

NiemanReports

January, 1957

The Press and the Fund for the Republic

Frank K. Kelly

Election Postscripts:

Washington Post Coverage

J. Russell Wiggins

The New York Times Surveys

Donald D. Janson

The Big Shift in Negro Voting

Richard L. Lyons

Reporting on China in Japan

Kazuo Kuroda

Canada's New Press Awards

Lester Pearson

The Foreign Correspondents

Theodore E. Kruglak

The Supreme Court and Its Critics

Luther Huston

Newspaper Sins Against Privacy

Ignaz Rothenberg

Technical Writing

Harold K. Mintz

American Scene — From Down Under: Desmond Stone — The Loma Weekly: James W. Carty, Jr. — Who Says So?: Carey McWilliams. Sale in Two Cities: Louis M. Lyons.

Reviews — Nieman Notes — Scrapbook

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; 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, Norwalk, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

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

VOL. XI; NO. 1

JANUARY, 1957

Sale in Two Cities

In Boston the *Post* went out of business this Fall. In Chicago the *American* was bought by the *Tribune* which has continued its separate publication. Both were victims of the competitive struggle. But their fates were otherwise quite different. All the other Chicago papers bid for the *American* whose sale price is reported in figures that run up to \$12,000,000. None of the Boston papers wanted any part of the *Post*. They are now sharing what was left of its circulation and they have absorbed a large part of that residue of staff that stayed through a series of suspensions until the final demise. Its presses were auctioned off in December. This is the only sale of the *Post* except the publisher's yacht.

The *Tribune* keeps the *American* in business as afternoon competition for the *Daily News*. The *Sun-Times* runs round the clock but is chiefly morning and evidently working itself out of the evening field. So Chicago still has four papers in three ownerships.

Boston had eight and now has seven. Only New York has more papers. This is counting the *Christian Science Monitor* as a local paper. It publishes in Boston and is local in its news and timeliness there and a local factor to somewhat the extent that the old *Transcript* was. The *Herald-Traveler* is a morning-evening combination; the *Globe* is morning and evening; there are two Hearst tabloids, *Record*, morning and *American*, evening, though both are sold in the evening. On Sunday Boston has the *Globe*, *Herald* and Hearst's *Advertiser*. The *Post* was morning and had a Sunday edition.

The change in Boston is obviously more marked than in Chicago. The old *Transcript* was at the top of the cultural range of Boston journalism until it died, a depression victim, in 1941. The *Post* was at the bottom, if the Hearst tabloids are put in a separate category, as they are in Boston.

The passing of the *Transcript* and the *Post* were similar in that no other paper wanted to bid for either. Their end thinned out a crowded field.

They leave Boston a more normal newspaper field and closer to a median quality of journalism. The *Post* pulled down the average, and in its final phase under John Fox, horribly. Its circulation had once gone above 500,000; its final claim was 250,000, a shrinkage of 50,000 in the four years of Fox control. That it failed so dismally under a policy of smear is the most encouraging note in New England journalism in a long time. For a long generation before its sale to Fox, the *Post* had been under absentee ownership and committee management and its survival all this time was a marvel of the inertia of public habit.

The *Post's* circulation drift was North, as with the other Boston morning papers, only more so. It went all over Maine and New Hampshire where its most remembered contribution was the *Post* cane, bestowed on the oldest inhabitant in each town and passed on in series. The holder of the *Post* cane had a distinction that guaranteed him an obit in the *Post*. Another feature was the *Post* Santa Claus which the *Globe* took on this Christmas, at the request, they said, of the mayor. This is probably the only feature of the *Post* that the mayor regrets, for it had a nasty habit of pushing politicians around in the interest of its publisher's projects.

The two *Globes* and the *Herald-Traveler* perhaps average out close to the common denominator of the big city papers. The *Herald* is Republican and aimed at the business man and the comfortable suburban reader. Its afternoon affiliate is flashy and has the biggest circulation of the four. The *Globe* is moderate in everything, puts its emphasis on the human elements in the news and avoids political commitments. It was Democratic until Bryan and has been middle-of-the-road since. The *Herald-Traveler* is a corporation, the *Globe* a family ownership operation, and the difference in ownership is reflected in the tone and attitudes of the two combinations that now offer the substance of Boston journalism. This, one always has to add, is without prejudice to the *Christian Science Monitor*, whose distinction is universally esteemed. But its impact on the local scene is about that of the New York *Times*, both gratefully taken in by a discriminating few—the *Herald Trib* too, by fewer.

The *Globe* and the *Herald* should be stronger by the elimination of the *Post* and their chances of serving the community correspondingly increased.

The only change visible in Chicago is in the business office. So that shortens our story.

But the Chicago papers committed considerable big black

(Continued on page 11)

Reporting on Communist China in Japan

By Kazuo Kuroda

Now that Japan and the Soviet Union have signed a provisional agreement for the establishment of normal diplomatic relationships, Japan's relations with Communist China are drawing a renewed attention from various quarters both in Japan and in other parts of the world.

Prime Minister Ichiro Hatoyama,* after the signing of the agreement last month, disowned any idea of proceeding with the negotiations with Communist China. We can take his statement at its face value, because (1) Japan now sees the way clear for acquisition of a seat in the U. N. as well as repatriation of Japanese prisoners in the Soviet Union, and there is no immediate need for further negotiations with Communist nations; (2) Japan has a regular diplomatic relationship with the Nationalist China Government in Formosa and the Hatoyama Cabinet or any other conservative Government of Japan is not likely to switch its support without the approval of the United States.

On the other hand, however, we must remember that continental China played an important role for the pre-war economy of Japan as the source of supply of raw materials such as iron ores and coking coal and also as the market for finished products. And it is easy to see that Communist China as well as the Soviet Union will step up their propaganda activities towards Japan.

Ex-Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida, critic within the conservative camp of Hatoyama's peace negotiations with Moscow, thinks if Japan is to resume diplomatic relations with Communist nations, Communist China should come first. Yoshida seems to be opposed to peace negotiations with any Communist nation at this time. But it is certainly possible that the restoration of peace with Moscow, unlike that with Communist China, will facilitate an overall rapprochement of Japan with Communist nations.

Resumption of diplomatic relations with Communist nations in itself is nothing surprising. It is already more than 10 years since the end of World War II and Japan cannot shut her door to her Communist neighbors indefinitely. But the problem is whether the Japanese people are prepared for regular intercourse with this special kind of neighbors.

