

NiemanReports

January, 1955

PRESS of the NATO COUNTRIES

R. A. Farquharson

Ten Commandments of Journalism

Doris Fleeson

Caribbean Seminar

George Chaplin

Cervi's Journal

Houstoun Waring

250th Anniversary of Our Press

Sam B. Warner, Jr.

Duty of a Free Press

Palmer Hoyt

New Newspaper Frontier

Simeon Booker

OTHER ARTICLES: *On Writing*, by Louis M. Lyons — *A Fantasy*, by David M. White — *Reporting from the State House*, by Edward W. Stagg.

REVIEWS: *The Fight for the West*, by Mort Stern — *Business and its Critics*, by Albert L. Kraus — *Demagogues Don't Last*, by Thomas G. Karsell — *Labor Unions in France*, by Guy Munger — *Korean Correspondent*, by William J. Woestendiek — *Preaching and Practice*, by Sam Zagoria.

Nieman Notes — Scrapbook — Letters

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Charlotte F. Robling, Darien, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D.C.; Melvin S. Wax, Claremont, N. H.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$2 a year. Entered as second-class matter December 31, 1947, at the post office at Boston, Massachusetts, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. IX, NO. 1

JAN., 1955

Ten Commandments of Journalism

By Doris Fleeson

1. Look at what you see. The greatest reporter in history was the little boy who watched a royal parade and said: "But the Emperor isn't wearing any clothes."

2. Of all the influences which seek to warp a reporter's judgment, the most respectable are the most dangerous. The Irish statesman, Parnell, put this another way when he said: "The greatest enemy of Irish freedom is the English dinner napkin."

3. Always take your work seriously. Never take yourself seriously.

4. A typical patriot is a man who thinks that the politicians of his country are the most corrupt and its women the most beautiful of any country in the world. Remember he is wrong on both counts and probably on all others. As a substitute, consider Adlai Stevenson's reminder to

the American Legion: "I venture to suggest that patriotism is not a short and frenzied outburst of emotion but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime."

5. Presidents and politicians, as well as judges, are as honest as most men but not more so.

6. Women are people. There is no such thing as the women's angle and don't let any editor tell you different. The so-called sob sister story is done best by the romantic and sentimental sex-men. All the highly paid gossip columnists are men.

7. Ninety per cent of what passes for genius is nothing but a good memory. Train yours.

8. Damn the cliches. Full verbs ahead.

9. Write American. Your living language is shapely, vital and far-reaching. Write it. I am not suggesting slang or colloquialisms. Far from it. On the contrary, keep your dictionary, Henry Mencken's *The American Language* and Fowler's *Modern English Usage*, well thumbed. One of my intellectual friends claims that the better, the Fowler, and he is right.

10. We are told that journalism is ephemeral. Don't you believe it for it is just not so. One day's story in one day's issue of a newspaper may not seem important in the cosmic scheme, but cumulatively the effect of what we do daily is not surpassed even by the historians. Newspapers have been and will remain the prime source of history. Forms and methods of presentation may change but not the need for good reporting and intelligent editing in a world which can only remain free if it knows the facts of its existence.

This is from a talk to a convocation of the School of Journalism, University of Nebraska, Oct. 6, 1954.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, elected by former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession.

Latin American News in the U. S. Press

by George Chaplin

I pretend no expertness on Latin-America. I have never been south of Bolivar's monument in Santa Marta. But I have been there and I have been moved by the experience. I am here as a fellow newsman and as a friend — one who has faith in his hemisphere and who believes the destinies of all of us are inseparable.

Our great problem is ignorance of each other. This is reflected in our coverage of your news and, I have little doubt, in your coverage of ours.

In a forum at Northwestern University, a Caracas editor lamented our over-simplified idea of Latin-America — an idea, he said, "in which a guitar, a sombrero, a burro, a song or a dance, a bullfight, a revolution, and a love affair are the essential elements."

A journalism student at Northwestern, following the remarks of that Caracas editor, made a six-week survey of the treatment of South American news by four newspapers. (Central America and the Caribbean were not included.) One of the four papers studied was small, with 26,000 circulation. The other three were large, one characterizing itself as an international paper. None of them came out very well in the survey.

In the one with the best showing, South American news added up to less than one per cent of the total editorial copy. In another of the papers, of the total foreign news covered, less than five per cent of it was from South America.

Conceding the limitations of such a survey, it fortifies the view that, excepting big news breaks, coverage of Latin-America in the U. S. press is woefully inadequate. On the *Item* we have been as derelict as most, but we are trying to rectify this with a weekly Latin-American Page and with stepped-up daily coverage.

In all of this, it is important to remember that, outside of our larger metropolitan papers, most U. S. dailies do an inadequate job of presenting *all* foreign news. An informal survey two years ago showed the entire U. S. press rarely devoted more than 15 per cent of its space to foreign affairs. Closer to home, we carry relatively little news about our northern neighbor, Canada.

George Chaplin is editor of the New Orleans *Item*. This is from a talk to the Caribbean Area press seminar in New Orleans, Nov. 9, 1954. Mr. Chaplin was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

I'm sure you suffer your own sins in this regard — both as to thorough, balanced coverage of news of the U. S. and coverage of your sister republics in Latin-America. But I would prefer to leave such confessions to you.

Now why this problem of meager hemispheric coverage? What are some of the major factors? Why has the North American focus primarily been toward Europe, and more recently, also toward Asia?

Let us consider, for one thing, the differences in the patterns of our culture, our heritage.

Parts of the United States have felt the stamp of Spain and France. But, basically, our ties have been with England.

The real conquest of this continent was by the artisans and the farmers who gave the London Company a period of Service for free land; the Pilgrims, Catholics and Quakers who came seeking freedom to worship.

They brought their womenfolk, worked their land, tended their shops, and raised their families. From England came their language, their political institutions, their law, their literature.

In this framework, they built a continent. Decades later, came heavy waves of immigrants from non-English-speaking lands. But the English heritage, solidly established, was never challenged. It absorbed the newcomers.

In Latin-America, by contrast, the imprint (outside of Brazil) primarily has been that of Spain. As William Schurz phrased it, "she left her mark very deep in the minds and souls of men and on their tongues."

This influence, as Schurz noted in his book, *This New World*, "was exercised directly for over three centuries. First, in the guise of conqueror and colonizer. Later, as governor, priest and teacher of subject peoples. Always as the progenitor of mixed races. Finally, after the independencias, as immigrants into countries that were no longer theirs to rule."

The Spanish character was, to be sure, somewhat changed by the New World's people and by its terrain and climate — the "paja y cielo" of the pampas, the "soroche" of the Andes, the jungles, the desert strips, the rain, the heat. But a basic resemblance has tenaciously remained to the men of Spain.

Each of these cultures — the English and the Iberian — has reflected its grandeur in the New World. Each has produced its great men — be they named Las Casas, Sucre,

San Martin, O'Higgins, Bolivar, Miranda, Sarmiento, Artigas, Marti — or Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln. And each culture, too, has had its flaws.

The differences in culture are reflected in language, in manner, in customs, in sense of values, in thinking, in reaction. The differences are further complicated by another hard fact — while we tend to speak of Latin-America as an entity, we are really talking about 20 different nations.

"Peru," said one observer, "is no more like Uruguay than Spain is like Switzerland . . . Haiti and Mexico are not even 'Latin' . . . and 56 million people (of South America's 110) are Portuguese-speaking Brazilians . . . in a single country making up three-fifths of South America proper."

Twenty nations, highly individualized, each with its own politics, its own economics, its own social system. That's a tremendous, if challenging, assignment for the reader — and for the editor who is trying to satisfy his readers' interests and, at the same time, measure up fully to his responsibilities to cover events of long-range importance, however drab and dull they may seem at the moment.

Interest in Latin-America suffers, too, from the fact that globally you are essentially peaceful people. So much of our news play in these times is governed by large-scale violence, the overt struggle for world power. The Soviet threat accounts for much of the news of Europe and, in recent years, of Asia, too. We have learned a lot about geography lately by reason of bloodshed.

Today's news market is a tough one for globally peaceful folk to compete in. In Latin-America there is still, of course, internal friction and some grudges. Words like "machetismo," "caudillismo" and "cuartelazo" are not yet outmoded in some parts. Most of your countries are still in ferment.

But the size of your military is governed more by domestic than international considerations. And there is remarkably effective hemispheric machinery for settling arguments. That makes for significant, but not very startling, news.

It's like the man who's been married to the same woman for 50 years. He doesn't make page one — unless he then shoots her.

Brazil, for example, has been plagued by a multitude of economic — and political — problems in recent years. But it took the death of Vargas to turn on the spotlight. Result — Brazil was a top story in the U. S. press for several days. I hasten to add that I saw a number of excellent background stories in print.

In the recent Guatemalan conflict, it was the Communist angle, the fear of a Soviet base being set up in this hemisphere, that created such interest in our press. It was the cold war turning hot, and very close by. The revolution started with very poor coverage. But by the time it ended

U. S. papers and news services had more correspondents on hand than Castillo Armas had troops.

All of us might help prevent such situations, of course, if we called attention in advance to the economic and other conditions which furnish fertile soil for Communist exploitation, and if we exposed Communist intrigues before they reached dangerous proportions.

With such reporting lacking, our readers do not have a proper frame of reference in which to evaluate the big stories when they do break.

There is a tendency to blame the news services and perhaps some of the blame is justified. A press service not only is interested in getting news out of a Latin-American country. It is also interested in selling its news report to papers inside that country. That means trying to stay on the right side of the government. It could mean not trying to develop delicate stories which are likely to invite government wrath in punitive measures.

There is also the question of stringers, both for press services and U. S. newspapers. As citizens of the country they're covering, they are likely to tread cautiously. And this obviously does not make for thorough, two-fisted reporting.

But in fairness to the press services, let me say this: editors get about what they demand, both in quality and quantity. When editors really want better Latin coverage, they'll get it. It depends on the individual paper's yardstick of news values.

An executive of a major press association, to whom I wrote, replied that they receive in New York by cable from Latin-America three to four thousands words a day.

The way cable and radio communications line up, he wrote, "it is efficient and rapid for much of the news of one Latin-American capital to go through New York to other Latin-American Capitals." The cable files from, say, Peru to Rio move via New York.

"Therefore, a basic spot news report on Latin-America for Latin-America is available here, in addition to the service sent particularly for this country. On normal days, we put out here (in New York) about two columns of news from the American republics."

The intimation is that there would be more, if telegraph editors sent the news to the composing room instead of putting it on the spike.

This executive touched on several of his service's problems. He indicated Latin politics are more sensitive than ours — are more likely to regard North American reporters as brash and are often offended by the news published about them in the north.

Another problem, he said, is that of bureaucratic barriers. The more dictatorial executives in various of the American republics take pains to curtail reporting and transmission of news which might be unpalatable to them.

"Enforced by either censorship or by broad laws and decrees which entail economic sanctions, this curtailment has two effects. It makes good reporting difficult. And it gives a government or country a bad name so that editors and readers abroad believe the worst about it and discount anything good."

Another authority on Latin-America with whom I corresponded, wrote this to me: The few Latin-American governments which have been public relations-conscious usually have limited themselves to short-term programs with limited financing.

These programs often have been terminated quickly because of discouragement, or because they have been pegged to individual, temporary objectives. In one or two cases they have been political, rather than informative, in their efforts to justify or popularize a particular regime.

I had a personal experience recently with this lack of informational tools. In preparation for the *Item's* Latin-American Page, I wrote to all the Latin-American ambassadors to Washington for background information, pictures and biographies of leading officials, etc. The material sent was so meager that I was astonished. In some cases, I received a single pamphlet.

But let us not abandon ourselves to gloom. We are disappointed about the past and, to some extent, the present — but we need not be overly discouraged about the future. There are many good straws in the wind.

More and more people are traveling through the hemisphere. More editors are getting a look at Latin-America, either individually or as members of groups sponsored by such organizations as United Fruit Company.

The work of the Inter-American Press Association, which met last year in Mexico, this year in Brazil and next year will meet in New Orleans, is notable. International House, through the efforts of people like Charles Nutter and Mario Bermudez, are performing a vital function in creating better understanding.

Student exchange programs are expanding. And, of major importance, Spanish is now the most widely taught language, outside of English, in the United States. In New Orleans, in the public schools 3,000 youngsters are studying Spanish; in the parochial schools, 2,500; at Tulane, 854; and at Loyola, 200. Throughout the U. S., courses on Latin-American are now taught in almost 900 universities and colleges.

It is heartening to know that this is not a one-way street. I recently read that 7,000 are attending English classes in Sao Paulo, 5,000 in Rio, 4,000 in Santiago, 4,000 in Lima, 2,000 in Buenos Aires — thousands in Central America — more than 55,000 throughout Latin-America.

No, I am not discouraged. Progress in communication can be made if people like ourselves are determined that it shall be made. The fact that we are here today is, I know evidence of that determination.

CERVI'S WEEKLY

Gene Cervi's personality is the key to his formula for success with a small metropolitan journal.

by Houston Waring

Wherever working newspapermen gather, the discussion sooner or later turns to the feasibility of starting a newspaper in a large city.

Marshall Field is the last one to try it—and that was thirteen years ago. Other publishers have added a morning or evening paper to one already established, but the Chicago *Sun* is the only major, independent newspaper to be launched in recent years.

The enormous expense of publishing a large newspaper has made it impossible for any but a multimillionaire to enter the field. How, then, does an independent viewpoint get a hearing in most metropolitan centers where conservatism directs the news and editorial policies more often than not?

Nelson Poynter of the St. Petersburg *Times* suggested a formula for small dailies in big cities a decade ago, but I don't believe that this was ever tried.

There is a formula for a metropolitan weekly, how-

ever, which has proved by Gene Cervi of Denver, whose *Cervi's Journal* has completed five years.

"I got the idea for the *Journal* twenty-five years ago when I saw a legal publication at the Denver court house," Cervi recalls. "I thought how ridiculous it was to go to all the trouble of publishing a newspaper and delivering it free to a lot of officials and lawyers. It seemed so absurd to go through all these motions and come up with something so dull."

Cervi mulled this over for twenty years, and on Sept. 24, 1949, he converted "Cervi's News Letter" into a bona fide printed newspaper with a tabloid format and restrained headlines.

"Our formula is very simple," he declares. "You take an ordinary reporting service and breathe some life into it."

The reporting service consists of such things as building permits, newcomers to Denver, building notes, promi-

nent hotel guests, new corporations, coming conventions, SEC reports, chattel mortgages, new Denver trade names, trust deeds, petitions in bankruptcy, local stock quotations, real estate transfers in city and suburbs, new stores, new car sales, coming events, and brief reviews of books for business. This sounds dull, but Cervi makes this news as bright as possible. It is vital news to several thousand business men who like it packaged in one place—once a week.

"I think what most people look for in *Cervi's Journal* are: the dynamic front-page story, the think piece on the editorial page, and our back page, which is devoted to people," Cervi will tell you. "I have fought to put to death the gossip column, and I don't believe our back page is gossip. If we ever print trivia, we name it just that."

Cervi does not worry about the two big Denver dailies' printing the news ahead of him.

"We get spot news but we interpret it," he explains. "A paper like the *Journal* must be started by local working newsmen who know their territory and people and who have something to sell. My twenty years as a reporter around Denver were invaluable to me."

As Cervi's Page One piece is often full of opinions, he sometimes warns the reader with a small caption: "an editorialized news report."

While most dailies have given up personal journalism, Cervi has revived it. He attacks people and he does it week after week. "But I seldom throw a brick through a man's greenhouse unless he has two million dollars," he once joked to fellow newsmen.

The *Journal*, with a circulation of 4,000, costs \$12 a year.

"This is the key to our readership," he says modestly, failing to credit his own flair for writing. "When a man pays \$12 for a weekly, he is going to read it thoroughly, and that means results for the advertisers."

Like all honest editors, Cervi strives to keep his independence. His biggest advertiser accounts for only 2 per cent of his gross, and so he has not had to do any pussyfooting so far. But he is afraid of getting too big.

"I believe our peak circulation will be 5,000," he confessed. "If we go beyond that we'll probably be so big that we shall begin getting cautious."

Cervi prints 20 pages on extra-quality 40-pound newsprint and he hopes to go to 32 pages this winter. His 125 advertisers per issue pay rates almost as high as the Denver dailies charge—from 17 to 29 cents a line. He justifies these rates by the avid readership of well-to-do subscribers. His average reader probably has an income four or five times that of the metropolitan daily's.

"Ray Campbell of the Denver *Post* says that our paper is an anomaly," Cervi comments to his friends. "He says we get our readers from the business world and then attack business. This is not so. We don't fight business. We be-

lieve in free enterprise, but we point out its weaknesses. We try to bridge the gap between the people and the dwindling dailies.

"There is a bright future in the next twenty years for young men to start weeklies in the Greeley tradition. I would recommend starting in the monopoly towns like Kansas City or Omaha—entering the field with ideas, integrity, and a burning passion. It is not enough to say that you are going to fight so and so. You must DO IT!!"

In order to devote his time to the editorial side of the *Journal* Cervi has it printed by a commercial printing establishment. Thus he does not have to spend an hour or so a day discussing inks, machinery, faulty wiring, or a shortage of printers. His staff consists of three advertising men, a bookkeeper who runs the office, a circulation man with a girl assistant, an all-around girl Friday, and an assistant to the editor. He is proud that they all get "Guild wages or better." Fifteen part-time people gather the statistics about bankruptcies and so forth.

"I think similar weeklies can be started by local newspapermen with something to sell," the Colorado editor declares. "They should have at least \$25,000 to carry them through the launching period. Although our paper was accepted from the start, it was the end of the third year before we stopped our losses. The only reason we succeeded was that the editor's loyal staff did heroic work. I am confident that I did three or four men's work those first three years. Even today, somebody must be thinking 24 hours a day, getting angles for the next issue. It is important for anyone starting a metropolitan weekly not to allow himself to think that the big dailies have you overwhelmed. There is enough news in any city for us all. Millions of dollars in uranium have been found in Colorado, but that doesn't mean there is not a lot of uranium yet to discover."

Cervi is not awed either by new media of communication.

"The printed word has an authority that radio, TV, and the movies can never have," he says. "It has an air of permanency."

The heart of Cervi's formula for a metropolitan weekly is interpretation and opinion. This opinion is personal, and the editor sees that the readers don't forget it. Quite often his main editorial will end with the slightly pugnacious words, "My name is Gene Cervi."

That is a chief reason why 20,000 persons in 4,000 offices make a scramble for the mail each Thursday morning.

Houstoun Waring also runs a successful weekly, a small town paper, though now nationally known—the Littleton *Independent*.

The Individual Papers of Europe

by R. A. Farquharson

As I have spent most of the last two years living in Paris and working for NATO I have had some opportunities of studying the press of the NATO nations.

Any observations I make on newspapers of these countries are necessarily generalized and may as a result be misleading. Language is the worst barrier for the appreciation of the press and a study of make-up does not give you the same result as actually reading the news columns. But in Paris I had translations of clippings from all the countries and through a series of tours of journalists saw newsmen from various countries regularly.

I have visited 13 of the NATO countries and have found that newspapermen are much the same the world over. Everywhere I went I found them friendly and eager to be helpful. In Greece, in Norway, in Italy, in Paris they were just as generous and as impecunious as they are in my native Canada.

But if newswriters were very much the same, there were noticeable differences in the newspapers. This I feel is the direct result of the commercial picture. The profit possibilities of modern mass circulation have not been developed to anything like the same extent on the continent as they have in North America and the United Kingdom.

The most interesting result is that the importance of the editor has not been eclipsed by the publisher and in fact there are many papers that do not have a publisher and would not know what to do with one if they had. In some countries there is a publisher but he is far from being the over-all commander. He is simply the mailing room foreman, the man who gets the paper out.

The job of publisher only developed on this continent when advertising became the life blood of the paper and the complicated problems of big business required someone to supervise all departments. Over most of Europe the newspapers are not in the big business league and exist primarily as journals of opinion. There is not the same high investment. There is not the same danger of an error in business judgment.

