a clear example of a formal effort to control press activity. The order by Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester was signed on October 27, 1962. It has the backing of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and remains in force despite complaints by the press that it amounts to a “gestapo” directive to discourage circulation of the views of persons who dissent from “the departmental line.”

The order states that all Pentagon personnel—military and civilian—must make a report of all conversations with reporters before the end of the business day. Sylvester justifies it as necessary to keep defense secrets from leaking. He also says it is to keep him abreast of all information made available, so he can make the same information available to other reporters in an orderly manner. He doesn't mention that it would also spot the sources of stories indicating disagreement with the McNamara line, which it is unlikely Sylvester would distribute widely.

The Sylvester order still stands. The press, after a few cries of rage, has accepted the chains with only a whimper. It remains as a precedent for other departments to follow if they feel too many dissenting opinions are being peddled by governmental subordinates.

Fortunately, some officials disregard Sylvester's directive and some reporters are enterprising enough to evade it. This should not make the existence of the directive any more acceptable.

Add to this, the McNamara “economy” move toward a single press office for the \$50 billion-a-year Defense Department.

Also, examine the indications that the Johnson Administration may curtail the presidential press conference.

There are indications he will depend mainly on those little spur-of-the-moment meetings with the regular White House reporters. These gatherings present a minimum danger of the tough question that often needs to be asked. Johnson has indicated he might supplement this with some informal television chats with a few reporters, who I will wager will be hand-picked.

If that is to be the new press conference format, then I'm against it. I would hardly accept the logic of one editorial writer who suggested that if Johnson feels the open press conferences of the past do not "fit his personality" then he should be allowed to change.

In the light of that type of editorial thinking, we can only hope that democracy fits President Johnson's personality.

The national television networks can, and do, serve as a great force in informing the public on important issues. However, television seldom serves as a leader in exploring bad government—seldom operates in a watchdog role. Television, with all of its money and manpower, usually waits until the daily press has done all the spadework on an issue.

It is unrealistic to expect more of television. The industry operates on government licenses, and under constant threat of more government control. This certainly limits its independence. But even without direct government control there are other factors that tend to make our three big networks "soft" on an incumbent administration without regard to politics.

The networks put great stock in exclusive interviews with high government officials, and it is obvious that they pay a price by limiting their independence. The price may be an unspoken assurance that the cooperative official will face friendly reporters, and will be treated in a kindly fashion. Official reluctance or refusal to cooperate with an aggressive television team can often be an effective way of destroying independence. It is not necessary to be angry at newspapers or television reporters or commentators who fawn over public officials with a simpering sweetness. Only feel sorry for them.

Examine these problems in context with a presidential directive to authorize a nation-wide government news service to be made available free to newspapers, radio and television. At the same time, there is a trend toward much higher costs for wire service for the independent press agencies—AP and UPI.

In addition to direct and subtle government controls many newspapers have been putting themselves in strait jackets of conformity by copying the story play and the editorial positions of some large East Coast newspapers. This tends to destroy the independent thinking and diversity William Allen White believed to be the great strength of the press. It is particularly destructive when the editorial policies copied come from newspapers that have been

demonstrably wrong on policies on Cuba, Ghana, Viet Nam and other areas.

Individually or collectively these developments cause me great concern. I believe they should cause great concern in the entire newspaper profession.

Over a period of 13 years, I have had the occasion to be critical of information policies of the Truman Administration, the Eisenhower Administration and the Kennedy Administration. I have tried to make that criticism tough and objective.

There is no need to apologize for the past criticism, for some high officials in each of these administrations engaged in unjustified secrecy policies that seriously interfered with the public's right to know about government. Each used a wide range of public relations techniques, distortions and outright lies to deceive the public.

The public officials deserved a lambasting for their arrogance in hiding or distorting the facts, but the press was also responsible.

It is true that high officials of any administration may fool any of us on a few issues for a short period of time despite diligent work. But if it becomes apparent that any large segment of the press is being fooled for any extended period of time, then the press just isn't doing its job.

Under the Truman Administration there were efforts to hide the tax scandals, the R.F.C. scandals and a good many other bits of "influence peddling" and "favoritism." However, there was aggressive independent reporting that cut through the Truman Administration's claim that there was no wrong-doing. The press did its job, and the public finally understood.

Under President Eisenhower, there were other unjustified efforts to hide the record. This time the press was slow to move. However, there were enough pockets of press aggressiveness and sufficient push behind two or three congressional committees to force exposure of the "conflicts of interest" in the Dixon-Yates case, and the illegal and improper activities at some of the regulatory agencies.