The Japanese Government has recently taken steps for strengthening the Public Security Investigation Bureau.

Kazuo Kuroda is on the editorial staff of the *Japan Times* (formerly the *Nippon Times*). He is an associate Nieman Fellow at Harvard this year under the auspices of the Asia Foundation.

But that is, to say the least, not a fundamental solution of the problem. More important is the fact that the ideological climate in Japan seems to be more vulnerable to communism than in Western nations and that there is no adequate system of reporting to secure the flow of objective information on Communist neighbor countries.

At present, Japanese newspapers have no regular correspondents in Communist China. There is one Japanese news agency maintaining a regular correspondent in Peking: Kyodo News Service. According to a survey by the Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association, the *Asahi Shimbun*, one of the big-three national dailies in Japan, has the following number of correspondents abroad: New York 4, London 3, Washington, D. C., 2, San Francisco 2, Honolulu 1, Paris 1, Bonn 1, New Delhi 1, Singapore 1, Taipei 1, Hongkong 1, South Korea 1, Cairo 1. The figures for the *Mainichi*, the rival of the *Asahi*, are: New York 2, Washington, D. C., 2, Honolulu 1, San Francisco 1, Los Angeles 1, London 4, Paris 1, Berlin 1, Bonn 1, Zurich 1, Beyrouth 1, Melbourne 1, Moscow 1, Taipei 1, New Delhi 1, Hongkong 1, South Korea 1, Manila 1.

The above figures show how heavy is the stress laid on the coverage of American news. And it must be noted that those correspondents, with a few exceptions of American citizens of Japanese ancestry, are all Japanese reporters specially assigned from the home office and that large Japanese dailies are supplied with news also from AP, UP, INS, Reuters and other news agencies.

Reporting on Communist China, therefore, is largely dependent upon (1) foreign news service and (2) monitoring of radio news. The Hsin Hua (New China) News Agency of Communist China is one source of news on Communist China. The Radiopress and the Soviet News Sha are playing an important role in radio monitoring.

This is not to imply that there is a danger of Communist propaganda infiltration through any of the above-mentioned sources. On the contrary, editors of Japanese dailies are doing as good a job as in any other Western nation. But it is rather unnatural for Japanese newspapers to have no means for direct coverage of news in Communist China. On the mainland of China, Japanese newspapers used to maintain a number of branch offices and scores of correspondents in prewar days, though this fact cannot be dissociated from the imperialistic expansion of Japan.

The lack of direct contact with the news sources in Communist China is at least partly responsible for two abnormal phenomena: (1) strong curiosity on the part of the people, which is to be explained as an attraction of the

unknown. (For example, the market value of a travel diary of Communist China is now definitely higher than that of the United States or any other Western nation); (2) "non-professional" reporting by novelists and scholars who have toured Communist China on the latter's invitation.

This summer, the State Department of the United States refused permission to American journalists to go to Communist China. The Japanese Government is also in a difficult position, because stationing of Japanese reporters in Peking may easily lead to stationing of Communist Chinese journalists in Tokyo, who are not employees of commercial newspapers.

It must be noted in this connection that representatives of the Japanese press did visit Communist China in 1955. This journalist mission had many able reporters as members but their travel was financed entirely by Communist China. Their reports, carried on page one of leading Japanese dailies, were avidly read but some leftists criticized them for "exaggerating minor defects of Communist China." After their return, *Ta Kun Pao*, an influential Communist Chinese newspaper, carried an article censuring one of the mission members.

Communist China is now inviting many other missions from Japan. Legislators, novelists and scholars have been invited and some of their reports have been carried by large Japanese newspapers. They are not professional newspapermen. And some of these "non-professional" reporters are inclined to extol the merits of Communist China.

In the summer of this year, Tatsuzo Ishikawa, a famous novelist in Japan, visited the Soviet Union and Communist China as a member of a cultural mission, which was organized by the Asian Solidarity Committee, a private organization in Japan. A series of five articles carried by the *Asahi Shimbun* (from July 11 to 15) caused a strong sensation among the *Asahi* readers and intellectuals of Japan. (Before I left Japan in September for this country, almost every intellectual in Tokyo was talking about the articles and I could not help envying the commercial success of the *Asahi Shimbun*.)

It is rather difficult to summarize the highly controversial articles in a few paragraphs. Here, only a few passages will be quoted as specimens. Mr. Ishikawa is not a Communist and he calls himself "a Liberal."

They are concentrating their efforts upon cultural and economic construction in order to consolidate the achievements of the social revolution. . . Communist menace is only a word coined by conservative politicians of capitalistic countries.

Criticism for criticism's sake has no value. Any criticism must be a stepping stone for progress. Japanese intellectuals are just marking time, muttering criticisms. . . . They are conservatives clad in progressive knowledge. . . . Both in Communist countries and other capitalistic countries, intellectuals are more positive and active. . . We have certainly freedom of speech. But it is aimless. It is only a freedom for freedom's sake.

Freedom in China may be less than in Japan. But they live in cities where there are no burglars. Which is culturally superior? In short, I think democratic states are already obsolescent, though I admit that I am speaking rather intuitively. They are the countries of the past lagging behind the time. (His articles are entitled as "The World Has Changed.")

Earlier in 1955, another famous novelist, Ashihei Hino, visited Communist China. And his account (published in book form by the *Asahi*) is more calm and reasonable. I am sorry that his criticisms of Communist China cannot be quoted for lack of space but they run in veins similar to ordinary Western criticism.

The resumption of regular diplomatic relationships with the Soviet Union was effected by the Hatoyama Cabinet, but it may be said that Hatoyama played into the Communist hands. The Soviet Union had vetoed Japan's entry to the U. N. and refused the return of Habomai and Shikotan islands close to Hokkaido. Hatoyama had to conform with the Russian terms to change their attitude on these essentials. The resumption of diplomatic relationship itself is not objectionable. But the way it was done leaves something to be desired. The Japanese people should be given the chance to know the Soviet Union and Communist China, not the tenets of Marxism but the realities under Communist rule. It is high time that something was done to rectify the situation.

* Just as this issue went to press, Hatoyama was succeeded by Tanzan Ishibashi, who is more in favor of expansion of trade with Communist China.