The multiplicity of political parties and the age-old feeling that each party should have its own journal is one reason for the comparatively greater number of newspapers and the relatively small circulations. Then too, the press has not yet recovered from the effects of German occupa-

tion. Existing papers had to follow the German line or go out of business. And some formerly famous newspapers went out of business when the Germans left. The resistance developed its own journals which functioned during wartime without advertising and those which still survive have not been blessed — or cursed — by prosperity since.

As a result political tie-ins are much more general than in this country and objective reporting is rare. The by-line writer has plenty of scope for his opinions and adjectives flow in a stream which would submerge a hard boiled news desk.

In a sense the personal journalism which so characterized the stalwart American editors of a century ago is still flourishing abroad. This is particularly true of Turkey where rival editors go after each other in terms which know no libel law. I spent an evening in Istanbul in the home of a highly cultured, genial editor who had just been described as a traitor to his country. The term traced back to the Ataturk days when his paper had been suppressed. The same editor was shot by leftist critics a year before but as soon as he was able to sit up in bed, interviewed one of his attackers and in three columns described in detail the motives for the attack.

For all his broad knowledge of the arts, his obvious culture and his warm-heartedness, translations of his own editorials showed that he could use just as strong language, both in attack and defense.

Newspapers, like people, are to a great extent the product of their surroundings and sometimes the criticism we make of the press of other countries does not take into consideration the entirely different conditions.

I think it is generally true that American make-up has been the dominating influence in the layout of the European press. Eight column lines and other typographical tricks lead to an impression of similarity that does not follow through when you study the copy.

In the United States the great news services are so generally used that a pattern of news coverage runs through even competing papers. This pattern was harder to find in Europe. In Greece I discovered the reason. A single wire, serving several countries laid down news but the copy had to be translated before it was of any local value. So what arrived in Greece was really source material instead of news processed for the press.

Criticism here of the lack of so-called free press is often made without consideration of all the factors. In some countries what we would regard as government interference is progressively less and it does not irk the editors

R. A. Farquharson now heads the Canadian Information Service in the U. S. He was formerly managing editor of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, and editor of the weekly magazine, *Saturday Night*. This is from an address to the Nieman Fellows at Harvard, November 16, 1954.

who have not been accustomed to our scope. I even ran into criticism of our methods with the suggestion that what we called freedom could be termed the tyranny of the press. Our news services are proud of their independence. But when we are critical of government subsidies of other news services we should remember the relative resources of the press.

In Turkey, the press, like the rest of the country, has developed spectacularly in the thirty years since Ataturk dramatically abolished the Arabic script and forced newspapers to use Roman letters. Reporters still write their copy longhand, standing at high desks. There was only one typewriter in the office of the leading morning paper of Istanbul which I visited last November. To Turks, accustomed to absolute control of the written word, present regulations mean freedom. It takes time for a press to get used to freedom and it also takes time for a government to be silent in the face of criticism, which may not be either accurate or just.

In Portugal there are probably more regulations than in the other members of the Atlantic Alliance, but I heard no criticism from Portuguese journalists. Certainly Mr. Salazar has no cause to complain about the extent or content of his press clippings. Visiting journalists are irked, however, and often their reporting sounds harsh to Portuguese readers.

Greece has been going through a difficult time and it is understandable that a government faced with a real Communist menace should aggressively protect itself. The editors I met in Greece seemed so relieved to have a stable government that they were not disposed to be critical. Incidentally, in Greece I encountered a strong pro-American feeling among the newsmen and a great willingness to use the U.S.I.A. material.

The press tradition in the southern countries is entirely different from the tradition in the northern countries and this should be remembered in any criticism of the press. In Scandinavia, in Holland, in France, writers are just as free as British or American writers. In Italy the attacks I read on the government certainly gave no indication that the press was in any way inhibited.

To generalize, I feel that newsprint cost and availability has been more of a factor in moulding the press than government rules. There were times in Paris, and a good many times since I have been living in Washington, when I have regretted that there wasn't a similar deterrent to large newspapers here. After affectionately reading the 8 to 12 pages of the Paris *Herald Tribune*, I resent the difficulties of finding news in the giant editions here.

I have often wondered whether the audience made the newspaper or the newspaper created the audience. Certainly the Paris *Herald Tribune*, edited for English speaking people living in non-English countries, was closer to being

tailor-made for me than any other paper. It carries all the important international news, the important local news, only the highlights of sport and crime and gives generous space to theatre, art exhibitions and book reviews.

In a somewhat similar way I have been impressed by the Washington press. The large audience of readers interested in politics, government and international news gives editors a chance to deal with the problems of the day and not surrender to circulation features. If someone would find a way of getting rid of 75 per cent of the advertising I could grow quite fond of the Washington papers. There is no doubt in my mind that the small British papers have won favor with their readers and there is no doubt that they have been proved commercially sound. But the British were able to jack advertising rates to a high that has never been visualized here and unless the newsprint companies were to ration newsprint I see difficulties in cutting papers to a comfortable size. Tomorrow I am visiting an executive of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association but have no hope that he will agree with my ideas.

I found my experiences with NATO fascinating even though the New York *Times* or the *Herald Tribune* scooped us regularly before we could issue releases on any good NATO stories. And anytime they slipped up the French press did the trick.

Working with Lord Ismay was a privilege. He believes that NATO has been the biggest single factor for peace in these cold war days and his staff shares that belief. Lord Ismay has an amazing appreciation of news and prefers to write his own speeches. I have never seen anyone more comfortable at a press conference.

NATO has studiously avoided any move to issue counter propaganda. Its information service is purely a factual service and takes no part in psychological warfare. This made the work more attractive for a Director of Information who had taken pride in his training as a straight newsman.

In Washington the same rules apply in directing Canadian Information in the United States. Canada is not concerned with making headlines, or with increasing the number of column inches. We are concerned that accurate information should be available to any writers interested in Canada. And interest in Canada seems to be definitely increasing. The Canadian Information Service in the United States is one of the smallest information services in this country. Including the press officer attached to our delegation at the United Nations, we have five officers in the U.S. and not all of these have had previous newspaper or public relations experience.

Our country is being linked more and more closely with your country and I know of no job more satisfying than to have some part in maintaining the cordial relations that have so long existed.

Smallpox and Jail Advanced Journalism

The 250th Anniversary of American Newspapers

By Sam B. Warner, Jr.

Two hundred and fifty years ago John Campbell, Boston's postmaster, published America's first regular newspaper, the *Boston News-Letter*. Some maritime items and two pages of news clipped from four-month-old London weeklies comprised the paper, no illustrations, no editorials, no features, and but few local stories. Hardly recognizable to today's reader as a newspaper at all with its scramble of type, letter paper size, and absence of recent news, the *News-Letter*, nonetheless, stood for 15 years as the nation's only newspaper, and so marked the start of our right to the free access to news.

Strange too for modern eyes is the large bold face line "Published by Authority" carried under the masthead. Every week before putting the paper to bed the postmaster journeyed up Beacon Hill for the royal governor's approval of the forthcoming issue. Thirty-one years later, John Peter Zenger of the *New York Weekly Journal* won for Americans against the governor himself "... that to which nature and the laws of our country have given us as a right — the liberty — both of exposing and opposing arbitrary power ... by speaking and writing the truth."

Though the legal victory remained uncertain for a generation as publishers continued to be harassed by the common law of seditious libel, never again were spiritless sheets like the *Boston News-Letter* molded by the government to satisfy the need for news. Zenger's victory was complete because in the thirty-one year period before his trial men like William Brooker and James Franklin in Boston had firmly rooted the newspaper as a medium of useful information and honest opinion in the new colonies. By solving the problem of how to publish a newspaper to fit the American situation they provided the model for subsequent papers, enabling those that followed to take advantage of the fruits of Zenger's victory.

John Campbell announced the purpose of his *News-Letter* was "... to give a true account of all foreign and domestic occurrences, and to prevent a great many false reports of the same." One of the fussiest proofreaders of American journalism he spared no pains to be accurate with what he covered. A note of correction followed a misplaced comma, and on a fire story the subsequent paper stated "... whereas it is said flame covering the barn, it should be said smoke."

What makes his brand of journalism so strange to us

today is his philosophy of the news. For him the newspaper recorded current history, the "thread of occurrences," and to that end he indexed all the important items in his paper so the reader could follow the news in chronological sequence, even though the uncertainties of the posts prevented publication in that order. Nor did the "thread of occurrences" encompass a wide variety of events. Overseas court, military, and political news clipped from the Crown-supported *London Gazette* took up two-thirds of the week's edition. The space remaining after a column of advertisements, Campbell filled himself, in an awkward style, with news of a Virginia murder or New York coinage law gleaned from incoming ships' captains, or he recorded the whereabouts of the governor, or the death of an important divine. Every week from May to October 1713 he filled his paper with a comprehensive coverage of the peace settlement of the War of the Spanish Succession, but he didn't dare print a word about the red-hot fight then raging in the Massachusetts Assembly over paper money and the financing of the war.

All in all in its fifteen years of monopoly the *News-Letter* was a pale sheet compared to contemporary London weeklies, but Postmaster John Campbell had his difficulties. A cautious man by nature, and a political appointee as well, ominous precedents dogged his steps. Fifteen years before, Benjamin E. Harris had tried to start a paper in Massachusetts only to have it suppressed after its first issue for the presumption of covering some local war news. Harris ended his days as a patent medicine salesman in London. Down in "liberal" Philadelphia Andrew Bradford, that city's first printer, fled to New York after printing a pamphlet on the minority side of a Quaker theological debate. As a royal official he undoubtedly knew that the governor himself had instructions to oversee the public prints to prevent any "... inconveniences that may arise by the liberty of printing."

The fact that all any publisher could count on was a small subscription list of 300-odd merchants and clergymen of his town also bore heavily on the type of news Campbell printed. Boston, the biggest colonial metropolis, with 7,000 souls was small enough so most of his subscribers knew what went on; foreign news was what they lacked. Travel to London was as easy as to Virginia in these days of bad roads and as many friendships lay in that direction as to the south. Moreover, local officials depended on London for their jobs, a situation that explains the close coverage of aristocratic London affairs.

Sam B. Warner, Jr., graduate student in American History at Harvard, published the Watertown (Mass.) *Sun* in 1952-1953.

In the rural areas where news of Boston and the other colonies might have been of more interest than that of Westminster, the infrequent and expensive posts, as well as illiteracy combined to prevent subscription in any numbers. The compelling demands of making a living as an eighteenth century farmer perhaps constituted the greatest limitation on readers. Indians had to be fought off, new land worked into cultivation, and running a farm with the same implements the Romans used consumed all the energy of the farmer and his family leaving little leisure or money for non-essentials like newspapers.

Two other forces combined to make all early newspapers written for the few not the many. The necessity of securing advertising to bear the costs of printing the paper bore hardest on pioneer publishers. Campbell with a fifteen year monopoly managed to fill a quarter of his paper with advertising, a revenue that scarcely covered his costs, as he complained to his readers, certainly not paying for his time. Furthermore, in these days before the invention of the fixed news-to-advertising ratio, newspapers were run on the notion that the amount of news determined the number of pages. If a packet arrived with a bundle of recent London dispatches the publisher ran a big paper to get in all the news, even though there was no more advertising to carry it.

The second force preventing the growth of popular journalism grew out of this precarious financial situation. Because the editor had to make his living as a postmaster, printer, or whatever, he encouraged voluntary contributions to fill out the columns of his paper. The local ministers, merchants, or literati obliged readily, but they wrote about what they and their friends were interested in, not for the "leather apron man."

In 1719 John Campbell lost his appointment as postmaster. The new incumbent, William Brooker, angered by Campbell's refusal to turn over the *News-Letter* as a perquisite of office, thereupon established the nation's second newspaper, the *Boston Gazette*. Under the stimulus of competition Brooker introduced a new concept of the news that went a long way toward solving the financial problems of colonial journalism, though it failed to give it a more popular appeal. Realizing that merchant support determined the success of his business, he put out a frankly commercial paper, one published "... in compliance with the desires of several merchants and others of the town. . . ." From the first stock market quotations became a regular feature. In these days of the great South Sea Co. speculation, Brooker followed the gyrations of its stock with great care, building several lead stories out of its bankruptcy and reorganizations. Of special usefulness too were the current commodity prices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Newport, R. I. These "prices current" listings carried not only the price but its probable direction,

"... Indian Corn 2s 6d & falling." Brooker did not go unrewarded for his efforts. By the end of his first year he stimulated enough additional merchant interest in newspaper advertising so that he and Campbell were now sharing twice the business the *News-Letter* ever promoted. At this point, however, he too lost his appointment, and Philip Musgrave, the new postmaster, took over the paper continuing his predecessor's policies.

Aside from commercial news the *Gazette* advanced little beyond the old *News-Letter*. To be sure it did introduce a more sensational and gossipy selection of foreign items like the following one from Ireland:

They write from Dublin of the 11th instant, that James Cotter, Esq., a gentlemen of about 800£ per annum, was convicted of a rape committed on the body of Mary Squib, a Quaker, on the 12th of August 1718 near Farmoy in that county, and was sentenced to be hanged yesterday.

However, both papers continued to be published "by Authority," so many important local stories never appeared in their columns. The only way a reader can learn that the paper money controversy was still at issue is to follow the advertisements for pamphlets on the subject that appeared on the back page. For a solid year, 1720-1721, the *Gazette* ran a succession of these advertisements without saying a word on the subject itself. In the battle between the governor and the Assembly over the former's salary only the governor's remonstrances to the Assembly appear in print.

Philip Musgrave thus broke the rules of fair reporting but he knew what he was doing. The governor prosecuted one of the *Gazette's* advertisers, a pamphleteer on the paper money debate, for seditious libel after a failure to get the Assembly to approve a revival of the licensing of publications law. Publishing "by Authority" was not required by English or Massachusetts statute, but by prudence.

Musgrave made his greatest contribution to American journalism when he moved the *Gazette* out of James Franklin's shop to another printer. Deprived of such a big piece of his business, Franklin set up his own paper, the *New England Courant*, the nation's fourth and Boston's third newspaper. In the five years of its existence from August 7, 1721, to June 4, 1726, James and Benjamin Franklin and their contributors quarreled with all the authorities of Massachusetts: ministers Increase and Cotton Mather, Harvard University, the governor and the General Assembly. For his intrepidity James twice went to jail and finally was forbidden to publish a newspaper. When the smoke had cleared away, however, the scope of news regularly included in a newspaper had greatly expanded; his successors not only published both sides of important local controversies, but also carried the forerunners of modern

features and editorials in the form of letters to the "author."

Not a postmaster, and never having been one, Franklin couldn't hope to get foreign news as fast as his competitors. However, he served his apprenticeship in London before setting up for himself in Boston and while there developed a taste for the literary journalism of opinion then thriving at the *Spectator* and *Guardian*. This style he attempted to transplant to America instead of the conservative and commercial approach of his competitors. About him gathered the dissatisfied intellectuals of Boston, men like John Checkley, bookseller, Anglican, opponent of the Mathers' Congregationalism, and Dr. William Douglass, first doctor with a medical degree in America. Together these men, with their friends, made up a literary club, the "Hell-Fire Club" as the Rev. Cotton Mather called them, and together they put out a paper such as the country never saw before.

The small-pox epidemic of 1721 provided the *Courant* with its biggest story. Cotton Mather, one of the colonies' most learned men, member of the Royal Society, minister of the fashionable Old South Church, had encouraged an apothecary, Zabdiel Boylston, to experiment with inoculation against small-pox. In July 1721, just as the year's epidemic got under way, Boylston announced the success of his experiments. Rumors immediately scurried about town that inoculation instead of giving immunity to the disease spread it. At the end of the month the whispering had grown so loud that Cotton Mather with five other leading clergymen rose to defend Boylston, both as to the efficacy and the morality of his methods. Moreover, they chose the *Gazette*, not the usual medium of a pamphlet, to broadcast their opinions.

It was into this atmosphere that the *Courant* jumped with its first edition. Franklin announced that its "... chief design . . . was to oppose the doubtful and dangerous practice of inoculating." Dr. Douglass followed with a steady stream of articles, serious and satirical, attacking the inoculators. He argued that there was nothing to be gained by such a "desperate remedy," inoculation spread the disease and was an immoral attempt to avoid God's punishment. Both the best scientific opinion of the day and popular sentiment supported him. In September and October as the experiments increased so did the plague. October 9th the selectmen ordered the statistics printed in the newspapers: 1,500 cases of small-pox since April in a town of 7,000. That same week the *Courant* ran an advertisement by a group of men who offered to purchase supplies for sick people. Three o'clock in the morning on November 14th, at the height of the panic, someone threw a bomb in Cotton Mather's home with the note "And damn you, I'll inoculate you with this, with a pox to you." All the papers carried a formal description of the affair by Mather. By January the scourge had run itself out and

most people calmed down enough to admit that the Mathers had been right — Boylston's methods were sound; but the *Courant* and the Mathers continued an acrimonious exchange on the subject for another year.

Perhaps Governor Shute enjoyed seeing these leaders of the highflying Puritans ridiculed as hypocrites, but when the *Courant*, in its issue of June 11, 1722, suggested that he and the General Assembly had been sluggish in tracking down pirates off the New England shore, the Governor ceased to be amused. A suggestion of collaboration with pirates in the eighteenth century constituted fighting words. The next day the Assembly declared the article a "high affront," and ordered Franklin put in jail. The Governor and his council hoping to use this opportunity to reinstate censorship, sent down to the Assembly a bill requiring Franklin to post a 100£ bond for good behavior and stating that "No such weekly paper be hereafter printed or published, without same be first perused by the Secretary." The Assembly, ever distrustful of the governor, refused to rise to the bait and turned down the whole bill. Three weeks after he was out of jail the unrepentant Franklin followed up a series of jibes at his imprisoners with a full page argument for freedom of the press based upon the Magna Charter.

The next January found him again in jail. He had attacked all Massachusetts' leaders in one issue: the Assembly for fighting with the Governor thus endangering the colony's charter, the Governor for going to London to get revenge on the colony, and the ministers for their constant hypocrisy. Just because the Governor was absent, the clergy, the acting governor, and the Assembly could work in concert. A joint committee of the Governor's council and the Assembly forbade Franklin to "print or publish the New England *Courant*, or any pamphlet or paper of like nature, except it be first supervised by the Secretary of the Province."

Franklin, a stubborn man, brought out his next issue in complete disregard for this order and was promptly thrown in jail. At this point young brother Benjamin, his apprentice, took over publication to get around a technicality of the order. James was placed under bond for trial but the indictment failed. It was the last important attempt to censor the press in Massachusetts. The *Courant* continued without interference for three more years when it died of lack of ads, and because the club of editors had lost one of its most important members, Benjamin Franklin, to Philadelphia.

By modern standards the *Courant* was not a good paper. When it covered local stories of importance it did so in a reckless and highly editorialized manner. However, by the very act of exceeding completely the bounds of prudence, it brought colonial controversies within the province of newspaper coverage. People became accustomed to

reading about issues of vital importance in newspapers. During the inoculation row the *Gazette* carried the letters and comments of Boylston and the Mathers, the *News-Letter* gave its support for a time to the anti-inoculators. In other words Franklin made newspapers out of his com-

petitors. Out of the fusion of his journal of opinion with his competitors' commercial features grew today's newspapers, daily sources of useful and timely information and opinion.

The New Frontier for Daily Newspapers

by Simeon Booker

A stone's throw from the offices of most U. S. daily newspapers lie the areas in which the fewest newspapers are sold and where residents, perhaps are the city's poorest newspaper readers — the Negro community. One out of every ten Americans is a Negro, but certainly not one of every ten daily newspaper readers is a Negro.

In practically every major city, the Negro community has the unofficial record for low newspaper readership. Home delivery programs are often skimpy, unprofitable for the carriers, while newsstand sales fluctuate with the headlines. Few publishers boast "peak" Negro saturation in circulation and many publishers are downright befuddled by the complex situation.