In the 1960 campaign, John F. Kennedy spoke of the importance of open government information policies. He indicated he would not permit use of "Executive Privilege" to hide records from the Congress and the public. In his State of the Union address he told us that healthy dissent would not only be tolerated, but encouraged.

However, for some reason it didn't work out quite that way. Kennedy authorized use of "Executive Privilege" to bar Congressional committees from information about government operations, and there were a large number of efforts to curb dissent and stifle criticism. Unfortunately, unknowing and short-sighted elements in the press were patsies for the Kennedy Administration. They even helped justify barriers to curb dissent and to curtail the flow of information.

Two major stories of the last year—the TFX case and

the Otepka case—can serve to demonstrate how many Washington reporters and columnists failed in their role as watchdogs. They failed on important stories, and became propagandists for two political appointees. They failed despite the documented record and the fine guidelines available in the excellent balanced reporting of Cecil Holland in the *Washington Star* and the columns of Hanson Baldwin in the *New York Times*.

The TFX story involved the integrity of the spending practices in the Defense Department, and the judgment of Defense Secretary McNamara. McNamara over-ruled the top-level Pentagon Source Selection Board that had favored the Boeing firm for a large plane contract. Testimony before the McClellan committee shows McNamara will waste more than \$400,000,000 by an arbitrary decision to hand the \$6.5 billion TFX program to Texas-based General Dynamics Corporation.

A few hero worshiping reporters and columnists, feeding on Pentagon press office distortions, have been giving the public the line that McNamara's decision will somehow save the taxpayers a billion dollars. They have taken and repeated factually inaccurate smears against the McClellan Subcommittee from anonymous Defense Department spokesmen. They have disregarded or rationalized the evidence of "conflicts of interest" that should have caused two of McNamara's top aides to disqualify themselves from having anything to do with the TFX decision.

McNamara over-ruled the unanimous recommendation that favored the Boeing version on the basis of a "superior performance" as well as a price that would be lower by \$100,000,000 to \$415,000,000.

It was possible that McNamara could have been right, but certainly the burden of proof was on him to establish he was right since he over-ruled his subordinates to give the contract to General Dynamics. He signed a five-page memorandum of "justification" on November 21, 1962, that was loaded with errors, according to the McClellan committee record. One of the errors was "a little slip-up" on the entire performance rating of the General Dynamics plane. The performance rating was generally inflated. Also, McNamara had a little error of \$77,000,000, a little error of \$32,000,000, and a little error of \$29,000,000.

To justify his decision, McNamara made a claim that General Dynamics had greater "commonality" of parts in its Navy and Air Force versions that would result in great savings on maintenance, repair, spare parts and training. The experts—civilian and military—testifying on engineering and military matters, have stated that the General Dynamics plane has little or no advantage over the Boeing plane in this area. One experienced aeronautical engineer declared that the idea of any substantial savings because of "commonality" was "popycock."

McNamara stated he could disregard the low bid by Boeing because Boeing cost figures lacked "realism."

Boeing officials stated they submitted detailed cost figures to the Defense Department, and had "backup material" available to demonstrate the realism on every figure in their bid. Boeing officials said the Defense Department never challenged their figures, but had arbitrarily tossed out their low bid. The McClellan committee proved the only Defense cost figures available had some rather dramatic errors—\$291,000,000 and \$340,000,000. McNamara could not have been right if he relied upon these figures, which he now admits were in error. What figures did McNamara have before him when he decided that Boeing lacked "cost realism" in making the low bid? When the auditors of the General Accounting Office questioned McNamara about his decision, he admitted he had no other cost study available. He said he made "a rough judgment" from his experience as an official at Ford Motor Company.

McNamara told the GAO he got the figures "out of my head." Comptroller General Joseph Campbell expressed his "surprise" that McNamara had no cost figures for such an important decision, and stated that the GAO feels there must be written documents to support multi-billion dollar decisions. But this wasn't all.

McNamara downgraded a modern braking device—the thrust reverser—in the Boeing plane as being a risky engineering venture. The General Dynamics plane had a conventional dive brake that some say will make the plane obsolete before it is in production. The Navy and Air Force wanted the "thrust reverser" in the General Dynamics plane because of its superiority. Experts have testified it will cost \$446,000,000 more to equip the General Dynamics plane with the "thrust reverser" at this stage.