Canada's New Press Awards

By Lester B. Pearson

When these Bowater Awards were announced, my friend, Harvey Hickey, the president of the Press Gallery, observed that "Canadian journalists have never had the incentive of such distinguished recognition, and the Press Gallery feels that the Bowater Awards will be a very valuable influence." I agree that public recognition of good journalism in Canada is desirable, but I am not sure about this matter of "incentive." It has been my own experience that journalists require no incentive whatsoever to write, and that, in fact, there is practically no way to stop them from writing once they have been inoculated with printer's ink.

I know that you would also like me to express your thanks to the panels who undertook the difficult task of nominating the two winners of these first awards, Mr. Frank Flaherty, for his series of articles on Freedom of the Press in Canada, and Mr. Allan Kent for his articles on Automation and its possible consequences for the Canadian economy. Perhaps I might add that, if I am correctly informed, both panels of judges had considerable difficulty in nominating the winners because of the high quality of the contributions.

It is my good fortune to have many friends among Canadian journalists—at home and abroad. It is my privilege to meet some of them from time to time; often at unearthly hours after a long and exhausting flight, a form of transportation to which my internal policies have never been able to adapt themselves completely and comfortably!

ACCURACY

My remarks—and they have of necessity often been extemporary—have been quoted now and again since I have acquired quotability through holding public office. On reflection I find that I have had very little to complain about on the score of misrepresentation or inaccuracy, and very much for which I am—and should be—grateful. Over the years only occasionally have I thought, and once or twice have I been sure from the record, that I was misquoted. More often I have been astonished at the emphasis or the interpretation given to my remarks; or shaken by the headlines sometimes put over them.

My own personal experience with the press of Canada has been a happy and helpful one. It does not support the position taken by Mr. John Gordon, the editor of the *London Sunday Express*, in presenting his evidence to the Royal Commission on the Press in Great Britain of 1947-49. Mr. Gordon on this occasion read to the members of the Commission a message which he had somewhat earlier ad-

ressed to his sub-editors and reporters. This was his message: "I do not wish to be hypercritical but the plain fact is—and we all know it to be true—that whenever we find a story in a newspaper concerning something we know about, it is more often wrong than right." This observation, mark you, comes from a hard-boiled newspaperman of long experience, and on it, of course, it would not be proper for me to comment.

Perhaps one difficulty in ensuring scrupulous accuracy on spot news, which implies a careful examination and checking of details, is that it takes time. But in the competitive activity of news gathering there must be a terrific incentive to "get there fustest with the mostest."

If accuracy, however, is important in news reporting, it is equally important in statements from those whose words are reported. Neither freedom of the press nor freedom of speech includes the right to be inaccurate, to mislead or to misrepresent—either by the speaker or the reporter. There is a two-way responsibility here.

I put another question. What is news and what is opinion concealed as news?

Serving public opinion with news and appealing to it with views, though compatible, are nevertheless distinct. In Canada (and we can be grateful for this) our press has developed a healthy tradition of distinguishing clearly between the uncoloured provision of news, which can include reports of the editors, through the expression of their own opinions, to influence public judgments.

It is inevitable, however, that the selection of news and the coverage and position given to stories can and does influence the results of even the best and most unbiased reporting. News is sorted and prepared by human beings, not by machines, and the results will never satisfy everybody.

I don't think we have much to complain about on this score in Canada. I do have a grievance, however, against the headline writers who at times can be as disconcerting as headline hunters! I appreciate, I hope, their difficulties of time and space, but I am also very conscious of their power to create wrong impressions—sometimes dangerously wrong impressions—of what is going on, especially now that we are becoming increasingly a race of headline readers and picture viewers.

THE "GOVERNMENT SOURCE"

I have another complaint in this field. Some journalist in a cafeteria or a corridor sees an official, Joe Smith. He gets some information. Joe becomes, in a headline next morning, "Canada," or at least "Ottawa," or at the very

worst, a "government source." The self-elevation of the "three tailors of Tooley Street" into "We, the people of England" has nothing on the headline promotion of an anonymous official into the Government of Canada. I admit at once that the fault in this kind of situation is not necessarily with the press. The culprit is very often a person—he might even be a politician!—who enjoys a feeling of ego-inflation from the fact that he appears in the press, even if anonymously, and takes steps to promote this enjoyment.

RIGHT TO OFFICIAL INFORMATION

There is another problem of perhaps more immediate importance, at least in Ottawa. What exactly is the right of the press to official information? It is certainly not absolute for it has to be subordinated to the public interest. This, if I may say so, is especially true in respect of international affairs where premature or misleading information can prevent important and good results; can also prejudice the growth of better relations between peoples, or even poison good ones which do exist.

The prior claim of public interest, however, simply begs the question by provoking others: what *is* the public interest, and *who* is to decide in any given set of circumstances?

There is certainly a danger of abusing the rights to news, in a way which prejudices the public interest. But there is also a danger in refusing to give information or in preventing it being given, by manufacturing or exaggerating a public interest, which may merely conceal a private prejudice. I leave you, an impartial jury, to decide which is the greater danger: the irresponsible exercise of the right to information by the press, or the irresponsible effort to prevent information appearing in the press? The way to make any decision unnecessary is, of course, to remove both dangers by the maintenance of a high standard of professional and personal integrity on the part of both givers and receivers of information.

It is said that a people gets the government it deserves, and in a sense that is true. The same thing, in a democracy at least, can be said about the press. The standards that readers insist on, publishers will be compelled to meet. But you who are in journalism, as I who am in government, will recognize that this doctrine that people get what they deserve is certainly no excuse, though it is sometimes used as such, for betraying our obligations or responsibilities. It can never justify a government or a newspaper or an individual in meeting less than the highest standards that are professed.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

We hear a good deal these days about freedom of the press. It is well that we should, especially as we live in a period where power in almost all human activity tends to grow and concentrate until it becomes that potential threat

that Frank Flaherty received an award for writing so wisely about.

This concentration and growth of power, however, applies not only to governments but also to the press, as the history of modern journalism shows. The right to start a newspaper, for instance, which surely is one aspect of freedom of the press, and which certainly does exist in our democratic society, now requires so much more in the way of finance and resources than ever before that its exercise is now severely limited in practice. Among other things, it requires a news agency franchise.

Big journalism has developed along with Big Government and Big Business, until today in one or two communities of our country the three main mechanisms for disseminating information and influencing public opinion—press, radio and television—are under single ownership and control. This process, if extended, must, I think, cause anxiety to all those who believe in freedom of press and opinion; and in free competitive enterprise.