In ostrich-like fashion, a lot of the publishers rationalize privately that Negroes cannot read, care little for civic betterment and are not concerned with world affairs.

On the other hand, while the influence of daily papers appears to be petering out in Negro neighborhoods, owners of enterprising radio and television stations are campaigning to crash what they call "America's largest untapped market." They describe the U. S. Negro annual income exceeding five billion dollars as larger than the yearly income of Canada's booming population. And they point to the vast sales market in the metropolitan areas — Washington, where Negroes comprise a third of the population, and such cities as New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia and St. Louis, where the Negro community is a sizeable segment of the population.

As a dyed-in-the-wool newspaper man, it goes against my grain to hear neighbors talk about getting their local news on some radio program in preference to sending a write-up to a newspaper. It's almost revolting to see officers of leading organizations more interested in getting a celebrity on a local radio interview show than in having newspaper reporters get a crack at him.

Several months ago, a circulation manager for a metropolitan newspaper told me, "I'm stumped. I've tried every gimmick I know to increase our Negro circulation from block-to-block subscription canvasses to telephone campaigns. But I haven't cracked the Negro market."

Simeon Booker has done newspaper work in Cleveland and Washington. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1952. He is now with *Jet Magazine*.

This is just about the gist of what I told him:

In the past few years, daily newspapers have made remarkable progress in format, typography and production techniques and have made advances in race relations but not enough in the latter area to keep pace with the trends in their own cities. I remember not so long ago when a certain daily newspaper carried a "News For Colored Folk" column adjacent to the classified advertising section which carried diverse items such as these:

"The Rev. Samuel Isom, pastor of Triedstone Baptist Church, will preach Sunday on "The Holy Father."

"Buy winter overcoats on credit at Gleens. Adv.

"Mr. and Mrs. William Spencer are vacationing in Birmingham, Ala., where Mr. Spencer has a brother who is a school teacher."

Most of the Negro organizations vigorously opposed the column and when the editors refused to discontinue it, the Negroes launched a boycott of the newspaper. But despite the protests, the column remained as the newspaper's only coverage of the Negro citizenry until the death of the writer. Then, the newspaper had lost the goodwill of Negroes.

Today, few newspapers conduct separate Negro news columns, either in practice or principle. The practice today, however, is to ignore the Negro community. As a result, there is, more or less, a tendency for Negroes to rely less and less on daily newspapers, more on radio and television. From the reading of local newspapers, Negroes cannot gain the happy feeling of belonging, a dash of dignity, a degree of self respect.

At the Johnson Publishing Company, we peruse daily newspapers from every state. We also scan the output of a major wire service. It is shocking to appraise the sum total of the so-called Negro news.

Crime news always runs heavy. Far less coverage is given to entertainment and sports. (Thanks to Jackie Robinson, Willie Mays and the host of prize fighters, sports pages carry some Negro news.) But there is practically no local social, civic, church, business or obit news.

Oddly, some southern dailies devote far more space to Negro activity—and much of it constructive—than do the northern metropolitan newspapers. Likewise, except for a smattering of a few small town journals, the tempo

of southern editorial thought is sober and reflective.

Of course, there are the wire service articles on achievements of Dr. Bunche or Asst. Labor Secretary J. Ernest Wilkins or Virgin Islands Governor Archie Alexander, which get an adequate display in papers from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But generally, that's the line of demarcation for Negro news. Daily papers just fail to cover adequately their own Negro communities, and Negroes, like every other group, want to see their own names in the newspapers. Aren't there distinctive, unusual, outstanding local Negro activities? Is it news when a new pastor takes over a 3,000-member Negro church? Or when a major Negro church conference holds its yearly conference in a major city? Or when a local Negro business group cites a member for some achievement? Or when a prominent Negro citizen dies? (Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, a nationally-known Negro leader, second perhaps to Mrs. Mary Bethune, died a few months ago and it was five days before newspapers in the area learned of her death.)

This exclusion of important Negro news has reinforced the view that daily newspapers are a luxury, not a necessary commodity. For the most part, Negroes do not have the same regard, the respect, the sense of loyalty to newspapers as many other groups do. Because they know they cannot expect to read about the doings of their neighbors, their weddings, their social life, their business affairs, even their deaths, they tend to depend upon other means of communication.

I remember the time when Negroes used to get "het up" about an offensive story or a picture in newspapers. But time (and radio and television) have changed the techniques. Today, Negroes don't seem to have the interest in daily journalism; seldom do I hear a squawk. Usually, my neighbors don't know what is printed in the newspapers.

I live in an apartment house in a middle-class neighborhood. In the wing of the building in which I live, I pass the homes of six families. Do you know how many families get home delivery service of newspapers? One.

If I edited a daily newspaper, I would dispel a lot of false ideas about how to attract the Negro reader—such circulation gimmicks as flash-in-the-pan "crusades," feature stories on bellhops and faithful porters, and an occasional "give 'em hell" civil rights editorial. I'd simply concentrate on expanding my paper's services and resources to cover the Negro areas—no more, no less than in any other section. That's the key to the problem. It's that easy.

This factor of a newspaper covering the Negro community is far more important — and profitable — than the belief some editors hold that the only way to make inroads in Negro sections is to adopt a so-called "liberal" editorial policy. Admirable as the "liberal" newspapers are, few of them gain the mass Negro support, unless their

"liberality" extends to complete news coverage. Negroes appreciate "progressive" editorials but they really don't expect newspapers to fight their civil rights battles, only cover and report them honestly and accurately.

I can think of plenty of cities where the so-called "liberal" newspaper is less popular among Negroes than the so-called "conservative" newspaper. Why? Here's what one bread winner told me in a northern city: "I read the 'conservative' newspaper because they cover our meetings and write up what happens. They give us fair coverage. Maybe they do write obnoxious editorials but who cares. Everybody knows how Negroes feel about the subjects because they print our side."

Before coming to Chicago, I often wondered how the *Tribune* could out-sell such model newspapers as the *Sun-Times* and the *Daily News* in the Negro sections. Here's what one Negro told me: "The *Trib* was the first to pay attention to Negro news. They not only attend our meetings and affairs but they do feature stories on our leaders and outstanding citizens."

While many of the newspaper campaigns in the Negro section are laudable, and in many instances result in improvement of conditions, the pattern, for the most part, has remained stable. Daily newspapers generally crusade in this manner: 1 — clean up the slums, 2 — knock out the gambling rackets, 3 — make on-the-spot excursions into the South to report on racial progress. Slum and racket campaigns, despite the good intent, often give the Negro community a city-wide black-eye, unless, of course, the newspaper gives balanced coverage to the rest of the community.

But you would think that in the fertile brains of daily newspaper editors, new approaches, new slants, new ideas would emerge. Is there no imagination in charting a program to win circulation in Negro areas? Do these same overworked procedures have to be pursued?

The same lack of imagination regarding editorial policies extends even to the operations of daily newspapers. Less than 25 Negroes serve on reportorial staffs of daily newspapers, even fewer in other departments. The hiring of Negroes is certainly no answer to solving the circulation riddle but it is a step in the right direction. It is a sign of faith to the community and it is a sign of faith to the newspaper. And right now, while newspaper strength is sagging in Negro sections, any move to halt the downward trend — in the long run — is worth trying.

* * * * *

When I finished sounding off, the circulation manager asked me, "Well, how can we really know we are servicing the Negro community?" You'll know," I said, "When you can check your circulation records and find that you have your share of Negro readers."

The Other Side of the Crevolin Affair

by William Stucky

The Crevolin Affair, as it got to be known among the horse crowd last August, has now been flushed off the sports pages by action of the California Horse Racing Board.

Andy Crevolin, Alhambra, Calif., car dealer, entrepreneur, and Johnny-come-lately horseman, was suspended from all major race tracks in the country for one month.

His offense: he talked too much in a magazine interview.

What he said in the interview raised a lot of Big Questions to horsemen and sports writers. What he said about *The Blood-Horse* magazine of Lexington, Ky., staffers who interviewed him raises still another question:

When a magazine and its reporters are scurrilously accused of unethical doings, shouldn't they have a chance — just as an individual should — to give their side?

The question is raised because, in the course of the sorry affair, Crevolin accused *The Blood-Horse* of everything except sedition. Among his charges:

1. He was misquoted.
2. He was quoted out of context.
3. He was interviewed after several drinks "in a spirit of conviviality" (with the plain implication that he was plied with liquor and taken advantage of).
4. He was refused the right to hear a playback of his interview, which was tape-recorded.
5. His off-the-record remarks were put on the record.
6. He was promised he could read his statements before they were printed, and the promise was broken.

Those are serious charges. They can't help a magazine, and, if true, they could get a reporter fired. Even if false but never answered, they could make it tough for the reporters involved to get other jobs in sports writing.

And if similar charges were made by one individual against another in some other field, most honest newspapers would knock themselves out to see that the accused got a chance to reply.

Yet, in the six weeks that the affair dragged on, while the charges were being picked up by the press services and printed all over the country, only one sports writer ever sought the magazine's side of the story.

Earl Ruby, sports editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, established immediately after Crevolin's first "I-was-misquoted" bleat, that the interview was tape-recorded.

William Stucky is reporter on the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and its Sunday city editor. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

That fact was included — although sometimes "allegedly" in almost every following story.

But neither Ruby nor any other newspaperman or columnist ever sought the accused's side while Crevolin went on with his charges.

It was not until Crevolin was finally suspended that:

1. Reporters at the hearing of the California Horse Racing Board listened to the tape-recording and reported that the interview seemed to quote Crevolin correctly and in context.

2. A Lexington radio news editor, Sue Fennimore of WLAP, got and reported the other side of the story. No one else has yet.

Ruby's explanation makes sense, and a lot of sports writers probably reacted the same way: "Crevolin's known for popping off. As soon as I knew the interview was recorded, I figured it was self-evident everything else he charged was false."

In retrospect, though, he doubts that the general reader had any way of reaching the same conclusion. The reader kept getting a repetition with variations on Crevolin's theme.

The Crevolin Affair broke on an unsuspecting sports world on August 12. On that day *The Blood-Horse*, one of the country's two specialized thoroughbred magazines, was delivered. *The Blood-Horse* is a trade publication. It's the official organ of the American Thoroughbred Horse Breeders Association, although no members of the association pass on editorial copy.

In that issue, dated August 14, appeared an interview with Crevolin. (At the time, he was owner of the biggest money-winning stable of the year; on the same day this spring, he won the Kentucky Derby with Determine and the William P. Kyne handicap with Imbros for a total take of more than \$200,000.)

Crevolin, generally known as a talkative soul, had logorrhea the day he was interviewed. Most of what he said was autobiographical and flattering, and of only mild interest even to horsemen.

But horsemen reacted violently to two things he volunteered:

The first, known to every experienced \$2 bettor in the country, was:

We don't try to win with our horses the first or second or third time . . . We give him experience. We're not going to kill a horse the first time he runs and break his heart."

The second was a far less responsible charge:

"I saw a race, believe me, in Arlington Park — a bunch of fillies — and I never saw a race where so many fillies were being pulled. I mean the boys actually weren't trying."

When Crevolin appeared before the California board, he and the board went ring-around-the-rosy on what he really *did* mean. Toward the end of that part of the inquiry, Crevolin made the definitive statement on the whole affair: "Maybe it isn't the right verbiage."

Crevolin was in California when *The Blood-Horse* came out, and most of the California sports writers lavished him with space. Beginning then, and continuing off and on until his suspension on September 27, he made his charges.

Right off, he "intimated" to Paul Lowry of the *Los Angeles Times* (who broke the story after reading the interview) that "he was tricked into the interview in the first place." Lowry suggested the printing of the interview was a scheme of Kentucky horsemen to discredit racing in California.)

To others, Crevolin said his remarks were made "in a kidding way" and "in a spirit of conviviality." And "we had some drinks and started talking." And "I asked *The Blood-Horse* boys if they were going to use all that stuff (50 minutes on the tape), and they said 'of course not.' I asked for a replay, and everybody settled for a drink instead."

He said "the story was exaggerated," and "they took a lot of stuff that should have been off the record and didn't even have the courtesy of showing me what they were going to print." He said, "I asked to have it played back (and) they said 'we don't wanna hear it.'"

The Blood-Horse people, naively unaware of the furor the interview would kick up, reacted by going into shock for several days. Then the papers from California began coming in, and they wired Lowry: "If you are interested in the facts regarding the Crevolin interview, here they are."

When they got no reply and no published statement of their version of the facts, they sat on their hands. They were all ex-newspapermen. They knew they'd get a chance to tell their side.

I tried to get Lowry's side, but he said he'd rather not be quoted. He still sees the printing of the interview in terms of Kentucky vs. California racing.

While sitting on their hands for the next three weeks (a policy decision made by Editor J. A. Estes), *The Blood-Horse* staff built up a good head of steam. By the time the September 20 issue of *Newsweek* appeared, they were ready to blow their valves. That issue contained one of John Lardner's typically off-beat sports columns. It was about *The Blood-Horse* and the Crevolin interview.

Any regular reader of Lardner's studied ambiguities knew without question that Lardner was sticking the

needle in Crevolin. But to the uninitiate, it *could* have been read that Lardner was criticizing *The Blood-Horse* for plying Crevolin with drink and sneaking in a recorder on him. *The Blood-Horse* people, uninitiated and by then hypersensitive, read it the wrong way and blew their valves. They considered parts of the column, Estes wired, "just plain lying."

Lardner replied with a gracious telegram, and in *Newsweek's* letters column on October 11 wrote "There was no intention to suggest that *The Blood-Horse* tapes without warning or that alcohol in people interviewed by it or other publications is ever anything but self-inflicted."

So much for the reporting of the affair. There remains the unreported part, the story of the interview as told by Crevolin's targets, never named but widely known among horsemen.

They are J. A. Estes, a former city editor of the *Lexington Herald*; Warren Schweder, managing editor, former reporter for the *Lexington Leader*; and Dan Bowmar, III, reporter, former part-time sports columnist for the *Leader*.

This is their side:

Schweder conceived the idea of running regular interviews with breeders, owners, jockeys, stewards — various people connected with racing. Purpose was to give some variety to the magazine. The interviews, and the technique of getting them would be similar to those of *U. S. News and World Report*.

The Blood-Horse scheduled the recording of the first interview during the Kneeland Sales when a lot of out-of-state horsemen would be in Lexington.

Because he was green at recording interviews, Schweder decided to pick as his first subject someone easy to talk to. With Crevolin's reputation for spouting off, he was a natural.

To give Crevolin a chance to be prepared, Schweder furnished him, 24 hours ahead of time, a list of the major questions they would explore.

The interview was conducted in midafternoon by Schweder and Bowmar in Crevolin's Lexington hotel room. Neither Schweder nor Bowmar had a drink before or during the interview, and they did not see Crevolin have one.

About a third of the way through, Crevolin asked for a replay of the interview to see how it sounded. He got it. He asked for no changes.

At the end of the interview, Crevolin was asked if he wanted a replay. He said he didn't have time. He offered Schweder and Bowmar a drink, and they accepted. While Crevolin was pouring, four Kentucky horsemen who had come to see Crevolin about a business deal arrived. They asked to hear the interview, Schweder started setting up

the recorder, and then they and Crevolin agreed they didn't have 50 minutes to spare.

Crevolin said he had to meet his wife soon, and the four wanted to talk terms to him about a mutually profitable arrangement for standing Imbros at stud at one of their nearby farms. (They later announced this had been agreed to although still later the deal fell through.)

In the presence of the four visitors, Schweder assured Crevolin the interview would be handled carefully and that others, including Editor Estes, would read it and double check for errors. Crevolin said, in effect, that there wasn't anything in it anyway, probably the sports understatement of the year.

After the one drink, Schweder and Bowman left.

The interview got the handling promised, although Estes read it hastily. It never occurred to anyone on *The Blood-Horse* that Crevolin's admission that he didn't punish his horses in their first races would lift an eyebrow. No horse owner does.

Neither that statement, nor the one about the pulled fillies was in answer to questions prepared by *The Blood-Horse*. They were volunteered, without — as one sports columnist suggested — "malicious prodding." So much was volunteered, in fact, that for makeup purposes *The Blood-Horse* had to insert questions in the middle of Crevolin's ramblings to break up the type.

The tape was transcribed, edited for factual details, cut some, and the interview printed.

Crevolin was not sent either the copy or a proof because, Schweder and Bowmar said in an affidavit to the California Horse Racing Board, he never said he wanted to see one. And the subject, they further said, was not raised at the end of the interview.

(This affidavit was contradicted by the four horsemen who joined Crevolin at the end of the interview. They furnished another affidavit to the effect that they heard Schweder tell Crevolin he could see the piece before it was published.)

The Blood-Horse people feel in retrospect that they sinned editorially in only one respect: Crevolin's charge about the pulled fillies was so irresponsible it shouldn't have been printed. With cameras on every race nowadays, it's next to impossible for any jockey, let alone several, to pull a horse without being detected.

For the rest, particularly during that long backstretch when they expected at any moment to be asked their version, they've got a feeling they were more sinned against than sinning:

Only one newspaperman in all North America bothered to get the smallest part of their side.

A Slightly Immodest Proposal

By David M. White

One bright autumn afternoon I was sitting in Boston Common perusing an exciting chapter in Ayer's *Directory*. My wife was making a pre-Christmas reconnaissance in Filene's bargain basement looking for a suitable present for her Aunt Matilda (the one who has everything lucre can buy). When I had casually suggested that we send her an ermine-trimmed yo-yo, I was excused from the expedition and told to sit quietly in the Common until she returned.

Fortified with all those delicious columns of statistics in Ayer's I stretched out on the bench and was having myself a ball. All of a sudden a rabbit darted in front of me and said, "Follow me." My first impulse was to say to him, "Get lost, Harvey! If you think I'm going to fall for that old Alice-in-Wonderland kick you're bewitched."

Sensing my indecision, the rabbit reached into his hip pocket, pulled out a slightly beat up Guild card and in a most beguiling manner indicated that if I were to follow him I wouldn't be disappointed. With ambivalent feelings that somehow I had flipped my Id, yet compelled by my journalistic curiosity I followed the creature.

When we came to a large hole he jumped in, indicating that we had arrived at our destination. Upon my protest that my bones had long lost the resiliency of youth and that I was not up to jumping down holes, the rabbit promptly showed me a button that said "Executive's elevator." Down, down, down we went and when we arrived at our destination and got off I readily perceived that we were at some kind of convention. A sign in the corridor said: "Luncheon of R.P.A. Executive Committee, Floogle Room, 12:30." I felt it might be a newspaper convention since there were lots of glasses with amber liquid in them on a long table and a large sign over them saying, "Drink me." Figuring I was already in to this up to my patella, but with visions of getting smaller than a kewpie doll or taller than a giraffe, I quaffed a glass. No doubt about it now, it was a newspaper convention, alright. Best damn Manhattan I'd had in a month.

Feeling a bit lighter I walked down the corridor to the Floogle Room. On the door was a sign indicating that the executive committee of the Realistic Publishers of America were in conclave therein. As I hesitated whether to go in or not, my little rabbit guide opened the door and beckoned me enter.

One of the publishers was in the midst of a speech, so I found myself a chair in the rear of the rather large

David M. White is professor of journalism at Boston University.

room and took out a crumpled laundry list which I always carry to make notes on the back of.

"And in conclusion, gentlemen," the speaker was saying, "I think we will agree that the wonderful slogan we adopted at last year's convention has set the tone for our great success in fighting Reader Apathy, the mortal enemy of the newspaper. I can't say it any better than to repeat our slogan, 'If you can sell soap — you can sell News!'"

The toastmaster then announced that the main part of the program would begin, a panel discussion by four of the R.P.A. members on "Successful Techniques in Newspaper Reception." The first panel member was from West Wahocket Falls, Ohio, and as clearly as I can decipher my notes, he said something like this:

"Like the rest of you fellows, we were mighty concerned about the fact that most of our readers didn't seem to remember much out of the news. After Doc Gallup came up with that survey of his in which he found that only about three out of ten people knew who fellows like Nehru, Anthony Eden or Georgi Malenkov were, we decided to take our own poll in West Wahocket. It was quite discouraging to find that our readers were even a little below the national average, especially since we were paying a telegraph editor good money to keep them informed.