McNamara contended that Boeing's use of titanium in the wing structure was also "risky." On this point, the McClellan Subcommittee has produced expert testimony of metallurgists, including specialists in titanium, who disagreed with McNamara. The experts testified there was no unusual risk involved in the use of titanium in the wing structures, and that the use proposed by Boeing was conventional.

General Curtis LeMay and Admiral George Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, approved the Boeing plane. They have told McNamara that they had reservations about the General Dynamics plane, and called it a "wrong decision."

Granted, this was a complicated and technical subject, but it was not impossible and the press, generally, failed to get to the heart of the matter.

There were only about a dozen reporters who read the whole record of the TFX investigation, and a few who read enough to be familiar with the weakness of McNamara's position—that he was wrong on facts. However, there were dozens of apologists for McNamara who have written authoritatively without benefit of reading the record. They have written from Pentagon handouts and

from confidential "inside information" straight from McNamara, Assistant Secretary Arthur Sylvester, former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric or former Navy Secretary Fred Korth.

Why would Defense Secretary McNamara over-rule a unanimous recommendation to make what experts regard as a "wrong" decision to pay the highest price for the second-best plane?

He had help on this case from Gilpatric, the former lawyer for General Dynamics, and from Fred Korth, whose Continental National Bank of Fort Worth had General Dynamics for one of its best customers.

It should be no surprise that both Gilpatric and Korth recommended that the contract should go to General Dynamics, rather than Boeing. Chairman McClellan and others have given the opinion that neither Korth nor Gilpatric should have had any role in the TFX contract in the light of their prior associations with General Dynamics. But many reporters and editorial writers—ignorant, gullible or lopsidedly partisan—could see no "conflict of interest" problem in the role of Gilpatric or Korth.

Reporters I had worked with, and I might say agreed with, on the "conflict of interest" in the Dixon-Yates case in the Eisenhower Administration, had no interest in going into the details of the role of Gilpatric or Korth. Others who had been aggressive in pointing up the role of Adolphe Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates case wrote only apologies for Gilpatric and Korth.

In some cases, it was ignorance of the facts. In some cases it was laziness in dealing with a complex record. I am afraid that in a few cases it was a foul political partisanship.

I believe that the press has an obligation to aggressively pursue any evidence that high officials have lied under oath about government operations. There is an additional obligation to ferret out all evidence that others were engaged in subornation of perjury or in condoning false statements or illegal wire taps. This would seem basic. However, in the words of Senator Morse, many uninformed reporters were "the parrots of the 'line' from the executive branch . . . (and) care nothing of the merits of the case made . . . in Congress."

Otto F. Otepka, the chief security evaluator at the State Department, became a State Department employee in 1953 shortly after the Eisenhower Administration came to power. Some reporters found this fact alone to be grounds for being hostile to Otepka, and they characterized him as the last vestige of McCarthyism at the State Department.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka was a career civil servant with no political ties who had been transferred from the Civil Service Commission to the State Department because of his experience as a lawyer and security evaluator. Otepka believed in a strict security operation, but he was not an irrational man who saw a

Red under every bed. In fact, it was Otepka who had recommended clearance of Wolf Ladejinsky in 1954 when some more zealous persons sought to label the career Agricultural Attache a "security risk."

He served with such distinction as a security evaluator that in 1958, Secretary of State Dulles awarded him the department distinguished service award. Early in the Kennedy Administration, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Roger W. Jones commended Otepka as a skilled and balanced security evaluator. That was before direct conflicts of testimony developed involving Otepka and his superiors.

Otepka delivered three State Department documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to prove he was telling the truth about the handling of a security problem. One of Otepka's superiors charged this was "insubordination" and violation of rules. To some reporters the delivery of documents to a Senate Subcommittee was justification for firing.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka delivered the documents to prove that he was telling the truth with regard to the handling of a security matter. His testimony had been in conflict with the testimony of one of his superiors, and he produced the records to prove he was truthful.

Otepka delivered documents that also proved his superiors were wrong. To some State Department-oriented reporters and editorial writers, this was "McCarthyism."

There are veteran reporters and editorial writers who do not understand the vital function of Congress in checking the administration and operations of the Executive Branch. Many can't tell the difference between a responsible investigation as conducted by the late Senator Kefauver, Senator McClellan, or Representative Blatnik, and one of the late Senator Joe McCarthy's free-swinging extravaganzas. Many didn't try to tell the difference. They are automatically against any investigations, and automatically mouth the Executive Branch line without regard for its inconsistency or provable fallacy.