This increase and concentration of power, both inside and outside of government, makes freedom of the press more important now than ever. The repositories of this power, even though they feel they are using it unselfishly and constructively, are often harassed and perplexed by its responsibilities and requirements. The burdens of authority increase, even in democratic states as the people make more and more demands on government—and on business—and as the mechanisms and processes necessary to meet these demands become more massive and more complicated. It is not surprising, then, that those who are clothed with some brief but burdensome authority, who are worried by the pressures and responsibilities that flow from it, tend at times to impatience at investigation by the Press as to how the power is being exercised. This impatience is increased when the inquiry, they feel, is not fairly and objectively conducted. There is, I think, in these circumstances, a justification for irritation or impatience. But otherwise, no one has any right to complain about the searchlight of honest press investigation, even though he may be dazzled or dumbfounded by it.

RESPONSIBILITY

There are, it seems to me, two main threats today to this essential freedom of the press. One comes from those non-democratic and dictatorial governments who dislike the check on power and authority which a free press can bring about. In totalitarian governments—communist or fascist—this threat has been converted into complete and absolute control; press and opinion are shackled and enslaved. Such a press—obsequious and obedient—can often be the cause as well as the result of totalitarian government.

There is another threat to press freedom, however, which comes when irresponsibility appears in the press itself. Such

irresponsibility in any one newspaper eventually impairs belief in the integrity and fairness of all newspapers. The resultant loss of public confidence and support inevitably makes it much harder for the press to stand up to those forces which would destroy its freedom.

These two things—freedom and responsibility—are, as we are so often reminded, inseparable. If one goes they

both go, and this applies to government as well as to journalism.

The first Bowater Awards for Canadian journalism, set up by the Bowater Corporation of North America, were awarded October 25 in Ottawa by **Lester B. Pearson**, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs. This is from Mr. Pearson's address.

Election Postscript:

The Washington *Post* Measured Its Campaign Coverage: Found They Came Out Even.

A Memo from Executive Editor J. Russell Wiggins to the *Post* staff.

The staff was under instructions to report the 1956 campaigns fairly, objectively and according to its best news judgment. It did just that. The result, we can safely say, was an admirable product and, as far as can be determined, the best campaign-election job we have ever produced.

One of the most interesting aspects of the result is confirmation of our belief that campaigns should not be reported by ruler-and-compass methods, but that good news judgment and lack of bias, operating by themselves, will produce the equality of treatment sought for. We had the Library see what the results would be from a tape-measure tally, on the papers from Sept. 1 through Nov. 6; findings (for national campaign news only) are shown below. They come as close to a 50-50 ratio as anyone could want; had they been any closer, we might have had cause to worry about whether we actually used a ruler instead of honest news judgment.

<i>All News Pages</i>	GOP	DEM	%GOP	%DEM
Headlines (No. of column units)	783	856	47.7	52.3
Pictures (column inches)	1090.5	898	54.9	45.1
Stories (column inches)	4154.5	4960.5	46.2	53.8
Texts (column inches)	984 ^(a)	947 ^(b)	51	49
<i>Women's Pages</i>				
Headlines	121	122	49.8	50.2
Pictures	549	466	55	46
Stories	561	567	49.8	50.2
<i>Page One</i>				
Headlines	113	101	52.7	47.3
Pictures	119	79	60	40
Stories	486	503	49	51

^(a) Ike 853.5; Nixon 130.5

^(b) Adlai 933; Kefauver 14

In addition, an analysis of front page political coverage was made, using a system perhaps not too scientific but nevertheless consistent. Banner lines were given a value of 20 points. Those headlines (measured by column units) and pictures (measured by column inches) below the fold were given a single value; those above, a double value. Five points were added for a story in the lead position; 4 points for a story twinned with the lead; 3 points for a story in the off-lead position, etc. By this system, which served to weight position and display as well as mere number of stories and photos, the Republicans got an index number of 874; the Democrats, 785; or GOP, 52.5 per cent, Dems, 47.5.

The slight advantage enjoyed by the Democrats in volume of stories and headlines is probably explained by the fact that at least during the first half of the campaign, Mr. Stevenson was speaking more often, and making more political news, than the President. The Republican advantage in volume of pictures used is doubtless a result of the fact that Ike is unfailingly photogenic and that, as a man doing things in our own area which made local news, we properly ran photographs of him doing them in our own back yard.

We had a bare minimum of critics—at least of vocal critics, the only ones we know about. The average of letters and phone calls combined to the Executive and Managing Editors' offices was no higher than three or four a week. Almost all complained of the treatment in a single day's issue; which meant that Republicans complained one day, Democrats another.

We made some mistakes, of course. In the last couple of weeks of the campaign we let the war news push the candidates off the front pages on a couple of days when we perhaps should not have done so. We handled President Eisenhower's speech of Oct. 31, on his own terms, as a non-political address; it was not, and we were unfair to the extent that we had no mention of Mr. Stevenson on page one next day. Conversely we had Mr. Stevenson on page one Nov. 4, with no mention of Mr. Eisenhower.

New York Times Election Survey Came Close

How they did it and how they assess results

By Donald D. Janson

A dusty Oklahoma farm four miles from the nearest telephone was the scene of an impromptu interview shortly before the 1956 Presidential election.

The reporter was the first ever to ask the homesteader there for his political views. The man of the Osage County soil seized the opportunity. As his booted shoe jabbed at the parched earth of the yard, he spoke with homely eloquence on the drought, the party in power and the price of hogs.

The reporter was one of five from *The New York Times* who were talking to voters in Oklahoma that afternoon. At the same time, three other teams were feeling political pulses in other states.

The bush-beating was part of an intensive survey of twenty-seven states that were expected to play key roles in the election.

Times staffers were out to learn more basically and more comprehensively than ever before what issues concerned the electorate most. The project was to include late re-surveys of states found to be close. Altogether, it was to keep the teams in the field for six weeks before the election. The Oklahoma farmer was one of thousands of ordinary citizens to be sought out by the press for the first time.

Simultaneously, the brains of politicians, local newspapermen and other informed persons were picked to help the teams understand each state's political climate.

The scope and depth of the venture was a new departure in journalism. In previous election years, the *Times* had done political roundups on states and regions by culling information from reports filed by stringers and regional staff correspondents. Or a single reporter had gone into a state to read political barometers and do a story. Usually he had had time to see only politicians and editors.

Teamwork added the vital grass roots dimension to the established practice of reporting the mood of voters. The team method grew out of discussions among *Times* executives and political reporters. It was given a trial run with good results in the Florida and California primaries last spring.