"Survey after survey showed that the most widely read part of our paper was the comics. We hired opinion experts from Chicago and they found out that 59% of our readers thought Adenauer was something you did in Spring when we went on daylight savings time; but 84% of our readers knew Orphan Annie's "bodyguard" as Asp. Our course of action was obvious. We decided to tell all of our front page news in the form of comic strips.

"We fired all of our copy editors and hired cartoonists in their place. One of our best-read strips of news is "The Capitol Caper" and we've been able to get a lot of life into good old Washington. Another good thing about using cartoon strips for news stories is that it enabled us to dispense with the editorial page. We've found that the readers mainly like to point to people in the news as good guys or as villains. So instead of printing old cut-and-dried editorials, we hold a conference with the cartoonists and we decide whether to draw the characters as good or bad guys. Our readers love it, since they don't have to tax themselves so much to figure out the news.

"After all, gentlemen, we've got to face the facts, television lays it right on the line to our same audience of readers and lets them know who's a bad guy and who's the hero. We can't play second fiddle to television and expect to hold our readers. You know, with the money we saved by eliminating our editorial writers we were soon able to run our front page news in four colors, and if I

say so myself our color is just as good as N.B.C.'s compatible color tubes."

"A stroke of genius, no less," I heard one of the publishers in front of me say to the man sitting next to him.

The next speaker on the panel was from Lower Megapolis, New York, and I was intrigued by his hand-painted tie embossed with little diamond chips that spelled out Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense. I'm a guy that admires philosophy wherever I find it.

"Fellows," he said, "I'd like to tell you how we've increased our readability so much that Flesch hasn't even got a place on his scale to show how readable we are. We call our style the Art of Vivid Talk because it packs such a wallop. I'll admit that we studied the success of some of the socko magazines, as well as some of the zestier 25 cent novels. Let's face it, sometimes you can learn from the opposition. We found that more Lower Megapolins were reading Viscera, the Magazine with Guts, than were reading our paper. And did you ever notice the way they gobble up every two-bit novel by Spookey Mullane?"

"So we hired Spookey Mullane as our readability consultant and got him to teach our reporters how to use Vivtalk, as we call it. Since that day our stories really crackle with excitement. In our paper nobody just 'says' something. How much socko is there in a phrase like 'Senator Ronch said?' How about 'Senator Ronch spit out words as if they were roman candles going off in his mouth.' That's vivtalk, boys.

"If we're going to compete with television's visual advantage over reading we've got to give the reader a verbal cue that will 'send him.' And frankly, men, we've found that 98% of our readers don't care where they're 'sent' just as long as they can go. Like Spookey Mullane tells our staff, anytime you can make the readers feel that little things are crawling up their spine, you're in. The research boys tell us that our vivtalk rating has passed C.B.S.' *Danger* and soon will be better than the goriest crime magazine on the market. It takes fire to beat fire, boys, and I can tell you honestly that every reader of the Lower Megapolis *Clarion* would rather settle down to an exciting, socko hour with our paper than look at a dull murder on TV."

The moderator next introduced a publisher from Blitt, Wyoming, whom I had noticed right after I'd entered the room. It would have been hard not to, since he had a trained bear on a chain sitting behind him. Furthermore, the bear was balancing a large rubber ball on his nose on which was printed "Read the Blitt *Star*."

Pardners," he said. (He was from the West — where every man who aint agin you is your partner.) "I'd like to tell you how we've been able to crack that old maverick, Reader Indifference. The answer is to make the newspaper mean something to the Family. We hired one of

them new-fangled research guys from Denver, an honest-to-god Doctor of Motivation. I soon found out that the thing that motivated him — but never mind about that. This guy is worth everything we paid him. He showed us that we were putting out a newspaper just about the same way my great-granpap did in the days when sweet Betsy Pike went through Blitt with her lover, Ike. Modernize your methods of distribution, he said. Make your readers think they're getting something new. They take the newspaper too much for granted, he told us.

"First thing we did was to embark on a real crusade. Nothing like a crusade to get the people's confidence. We shot the works against 'Scratch Sheet Willie' Snodgrass, Blitt's resident bookie. Getting 'Willie' booted out of town made all of the blue-noses happy. That still left us with the horse players (which in our town made up about 75% of our readers) a mite angry with us. But we made it up to them by setting up a branch pari-mutual office in our lobby. Took a bit of doing at the State Legislature, you know, but we convinced the solons it was better than a sales tax.

"Like I said, you've got to convince the people that you're giving them something new. That's the way those soap boys keep selling the housewives on Squish, the detergent that makes your dishes sing, or Whiz, the soap that makes you yell Gee. We decided to use some of these market research gems. Pardners, we've got the only newspaper in the Yewnited States that can safely make the claim that it is 99.44% pure.

"We are the only newspaper that has invited folks to come to our composing room and printing plant to see how hygienic a shop can be. They find that all of our printers are dressed in antiseptic white. Before a printer touches a piece of type they'll see that his hands must be sterile. Our ink is prepared especially for us by Parke and Davis and we can guarantee that not one of our readers

who has an allergy to printer's ink will ever sneeze by coming into contact with our paper. Another one of the Doc's ideas was to vacuum-pack all of our papers in cellophane that we sell on the street. And on holidays we gift-pack them.

"Pardners, since we got hep to modern methods of motivation we're doing the greatest business we've ever had."

He ended his remarks in a thunder of applause, and the moderator then asked if anyone in the room would like to ask the panel participants a question. Since all of the publishers were still busy writing down on their little pads all of the good ideas of the last speaker, I raised my hand and was asked to give my question.

"My question is directed to any of the three speakers, sir. Although I am fascinated by the ingenuity of these devices, I can't help feel that the concessions you seem to make in the name of the almighty Reader seem awfully drastic. Don't you really have faith that the readers of American newspapers aren't completely a bunch of frustrated nin-compoops who must be pampered with all the tricks from the huckster's cornucopia?"

Bedlam broke loose in the room. I heard shouts of "Spy!" "Get that Unrealist fink outta here!" "Throw the bum out!"

I saw a fist holding a pica ruler flashing through the air at me. Then, as Spookey Mullane would say, I was going, going, gone. I felt like I was in a bathtub 84 feet deep and that if I couldn't reach that floating piece of Ivory Soap I would surely sink.

* * * * *

I woke up to find my wife nudging me in the ribs.

"Oh dear, I'm sorry to be so long. I couldn't find a single thing for Aunt Tilly, either. Heavens, I've been gone more than two hours. It's later than I thought."

"My sweet," I smiled and said under my teeth, "It's later than you think."

Reporting from the State House

By Edward W. Stagg

There is hardly a more important responsibility for the press and radio of our country than telling the people what is happening in their governmental affairs — whether that be local, state, national, or international. We cannot have sound democratic government unless the people have information on which to base intelligent decisions. In our society today, the press, radio, and now television are the

major agencies dedicated to the task of keeping the people informed.

There is, of course, a growing awareness on the part of public officials — or so it seems to me — that they must do their best to tell the government story to the people. The increase in public relations people in governmental agencies is evidence of this awareness. While there are some recognizable weaknesses in the official handouts, they do perform many valuable services.

In view of the very heavy responsibility that rests on the press and radio for informing the people about governmental affairs, it is important that every effort be made to discharge this responsibility in the best possible manner.

Mr. Stagg is with the Public Research Council of Louisiana, Inc. This is a talk to the National Municipal League in Kansas City, Nov. 8, 1954.

When it comes to reporting and interpreting state government, there are some basic criteria of all good reporting which must be met. These might be listed as follows without any attempt to rank them in importance: fairness, competence, and accuracy.

Fairness will do more than anything I have found to win confidence and trust from the readers and public officials with whom a reporter deals. Once I read that no reporter should write a critical story which would prevent the reporter from feeling he could sit down at lunch the next day with the person involved in the story. That's probably a very good test. And it does not imply a weak reporting job, nor a trained seal act. It simply means that the reporter should see that the subject of criticism gets a fair break. When the reporter does this he establishes a reputation for sincerity and dedication to the best interests of the public. And the paper for which he works gains prestige, influence, and leadership.

It does no good, though, for a reporter to be fair if he is incompetent in the selection of issues or stories to write or if he is so inept at writing that his reports are confusing. So competence is a virtue to be prized.

Competency in writing and in judgment as to news stories usually goes with accuracy. But accuracy needs special emphasis. People must have the truth on governmental issues if they are to hope to make sound decisions. By and large, it is the reporter covering the story on whom they rely. So there is a very grave responsibility resting on the reporter to get his facts straight.

A characteristic of a good reporter, going beyond the points mentioned, is trustworthiness. This shows up in getting confidential tips and in getting background information, frequently given off-the-record. There are some problems involved in "off-the-record" conversations with public officials. A reporter runs the risk of having his hands tied for no good reason. But there are ways of meeting these problems while maintaining integrity. And the reporter who is trusted certainly gets more and better information on which to base stories.

There is one other characteristic of a good reporter. It is one of humility. The reporter is handling a very powerful thing — the written word. I recall meeting a Russian general during the war. He was inspecting one of our defense plants. When he learned who I was, he said, "Ah, you are a dangerous man." It was a surprising remark to me at the time. But there was something in what he said. And since the reporter is dealing with a powerful force, he should use it humbly to advance truth.

Now let me turn to four phases of capital reporting which seem to be specially useful in the interpretation of governmental affairs, assuming we have reporting that meets the general criteria already discussed.

First, there is a very useful place for the "what's it all about" story. Many times reporters are dealing with very complex subjects such as budgets, that can't be adequately handled in a spot news story. Much can be gained by either using a side story which tells in A, B, C fashion what the big news story in the adjoining column is all about. Such a story can be very valuable as a day-after follow-up story, or later.

A couple of stories come to my mind in this connection. For my paper, at least, the day-after story on the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima was more important than the spot news story. People couldn't grasp right off the significance of an atomic explosion. They showed more interest and bought more papers next day telling what it was all about. It is my belief that papers can win circulation and prestige by doing more explanatory stories, even where there is a weak news peg. One of the useful devices is the column where the reporter has elbow room to explain things.

A second phase of reporting which seems to me to need greater emphasis is that dealing with the really significant affairs. In my own experience, this has seemed to be a special need in legislative coverage. When legislatures meet, there are many things brought up in debate that can furnish some passing entertainment in a paper but which don't really amount to much. There is a temptation to grab one of these things for a story instead of grubbing out the background of some measure which could have widespread effect in a state. From what little I have seen, I believe the newspaper gains when it tells the people about important proposals that will affect them.

There is no escaping the need for alertness in reporting situations in government that reflect poor administration, injustice, and chicanery. The people have a right to know how their officials are conducting public business. The reporter is the one person best able to tell them. There is a place in a good newspaper for the expose story. And I believe nothing is more likely to keep officials straight than the ever present possibility of public exposure of wrongdoing. I know this type of reporting has its occasional unpleasantness. But if the reporter makes certain of his facts, gives an official a chance for an explanation, he will retain respect regardless of whether his story gives an unfavorable report.

There is a remaining aspect to capital coverage that has a special appeal to me. It is the reporting of state activities in its programs to aid unfortunate people who are in its hospitals and other institutions. Some people who are casualties of our society have political influence and so get attention. We can see this in our state in the liberal pensions persons 65 years of age and over receive. We, at the same time, see much less assistance — proportionately speaking — for the dependent children who can't vote.

And we see still less assistance for persons in the mental, penal, and correctional institutions. For many of these groups, the press is the major hope for improvement. The press can be their spokesman. And without the interest of the press, little will be done for them. So I would urge a reporter to take an interest in this field.

In connection with what can be done to help interpret state government, let me say a few words about the work and responsibility of such organizations as the National Municipal League and the various governmental research agencies such as the Public Affairs Research Council for which I work in Louisiana.

These agencies are doing an increasingly important job in the interpretation of governmental affairs to the people. They are the agencies on whom the press frequently relies for impartial and accurate information on complex governmental matters. And they have a responsibility for presenting their findings in a fashion that will aid the mass media in relaying their research work to the people. It does little good for a fine piece of research to be buried in a library where the scholars may look and marvel. Good research needs to be brought to the attention of the people. And the responsibility for planning programs that will do this falls first on the research organizations.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "A nation that expects to be ignorant and free . . . expects something that never was and never will be." I believe this applies with special force today. If our people cannot understand government, they will take little interest in it. In our state we have a habit of submitting many things to the people in the form of constitutional amendments. The people don't understand them, and they stay away from the polls in droves. We have had state bond issues approved by as few as eight per cent of the registered voters. With government at the state and national levels becoming more and more complex and having increasing impact on our daily lives, we must have an informed citizenry. Otherwise a few people will take advantage of the national ignorance and take charge.

The press, radio, and television have a major responsibility in doing their best to see that we have an informed citizenry. If they fail in this high obligation, then I will fear for democracy. I think these media of mass information will live up to their responsibilities. We had in our state a recent good example in a vote on 31 proposed constitutional amendments. Some of them turned out to have serious flaws. The press and radio reported the facts to the people. There was no special controversy from a political standpoint. But the people were informed and they turned the bad amendments down. On the premise that our press and radio will continue to tell the people the truth and that our people will then vote wisely, I rest my faith for a finer state and nation as the years go by.

Words and Writing

by Louis M. Lyons

Philip Gibbs, in *Adventures in Journalism*, speaks of a need of the journalist. It applies to all writers.

A feeling for the quality of words. This suggests precision in the choice of a word, an ear, as we say, for the right word. A sense of the fitness of the language for the purpose. In short, style.

This is not a common trait of American journalism. It is a part of our practicability as a people, that we go for the facts and let the style take care of itself.

A much more American definition of a journalistic imperative is one I once heard a seasoned reporter give: PERENNIAL CURIOSITY. That is, a compulsion to find out, a fresh questioning approach, an unjaded interest, a capacity to inquire and to listen and to learn, to absorb, to get at the meaning of things—to acquire understanding.

Now these two supplement each other, in providing something to say and a happy way of saying it, to be effective.

Those, I suppose, are the two requisites of writing—something to say and ability to say it so as to interest readers.

This adds up to communication, a universal need, one heightened by the velocity of every kind of impact of our times.

Young or new writers are more apt to miss the part about having something to say—to be completely absorbed in the processes of writing.

That puts the cart before the horse. It yields overwriting—a too self-conscious pre-occupation with the form of writing. I suggest one cause of this is an absence of any other subject for pre-occupation—that is, a lack of knowledge of the subject.

At any rate, that comes first. The reporter's role is to go and find out the story. How can one possibly use the precise word for a description if he hasn't observed what he is trying to describe? The words are apt to spring to their task if the writer has received a vivid impression of an actual situation.

The eye-witness report of the disaster is at a premium in newspapers, even though the eye witness is not a writer. But he has something you can't take away from him, and that you can't duplicate if the horror were not seared into your own eyeballs.

This is recognized universally. All the eyewitness contributes may be a few stark words—graphic, brutal, blunt, shocking, horrifying, moving—whatever quality they have it is one of sheer impact. The thing hit him and left its mark.

Samuel Eliot Morison has more writing style than any

other contemporary American historian. It may be only coincidence that he follows the scent of the story himself. He goes out after his own raw material. He outfitted a ship to follow the course of Columbus. He stood on the deck of the "Massachusetts" when it shelled the North African Coast. He was with the ships at Saipan and Kwajalein, indeed on the flagship. He writes both as reporter and as historian.

To a graduate student, studying the New England fisheries, Morison advised one January: "Go out to the fishing grounds with a fisherman. This is a good time to go. It's good and rough."

As to style, Samuel Morison says, in his very practical leaflet; "History as a Literary Art:"

Just as Voltaire's ideal cure advises his flock not to worry about going to Heaven, but to do right and probably by God's grace they will get there; so the writer of history had better not work consciously to develop a style but concentrate on day-by-day improvement in craftsmanship. Then perhaps he may find some day that his industry, which left readers cold, is carried to a large popular audience by something that the critics call style.

His practice and preaching come from sound background.

His greatest antecedent as a New England historian was Francis Parkman. Parkman's unique contribution to the history of this continent was that he went all over it. To write of the Indian wars he lived in the forest, tramped and camped like an Indian, explored the sites of their battles, went over the ground. Parkman's *French and English in Canada* is a classic, and also a graphic report. This was true of his earliest journals, and became a part of the writer from his college days, when he spent every summer exploring the forest and reaching toward the frontier and filling notebooks with detail.

The very first of his journals describes a trip up Mount Washington. Read it, if you have ever been up Mt. Washington yourself. You will read what you yourself saw, felt, experienced on your trek, as Parkman put it all down 100 years ago. All of it—the view, the clouds on top, the difficulty of the trail, the burden of the pack, the mountain flowers—all of it. He wrote it down in the freshness of his first experience, and captured every sensation, every fact, every bit of interest, every crumb of information that came out of the trip. It fascinated him. It excited him. It filled him with a new crop of facts. It gave him a zest for the mountains and forests and the life out of doors, and he writes these feelings in his notes.

Now this was a hard chore. He was going all day, and pushing himself to get over the ground. His stops were few, and certainly hot and hungry ones. At night there was no light after sundown. He had to carry everything,

even his notebooks. Yet he wrote in the heat and zest and excitement of the trip. Because the words were wrought in the striving of the adventure, they are as current today as in 1854.

Who was it who envied the bards of ancient days who wrote when the words of the language were fresh with dew? But words that tell the sharpened actuality of action are not dulled by usage. It is the fancy word that won't stand repetition, the synthetic word that reminds the reader of your contriving.

You are not conscious of Parkman's words as words. You see them as windows to what he describes.

May I suggest that there is no substitute for great models of writing? To read Parkman's journals is itself a vivid experience.

A veteran reporter of my cub days—Frank P. Sibley—was said by his colleagues to have a photographic mind because he could describe in such faithful precise detail a colorful event—whether a parade, a fire, a shipwreck, or a court room scene. He was a great talker too, and what I noted about his writing was that he wrote in the same natural, direct, explicit way that he talked. But he had his models. He once advised me to read Kipling. He said I would find that Kipling never had a character merely walk or run. He leapt, darted, vaulted, sped, swept, skipped, slid, slithered, whisked, loomed, glided, flung, crashed, trod, tiptoed, stole, flitted.

Meyer Berger of the *New York Times* today has much the same descriptive gift in reporting as Frank Sibley had,—and the same disdain, let me add, of reporting by telephone. He goes to the scene, follows the trail himself. He won the Pulitzer prize for local reporting that way in 1949.

Berger could have got it by phone to the police. Or picked up the notes of the district reporters and woven it together. But he went out on the trail and followed in detail the course of the deranged veteran who went on a shooting spree in Camden and killed the first 12 people he happened to meet. Berger traversed the course of these shootings, talked to people who had been at each spot, oriented himself to the scene of each crime, and reported it with a sense of having experienced it—almost with the impact of an eyewitness. That was reporting. I am sure he had no problem of finding the right word. He needed no thesaurus. The thing was vivid in him; the story told itself because he had made it a part of him.

The business of going and seeing—of experiencing the thing for yourself—is fundamental to everything else. Everything flows from that. You have to know what you are talking about. You have to know what it is, who is doing it, why, what kind of person he is, what he is up to, how he does it, what he feels about it, and everything else. You have to know the situation. You have to ask the questions that can only arise from having first exercised enough

curiosity to explore it yourself. You have to ask the questions of the man who knows, who lives with the answers. Doing that you multiply the dimensions of your story. He is a story too. And it is no good to talk to him on the telephone with the pat little list of questions you noted down on reading the report. You want to spend a day with him in the field, or take the trip yourself, or somehow share the experience. The stuff needs to be dug out if it is to have substance.

You need to take time, and if you are dependent on some one else who has the story, you have to adjust your time to his. You need to get at him when he is free and relaxed—not watching the clock to see when his next appointment is due, or his train.

That is one objection to the telephoned interview—one of many. You can't tell whether you have caught him at a bad time or not. Even if you haven't, you can't tell anything but the surface, obvious facts that way.