In their eagerness to oust Otepka, two State Department officials—John F. Reilly and Elmer Dewey Hill—took part in attaching a listening device to Otepka's telephone. A third official—David Belisle—knew about it.

All three testified under oath that they had no knowledge that any wire-tap, "bug," or listening device had been attached to Otepka's telephone. Not until after a Senate floor speech warned of perjury, did these three high State Department officials write letters to the Senate Committee admitting the use of listening devices on Otepka's telephone. However, in admitting the use of the listening device, the three high officials explained that there was no listening on the wire and no interception of Otepka's calls. Since then, these letters—prepared in the State Department legal office and approved by Rusk—have been established

as being inaccurate.

Electronics expert Hill has testified that he actually recorded more than a dozen conversations on Otepka's wire as part of a plan to try to get evidence to serve as a basis for ousting the security evaluator. He testified that Reilly knew of the recordings and had a special interest in one of them.

The documented record shows what is characterized by Senator Dodd as "perjury," "falsification" and "lying" by three high level officials who were trying to "get" Otto Otepka. Yet some newspapers have ignored this story. Others have continued to take the State Department line that the proof of "false" testimony on the wire-taps is not connected with efforts to get Otepka.

Although Reilly and Hill have resigned, they have not been criticized by Secretary of State Rusk. Rusk allowed Belisle to remain in the State Department for weeks after becoming aware of the "untruthful" statements in the transcript. Secretary Rusk and his top aides continue ahead with the Reilly-initiated charges to oust Otepka for cooperating with Congress.

The activities of the State Department have been an outrageous, cynical and brutal effort to crush a dissenter for telling Congress the truth. In many ways, it is as bad as anything Joseph McCarthy did in his most irresponsible moments.

But more outrageous than the State Department's action has been the press performance. Some newsmen accepted the State Department philosophy that dissenters like Otepka should be squelched, and Congress barred from the facts.

The Otepka case involves the effectiveness of the whole Department security program. It involves the question of the integrity of many high level officials in a Department that is entrusted with vital foreign policy decisions. Yet, with only a few exceptions, the press has ignored this major investigation or has given it coverage warped by State Department distortions.

Fortunately, most reporting has been better than the reporting on the TFX investigation and the Otepka case. Most stories are less complicated, and take less concentrated study.

The comments on the weaknesses of the press and the problems of the press should not discourage the young reporter. Where the job is being done poorly, there is great opportunity for those who will study and work on the complex jobs. There are always many reporters willing to cover the easy story—the story that takes only a small amount of background study and guarantees good play in the paper. There are always too few on the stories that take weeks of work, that have an uncertain future, make sources angry, and may be buried with the want ads.

For this reason, there will always be plenty of room for reporters and editors who will tackle the tough story.

Last October and November, the press demonstrated in the Bobby Baker case that it has the courage and the great capacity for a deep investigation when it has the will to do the job. In a few short weeks the press had a hundred or more reporters probing nearly every political, social or business deal that Baker had touched.

Unfortunately, I must report that the interest of many others did not arise until after the appearance of a story about a German party girl who had been on the fringe of some of the Baker social action. She had also cavorted with some important political figures. Prior to this story there were only a handful of us doing any more than casual work on the subject. They included Julian Morrison of the *Washington Daily News*, and Larry Stern and Jack Landau of the *Washington Post*. It is amazing how a little sex angle stimulated editorial interest in good government.

I have been fortunate to work for publishers and editors who understand important stories about government without the necessity of being stimulated by a sex angle, a vicuna coat, a mink coat or a crude pay-off. It isn't that they are uninterested in sex, but simply that they don't need it to be interested in "conflicts of interest" and the more subtle forms of bad government.

Our editors understood when Senator John J. Williams said the integrity of the Senate was involved in the Baker probe.

They understood that the evidence of an arbitrary decision on a \$6.5 billion TFX contract was important, even though complicated and lacking a flashy angle.

They understood that evidence of laxity in the State Department security division was vital, and that allegations of falsification by high officials was a grave matter.

If we are to have effective reporting of complicated issues of government, it is vital to have editors who understand what they are doing. William Allen White knew what he was doing, or he tried to find out the facts. He understood the folly and failures of the press of his day, and he made no claim to personal infallibility. He worked hard and constantly re-examined his position.