The principle on which the team operation rested was that two reporters going into a state could cover twice as much

as one; five—five times as much. (W. H. Lawrence, a team captain for both the primary and general election surveys, found the team operation "much more" than five times as productive as a one-man job.)

The added manpower permitted sounding out voters in meaningful numbers. No matter how knowledgeable "informed sources" might be, there was no substitute for the horse's mouth for learning what issues and attitudes held the minds of voters and groups of voters in particular states, why these views prevailed and what they portended for candidates for President, Governor, Senate and House.

The team operation was not a poll, although some polling was included in the techniques used. The team method had the merit of reportorial checks and balances not available to pollsters.

Each reporter was free to judge each response, from politician and voter alike, for reliability. Questioning could be flexible and thorough enough to probe whatever came up. Samplings could be expanded as the opportunity arose. The findings of each reporter could be checked against those of the others on the team.

Actual working procedure varied by teams and was subject to day-to-day circumstances. Usually a team met under one roof the day before the story on a particular state was to be written. The roof often was that of a hotel in a principal city of the state. If time was too limited, it might be the roof of a train or plane bound for the next state to be covered.

At the talk-it-out session, reports were turned in to the team captain and read all around. Discussion followed. As one correspondent put it, "odd bits of highly perishable data dovetailed remarkably into the over-all picture."

Decisions were taken as quickly as possible on how the races shaped up, and why, and what was prompting voters to see things as they did.

How to divide the next state among team members for coverage would be decided before the conference broke up. The captain or his designee then was set to write the story of the survey just completed. The reports stayed with the writer for reference while the team members scattered to starting points in the next state.

In covering a state, the captain usually saw state and party officials at the top levels. Since he also was doing a lot of writing, the captain's time to roam was limited. He received nightly informational calls from his team members

Donald Janson was taken off the copy desk to serve on one of the *Times* campaign teams. He is now *Times* regional correspondent at Des Moines. He was Nieman Fellow from the Milwaukee *Journal* copy desk in 1953.

and kept in touch with Clifton Daniel, who coordinated the survey from New York.

The captain's chores could run quite a gamut. Bill Lawrence, at the Governor's mansion in Kentucky for dinner one day received an unexpected call. Delta air line had tracked him down to report that a typewriter assigned to his team had turned up in Knoxville. Lawrence, adding baggagemaster to his previously acquired roles of mentor, guide, father confessor and drinking companion to his team members, solved the mystery when the evening calls came in.

A team member had got a stranger's similar machine in an airline luggage shuffle a few days earlier. The team was to be in Nashville for an hour en route to Tulsa soon, so the "baggagemaster" arranged for an exchange of the portables there.

For the team members, there was a flexible degree of specialization in covering a state. Labor reporters usually took the largest union centers. Others regularly drew farm areas and became accomplished at lining up the most reliable Hertz or Avis rental cars. Others worked in cities, hopping from one town to another and, once aground, getting about by cab and afoot.

There were limits on specializing, however. Labor reporter Stan Levey found himself talking to farmers at a backwoods feed store in West Virginia one day. He ran into no difficulty until a suspicious native squinted at him and said: "One thing we don't like around here, stranger, is revenooers."

Effective interviewing was over at the feed store.

Ordinarily a team had three days in a state, but too often a team member had only three hours in a city.

Usually an editor or political reporter could supply a fill-in and the names of informed persons to see. Armed with their predictions, for whatever they might prove to be worth, and some background on local issues, the team member could seek out ordinary voters until time to push on.

Calling ahead for appointments and hotel reservations often proved time-saving.

The day's work was likely to run late, with news sources to be seen informally after dinner or gatherings of farmers, parents, church members, ethnic groups, etc., to be checked.

Even after that, sleep yielded priority to writing of the day's report. Not to type up notes nightly was dangerous on a tight travel schedule, although time spent on a train or in the air could be stolen for writing. Ray O'Neill, national news editor, held to an unvarying requirement of a story a day from the teams. Days off, provided for in the plan sheets, were in theory only.

In New York, the team reports received an extra measure of care in editing. Mr. Daniel gave each piece a preliminary going-over for content. From time to time he reorganized, simplified and clarified without violating the writing style or jostling delicate points of analysis. He and Harold Faber, who also handled the complicated advance scheduling of stories and team movements, sometimes phoned the team correspondents for elaborations.

As soon as the copy was ready, it went to the national news desk for a close reading. Later both Mr. Daniel and the desk checked it in proof, where final trims for space were made. The editing was uniformly praised by the writers.

A state profile was run with each report. These sidebars also got five editings, and were rewritten to any extent necessary to fit the stylistic mold set for them as "State in the News" sketches.

The survey found that President Eisenhower would win a handsome electoral-vote victory, but did not measure the magnitude of his popular vote.

It foresaw his triumph in twenty-one states and Adlai Stevenson's success in Missouri.

It had Texas and Virginia leaning Democratic early in the survey but relegated them to the doubtful realm in a team re-survey story after the revolt in Hungary and war in Egypt had broken. These states went to the President.

The survey missed on the other three states covered—West Virginia, Tennessee and Oklahoma. A Stevenson advantage had been found in each and there was no opportunity to re-survey these states after the crises abroad developed. A post-survey story based on memoranda from *Times* stringers and regional correspondents did report that the situation overseas seemed to be swelling the Eisenhower vote throughout the country. A post-survey story on Tennessee did the same for that state specifically. These post-survey, pre-election pieces were complementary to the survey but were not team reports and could not be counted in any box score on the team operation.

The survey found that other Republican candidates would trail the national ticket, and that the Democrats would continue to control Congress.

Also found and reported were a farm revolt that would not be sufficient to hurt the President, a considerable Eisenhower vote within organized labor, a fractional shift of Negroes to the Republicans, and the strong appeal—particularly to women—of the President's "peace" record.

Team members found most persons interested in the survey idea and willing to express themselves. Few doors were slammed or shoulders turned.

An exception was a burly bartender on Pittsburgh's south side who doubted that his customers from the near-by mill

wanted politics with their beer. He invited the reporter to continue at the risk of "a poke in the nose." The team member shifted his elbow bending with millworkers to the bar across the street.

Reader response indicated that the survey was closely followed. Politicians and newspapermen who were sought out by team members gave generously of their time. Many hailed the project as a responsible effort to get at the biggest but most elusive domestic news of the day.