You need to see your man for one thing to understand him, and you need him to know you to establish confidence for the details that make a story. I don't mean the confidence that you mustn't break, the confidential remark. But the confidence to feel you are a real person who has enough sense, enough interest, enough understanding and workmanship, enough integrity, for him first to bother with you, and next really to share with you what it all means to him.

It is only this shared experience that makes a real story. It comes only from establishing confidence—of proving a right to share what perhaps is his life work or deepest interest. People don't wear their lives on their sleeves for lazy reporters. A true workman feels set up that some one shares his interest; correspondingly he can feel slighted that you act as though it was not worth a substantial effort on your part to explore it with him. I remember a story of which I thought nothing special as I wrote it. But the office said it was one of my best stories. So I thought a little about it.

It was a story of Charles Cole, when he became president of Amherst. He was teaching at Columbia, when I went to see him, first telephoning him for an appointment. I was in luck to start with. For a news magazine out that day had a story about him. I naturally began by taking off from what seemed to be the basic facts in their story. I vividly remember his impatience with it. "Look," he said, "you came down here from Boston to see me to do your story. They couldn't spend a subway fare to come across town. The writer had a researcher call me up." And he then checked off the mistakes he had counted in their few paragraphs.

Well, that contrast in his treatment made him very sympathetic to my project. We had a long, chatty afternoon,

ranging all over—and it was intensely interesting to me—which of course is why it made a good story.

If a story is in a person and can only be got from him, the subject needs to be played subtly, almost like a game fish. You need to get him relaxed. If he says he's got only a few minutes, tell him you don't want to be a nuisance; you'll come back at the end of today, or tomorrow, or see him tonight—whenever is best for him.

And then the thing is to ask questions only until you get him launched on his own talk. Let him talk. It's his story you want. Only after he's talked of his own interest enough to feel easy and interested does he tell the anecdotes and details that make the story, and that illumine his personality. Much of this you don't need to write down. You can remember his stories till you get back to your desk. The really vivid or picturesque detail is etched in your impression. You couldn't lose it. He may flow more freely if you use a pencil sparingly. You can soon tell. Or the reverse. A methodical man—an engineer or a scientist—may worry about it if he doesn't feel the details are being set down precisely as he recalls them. You have no trouble catching this mood and adjusting to it. A trained reporter must sometimes do as a diplomat always has to do: remember the conversation till it is over. Then he recalls it in his diplomatic report. This is not really very hard to do on a subject that interests you. Anybody can get total recall of a funny story, for instance. But never hesitate to ask precisely, and check on the essential figure or date or fact that you must have right.

You may need to wait for this till the end of the interview, so as not to break off an interesting recital. But before you go, pin it down. The interviewed will have increased confidence in you because of your care. But there is a difference between care and pettifoggery. Don't bore a man with picayune or fussy quizzing on details that to him are obviously inconsequential. Or if they are essential to you, wait till he's told his story his own way before badgering him on the points he's left out.

You have to have capacity yourself to share his interest to do a good story. That's a large part of Frank Sibley's perennial curiosity. It is the opposite of the blase. The reporter who's bored with a story is a total loss.

Don't be thrown off by my laboring of the *reporter's* function. I am not thinking only of newspaper work. The newspaper reporter actually works under special limitations from which he is released in the more leisurely, more expansive, more rounded, more broadly based reporting needed for media with less pressure of the immediate deadline.

Leaving out fiction—with which I do not pretend any ability to deal at all—all writing is based on reporting: that is, on observation of facts—on finding things out—on knowing what you're talking about.

You have nothing to communicate until after that is done, unless you are weaving romances out of your own imagination or intuition or the revealed word of God—and that would leave most of us with a scant production.

But whether you are writing history, or any kind of article, the first thing is to get the facts straight, and not only straight but as full and detailed, as specific, as vivid, as colorful, as meaningful, as they are. That is, to get the story in all its dimensions. This means work, and craftsmanship.

There is such a thing as a natural reporter—as there is a natural athlete. We recognize him when we see him at his game. Any one can improve his golf stroke or tennis game or batting average by practice, by using great models, by hard intelligent work. But most of us early discover that we are not natural athletes and are never going to play on the varsity or in the major leagues. It is fine school spirit to be a scrub, and good exercise and interesting. But there is a question whether to spend your college years on the substitutes' bench instead of playing in the band or editing the college paper or making the dramatics club.

So with writing. There is a certain minimum of individual talent without which one might be well advised to cultivate another occupation.

There are ways of detecting a prospect of writing ability. Letter writing for instance. We all know people whose letters are vivid, warm, humorous, descriptive, charming and informing to read. We have other friends who can't seem to get beyond "Wish you were here"—"See you next month"—"Like the job"—"Thanks for the book." As between them we wouldn't have much doubt which to suggest for a writing job, and which to advise to go on with his business course.

Writing includes editing. The selection from your material. What to leave out is one of the large questions.

You don't want to wear the reader down with an encumbrance of unessential detail. The story gains in dramatic quality, in efficiency, by omission of all you can do without.

Herbert Feis' fine book, "China Tangle" was written from vast documentation, from State Department and such sources. He lets you know he has it and has digested it; but he doesn't make you wade through it all. He gives you the gist of the report. He has exercised great restraint in thinning it down to a lean chronicle,

Probably no writer is a sufficient editor of his own stuff. But he must be the first editor. He must cut and revise and check with himself as to whether this is just what he wants to say and whether he has said what he meant.

The essence of all editing is in Harold Ross' crotchety cryptic, "Who he?"

Who he? You want to be sure you don't leave any unanswered questions, any unintended puzzles for the reader.

The self-editing part of writing calls on restraint. In handling a set of facts familiar to your readers, restraint is on the side of safety.

Remember when Senator Dirksen tried one of his patented tear-jerker speeches in defense of Senator McCarthy, on Sen. Flanders censure motion last summer. As Dirksen's eloquence carried him away, he called McCarthy "this humble man," and the audience laughed. Well, he wanted them to cry. Some things you can't do just to fit the stereotype. In Dirksen's lexicon the fellow everybody was picking on had to be a humble abused little orphan. It didn't fit. It ruined his effect.

The explicit word makes strong writing. Consequently the reporter may have to sacrifice it when it risks libel. If you can't prove a man is a thief, better say crook. You can't always prove the fact. Who is to say that Sen Malone is one of the ten worst senators. *Time Inc* can risk action on it. And a senator is reasonably fair game. But in such situations most publishers won't risk a suit. So we have in journalism sometimes to use weasel words and indirect and vague statements, and trust to the imagination of the reader to render them explicit.

But in able hands, risk is lightened by understatement which may have a special piquancy of its own. Many laconic Yankee ways of putting things gain strength by such understatement, which keeps them on the safe side. You say "There's no love lost between them." "I wouldn't put it beyond him." "Nobody'd call him the most brilliant member of the House." "We'd just as leave somebody else would run." "The town didn't exactly go into mourning when he was defeated." "Some would say he might have done different." "You could go further and do worse." "He doesn't do too bad a job when he'll work at it."

Restraint will serve well for other contingencies than libel. "One of the few times in history" is safer than "the only time." "One of the greatest milers" will provoke less resistance than "the greatest" and do about the same job. With a little care a writer can secure the effect of a strong statement without risking a superlative.

"First and foremost get writing" is Samuel Morison's admonition to young writers. The deadly defect of postponement, he warns, has been fatal to many fruitful projects.

"Don't procrastinate like Gen. McClellan, seeking every excuse for not advancing till the last mule was shod." This is in Morison's little classic, "History as a Literary Form," written for historians, but as pertinent for any kind of writers. It is now to be found in his book "By Land and by Sea" published by Knopf in 1953.

This is from a lecture at Breadloaf Writers' Conference, 1954

The Duty of a Free Press

by **Palmer Hoyt**

The case of John Peter Zenger had many significant aspects and results. His acquittal on the charge of libel by a jury established for the first time that truth was a defense against libel. Before the Zenger decision, it had been held that the greater the truth, the greater the libel.

Zenger was tried after spending nine months in jail. He was brilliantly defended by Andrew G. Hamilton of Philadelphia, who successfully contended (1) that free men have a right to remonstrate publicly against official abuses of power and (2) it is up to a jury, and not the judge, to say whether a statement is libelous.

In order that we may take a full look at the significance of the award established in the name of John Peter Zenger, let's take a brief look at the guarantee of freedom of the press in this great republic of ours. Let us first note and remember that the constitutional guarantees of this basic privilege of freedom are made on pieces of paper that can be and have been violated in this country by reckless, daring or unprincipled men highly placed in our national councils.

So let us then note and remember: unless the principles of freedom of the press and all our other freedoms are deeply graven in the heart of every American, constitutional protections may go for naught no matter how finely worded.

In the forefront of the guardians of our freedoms must be the newspapers. In this role, the newspapers of America must assume increasingly the mantle of greater responsibility. There are many reasons why, but not the least is that the newspapers are the unlicensed medium of mass communication closest to the people. This is important, as witness the fact that less than a year ago Senator Joseph R. McCarthy bullied the television networks into granting him a half hour of time to answer former President Harry S. Truman who had made a brief mention of McCarthyism on a similar hook-up. Senator McCarthy, in his turn, barely mentioned Harry S. Truman, but spent his time attacking Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

Why did the networks grant Senator McCarthy "equal time" on such a thin excuse? Because the Wisconsin senator had two friendly appointees on the Federal Communications Commission, and the big wheels of radio and television might have been afraid to do otherwise. The possibilities of government reprisal that all licensees must feel are clearly shown by this incident.

This is from a talk by **Palmer Hoyt**, publisher of the *Denver Post*, upon receiving the first John Peter Zenger award, established at the University of Arizona.

Thus it is necessary for newspapers to function more sharply, more adequately than ever before. And, believe me, there is nothing wrong with this country that repeated strong dosages of the facts will not correct. Even McCarthyism will melt away before this treatment.

Newspapers would do well to remember that while freedom of the press is guaranteed under our laws, freedom of information is a matter of the individual initiative, integrity and ingenuity, and public office holders are apt to believe in censorship as far as their conduct and the conduct of their offices is concerned.

Much attention fortunately has been paid of late to the question of freedom of information with powerful newspaper groups actively concerning themselves with the problem of obtaining all necessary facts for the public at every level of government. The American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press Managing Editors association, and Sigma Delta Chi, recognized with increasing clarity that news is the great prophylactic against irregularities in government and per se the greatest champion of civil rights, the very cornerstone of democracy.

In connection with freedom of the press I have the feeling that the most sacred obligation that can be undertaken by newspapermen is that of presenting the facts squarely day by day in so far as time and space permit, looking toward that totality of fairness that all newspapers must hope to achieve if they are to call themselves newspapers.

Thus, I say, no newspaperman has the right knowingly to twist or distort the news. Such procedure is more than sharp practice; it is more than political manipulation; it is plain dishonesty.

As with other editors, I find some of my time taken up with people who would have me print no news of crime or violence, who would have none of the chronicling of political scandal, who would have our newspapers reflect only sweetness and light.

My answer to such good citizens, I fear, has become somewhat stereotyped. It goes something like this:

"As I see the daily newspaper, it is a mirror of contemporary life. It must, if it is to be a good public servant, reflect life as it is. If crime and violence be a part of our life, then the mirror must show crime and violence as it must also show constructive and unselfish actions."

Several years ago the *Denver Post* was very actively

pointing out highly irregular matters in connection with the operation of the state penitentiary. These matters, both financial and humanitarian, concerned the warden quite intimately.

A business leader in Denver was so vocal in his criticisms of the *Denver Post* that I heard of it and invited him into my office. I told him of the reports that had reached my ears.

He swallowed hard and said, "Yes, I have been criticizing the *Post*. I didn't like the guy you supported for the senate, and I don't like your criticisms of the warden of the penitentiary."

"Mr. Blank," I said, "Let's forget the senate, but do you doubt that the warden of the penitentiary is violating the law as we charge or that he has been so doing for 22 years?"

"Oh, no," he replied, "I'm sure all your charges are true, but you're giving the state a bad name."

"Mr. Blank," I replied, "A few weeks ago I had lunch with you and some other Denver businessmen. You were violent against the five per centers; you were enraged over the scandals in the RFC; you were bitter about some of President Truman's associates. Now, let me ask you, if there be wrongdoing in Washington, if there is waste and extravagance in the capital, if there be a toleration for law violation, then where do you think the type of Washington climate that permits that sort of thing is created and who do you think is responsible?"

My visitor allowed as how he didn't know.

"I'll tell you," I said. The Washington climate you pretend to detest is created in Denver, Colorado, and you're the man responsible."

My visitor was shocked.

I went on to explain, "When you, a businessman in Denver, can tolerate graft and wrongdoing at home, when you want it exposed because it will hurt the town, then you are responsible."

And so it is. The political climate in Washington is set and established in Denver, in Tucson, in Phoenix, Red Oaks, Los Angeles, Las Vegas and all the other towns and cities and hamlets that make up our glorious country.

And so with newspapers. Afghanistanism is a fine thing in Afghanistan but it is a bad thing in Washington, D. C., too.

Generally speaking, the newspapers of the United States, individually and collectively through their organizations, have been zealous and effective guardians of the freedom of the press, a right guaranteed the people by the Constitution.

Certainly, without a free press no other freedom can long survive. It is not surprising that in every land where democracy has been replaced by a dictatorship practically the first move made by the despot has been to shackle

the press and make it a servile mouthpiece of the totalitarian regime.

But let us never forget that freedom of the press is only one of the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. There are others. There are also, to name only some of them, freedom of speech and the right of trial by jury, and the right of an accused to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to be confronted with the witnesses against him and to have counsel for his defense. These and the other rights included in the Bill of Rights all form part of an inseparable pattern of restraint of government which distinguishes our system from totalitarian regimes.

There can be no freedom of the press, certainly not for very long, where there is no freedom of speech. Freedom of the press and freedom of speech cannot long survive where the fundamental rights of individuals are curbed or destroyed.

For its own sake, therefore, as well as for the higher good of the nation, it would seem to be the inescapable duty of our newspapers to combat with all the vigor they can any infringement on any of the basic rights.

I wish it could be said that this has altogether been the case. It has not. I need only point out in this connection that during the years in which the dark shadow of Senator McCarthy has spread over the landscape by no means have all newspapers shown him up for what he is—a grave threat to all our basic liberties by his contemptuous flouting of the rights of individuals.

In the New Testament there is a verse that I think applies particularly to one of Joe McCarthy's victims:

The quotation, Matthew 25, Verse 40:

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you,

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."

These beautiful Bible words apply to a simple and ignorant colored woman who lost her job because Joe McCarthy and his faceless informers made a mistake, a tragic blunder. I would like to quote a page from the new book, *An Almanac of Liberty* by William O. Douglas, justice of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The Case of Annie Lee Moss

The manner in which committees have trenched on the liberties of citizens is shown by a March 1954 hearing before the McCarthy committee investigating government operations. Roy M. Cohn was cross-examining Annie Lee Moss, a widowed colored woman, unskilled and with little education, who "transmitted" messages for the Army but never worked in the code room. She had an attorney, but McCarthy refused to allow him to speak. Mrs. Moss was now unemployed, for when the investigation started she had been suspended. It appeared that there were three Annie Lee Mosses in

Washington, D. C. *This* Mrs. Moss hotly denied she was or ever had been a communist or attended any communist meetings. No testimony was offered against her.

Mr. Cohn adopted the tactic of smearing by innuendo, "We have the testimony of Mrs. Markward, the undercover agent for the F.B.I., stating that an Annie Lee Moss was a dues-paying member of the communist party, the Northeast Club of the communist party. We have corroboration of that testimony by another witness who . . . gave a sworn statement to the effect that she also knew Mrs. Moss was a member of the Northeast Club of the communist party."

But those witnesses were not called to confront the accused and to establish that *this* Mrs. Moss was *the* Mrs. Moss to whom Cohn referred and to give *this* Mrs. Moss the opportunity to defend against the charge.

Sen. McClellan protested, saying that if there was evidence against Mrs. Moss, she was entitled "to have it produced here in her presence." Chairman Mundt ruled that the statement of Cohn be stricken.

McClellan's protest took up the earlier challenge by Eisenhower:

In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot hide behind the shadows, he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will inflict . . . If we are going to be proud that we are Americans, there must be no weakening of the codes by which we have lived. By the right to meet your accuser face to face, if you have one. . ."

Thus the president speaks on faceless informers, and all good men and true hold with him. And yet the faceless informer speaks on. Who and what is the faceless informer?

The faceless informer is one who from the cloak of "official position" and the darkness of "security" makes charges against another without revealing his identity, the source of the charges or the proof.

A few months ago in Colorado all who respect civil rights and the due process of law were shocked and startled, yes, and frightened when the governor named six teachers, five in public school systems and one in the university as ones whose loyalty might be questioned.

The governor distributed this derogatory information about the teachers, but utterly refused to identify the source from which it came, except to say that it was "reliable" and "an official source." He hinted at the F.B.I., the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army, Navy and Air Force Intelligence Bureaus, and the State Highway Patrol. He said the governors of all the states were receiving such

information, by request, and transmitting it to school authorities.

The cases of these teachers were handled summarily, in all but two instances. They got no hearings for one reason or another, never were told who accused them, or even what specific charges stood against them. In short, they were denied fundamental *due process* on an issue of the gravest importance to them, to the schools and to national security.

The *Denver Post* determined to find out whether, as the governor had indicated, that was the state of things generally, or anywhere outside Colorado. The distinguished associate editor of the *Denver Post*, Lawrence Martin, was assigned to that inquiry. He went from coast to coast, into a dozen states in all.

The faceless informer we are referring to is one who, behind the screen of individual or high official anonymity, has been and is continuing to put out information reflecting on the loyalty of school teachers, most of it imputing guilt by association—and in most instances, association in the past, not the present.

The dissemination of such anonymous information has become routine procedure in many states, perhaps in all, through governors, attorneys general, state and local school administrators.

In some communities, its source has either been directly revealed as the F.B.I., or indirectly linked to the F.B.I. in "confidential" statements by state and local authorities.

When sent out from official sources, such information is customarily defined as an "alert" to school officials—not as charges or accusations.

As handled locally, the information, however, at once takes on the nature of charges, and an immediate compulsion is felt by local school administrators to act upon it, whether they have facilities for checking upon it, evaluating it, or not.

In few, if any, cases has information from federal investigators been supported by evidence or proof.

Names of suspected subversives have in many instances been bandied about, resulting in damaging publicity before any conference, hearing, formulation of charges or other due process has been had.

Laws in several states, designed to protect schools from subversive infiltration, have been weighted against the suspects or defendants, putting on them, rather than on their accusers, the burden of proof. The result has been establishment of the rule of presumed guilt until innocence has been proved—in itself a flagrant violation of the established judicial rule of innocence until guilt has been proved.

The fundamental, inalienable right of any person put under suspicion or accusation to confront an accuser is everywhere violated in the so-called preliminary consideration of cases. Decision is made customarily by weighing the

unsupported word of the accuser against the unsupported word of the teacher.

As a result, more than twice as many suspects have resigned or retired as have gone to hearing. No one knows today whether the imputation of subversion to those teachers is justified or not. Fear has become their grand jury, judge, and prosecutor and has forced from them an implied confession, in the form of a resignation.

It is my belief that Joseph R. McCarthy has not only split the Republican Party, harmed the administration, including the chief executive, but has made a shambles of the dignity of the U. S. Senate and the American people.

It is now apparent in this the fifth year of the McCarthy siege against the American mind that U. S. Senators and U. S. editors all too often suffer from the same vitiating malady.

How many senators do you imagine are fully informed about the man who has led them around by the nose for four long years?

How many senators have read the Hennings report? or the Benton report? or the *Congressional Record* for February 20, 1951, which chronicles the U. S. Senate's feeble attempt to find out whether Joe McCarthy said in Wheeling, West Virginia, on February 9, 1951, that there were 205 card carrying communists in the State Department, or 81, or 57? The noble senators, by the way, never did get an answer to that question.