The William Allen White attitude exists today, although it is not as prevalent as it should be. It exists here in the Middle West in many places. I know it exists in the work and attitudes of Editor Kenneth MacDonald, Managing Editor Frank Eyerly and News Editor Charles Reynolds of the *Des Moines Register*. I know because I have had the closest association with these men over a period of about 20 years. Intelligent and balanced independence is the quality they have in common with William Allen White.

I know that some of the same inquisitiveness, independence and dedication exists among other editors in the Cowles organization and on other newspapers far removed from Washington and New York. The independent editors seek to avoid being simple mirrors of the writings in a few

Eastern newspapers. The editors with real common sense can distinguish between informed and independent Washington commentary and the comments of a few journalistic prostitutes who simply parrot the shallow (but often sophisticated sounding) views of a few high-positioned political frauds.

I am elated when editors and reporters demonstrate aggressive independence as in the Bobby Baker investigation. We are all hurt when independence is destroyed or given away as it has been in much of the coverage and comment on the Otepka and TFX investigations.

Newspapering is a profession that gives us the opportunity to be in day-to-day touch with the great people and the great moments of our time. It also brings us in contact with some worshipers of good and bad alike. It is a disservice to our profession if we mislead our readers about the crooks and the clever charlatans who often win public office.

Ours is a profession that gives us the opportunity to be a strong voice and a strong force for good government. We can mold good public officials into better public officials by demanding top performance. We can make bad public officials toe the line or risk exposure and ouster.

It is in the power of each reporter and each editor to make his own choice. He can take the easy way and be a

patsy for those in political power, but knowing in the end that he was a weak-kneed hero worshiper who bent to any political wind of strength. Or he can be a force for good and serve as a real check on government.

This is a business I love. I am submerged in it. If I am critical, it is because I know it can do so much more and can be so much more effective than it is. It has improved, but it needs more improvement. It needs people who will work in the face of the frustration of long and difficult tasks. It needs people of courage who will not flinch when the job requires risking the disfavor of the mighty or the popular view of the moment.

The press needs, and always will need, the independence characterized by William Allen White. The least we can do for his memory is to constantly remind ourselves of the many ways that a free and independent press can be weakened or even destroyed. It is our responsibility to aggressively oppose anything that may contaminate the life line of democracy.

This is the fifteenth annual William Allen White Lecture, given at the University of Kansas on February 10 by **Mr. Mollenhoff**, Washington correspondent for the Cowles Publications. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1949-50.

Toronto *Star* — Martin Goodman
 United Press International — William
 Eaton
 Washington *Post* — Julius Duscha, Carroll
 Kilpatrick

Nieman Coverage

Among the former Nieman Fellows seen at work at the Republican convention in San Francisco or the Democratic convention in Atlantic City:

A. B. C. — Robert Fleming, Piers Anderson
 Atlanta *Constitution* — Reg Murphy
 Baltimore *Sun* — Peter Kumpa
 Boston *Globe* — Robert Healy, Wilfrid Rogers, Louis Lyons (and James Doyle of 1964-65)
 C.B.S. — Alexander Kendrick
 Chicago *Daily News* — Peter Lisagor
 Chicago *Sun-Times* — Tom Ross
 Cowles papers — Clark Mollenhoff
 Denver *Post* — Mort Stern
 Detroit *News* — Tom Joyce
 Gainesville (Ga.) *Times* — Sylvan Meyer
 Hutchinson (Kans.) *News* — John McCormally
 Indian *Express* — T. V. Parasuram
Jet — Simeon Booker
 Knight papers — Edwin Lahey
 Los Angeles *Times* — David Kraslow
 Melbourne *Age* — Bruce Grant
 Nashville *Tennessean* — Wayne Whitt
Newsweek — John Lindsay, Peter Goldman
 New York *Herald Tribune* — Dom Bonafede
 New York *Times* — Tom Wicker, Joseph Loftus, Anthony Lewis, Wallace Turner
 Philadelphia *Bulletin* — Peter Binzen
 Riverside (Calif.) *Press-Enterprise* — Norman Cherniss
 St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* — Robert Lasch, Richard Dudman
 San Francisco *Chronicle* — William German, Kenneth Wilson, Jack Foisie, Melvin Wax
 San Francisco *News-Call-Bulletin* — Mary Ellen Leary, Harry Press
 Scripps-Howard — William Steif
 Southeastern Newspapers — Wayne Kelly
Time, Inc. — John Steele, Simmons Fentress

Kendall Foss

1904 - 1964

Mr. Kendall Foss, managing editor of *Business Week*, the magazine he helped to found in 1954, died August 12 in Southampton, Long Island, after a long illness. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1945.