Post-mortems at the *Times* are continuing. Recently Managing Editor Turner Catledge posed ten questions for those who took part:

1. Was the team method good and how could it be improved?

The replies were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the method. All hands agreed with W. L. White, one of the captains, that the "team techniques were eminently sound in principle" and the "approach itself was fundamentally good." Simultaneous observation in a state by several reporters was considered to be the essential crux of the system. Findings then could be easily meshed when teams met in assessment session.

It was agreed that more time for preparatory study would have greatly increased the effectiveness of time in the field. Week-ends were found to be of limited value for useful leg-work and the reporters suggested that this be taken into account in planning any future itineraries.

2. What were the best sources of information, in the light of eventual election results?

Opinion was divided on the comparative usefulness of knowledgeable people and ordinary voters. The consensus was that no generalization could be made about categories of sources. The most astute politicians were found to be extremely helpful when they were speaking off the record and were willing to level. Local newspapermen often were on top of the political situation. But the ordinary voters, if interviewed in meaningful numbers and groupings, held the ultimate answer.

As several team members pointed out, voters supplied the evidence with which to decide which "experts" were most accurate.

3. Did the information obtained from professional sources agree with that from voters? Which was more accurate?

Team members found that both were necessary and that they often jibed. Gladwin Hill put it this way:

"Professional sources provide big-picture information. Voter surveys provide more detailed information, particularly on motivation nuances which the high-level boys often are too high up to get. The two are complementary. You have to look at both the forest and the trees.

"At the same time, I think it's treacherous to project a

fifty-person sidewalk sampling into any sort of Gallup-type conclusion about how sentiment is divided. I used Joe Blow interviewing chiefly for gross indications: I would take a known heavily Democratic chunk of sentiment, such as fifty aircraft workers, and see how much Ike sentiment there was. If Ike did as well as fifty-fifty in such a group, it was a reasonable inference that he was far from licked yet. In this way, from state to state, we established fairly positively that all the 'switch' talk was off the top of Finnegan's head, and that there wasn't much significant anti-Nixon sentiment."

Good cross-sections were found to be necessary in order to extract the most accurate data from voters. Interviewing each person privately was likely to get quicker and more reliable answers than speaking to voters within earshot of their friends or acquaintances. Thus ringing doorbells, while time-consuming, often produced more straightforward replies than polling more than one person at a time in crowded places.

Team members found value in not being tied to the arithmetic of polls. They were free to include their own intangible impressions after days of surveying a state.

4. Were there "psychological blocks" that prevented teams from correctly assessing data and areas?

Team reporters had found, for example, no clear indication of the shifts to come in normally Democratic Chicago and Bridgeport, Conn. Team members conceded a tendency to discount the possibility of changes in traditional voting habits. They suggested more time for direct voter sampling to help detect potential swings.

5. Why did the survey fail to anticipate the landslide proportions of the Eisenhower vote?

The consensus was that developments abroad just before the election at least accentuated the Eisenhower trend considerably. These war scares came too late to be taken into account except in two re-survey stories.

Several reporters pointed out also that the Stevenson campaign had sagged while the survey was in progress. Team captain Leo Egan noted that indications of this were mentioned in a number of stories, but not as prominently as they might have been. Some felt by hindsight that it had been hard to give sufficient credence to Stevenson campaign failings because so many Democratic state and Congressional candidates were winning.

6. Why were we accurate in forecasting the Democratic Congressional victory and attitudes of groups?

Team members found it easier to size up parts of the whole than the whole itself. Local issues and personalities were key factors in some races. As for groups, investigation was simplified because easily detected issues were among motivating factors: civil rights for Negroes, "peace" for women, costs and income for farmers.

7. Was the time of the survey good?

Opinion was unanimous that publication of the series could not have been started earlier without taking on monotony for readers. But there was a consistent desire to get groundwork underway sooner.

Some reporters were for running re-checks on all close states, right up to election if necessary to take into account any late developments that might influence voting. Others suggested that every state be reported, at least by one man, in order to miss no such surprise swings as took place in Louisiana.

8. Should we have regional and group surveys instead of state-by-state reports?

The opinion was unanimous that division by states had the most meaning for the reader. Electoral votes are allotted by states. State races were a part of the survey.

The consensus was that findings relating to groups also were handled in the manner most useful to readers. Group tendencies were included in the state stories and rounded up in supplementary stories.

9. Should we have attempted forecasts?

There was some feeling that the *Times* should stick to reporting trends and let the pollsters make the forecasts. The majority opinion, however, was that while forecasts were not necessarily required in each state story, the reporting of findings automatically and legitimately amounted to forecasting in many cases. As one reporter put it:

"What we were primarily trying to do was not crystal-gaze results but inventory and assess the factors in each state situation. We rightly called 'em where we could see them, and where we couldn't said the outcome was uncertain."

10. How about the writing?

The reporters felt that there ought to be no pat formula. Apt feature leads were praised; so were straight news leads when needed to tell the story. Some of the writers wanted more space devoted to analysis. Others liked generous use of colorful illustrations. They cited the frequent plaudits received for the featurized state profiles.

Further analysis of the expensive team operation remains to be made. Meanwhile, its value as a method for surrounding a story of massive proportions has been proved.

The usefulness of team reporting is not limited to elections. The *Times'* recent survey on integration in Southern schools was another pioneering example of a team undertaking, that time on a regional scale.

Mr. Catledge plans to continue to use staff teams to report political, economic and social trends when the significance of the story warrants such coverage.

SALE IN TWO CITIES

(Continued from page 2)

type to the story. It was the lead in the *Tribune*:

Tribune Buys American

The same head was the banner in the *American*. Chicago publishers are more articulate than Boston's and they had lots to say about the big deal.

The part of the *Tribune* statement that the *American* quoted ran:

"The Tribune Company feels that the Chicago *American*, with its own fine record of more than half a century, should continue to serve its more than 500,000 families daily, and its 700,000 on Sunday."

"There is need," the statement went on, "for the Chicago *American*—a need in the social, political and economic life of Chicago, and the Tribune Company has purchased the Chicago *American* as a sound investment."

Mr. John S. Knight, who owns the *Daily News*, devoted his signed Sunday article to the deal. He saw it differently. The head on his piece was:

American Sale Shows Trend Toward Monopoly

He described the *American* as now "a docile captive of the *Tribune*." The *American's* losses, Mr. Knight said, had run in excess of a million dollars a year and he ascribed this to years of mismanagement. He contradicted the *Tribune* statement that the purchase was "as a sound investment." Rather, he said, it was "as an insurance policy against the future."