Or how many senators have read *McCarthy The Man, The Senator and The Ism*? Or how many have read the 45th annual edition of *Progressive* magazine devoted entirely to the strange antics of the junior senator from Wisconsin?

Or how many have read that master job of research *McCarthy and the Communists* which thoroughly documents McCarthy's false charges, false starts and false representations?

Or how many newspaper editors either?

Or how many editors realize the hoaxes that Joe McCarthy has involved them in, or care?

In early 1951 as editor of the *Denver Post* I created a mild storm in journalistic circles by sending a memorandum to the news staff on how to handle McCarthy and others careless of facts who used official immunity to attack without proof. The memorandum was little more than a cautioning hint but it did result in demands for proof and did result in equal space for the accused; but it didn't stop the hoaxes.

Let's look at a couple:

On July 1, 1953, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy called a gratuitous press conference at which time he gave out some amazing information which included generally these charges: That on an unspecified date three unnamed and unidentified employees of the U. S. State Department re-

ceived a bribe, specified sum \$150,000, from an unnamed ambassador to do certain unspecified acts (presumably illegal) in behalf of an unnamed foreign country (presumably Latin or South America).

The country was electrified. The papers had built Joe up by that time until he was generating a lot of power. After all, wasn't he a U. S. Senator? Newspapers the country over played the story prominently, many with big banner lines, certainly virtually all with substantial space on page 1.

There was no follow-up but there was one paper that asked the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the F. B. I. and Joe McCarthy for some facts. That paper was the *Denver Post* and the questions were asked through the *Post's* bureau and through the wire services. The answer was always the same—no comment. The wire services got sick of their job. The *Denver Post* became the *Denver Pest*. But we kept after it.

Finally after two and a half weeks Joe spoke up. He'd been silent so long. He said:

"Oh, that story. I don't know anything about that. I got that from some reporter in San Diego."

What was the outcome? Well I can tell you that, too. In mid-January of 1954 R. W. Scott McLeod, credited with being McCarthy's boy in the State Department, issued a formal announcement that after a three months' investigation the Department had concluded that there was absolutely nothing to it.

What did the papers do with that? I am afraid it drew no banners. In the case of the *World-Telegram and Sun* in New York City a three-inch item drew an inconspicuous place on page 6.

A hoax if there ever was one and we fell for it.

Another hoax on a vastly larger scale was the Fort Monmouth case.

Here are the facts, briefly told, of the scandalous recklessness of Senator Joe McCarthy in his sabotage of Fort Monmouth, one of the free world's most vital security installations:

"It has all the earmarks of extremely dangerous espionage. If it develops, it may envelop the entire Signal Corp.

"It appears to be a case of current espionage of an extremely dangerous nature.

"(It) definitely involves espionage (relating to) our entire defense against atomic attack.

"There is no question now, from the evidence, that there has been espionage in the Army Signal Corps.

"We have uncovered very, very current espionage."

All this he said, and yet the record written since those charges were broadcast shows not a single case of current espionage uncovered, not one official or employe at Fort

Monmouth charged, much less convicted, of espionage. Not a single scientist at Fort Monmouth has so much as taken refuge in the Fifth Amendment, and all have offered proof they have no communist affiliations. Not one instance of anything related to espionage at Fort Monmouth has been disclosed by the Army, F. B. I. and other thorough investigations. And no official report on McCarthy's investigation of Monmouth has ever appeared.

One needs no more damning instance of the McCarthy technique than the Ruth Levine references made by him in the Monmouth case.

Here is the stage business of that black little side-drama:

Secretary of the Army Stevens told McCarthy's committee that to his knowledge there were no communists at Monmouth, and that none had invoked the Fifth Amendment.

McCarthy came back with, "When the Secretary of the Army makes . . . a statement which is so clearly false, known to us to be false, the only way I can correct it is to pick up a few of the individual cases which show that he is not speaking the truth."

He cited the case of "a Ruth Levine who had top-secret clearance in telecommunications" who was "subpoenaed December 13 (1953), appeared December 16 and took the Fifth Amendment as to conspiracy to commit espionage. I don't think you want to make that misstatement of facts, Mr. Secretary."

Now for the facts. There was a Ruth Levine, all right. She had been subpoenaed, she had resigned her job, and she had pleaded immunity under the Fifth Amendment.

But the one mighty fact was this—Ruth Levine wasn't, and never had been, an employee at Fort Monmouth!

She had been an employee of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, a private concern, subsidiary of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

Through this and the hideous travesty of the whole Fort Monmouth episode, an irreparable blow has been dealt to American defense, and to the security of the free world. Morale at Fort Monmouth has been dealt an almost fatal blow. Its effectiveness as a bastion of scientific study, experiment and development against communist aggression has been reduced as effectively as if most of its physical plant and personnel had been wiped out by bombs. In fact, maybe the damage is even greater than it would have been by physical violence, for physical attack gives rise to determination among survivors, whereas McCarthy's salvos of slander, accusation and suspicion have left their survivors

with little heart to pick up from where the disaster left them.

The hurts done by the McCarthy offensive against Fort Monmouth have been to Americans, and to the United States as a nation and her allies. The only ones benefited by his assault have been Soviet Russia and other enemies of freedom. Was it sabotage? Was this treason?

It is true that the number of newspapers critical of McCarthy has grown during the last year or two. But there are still many of them who are his supporters, his apologists, even his devotees.

Those newspapers, the *Chicago Tribune*, the Hearst press and others like them are, from the long-run point of view, as short-sighted as they are self-destructive. McCarthy is not and never has been a believer in a free press. Proof of this is to be found in the way he has tried to smear every journalistic critic as communist or pro-communist. They are all part of what he calls "the left-wing press," or "branches of the *Daily Worker*," a category in which he includes the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Denver Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and latterly, the *Scripps Howard* newspapers—in fact all who oppose him, all of them he would have us believe are doing the work of Moscow.

Liberty, like peace, is indivisible. Once we permit any demagogue to lay hands on the rights of individuals and let him get away with it, it only becomes a matter of time before all other rights guaranteed under the Constitution, including freedom of the press, are placed in mortal jeopardy.

Many years ago back in 1789 a well-informed and realistic member of the Congress, Edward Livingston, made a very interesting statement which could be uttered today, as descriptive of our present scene. He said, and I quote, "If we are to violate the Constitution . . . the country will swarm with informers, spies and all the odious reptile tribe that breed in the sunshine of a despotic power to convey your words distorted by calumny to the secret tribunal where fear officiates as accuser and suspicion is the only evidence that is heard."

In this era of moral turmoil, it is increasingly obvious that the Constitution must be protected, if freedom of the press is to be guaranteed. It is equally obvious that the American newspapers must form the bulwark of that defense. God grant them the wit to see and the strength to strike.

* * * * *

Book Reviews

The Fight for the West

by Mort Stern

BEYOND THE HUNDREDTH MERIDIAN. By Wallace Stegner. Houghton Mifflin. Boston. 376 pp. \$6.

The simple, central fact of life in the two-fifths of the United States between the 100th meridian and the Pacific coastal area is aridity. Although this is where many of America's greatest rivers start their lifegiving courses to the sea, the land of the region gets barely enough or not enough annual rainfall to support agriculture.

The land, or a substantial portion of it, can be (and in many instances has been) made remarkably productive, if the rivers are tapped and the soil irrigated. But since intelligent use of the water resources of all the citizens of a river basin for their total benefit is beyond the capacity of individual men or individual states to plan and carry out, the alternatives are cooperative basin development or federal government action.

By now this viewpoint is not new, and it may not sound controversial, but it is. Here progress runs into conflict with the emotionally-charged concept of the rugged individual, carving out his destiny with his own two hands, and it conflicts with the specific interests of those persons who would control for themselves the water, land and wealth of the region.

Seventy-five years ago a brilliant natural scientist became one of the first to try to head off the waste and monopolization of the resources of the West. He very nearly succeeded then, and he laid the groundwork for the progress that has been made since. He was John Wesley Powell, the central figure of Professor Wallace Stegner's history-biography, *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian*.

In spite of the immensity of the heritage Powell left—he was the father of the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Reclamation Bureau and in a larger sense of most of the government scientific bureaus—he has been almost totally bypassed by historians. The western historian, Bernard De Voto, in his introduction to Stegner's book, at-

tributes this to the dominance in historical analysis of Frederick Jackson Turner's theory of the significance of the frontier in shaping American individualism, and an unconscious rejection by writers since Turner of anyone and anything in conflict with the theory. Whatever the reason for the failure of historians to recognize Powell's stature, he regains it at the hands of Stegner.

Powell appeared on the western horizon in 1867, led to the Rocky Mountains by his virtually home-trained scientific curiosity. His modest scientific probing there was followed by his decision to explore the unknown stretches of the treacherous Colorado River, from the Uintas in Utah to the end of the Grand Canyon in Arizona. As Stegner puts it, the Colorado River exploration "unlocked the last great unknown region in the country." At great personal risk, and only by foresight and planning, he had compiled scientific data, made a start on accurate maps, and unearthed some little known Indian culture. The government would back his further scientific inquiry in the region.

Ten years later, Powell, by this time well on the way to institutionalizing this sort of government pursuit of knowledge, was able to bring about the founding of the U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of American Ethnology—both of which he soon headed. With the facts turned up by his dedicated aides in the studies of earth and man, Powell was led to formulate a new approach to the settlement of the West—one radically different from the then prevalent system of parceling land according to the old notion of what size farm would make a homestead, irrespective of water conditions. Powell saw the existing system forcing small farmers into failure and in effect giving the land to the speculators.

In his *Report on the Lands of the Arid Region of the United States* (1878), he proposed for the arid region that water rights be made inseparable from the land, that pasturage farms be divided into 2560 acre parcels and irrigated homestead farms

be scaled down to 80 acres, and that government or the people themselves by co-operative effort should develop and distribute the water for the common good. Powell's factual case conflicted with popular notions and was beaten in Congress. But ten years later, pressed by constituents who had been victims of blizzard, drouth, flood and land grabbers, the politicians turned to Powell and his plan of government development of irrigation projects. By this time Powell was thinking in terms of multiple purpose, whole basin river developments. Powell was allowed to launch his Irrigation Survey in 1888, and while he never quite got the go-ahead for his plan, the idea had taken hold. The Reclamation Bureau was created by Congress in 1902, the year of his death, and the government was given the tools to reclaim the arid region.

Powell had stood against local interests and selfish interests in his belief that public service meant working for the good of the people as a whole. As he saw it, no man had the right to satisfy his wants at the expense of his fellows. Much that Powell hoped and worked for has come to pass. But the fight he fought is still on and the antagonists are much the same. Only now the advocates of disposal of the public resources to local and not-so-local interests seem to have penetrated the departments and agencies which would have been Powell's bastions.

In *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian* Stegner, a professor of English at Stanford University and best known as a novelist up to now, has made a valuable contribution to the history of the West. The book is extensively and systematically documented and, incidentally, beautifully illustrated with reproductions of landscapes from the Plateau country.

In the unwinding of the Powell story, Stegner, the competent novelist, demonstrates not only his skill with plot and characterization but also his own erudite facility with the intricacies of geology, ethnology and art, and his intimate knowledge of the region about which he writes. In his dedication to De Voto, Stegner says: "This is a book in the area of your vast competence, one that you might have written more appropriately and certainly more authoritatively than I." He is being unnecessarily modest.

Business and its Critics

by Albert L. Kraus

THE ATTACK ON BIG BUSINESS
by J. D. Glover. Harvard Business
School. 358 pp. \$4.

"What newspapers say is dictated by the advertisers." "Newspapers want press freedom only to scandal-monger and build circulation." "The press of America is devoid of heart and soul; what mind it has is dominated by the dollar sign."

If reporters and editors feel compelled at times to answer such attacks on their life work, they may begin to understand the resentment of well-meaning businessmen to similar assaults on their own. For if American journalism has changed in the last 50 years, American business has changed even more. The robber barons have given way to the hired managers, the Newport cottage-palaces to the ranch houses of suburban Detroit. Withal has begun to emerge a business concept of responsibility to American society not inferior to the good intentions of other large American power groups—organized labor, organized agriculture, organized politics and organized public opinion.

Yet for all his good intentions, the businessman finds himself misunderstood. His failures are derided as "inefficiency," his successes as "competition throttling," his acceptance of social and political responsibility as "paternalism" and "running the country," his very devotion to the American dream of an ever rising standard of living and progress as "sordid materialism."

This leads J. D. Glover, Harvard Business School professor, in his book, *The Attack on Big Business*, to write:

"Big business, as an outstanding stereotype, has served for many people the same purposes as 'the Jew' served the Nazis. It has been a useful *bete noire* on which to focus all kinds of hostility. Like 'the Jew,' it has been blamed for inflation, deflation, war, frustrated hopes for peace, over-production, and under-production. It has served as a sacrificial goat for all

the aberrations and personal failures of an ever imperfect but ever hopeful humanity. This stereotype, like others, has served as a substitute for thought and a focus for free-floating hostility."

Glover's book is an article of faith—faith in what he sees as the inherent capability of responsible, rational individual Americans to evolve a good society. More, faith in the ability of American administrative science to solve not only problems of production but problems also of distribution, of man's social and political organization, and of his moral and ethical needs. The businessman's record, he feels, is not nearly so black as the critics contend. He has proved no worse and probably a little better than other human beings representative of society as a whole. If his sins have been more widely headlined than his virtues, that is the error of the critics.

True, the critics have done useful service in spotlighting shortcomings to which businessmen themselves may have been blind. They have served a "useful, even indispensable" function in pressing adoption of workmen's compensation, food and drug, financial disclosure and unemployment relief laws. But insofar as the critics have proved themselves ignorant, yea arrogant in their ignorance, Glover feels they have done not only business but the nation disservice. In particular, he challenges the critics' "unrealistic" notions about the function of the business unit in mid-Twentieth Century America, their "mechanistic, materialistic" philosophies, their tendency to fit real enough facts to preconceived ideas, and their "static, utopian, prescientific" method.

The critics damn, he feels, without knowing what they damn. Although many aspire to be social scientists, few actively put the human being under the microscope to see if he behaves according to their notions of how he should behave. To remedy this, Glover would have business begin clinical research "into the reali-

ties of human relations." He would have it practice greater social skill—"not skill in the Machiaevellian, manipulative sense (human engineering) but skill in the sense of technically competent and socially responsible administrative action." Businessmen have demonstrated success in licking their production problems. They can solve their human problems as well.

In any pragmatic philosophy, of course, the chief danger is the possibility of equating *what is* with *what should be*. Almost every newspaperman will acknowledge that when a newspaper is hemmed in by serious business office difficulties, it is incapable of fulfilling the highest standards of journalistic service. It does not follow that given prosperity, responsibility will necessarily result. Another danger is the possibility of confusing social means with social goals. A newspaper can become so concerned with readership and readability that it neglects printing anything worth reading. A third danger is the possibility of having so many objectives, all of seeming merit and equal claim, that one in effect has no objectives at all. Both newspapers and business firms will be judged in terms of their accomplishments. Indeed, they must be.

If Glover's administrative republic is not to bog down in a morass of good intentions, business units must map out clearly defined social goals—specific goals they reasonably can expect to meet in one-year, two-year, five-year periods. These human budgets must be updated regularly, much as firms constantly revise and extend their sales forecasts and long-range economic plans.

Thus, the importance of the critic. He can help establish social goals. He can help measure performance. Unlike the administrator, he is not faced with the same daily imperative to making decisions on the basis of too little background and too few facts. He is freed from having a vested interest in his own mistakes. He can postpone judgment when necessary. He can limit his areas of inquiry. Chiefly, he can test day-to-day business judgments against enduring values, albeit "static, utopian, pre-scientific" values, but values that arise from the long past of man's written and unwritten history, values that often intuitively antedate logical confirmation by scientific method. Businessmen might consider an extra seat at the

director's table for the critic—non-salary, non-voting, of course—a sort of corporate loyal opposition. At the very least, the social-ethical critic should be accorded the same role of "expert" the businessman already has accorded the economist and the industrial psychologist.

Moreover, in his own role as critic—of government, of education, of the labor unions—the businessman might temper his criticism with knowledge and understanding equal to that he expects from others.

This suggests that something more is needed than wider goals, better education, ever greater social skills, important as they are. That is the businessman's need—no less than the labor leader's, the politician's, the teacher's and the newspaperman's need—for a will toward understanding and for recognition that in the final analysis whatever progress mankind achieves will not be mankind's doing alone.

Labor Unions in France

by Guy Munger

THE FRENCH LABOR MOVEMENT
by Val R. Lorwin. Harvard University Press; 346 pp. \$6.

In the concluding chapter of this book, Dr. Lorwin quotes a French politician "of unusual courage" to the effect that "if it is better to be rich in France, it is better to be poor in England." A footnote identifies the courageous politician as Pierre Mendes-France, now French premier. The quotation and the footnote sum up nicely one of the central themes of the volume and its obvious timeliness.

Dr. Lorwin devotes the first half of his book to a history of the forces that have made France a leader in political democracy and caused it to lag in the field of social legislation.

The history of French labor begins with the 1789 revolution and the development of the forerunners of modern trade unions. Dr. Lorwin gives special attention to the force of syndicalism and its influence on French thinking on labor problems. ("Revolution was the opium of the working people for whom religion had no appeal.")

The story continues through the period between World Wars I and II, the split in the General Confederation of Labor (CGT), and the rise and fall of the Popular Front. A description of labor's heroic role in the World War II Resistance leads into a detailed analysis of the 1944-53 period with Communist conquest of the CGT.

The second portion of the book is particularly valuable to an understanding of present day French labor and includes a study of union structure, financing, collective bargaining, and labor disputes.

Newspapermen, whether labor specialists or not, will find much of interest in this book. Dr. Lorwin, for example, illustrates how French labor unions "are less instruments of collective bargaining than of political action," a "reflex" of class consciousness rather than a move for job control. The shaky dues collection system and lack of interest among members are among other French labor problems that suggest interesting speculation on American parallels.

Deserving of special mention is the appendix with its chronology of French labor developments and parallel political events, texts of important documents, membership figures, and a thorough bibliography.

Dr. Lorwin is at present assistant professor of industrial relations and social sciences at the University of Chicago. He formerly served as economist with the Labor Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Division of International Labor Affairs of the Department of State, and was a member of United States delegations to meetings of various United Nations bodies. *The French Labor Movement* is one of a series of Wertheim Publications in Industrial Relations prepared under the Jacob Wertheim Research Fellowship of Harvard College.

Demagogues Don't Last

by Thomas G. Karsell

AMERICAN DEMAGOGUES. By Reinhard H. Luthin, Beacon Press, Boston. 368 pp. \$5.

For students of American history, including those fascinated with the current McCarthy exhibition, this book is certainly required reading. While it is absorbingly horrible, in its characterization of the gullible American voter, so also is it left-handedly reassuring for none of the demagogues now passed into history has remained at the peak of his power until the end of his time, save Huey Long. Even the Long regime showed signs of decay before Long's assassination.

Here is a complete rundown on the political careers of Bilbo, Marcantonio, "Alfalfa Bill" Murray, James Curley, the Texas Fergusons, Gene Talmadge, Big Bill Thompson, Boss Hague and Joe McCarthy. The author has carefully documented the climb to fame of each of these men, making no effort to generalize common characteristics.

While it seems a pity that Mr. Luthin didn't wait a bit longer, so McCarthy's final crash could be included in the document, the case histories of the others prove the old saw that, at least on the American political scene, truth indeed seems stranger than fiction.

As a Mississippian, I was most intrigued by the Bilbo chapter, which was lucidly written and filled with curiously little known aspects of "The Man's" incredible career. Thus filled with respect for Mr. Luthin's ability as an unbiased historian, I read the other chapters with even greater interest.

Perhaps the book's lesson is that no section of the nation has a corner on human frailty and intolerance, for these are the demagogue's stock in trade. In the case of each of the ten political rascals, emotionalism has played a major role in his usually spectacular rise to national prominence. Logic had no public part in the magnetic personalities of the ten, for each of them seemed to shun logic as though he had private knowledge that it would destroy him.