From 1927, when he graduated from Harvard, until 1954 he represented several news organizations abroad. He was a foreign correspondent for the United Press in London, the International News Service in Moscow, The New York *Times* in Berlin and The New York *Post*. He also worked for the Washington *Post* and was a contributing editor for *Time* magazine. He served the Tennessee Valley Authority as a public relations official and the Rural Electrification Administration as a personnel executive.

After his year studying under the Nieman Foundation, he returned to Berlin as war correspondent and political columnist for The New York *Post*. He became editor of the United States Military Government's German-language newspaper, *Die Neue Zeitung*, after the war. While in that position he was instrumental in founding the Free University of Berlin. The university awarded him an honorary degree in 1954.

Mr. Foss is survived by his widow, the former Maryanne Bishop, and two daughters.

Nieman Notes

1940

Hodding Carter's first book of poetry was published July 3 by Doubleday. Its title: *The Ballad of Catfoot Grimes and Other Verses*.

1941

The American College Public Relations Association at its annual convention in Los Angeles in July gave its outstanding achievement award to William M. Pinkerton, Harvard University News Officer.

1949

Alan Barth received the first Oliver Wendell Holmes Bill of Rights Award of the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union, May 6.

Grady Clay, real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, addressed the American Institute of Architects' California Council May 14, on "Public Opinion and the Building of Cities."

Tillman Durdin is on leave from the New York *Times* editorial page, writing a book on Taiwan. Durdin was one of the old China hands before the *Times* took him back to New York on editorials.

1951

Simeon Booker was one of the speakers on a human rights panel at the American Newspaper Guild convention at Long Beach, Calif., July 13-17. Booker is Washington correspondent for *Jet* and *Ebony*.

Bob Eddy, assistant to the publisher, Hartford *Courant*, has been named to the board of trustees of the Hartford College for Women.

Little, Brown & Co. brought out this summer Dana Adams Schmidt's new book, *Journey Among Brave Men*. It grew out of Schmidt's experience with the Kurds in their rebellion. He had already received the George Polk award "for the best reporting requiring exceptional courage and enterprise abroad" for his reports on the Kurdish rebels in the New York *Times*.

1952

Robert W. Brown of the Montgomery *Advertiser* has been named managing editor of the Rock Hill (South Carolina) *Evening Herald*.

1954

Robert E. Hoyt has joined the Detroit *Free Press* staff. Formerly with the Akron *Beacon Journal*, he became their Washington correspondent, then served for several years as municipal service director of Akron.

1955

William Woestendiek left *Newsday* in June to become assistant executive editor of the Houston *Post*.

Archibald Parsons has been named assistant to Robert W. Gibson, newly appointed foreign editor of the Los Angeles *Times*. Parsons has served in West Africa with the Ford Foundation since 1959.

1956

Pat Whealan, editorial writer of the Windsor (Ontario) *Star*, was one of four Canadian newspapermen invited by the British Information Service to a tour of the British Isles in May-June.

1958

In the September reorganization of the top editorial posts on the New York *Times*, **Tom Wicker** was named Washington correspondent, and James Reston moved to associate editor. Wicker has reached this top Washington spot at 38 after four years with the *Times*. Since 1962 he has been roving political correspondent and has written all over the paper, daily, Sunday, news and magazine. He covered the assassination of President Kennedy and his funeral in two of the great stories of 1963. He worked the laboring oar of running story at both national political conventions.

A native of North Carolina, he was graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1947. After working on several small papers in the State, he joined the Winston-Salem *Journal-Sentinel* in 1951, served successively as sports editor, Sunday editor and Washington correspondent, and in 1959 became associate editor of the Nashville *Tennessean*. There his work attracted the attention of James Reston in his constant search for fresh talent for the *Times* Washington Bureau. Besides a great grist of political writing, Wicker has turned out half a dozen novels in a decade of demanding journalistic assignments.

1959

Bruce Grant is now serving the Melbourne (Australia) *Age* as its Washington correspondent.

1960

A daughter, Ellen, was born May 22 to the **Edmond Rooneys** (Chicago *Daily News*).

Jack Samson, formerly an AP reporter has left KB-TV, Albuquerque, N.M., to become editor of the weekly Albuquerque *Courier*.

1962

The Toronto *Star* has shifted **Martin Goodman** from Washington back to the home office, in transit to assignment to London.

1964

Random House has published a second book by **Tom Ross** and David Wise, *The Invisible Government*. They are the authors of *The U-2 Affair*.