He quoted *Newsweek* about the *American's* sale:

"The curtain had finally rung down on the slapdash, gin-soaked kind of newspapers that inspired the play 'The Front Page.'" He also quoted *Newsweek* that the target of the *American* would be "Jack Knight's *Daily News*, currently strong with daily sales of 640,000."

"We accept the challenge" Mr. Knight rejoined, "and will try to win with ideas instead of matching dollars."

The *American* retorted in kind:

"We read that our competitor across the river is pretty mad because he was unable to acquire the Chicago *American* and merge it with his own newspaper."

"The 1,800 employees of the *American* aren't mad at all. We are very glad about it."

"We're happy that we'll be able to provide our neighbor afternoon paper with 'even tougher competition than before,' as he put it."

"Nobody's mad over on our side of the river."

L. M. LYONS

Washington Post and Times Herald Nov. 18

The Big Shift in Negro Voting

By Richard L. Lyons

Negro voters in southern cities reversed habits of a generation this year and switched in large numbers to vote for President Eisenhower.

Northern Negroes switched also, but in far fewer numbers. In some northern cities the change was hardly measurable, particularly when placed against the voting pattern of the entire community.

Election returns made it evident there had been a significant Negro presidential voting switch away from the Democratic Party standard bearers with whom they had been allied since Franklin D. Roosevelt's day. A survey of predominantly Negro precincts by the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* in cooperation with correspondents in key cities points up the extent of the shift.

These facts stand out:

In every city surveyed, President Eisenhower won a larger percentage of the Negro vote than he did in 1952.

The biggest switches were in the South. A typical Negro precinct in Richmond gave President Eisenhower 17 per cent of its vote in 1952 and 80 per cent this year. In Philadelphia, Detroit and St. Louis there was very little change—hardly more than in white precincts.

While Negro leaders gave various reasons for the change, the vote pattern indicated the overriding issue was civil rights, which most Southern Democratic politicians have fought and most Northern Democrats have supported.

Negroes can take credit for holding Tennessee for President Eisenhower. Their switches in Memphis alone were far more than his state-wide margin. Louisiana politicians have called the Negro vote an important factor in that state's switch to the Republican column.

For the most part Negroes crossed lines to vote for a man, not a party. They voted for President Eisenhower but generally stayed Democratic in local and Congressional contests—although national Republican officials claim Louisville Negroes elected Thruston B. Morton to the Senate.

The big question is whether these switched votes will stick to the Republican

label in future elections and put the South into a real two-party structure. Negroes form a small minority of the total vote. Their total turnout this year was estimated at four million out of about 61 million votes cast nationally. About 500,000 Negroes voted in the South.

But their performance served notice that the southern Negro vote has become a factor politicians must reckon with in the future.

Here is the city-by-city story of Negro voting this year:

ATLANTA: Precinct 3-B, considered the "most typical" Negro unit in this Deep South city, cast 33 per cent of its vote for President Eisenhower in 1952. This year it gave him 87 per cent of the 1850 votes cast. This is part of the district of Rep. James C. Davis (D), pro-segregationist who conducted the House investigation of Washington, D. C., school integration this fall. Davis was re-elected with nearly 60 per cent of the total district vote, but his opponent drew the highest vote ever received by a Republican running for an office below the Presidency.

Ralph McGill, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, said:

"In the South, Republican campaign orators who spoke to Negro audiences hammered away at the claim that a vote for the Democrats was a vote for Sen. Eastland and all others like him in the Democratic Party. (Sen. James O. Eastland (D-Miss.), a strong segregationist, is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee which handles civil rights legislation.)

"This was a valid argument to the southern Negro," said McGill, "because nowhere in the southern politics was there a Democratic office-holder who had supported him (the Negro) in the segregation issue. The same argument was not nearly so valid in the East and West where Democratic office-holders had made common cause with him. The future of the Democratic Party as a national political force now seems to be inevitably bound up in this issue."

BALTIMORE CITY: In 54 predomi-

nantly Negro precincts, President Eisenhower increased his strength from a 34 per cent average in 1952 to 54 per cent. White voters showed a marked, though lesser, shift. The President piled up majorities all over the city, carrying it overall by 56 per cent. Stevenson won 51.7 per cent of the city vote four years ago. In the Senate race Negroes shifted away from Democrat George P. Mahoney toward Republican Sen. John Marshall Butler, although Mahoney won the city by a hair. All three Democratic congressmen were re-elected.

BALTIMORE COUNTY: In two typical Negro precincts in the county just outside Baltimore City, the President's vote climbed from 18 per cent in 1952 to 57 per cent. The county went Republican by a 2 to 1 margin, about the same as in 1952.

CHICAGO: A check of two largely Negro South Side wards showed a definite switch away from Adlai Stevenson, but no avalanche. The second ward gave President Eisenhower 32 per cent of its vote this year, compared with 23 per cent in 1952. The 20th ward gave him 43 per cent this time compared with 30 per cent in 1952. President Eisenhower picked up five per cent in the city as a whole and carried it by a narrow margin.

Both wards are in the Congressional district of Rep. William L. Dawson (D), longtime Chicago Negro leader. He attributed the shift to the war scare and more Republican campaign money rather than to "disenchantment" with Democrats over civil rights.

CLEVELAND: Figures received by Val J. Washington, director of minorities for the Republican National Committee, showed gains of 12 to 15 per cent in every Negro ward. In the 18th ward where he had 40.2 per cent of the vote in 1952, President Eisenhower this year drew 54 per cent and carried it by a vote of 4778 to 3975.

DETROIT: Edwin A. Lahey of the Knight newspapers reported that a check of four key Negro precincts in Detroit "showed nothing to indicate any disenchantment with the Democratic Party."

GARY, IND.: In this steel city where Republicans had carried no Negro precinct since 1936, President Eisenhower this year carried seven precincts and won

42 per cent of the Negro vote compared to 17.2 per cent in 1952, Washington said.

GREENSBORO, N. C.: The precinct with the largest Negro registration—number 5—showed the most dramatic switch. In 1952 it went for Stevenson, 222 to 179. This time it went for Eisenhower, 1038 to 530—a jump from 8 to 66 per cent for Eisenhower.

Two other Greensboro Negro precincts which had gone for Stevenson by better than 65 per cent in 1952 gave President Eisenhower a 52 per cent majority this year. Wealthier white residential areas voted Republican both years without much change. White laboring areas showed some shift toward Eisenhower this year, but less than Negro areas.