The author has been fairer than one might expect him to be in dealing with

these men who would wreck the foundations of the Republic for their own purposes. While recognising the cynicism of most of them, he credits many of the demagogues with having started out in politics with the best of motives. Tracing the perversions of honor in these men, Luthin has been careful with the record.

In his windup chapter on "The Mark of the Demagogue," the author has gathered the traits these men held in common without belaboring the point purely for the purpose of fitting them into a single mold. He has done a spectacular job of assembling between the covers of one book some of the most sordid chapters of American history.

All Americans interested in maintaining the nation as one dedicated to the preservation of our freedoms should have more than merely a nodding knowledge of these men and their fantastic followings. This book lumps them together less as a portrait of the demagogic politician than of the American sectional voter.

Korean Correspondent

by William J. Woestendiek

TOKYO AND POINTS EAST. By Keyes Beech. Doubleday, New York, 255 pp. \$3.75.

Keyes Beech has written a breezy informative account of his life in the Far East for the past six years. His book yields an able correspondent's observations on both the big and the little incidents of the Korean War that never got into the papers but make better reading than much that did.

Beech is writing of the happy and the tragic things that he saw with his sharply trained eye, and his war stories all come to life.

The book has no particular unity or order, but this seems to add rather than detract from its interest, once it begins to move.

Unhappily it doesn't start moving until the author has used the first half of it to describe the personal world of Keyes Beech, his troubles and his thoughts. To those who know the author personally, his problems with a bankrupt marriage, his cynical comments on life in the United

States and his search to find in what direction he is going undoubtedly are interesting. But to the general reader the story of the Marines' bloody escape from Yudam is a lot more important than the author's troubles with martinis and waitresses.

But once Beech steps down stage and starts telling his adventures in Japan, China, and especially Korea, his book picks up speed at a tremendous rate.

As he finds his pace he demonstrates the qualities that won him a Pulitzer Prize and a Nieman Fellowship. The reader realizes that he is travelling with one of the smartest, toughest, bravest of the correspondents who bounced all over Korea during the war. Characteristically, Beech commandeered himself a jeep early in the war. This was after the Han River Bridge was blown up while he happened to be crossing it. He waged a private war to keep the jeep which was officially government property, but "morally" his because the Communists would have seized it if he hadn't.

The jeep made him the envy of most other correspondents and apparently gave him a constant passenger in the person of Marguerite Higgins of the New York *Herald Tribune*. Beech and Maggie exchanged some nasty remarks, but Keyes devotes a lot of space to praising Higgins' work and tells how she shamed many of her male compatriots into taking the same risks she did. Of Higgins he writes:

"So far as her trade was concerned, she had more guts, more staying power, and more resourcefulness than 90 per cent of her detractors. She was a good newspaperman."

Many of Beech's anecdotes concern his adventures with fellow newsmen. Others are brief descriptions of the war itself.

War, Beech writes "is a lot of little things, disconnected fragments of sight, sound and sensation. . . . It is the little things that a man remembers, for in his worm's eye view of the world the little things become the big things."

Beech describes these "little things" vividly. Lying on the side of a hill under fire, watching men as they are carried into a first-aid station, diving into a ditch ahead of machine gun fire, listening to a group of GI's talk about the war—these are the worm's eye views Beech lets the reader share with him.

And these views, written by a man who has seen a lot and thought a lot, tell more about Keyes Beech than he does about himself.

Preaching and Practice

by Sam Zagoria

NEWSMEN SPEAK — Journalists on Their Craft. By Edmond D. Coblentz. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles. 197 pp. \$3.50.

The newsmen doing the speaking in this book of essays are the brass of the industry—publishers, editors and columnists, for the most part. Such journalistic greats as Joseph Pulitzer, Adolph S. Ochs, William Randolph Hearst and Colonel Robert R. McCormick are quoted on the high-minded instructions they laid down in their attempts at serving the public through their newspapers. No newsman could quarrel with Mr. Hearst when he commented, "When free discussion is denied, hardening of the arteries of democracy has set in, free institutions are but a lifeless form, and the death of the republic is at hand." Likewise, the colonel is unassailable when he says, "It is the duty and responsibility of a newspaper that the news shall be treated as news, and that news shall be printed according to its news value and not distorted to accommodate the wishes of anyone."

It is clear, however, to any discerning newspaper reader that employees of some of these publishers have broken the rules—regularly. It is equally clear that the guiding principles of some of the publishers are still straight arrows pointing the right way even in troublous times.

It was interesting to this reviewer that there were only two pieces devoted to the role of the reporter and one of these was by O. O. McIntyre—a columnist. The reporter, praised in novel and movie as the star of the newspapers, holds a lesser estate within his own trade. Coblentz, veteran Hearst editor and adviser, reprints a 1925 McIntyre writing bearing on this:

"The newspaper reporter strikes the highest note of happiness and excitement in the human scale. I have yet to find a reporter who willingly left his job for

one more lucrative in another line. Yet they all do.

"For the truth is, the skilled reporter is worth more than the profession pays him, and he soon finds it out and goes to other fields. He quits romance for dollars, with regret."

It has been clear for a long time that the reporters are in the back row when the heavier pay envelopes are passed out. Many a budding—and happy—reporter has been offered a post on the desk and warned that this is the only route in the newsroom to more money. And many a reporter who stayed on the street anyway discovered this was true. He may have been happier, but his grocer was less so.

Publishers still refer to a reporter as their ambassador to the world, reminding him daily, "The impression you make in your daily work is the impression the paper makes on the people you meet!" Editors hail the reporter as the man who provides the raw material on which their great paper thrives, "You're the backbone of the paper," they say. "It can only be as good as the stories you bring in."

Now if we could only get these folks to drop the hearty backslap and pick up their pens.

instead of merely speaking it, the spelling may be held to be in character. That is, incidentally, a fine article by Harold L. Cross.

Having determined to master its navigational intricacies, I ran afoul of what would seem to be either—God forbid—a mixture of metaphor, or a mere typographical error of spelling.

At the bottom of Page 44, in the paragraph "Labor And Anti-Trust," we find ourselves in "Interstate Commerce Bay," presently to enter "Sherman Act Cove" of that bay. It is on the waters of that cove that the Supreme Court, by a decision of 5-3, upheld the Sherman Act against the Associated Press, in doing which—and now I quote—"the majority justices rode off in three divergent directions." To save the metaphor, "rode" should read "rowed."

ROCKWELL KENT

Ausable Forks, N. Y.

Sailing With Harold Cross

To the Editor:

It is always a pleasure to go sailing with Harold Cross. His trip along the Maine coast, past Scoodic Point, contains so much of interest that I hope you will forgive a few comments which seem necessary to adjust the compass.

We have much to worry about, but certainly your readers should not gather the impression that we have not had a persistent and fabulous advance in terms of freedom since the Constitutional Convention of 1787. I believe that the failure to advance further and faster is due to the fact—omitted in the Cross article—that the Constitutional Convention never discussed or considered freedom of the press, speech or religion. It is difficult to realize that the Founding Fathers were not really much in favor of it. Only three states at that time permitted a Jew or Catholic to hold office, a situation not completely corrected in all of our states until close to the Civil War. It took us until about 1920 to twist the First Amendment to the Constitution so as to restrain

state action. In fact, the First Amendment was not conceived as a declaration of freedom but was added to make sure that our new Republic would not presume to exercise those powers of censorship which the states wanted to preserve exclusively for themselves. As against such background, we can write with pride and optimism—two essentials for further advance. It is interesting also to note that Cross's observations with respect to the economics of the marketplace are not intended, I trust, to indicate a complete hands off position by the government vis-a-vis the press. If this were the case, our federal budget would come closer to balancing by 250 million dollars—the subsidy handed by taxpayers to magazines and newspapers. Other notes of despair in the Cross piece will soon be subject to evaporation. For example, I suggest that we are about to abandon the subjective and vague "clear and present danger" rule and replace it by the more objective Brandeis test: is there time to make answer, or in the alternative, time for the state to protect itself against substantive evil. Moreover, for the first time we are in the process of reviewing our greatest national act of faith in empirical terms: that a free, open and disclosed marketplace of thought is the best medium known to man for arriving at truth. We will distinguish secret speech from public speech, since secret speech is never "clear" or "present." Moreover, the monopolies of the marketplace in line with the AP, Lorain and other decisions, will be reduced because we now know that if the marketplace is monopolized, the people of our Republic may, *most unwisely*, decide that the monopoly might as well be run by the government as by private individuals. I must say, in thinking over our history, that our Republic has been sailing "full and bye," and has overcome temporary setbacks such as the Alien Sedition Laws, neurotic Anthony Comstock ideas of obscenity and Huey Long's tax controls.

The difference between Cross and myself is that I see the mug of rum as half full, and he sees the same mug as half empty. Is it not possible that man follows optimism more readily than despair?

MORRIS L. ERNST
285 Madison Avenue
New York City

Letters

Rowed

October 27, 1954

To the Editor:

For your great courtesy in sending me the *Nieman Reports* I owe you not only thanks but an apology for so rarely acknowledging my debt to you.

Maybe I could give you no better evidence of the care with which I read the *Reports* than to tell you that on Page 41 of the October number I find what are, by my book, two misspellings, namely, "principle" for "principal" in speaking of the eleven Communist leaders, and "nickle" for "nickel" in the Al Smith quote. Of course, if Al Smith *wrote* that line,

From Robert Leigh

I value *Nieman Reports* very highly. Keep up the good work you are doing

ROBERT D. LEIGH,
Butler Library,
Columbia University

Bargain

Nieman Reports is a great bargain at \$2 a year. Please renew my subscription.

ELIZABETH A. GREEN
South Hadley, Mass.

Dog-eared Evidence

November 20, 1954

To the Editor:

Enclosed you will find \$1.00 check for a year's student subscription to the *Nieman Reports*. The dog-eared pages of my copy are evidence of the enjoyment I received from it.

As an aspiring newspaper man in my junior year here at Allegheny College, I feel that the *REPORT's* material is equally as important as any of the subjects in my academic schedule.

As I have missed past issues of the *Reports*, I would like to know the possibility of ordering back issues.

WILLIAM R. MEYER

Nieman Scrapbook

U. S. Joins Copyright Agreement

From the Herald Tribune Bureau
WASHINGTON, Nov. 5.—President Eisenhower today signed the Universal Copyright Convention for the protection of the property rights of authors, composers and owners of literary, artistic and scientific work.

The convention was drawn up at Geneva on Sept. 6, 1952. Forty countries have signed an agreement indicating their intention of joining. Of these about eight, including the United States, have ratified the convention, and three have

deposited their instruments of ratification at the headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in Paris.

Twelve Must Join

The convention will come into force three months after the deposit of twelve of these instruments. The Senate ratified the convention June 25 and the additional legislation required was passed by Congress in August and signed by the President in Denver on Aug. 31.

President Eisenhower signed the convention at the White House today in the presence of legislators, authors and representatives of libraries and publishers. Before the ink was dry on the paper, Rex Stout, writer and president of the Authors' League, told the President that now he could sell more copies of his book *Crusade in Europe*.

"We don't have to sell more of that," the President laughed.

The convention provides that each participating nation will accord the same treatment to works on foreign writers and composers that it gives to its own. It also simplifies the procedure under which authors and composers can obtain protection of their rights in foreign countries.

Science News Survey

A survey to learn public reaction to science news reporting is being launched by the National Association of Science Writers and New York University under a \$10,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

The goal of the study is to make science news "more meaningful to the public and more accurate in its presentation of science facts and ideas," according to Hillier Kriegbaum, associate professor of journalism at NYU's School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, who will direct the survey.

The NASW plans to engage a professional fact-finding organization to ascertain the attitudes of a nationwide cross-section of the public toward science reporting by newspapers, magazines, television and radio stations, and motion pictures.

The Association and NYU already have surveyed the attitudes of editors and scientists. This third project, says Professor Kriegbaum, will complete the triangle in

Scrapbook—

the science-press-public relationship study.

Groundwork for the survey is being worked out by a committee headed by Professor Kriegbaum and including Alton Blakeslee of the Associated Press, Earl Ubell of the New York *Herald Tribune*, and Martin Man of *Popular Science Monthly*.

FREEDOM OF NEWS URGED BY UNESCO

*Soviet Bloc Joins in Backing
Declaration—U. S. Deplors
Proviso on 'Distortion'*

By EDWARD A. MORROW

MONTEVIDEO, Uruguay, Dec. 8—The Soviet Union and five of its satellite states endorsed today a resolution calling upon members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization "to assure freedom of expression and to remove barriers to the free flow of undistorted information."

The resolution, which was adopted by acclamation at the organization's eighth general conference, was sponsored by the four great powers as well as Mexico, Lebanon, Liberia, India, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador and Colombia.

The action caused speculation as to why the Soviet representatives chose this meeting to unbend in this direction. Some observers felt that Soviet acceptance of the resolution was historic, even though the declaration contained a safeguard in referring to "undistorted information."

In presenting the United States' point of view, Representative Hugh Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania, said his delegation and some of the other sponsors were somewhat concerned over the fact that the resolution referred twice to "the free flow of undistorted information" rather than to the free flow of information.

"We accepted this qualification with difficulty because we felt that the word 'distorted' might lend itself to misinterpretation," Mr. Scott said. "It might be used as a pretext to impede rather than encourage the free flow of information. It conjures up the specter of censorship, of government control, of artificial restrictions imposed upon the press, radio and films.

Scrapbook—

"This is a concept which the American people have always firmly rejected and they find repugnant any suggestion that straight reporting may be distorted information. We do not believe that it can be left to any government authority to decide what news is most likely to be conducive to improved international relations."

With this important reservation, the United States firmly supported the resolution, of which it was one of the sponsors.

The Soviet delegation's acceptance of it also represented a marked change in its attitude. Earlier the Soviet delegates had presented a draft resolution calling for "measures to prevent the use of means of mass communications for the propaganda of war."

This proposal, which was withdrawn in favor of the one adopted today, had the usual tenor of Soviet resolutions introduced before the United Nations. It asserted that in some countries mass com-

munications media "contain inadmissible propaganda for a new war, appeals for aggressive action and also propaganda advocating enmity and hatred among the peoples."

An expected Soviet attack along this line before the mass communications panel never materialized and a tentatively planned United States counter-attack on Soviet jamming of United States broadcasts thus was believed unnecessary. The Soviet spokesmen's behavior has been so mild that it has created goodwill for their delegation.

Speaking on behalf of the resolution, which called on all member states to take measures assuring the free flow of news, the Soviet delegate explained that in his country there were specific laws prohibiting war propaganda. He expressed the hope that today's resolution would become an important part of the UNESCO program.

N. Y. Times, Dec. 9.

Yonkers Herald Statesman, Aug. 13

'Journalistic' Defined Correctly at Last

For two decades it has been possible for any self-respecting newspaperman or woman to turn to the usually authoritative Webster's New International Dictionary and work up an easy fit of anger and dismay.

Among newspapermen, "journalism" is a word of distinction, the name of a noble profession, a labor of love and a public service.

To the newspaperman, "journalistic" is an equally exciting word, reflecting the efforts of an army of reporters and editors in everyday ferreting out of the news and presenting it rapidly and accurately to the public, which has a right to know what is going on.

* * *

In Webster's New International, however, the definition for "journalistic"—has been: "Characteristic of journalism or journalists; hence, of style, characterized by evidence of haste, superficiality of thought, inaccuracies of detail, colloquialisms, and sensationalism; journalese."

Within a short time journalists began trying to correct this brazen misrepres-

entation of their craft, but to no avail.

In recent months the movement to effect corrective measures, to produce a fairer and more accurate definition, has been revived.

Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalistic fraternity, reports that it has won a promise of change in the next edition of Webster's New International Dictionary put out by G. & C. Merriam Company.

Hereafter "journalistic" will be defined as follows:

"1. Of or pertaining to or characteristic of journalism or journalists.

"2. Specif., as to style of expressions, appropriate to the immediate present and phrased to stimulate and satisfy the in-

terest and curiosity of a wide reading public—often in distinction from literary."

* * *

We salute Webster's New International on its decision to make amends, and Sigma Delta Chi for having brought it about.

* * *

N. Y. Times Man Views Sheppard Case

Standing in the eye of the hurricane of publicity howling around the Sheppard trial here, one gets the impression that if the sensational murder case had not existed it would have been necessary for the press to invent it.

Since the murder of Marilyn Sheppard last July, the *Times* had been giving the case about as much publicity as it usually does the table of third-class mail closings. So, when city editor Frank Adams told me to fly to Cleveland to cover the Sheppard trial, I knew little about it.

When I arrived in Cleveland, I asked an attendant where the pressroom was and when he learned I was from the New York *Times* he rushed me into the judge's chambers. The judge welcomed me aboard and gave me a pass to get in the trial room.

Then, a couple of young reporters introduced themselves and asked how come the *Times* had finally deigned to recognize the Sheppard trial. I replied that Turner Catledge had instructed me to report the proceedings as news with "dignity and restraint"; that I was to keep the case "in focus" in view of the general journalistic uproar over it. For some reason this gave me a reputation as a dry wit. The *Cleveland Press* announced that afternoon that a "very Timesish looking New York *Times* reporter" had arrived to cover the trial. Next morning, the *Plain Dealer* printed an interview with me, and a day or two later Walter Winchell scooped the world with this breathless news.

The courtroom is filled almost exclusively with press and radiomen. Photographers pose the judge, jury and counsel in the courtroom during recess. Radio reporters with tape recorders interview all the participants except the accused man. The reporters even interview the witnesses at home before they are called, and the entire case has already been tried in the papers and on the air.

Most papers have their stars on the job—Dorothy Kilgallen and Bob Considine of INS, Doc Quigg of the UP, Pulitzer Prize Winner Ray Spriggle of the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, Andy Tully of the *Scripps-Howard Washington* staff. Even Inspector Robert Fabian of Scot-

Scrapbook—

land Yard is here, masterminding for a syndicate of twenty-five papers. Some have four or five assistants, artists to draw courtroom scenes, leased teletypes to their offices, royal suites in the hotels.

To give an idea of what kind of material they have to work with—the first day after the jury was sworn, the jurors were taken through the suburban home where the murder was committed. Six cops held back the baying press gang behind thick ropes strung between trees around the house, but some camera men sneaked between the cops' legs. Meanwhile, a helicopter with Cleveland *Press* photographers in it hovered with a deafening roar over the scene.

Next day, the prosecution showed full

color slides projected four feet square in the courtroom of the murdered woman's head, battered by thirty-five blows. There were seven views, with and without her scalp on. I could not get one word of this in the *Times*, and only about a dozen innocuous words concerning the scene at the murder-house. I appreciated the big yuk-yuk at my "dignity and restraint" when I saw pages and pages of blood-soaked adjectives in the papers of my alleged competitors.

Chief Defense Counsel William J. Corrigan, a Clarence Darrow sort of personality and father of Faith Corrigan of the *Times* women's news department, asked me whether the *Times* would print the verdict.—*Ira Henry Freeman.*

Times Talk—December

advertising and propaganda techniques that were in vogue.

These techniques had proved effective in the 1952 Presidential campaign and the new regime thought it could get away with more even in statecraft. The figures fooled neither the press nor Mr. McCarthy, who certainly has proved a greater challenge to the Eisenhower Administration than he was to the Truman Administration.

In recent months there has been a diminution of huckstering, although some of the bluffs employed in foreign policy pronouncements indicate that the lesson has not been driven home.

This particular aspect of the relationship of the press and the President awakened some pro-Administration papers to the realization that they would do little good for the country and for the press itself, to say nothing of Mr. Eisenhower, if they persisted in treating the Administration with editorial kid gloves.

Patience Toward Newcomer

The new President of a party twenty years out of power would naturally be treated patiently in his first year. The press was kinder to Mr. Truman in the earlier years of his Administration, too, although there was vitriol in almost every editorial page toward the end. Will the press be as free-swinging as the situation warrants in Ike's third and fourth years?

Among newspapermen much is being made of the fact that editors and publishers are being more than kind to the Eisenhower Administration in numerous instances where it has appeared to act contrary to the public interest. A common saying wherever newspapermen gather is: "Imagine what they would be doing to Truman if he had done that."

Robert L. Riggs, chief of the Washington Bureau of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, expressed this attitude as follows in an address at the 45th annual journalism week of the University of Missouri's School of Journalism last April: "I should like to emphasize that I did not say newspapers should be in a constant state of growling, snarling animosity toward public officials. That extreme to which most papers went in their bitter hostility toward Harry S. Truman is as deplorable as the bootlicking sycophancy which they dis-

The Press and the U. S. Administration

Newspapers Have Been Too Lenient in Their Editorial Treatment of the Republican Government and Its Policies

*By Anthony H. Leviero,
Washington Corres. The N. Y. Times*

It required a journalistic campaign to shatter the "numbers game," the term that Washington correspondents applied to the Eisenhower Administration's extravagant claims that it was sweeping great numbers of subversives out of the government.

On this issue occurred perhaps the first concerted change of mood of the press toward the new Administration. The tolerant, forbearing attitude toward the new President in his first year gave way to sharp criticism and demands for an honest count.

For more than three months the press had to besiege the Administration, at White House news conferences and elsewhere, before there was any official admission that the figures were substantially false. Unfortunately, the numbers game began at the highest level, in a White House statement that 1,456 security risks had been removed. That was last fall. Then a state paper of the President himself, his Message on the State of the Union, carried the game forward by raising the figure to 2,200.

It must be said that President Eisenhower merely referred to those removed

as "security risks." And he explicitly said that this did *not* mean they were Communists or Communist sympathizers. But other high Administration officials and Senator Joseph R. McCarthy described the growing number of fired "risks" as traitors, Communists and perverts indiscriminately. This of course served to intensify the interest of the press.

Newspapers Act

The press corps, spearheaded by the Washington *Post* (now the Washington *Post and Times-Herald*), the Washington *Star*, and the Washington *Daily News*, cracked the issue, proving that a substantial number of the figures, as well as the name-calling, was wrong. Zealous department officials, trying to do their part in helping the Administration to steal the Red hunt away from McCarthy, had served up to the White House figures that included persons who had died, were transferred to other departments, resigned under honorable conditions, or lost their jobs through the reduction-in-force policy of the Administration.

For the Eisenhower Administration the lesson in this should have been that huckstering does not pay. "Huckstering" was a common expression in Washington in 1953. Newsmen used to describe the

Scrapbook—

played toward Dwight D. Eisenhower during his first year in the White House."

Baffling Talk

The Indo-China situation is an example. Administration utterances on this issue fluctuated violently in the small compass of a couple of months. Both the President and Secretary of State Dulles indulged in talk that completely baffled the public and the press, without fooling the enemy. First the position was that the United States should not get involved in Indo-China. Then that it would be a calamity if Indo-China fell. President Eisenhower said that the fall of Indo-China would be like the toppling of the first domino, causing all the others to fall also. Ike's lecture on the geopolitics of South East Asia that went with the falling domino theory was impressive.

Then there were signs that we would intervene. Vice President Nixon said so in so many words, for one. Somewhere along the line the threat of massive retaliation got into the picture. And then it was plain nothing would be done. Indo-China fell, and it is too early to say whether it is the first of the line of falling dominoes.

What newspapermen are saying now is that if Mr. Truman or Adlai Stevenson had been in the White House, they would have been threatened with impeachment for the huckstered bluff that was our Indo-China policy. Yet few newspapers have given this issue sharp treatment.

Washington correspondents still marvel at the audacity of one of the biggest bluffs. That was the "unleashing" of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in President Eisenhower's first State of the Union speech. The implication was that the preceding Democratic Administration did not want Chiang to hit the Communists. Yet Chiang, unleashed, is conducting no more of his feeble raids on Communist territory than before he was "unleashed."

Severity Deserved

Few newspapers have treated this bluff with the severity it deserved, for it is well known by informed persons that the United States Seventh Fleet was placed in the Straits of Formosa at the outset of the Korean War for the primary purpose of preventing the Communists from invading the strategic island that harbored

Chiang's beaten and fugitive Army. The United Nations forces could not have fought in Korea if Formosa, athwart their communications, was under Red control.

Another puffed theme, though this one was fairly well deplored, was the Administration's glowing suggestion that the day of liberation for the oppressed under the Soviet yoke might be near at hand. In the same category may be mentioned the mysterious "new look" defense program that was supposed to give the country more security for less money, although it involved the reduction of four divisions of troops. Another was the empty concept of "instant and massive retaliation." It proved to be nothing more than a long-standing United States strategic concept in fancy dress.

To return to the domestic scene, President Eisenhower shocked many editors with his personal order directing the Atomic Energy Commission to make a power contract with a particular, private power company, instead of having the Tennessee Valley Authority supply the additional power. Many Washington newsmen believe that this unusual act, favoring a particular company at the expense of T. V. A. and the taxpayers, has not received nearly as hard an editorial drubbing as it would if Truman had ordered the deal.

McCarthy Issue

On the McCarthy issue editorial criticism has been strongest. Some of the most important pro-Administration papers have been most outspoken, in fact scathing: The New York Times: . . . "the Eisen-

hower Administration had surrendered lock, stock and barrel to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy." The New York *Herald Tribune*: "What happened yesterday afternoon on Capitol Hill must be set down in the light of facts now visible as a sorry betrayal of interests which every American shares. Under severe party pressure, the Secretary of the Army surrendered to a Senator who had humiliated and bullied an Army general . . ." The Washington *Post*: "No honorable Administration can ignore the wave of public retching in response to the Stevens-McCarthy fiasco . . . The question now is simply whether President Eisenhower will grasp his responsibility to speak out on behalf of that most fundamental of all American institutions, the country's self-respect."

The President as an individual has gone virtually unscathed in the editorial columns. In 1953 he was absent from Washington approximately 120 days for vacations, golfing trips, and public business, including partial days of departure and return. Hardly any criticism has been heard on this score yet.

Promise and Performance

A view among newspapermen here is that the press has not been adequately critical and analytical of promise and performance.

* * *

The Washington press corps, as usual, is coming through with the plain hard facts of political life in the capital, regardless of the party in power, but many of the editorial pages haven't caught up.

—September Bulletin of the International Press Institute

Breit-Hemingway Chatter Makes Nice Literary Platter

Harvey Breit, assistant book review editor, introduced the interview de luxe last month to get a front-page piece for the Sunday (Nov. 7) Book Review on the Nobel Prize award to Ernest Hemingway.

Harvey was in the Forty-third Street radio communications room. Mr. Hemingway was in Havana. Harvey's questions and the author's replies were automatically recorded as they talked on overseas radio-phone hookup.

Groundwork for the interview had been

carefully prepared in anticipation of the award. On Oct. 26, two days before the announcement, book review editor Francis Brown suggested the idea to Harvey. Harvey cabled Hemingway:

Furthest thought from our mind is to jinx you nevertheless would you consider telephone interview with us based on the Big Prize? Request based on fourth estate enterprise not friendship.

Harvey and Mr. Hemingway have been friends for years.

Mr. Hemingway replied by telephone

that he was reluctant even to talk about the prize before he got it but agreed to an interview with Harvey if he did win it.

There followed an exchange of cables between Francis Brown and George Axelsson, *Times* correspondent in Stockholm. Mr. Brown queried Mr. Axelsson: *Is it certain Hemingway Prize-Winner also what hour Thursday is winner announced?*

Mr. Axelsson replied on Oct. 27:

Eyem told its in bag for Hemingway but you should wait announcement ten ayem New York-time Oct. 28.

Mr. Brown discussed the idea with Sunday editor Lester Markel. They decided to hold Page 1 of the Nov. 7 issue for the interview. Since Book Review closes ten days before publication date, this meant working close to deadline. The piece would have to be ready for the printer by 6 P. M. Oct. 28. Breit prepared an essay on Hemingway to be used if, for any reason, the telephone interview didn't come off.

Harvey arranged in advance with Fred Meinholtz, communications chief, for the radio-phone hookup. When the prize was announced on Thursday morning, Harvey went to the third floor radio room. When Charlie Klein of the communications staff got a call through to Hemingway, the author said he would be ready to talk within twenty minutes. Klein hooked an automatic disk recorder into the circuit, added a monitoring line for himself. It was to be a three-way conversation with Klein interrupting for clarification if it became necessary.

After the connection was made at 12:45 P. M., the interview flowed smoothly. Harvey had his questions on paper; Mr. Hemingway gave his answers in the professional manner, including punctuation and quotation marks. For example, Harvey asked: "Any advice to young writers today?" and got the answer: "It reminds me of the one that somebody asked Tony Galento comma you know comma if he had a message for the youth of America period he said quote tell 'em to get to bed early and that Max Baer is a bum period end quote."

The recorder took down both ends of the half-hour conversation. Then Charlie Klein quickly converted it from disk to typescript and Harvey had the complete

interview before him as he wrote his piece.

Times correspondents often prepare their copy and read it into the automatic recorders from both near-by and remote

points. This was the first time, though, that the recording device had been used as question-and-answer medium.

Times Talk—December

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, gave his eldest daughter, Doris Lee, in marriage, January 1, at a wedding to her classmate of Purdue '54, James V. Sprong of Buffalo. They will live in Pittsburgh.

1940

After selling the weekly *Meridien Times* in Idaho, Hazle and Oscar Buttedahl took ten months off to "see the U.S.A." Then they settled in Santa Rosa, California, 50 miles north of San Francisco, and bought the *Montgomery Village News*, a suburban weekly there.

Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) *Delta Democrat-Times*, gave a lecture at Andover Academy, Nov. 19, led a seminar for the Nieman Fellows, Nov. 18, and took in the Harvard-Yale game the 20th.

Charles Edmundson is now stationed in Bombay as public affairs officer for the U. S. Information Service. Among the first people he met there were Alice and Angus Thuermer (1951) of the American consulate in Bombay.

1941

Vance Johnson this Fall became assistant to publisher Paul Smith of Crowell-Collier publications. Smith was his old boss when Johnson was Washington correspondent of the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

1942

Harry Ashmore was elected a director of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., Dec. 20th, along with Chester Bowles and Robert E. Sherwood.

Ashmore is executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, and author of *The Negro and the Schools*.

The Fund for the Republic is an independent, nonprofit corporation, established in 1952 to support activities directed toward the elimination of restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry and expression in the United States, and the develop-

ment of policies and procedures best adapted to protect those rights.

1943

Robert Okin has joined the staff of the American Heart Association to report new developments in heart work and counsel on public relations.

Back from exploring Yugoslavia, this Fall, Fred Warner Neal began a round of college lectures for the American Universities Field Staff. He was at the University of Kansas in December, expected to reach Harvard by Spring. Address: Political Science Dept., University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. He's on leave from there.

1944

Mr. and Mrs. Herbert C. Yahraes, Jr., announced the marriage of their daughter, Genevieve, to Lieut. Philip George Neff of the U. S. Navy, Nov. 27, in Washington.

1945

The first of a series of press institutes is announced for Feb. 14-18 at Ohio State University, with Fred W. Maguire as director. City editors of about 25 Ohio papers are scheduled to attend the seminar and concentrate for five days on municipal problems. Other press seminars for other departments of newspapers are planned.

1946

Mary Ellen Leary (Mrs. Arthur Sherry) was made associate editor of the San Francisco *News* this Fall. She has long served the *News* as legislative reporter and State political editor.

Leon Svirsky of *Scientific American* was married Sept. 4 to Ruth Carolyn, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Isaac Carl Hotaling, at Chappaqua, New York.

1947

Frank Carey, Associated Press science writer, received a Christopher literary award for a story on Thomas E. Murray, Atomic Energy Commissioner, published last February. He quoted Murray on the

atom: God made the atom. Because God made it, the atom is good. We know nuclear energy can be developed to constructive and destructive purposes. It rests with man's conscience to decide which it shall be."

The Christophers make annual awards "to encourage personal responsibility and individual initiative in serving the common good, in the fields of communication."

Carey's story was reprinted in the *Digest* and in *Information*.

1948

Rebecca Gross was back at work as editor of the Lock Haven *Express* in October and within a month had published an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* and addressed the New York Newspaper Women's Club.

Margaret and Walt Waggoner and family sail on January 26 on the Queen Mary for The Hague, where Walt will set up a New York *Times* bureau to cover the Benelux countries.

1949

Collier's for October has a featured article by Robert de Roos, on "The Case of the Missing Sardines," the story of scientists' exploration of the oceans to try to solve the mystery of the depletion of the sardine fisheries.

David Dreiman of *Life* was guest lecturer this Fall at Boston University department of journalism, discussing pictorial journalism.

Christopher Rand's travels in the New Yorker had reached as far as Afghanistan by the issue of Dec. 11.

Tillman Durdin added Indonesia to his Indo-China coverage for the New York *Times* this Fall. His wife, Peggy Durdin, has found major feature material in the new Vietnam State, for the *Times Magazine*.

1950

Dwight Sargent, editor of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald*, is running a series of 21 editorials on the State legislature, a parallel to the series he ran two years ago, "If I Were Governor."

1951

Motion picture and television rights to Commander William Lederer's book, *All the Ships at Sea* have been purchased by Ray Bolger, who plans to film the story for theatrical presentation next Summer. Bolger will star in the play and will

add some dance sequences in the film, which, like the book, will blend fact and fancy.

In September Edna and Hoke Norris announced a new member of their family, then three months old, Marion Dees Norris. At four months she had already become so acclimated to a journalistic household that she slept one Sunday morning till 9.15. Hoke claims a new record for infant consideration.

Wellington Wales resigned the editorship of the Auburn (N.Y.) *Citizen-Advertiser*, this Fall and joined the news staff of the Boston *Herald*. His Boston address: 92 Mt. Vernon St.

1952

Louise and John Steele (Washington bureau of *Time*, Inc.) spent the Harvard-Yale game week-end in Cambridge.

1953

The month his book came out—*Tokyo and Points East*, Keyes Beech was covering much territory, East, South and West of Tokyo, all the way from the Philippines down to Burma and Indonesia, for the *Chicago Daily News*.

William Gordon, managing editor of the Atlanta *Daily World*, contributed several articles to the *New Leader* magazine, and an article on "Desegregation in the South" to the *Antioch Review*.

Donald Janson moved from the Milwaukee *Journal* copy desk to the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* in August.

Robert Nielsen of the Toronto *Star* did a series for his paper on McCarthy. His present assignment is to cover the Canadian House of Commons in Ottawa.

On returning to the Auckland *Star* from his fellowship year in Cambridge, Ross Sayers wrote an article on Christmas observance in America, describing the candles in windows and decorations of public places. He asked, "Why don't we do it?" This Christmas, for the first time, Auckland was decorated for Christmas.

Sayers planned the entire news coverage of his paper for the Queen's tour of New Zealand. He has since been promoted from chief of staff (city editor) to assistant editor (managing editor).

Second prize in the New England Associated Press news contest went to John Strohmeysers' series in the Providence *Journal* on race tracks, including their po-

litical tie-ups and their habit of employing newspapermen.

In December Melvin Mencher joined the news staff of the Fresno (Calif.) *Bee*. His previous newspaper work has been in New Mexico.

William Steif, of the San Francisco *News*, and his wife were visitors in Cambridge this Fall.

Watson Sims reports a new assignment in Associated Press in New York, to News-features, which lifts him from the 4th floor to the 6th and puts him on days.

1954

A series of articles on Boston's financial problems by Robert C. Bergenheim in the *Christian Science Monitor* has been reprinted in a booklet "The Millstone Around Boston's Neck" and circulated by the president of the Boston City Council.

Charles Eberhardt joined the staff of Voice of America this Summer, on the English translation desk. His office address: USIA building, 19th and Penn. Ave., Washington, D. C.

1955

The first Nieman baby of the 1954-55 academic year was born December 17 to Sally and Piers Anderton, a daughter, Joan. Her father is on leave from the copy desk of the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

Samuel D. Zagoria resigned from the news staff of the Washington *Post* January 1, to become administrative assistant to Senator Clifford P. Case of New Jersey. Zagoria is a native of New Jersey, a graduate of Rutgers, had been on the *Post* since 1946. In 1952 he won the Washington Guild's award for public service news reporting.

OUR REVIEWERS

The book reviews in this issue are by seven newspapermen now on Nieman Fellowships:

Mort Stern, night city editor, Denver *Post*; Albert L. Kraus, business writer, Providence *Journal*; Guy Munger, State editor, Greensboro (N.C.) *News*; Thomas G. Karsell, managing editor, Greenville (Miss.) *Delta Democrat-Times*; William J. Woestendick, Sunday editor, Winston-Salem (N. C.) *Journal* and *Sentinel*; Sam Zagoria, reporter, Washington *Post*.

Post Mortem on the Sheppard Trial Coverage

This challenging editorial in the Toledo Blade, December 22d, was received after this issue had gone to press. Bui it is provocation for a postscript:

Free Press and Fair Trial

At this distance, some 100 miles from Cleveland, it looks to us as though the Sheppard murder case was sensationalized to the point at which the press must ask itself if its freedom, carried to excess, doesn't interfere with the conduct of fair trials.

The hue and cry raised in Cleveland newspapers after Marilyn Sheppard was found murdered could not help but inflame public opinion even as it pointed the finger of suspicion. One of the papers, which virtually demanded the arrest of Dr. Sheppard, almost had a vested interest in his conviction.

During the long-drawn-out trial the Cleveland papers, and a good many others, treated it like a Roman holiday. With a man's life at stake, they competed with one another in whipping the evidence up into one sensation after another. Skeletonized summations of lengthy testimony came pretty close to drawing conclusions from it.

Day after day the public, and the jurors, were treated to opinion-shaping headlines, such as:

**QUIT STALLING AND BRING HIM IN
SAM DECLINED JULY 4 LIE TEST
SAYS DR. SAM TALKED DIVORCE
TESTIFIES SAM CHANGED STORIES**

**CHARGES SAM FAKED INJURIES
SAYS MARILYN CALLED
SAM A "JEKYLL-HYDE"**

The same thing, of course, has been done with celebrated murder cases before, and perhaps the Sheppard trial belongs in the Hall-Mills or Ruth Snyder-Judd Gray category. Yet from what we've heard, we judge that the reaction of the public to newspaper sensationalism in this case was somewhat different. Possibly its taste has become more mature; maybe it has learned to expect improved standards from the press; perhaps it is more concerned nowadays with civil liberties.

In either event, there was considerable criticism of the way this story was handled which came not alone from judges and lawyers but also from the public. And we think that it is justified, because we do not believe that the rights of a free press are paramount to that of a fair trial.

After all, a fair trial, involving the age-old struggle of the individual against all-powerful government, is the most basic, the most essential of all human rights.

From the dawn of civilization mankind has looked to it as the first line of defense against oppression under any form of government. Before the other powers of kings and tyrants were questioned, the right of courts to do justice between them and their subjects was demanded and sometimes accepted.

In modern times even dictatorships, of the man on horseback or of a collectivized

people, have at least pretended to keep their hands off the courts so that they could at least appear to hand down judgments according to the law and the evidence.

And should American newspapers do less today?

Their freedom of the press, gained in the last century or so as the democratic concept evolved, is not an absolute. It is much more like a social tool to be used wisely and responsibly for the public good. And newspapers employ it to their peril when they interpose themselves between the people and their courts and undertake to try cases in print before, or as, the evidence is presented to the jury.

Incidentally, newspapers would be the first to protest if anybody else should attempt to obstruct justice in some such fashion.

In its own handling of the Sheppard case, *The Blade*, which staffed the trial gave it ample coverage. There was a great deal of interest in it in this neighboring city. But our reporting was restricted to an objective, straightforward account of the courtroom proceedings. We avoided slanted headlines, color stories, and lurid pictures.

Had the trial been held in Toledo, there would have been no question about its fairness, no demand for a change of venue. The verdict would have been left strictly up to the jury. The public would have had to form its own opinion.