Greensboro Negroes voted Democratic for state and county offices. One local newsman guessed this meant the war scare and the President's personal popularity counted more than civil rights in their switching.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.: A typical Negro precinct in this southern Florida trading center gave President Eisenhower 11 per cent of its vote in 1952 and 50.5 per cent this year. A typical white precinct gave the President 63 per cent of its vote in 1952 and 59 per cent this time.

Duval County, which includes Jacksonville, went Republican in the presidential contest this year for the first time since 1928. Negro switches apparently were an important factor. Again, there were few Negro shifts below the presidential level. "The figures would seem to indicate not so much a trend to Republicanism among Negroes as a shift to Eisenhower," said a local observer.

KANSAS CITY, KAN.: In 17 all-Negro precincts, President Eisenhower increased his vote from 24.5 per cent in 1952 to 43.8 per cent. The *Kansas City Star* said the shift was only for President.

KANSAS CITY, MO.: Across the river in Missouri, the shift was scarcely perceptible. In one typical Negro precinct the Eisenhower vote rose from 16 to 20 per cent; in another, from 13 to 17 per cent. The *Star* attributed the Democratic strength to better organization.

LOUISVILLE: Republican National Committee figures show the President's strength among Negro voters jumped from 43 to 58 per cent in this border state

city. White voters also shifted to the President but not by so great a margin.

MEMPHIS: Thirty-eight Negro precincts in Memphis and Shelby County which cast 68 per cent of their vote for Stevenson in 1952 turned around this year to cast 54 per cent for President Eisenhower. This shift of nearly 20,000 votes in the Democratic stronghold of the late Edward H. (Boss) Crump switched the city to Republican and was nearly four times President Eisenhower's state-wide victory margin.

A typical white Memphis precinct cast a larger vote for Stevenson this year than in 1952.

George Lee, Memphis Negro leader, said the big issues among Negroes there were "Eastland, Talmadge and the White Citizens Councils." Herman Talmadge, former Georgian governor and a strong pro-segregationist, was elected to the Senate last week. The Washington school investigation also was an issue. William Gerber, chief counsel for Davis' investigation, is a Memphis attorney.

MONTGOMERY, ALA.: White and Negro voters switched to President Eisenhower for different reasons this year. As a result the "Cradle of the Confederacy" went Republican for the first time since Reconstruction days. A slate of pro-segregationist electors plus Negro switches gave the city to President Eisenhower by 1783 votes.

But while there were switches in both races, the biggest occurred among Negroes. About 2500 Negroes voted in Montgomery this year—twice as many as in 1952. Stevenson won all the Negro precincts in 1952. This year 59 per cent of their vote went to President Eisenhower.

Said Thomas J. Sellers, Jr., city editor of the *Montgomery Advertiser*:

"The Negro community has proved itself a bloc politicians must contend with here. . . . In an extremely close race, the Negroes could be the deciding factor. To what extent local politicians will attempt to woo the Negro vote to insure their election to office will indeed be an interesting thing to witness."

NASHVILLE, TENN.: In 10 Nashville Negro precincts where he won 26 per cent of the vote in 1952, President Eisenhower this year drew 52 per cent. The

city as a whole stayed Democratic by a slightly reduced margin.

Biggest Negro switches were recorded in precincts around Nashville's Negro colleges. The Nashville *Tennessean* quoted one local Negro leader as saying:

"We have seen more concrete gains in civil rights during the Eisenhower administration than in either the Roosevelt or Truman administration. Negro voters are waking up to this fact."

NEW YORK: In the 14th Assembly District, a heavily Negro section in south central Harlem, President Eisenhower took 18 per cent of the vote in 1952 and 26 per cent this year. The President won more votes than lesser Republicans on the ticket, but made little dent in the district despite endorsement by the Negro paper, the *Amsterdam News*, and the backing of Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (D) of Harlem.

The Republican National Committee said President Eisenhower made gains averaging 12.5 per cent throughout Harlem.

By contrast, a typical white area, the polyglot 10th Assembly District which Stevenson won 3 to 2 in 1952, went to President Eisenhower this year 5 to 4. Stevenson won the city again, but his margin dropped from 55.4 to 51 per cent.

NORFOLK: Three Negro districts in Norfolk gave the President 13 per cent of its vote in 1952 and a whopping 83 per cent this year. Four years ago Rep. Porter Hardy (D) carried every Negro precinct. This year Hardy lost six precincts in the city. All were largely Negro. There was relatively little switching of white votes to the President, who carried Norfolk both times.

PHILADELPHIA: Negro precincts voted about 3 to 1 for Stevenson. There were no significant defections from 1952, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* reported.

Philadelphia as a whole voted 57 per cent for Stevenson, a drop of one per cent below 1952. Negroes may have been voting for a man here, too, but he was a Democrat—former Mayor Joseph R. Clark, Jr., who was elected to the Senate. Clark wrested city control from a long-entrenched Republican organization. While Mayor he worked for equal job opportunity and set up a human rights commission.

PITTSBURGH: In two largely Negro wards, President Eisenhower's vote increased from 24 per cent in 1952 to 39 per cent. But the striking fact was that Negroes stayed away from the polls in droves. Stevenson lost heavily in Negro precincts, but the President made relatively small gains. The Democratic majority in Pittsburgh as a whole dropped from 56.1 per cent to 52.3 per cent.

RICHMOND, VA.: Some of the most sensational Negro switches showed up in the capital of Virginia, which has been the leader in the fight to block school integration.

The 18th precinct gave only 8 per cent of its votes to the President in 1952, but gave him 72 per cent this year. In six typical Negro precincts, Eisenhower's strength jumped from 16 to 74 per cent. In Richmond the switch voting carried down through a congressional race and even showed up as a vote against some innocuous constitutional amendments.

Richmond's white voters also shifted to President Eisenhower but in lesser numbers. He carried the city 3 to 2 in 1952 and by nearly 3 to 1 this time.

ST. LOUIS: Little change revealed in Negro areas or in the city as a whole. In three typical Negro districts, President Eisenhower's percentage increased from 21.1 to 24.8. Stevenson won these precincts by 21,071 to 6,950. The vote was 6,000 below the 1952 figure. St. Louis gave Stevenson 61.1 per cent of its vote this year—just a shade under his 62 per cent margin in 1952.

WASHINGTON, D. C., area: Washington residents don't vote. Two Negro precincts in the Maryland suburb of Prince Georges County gave President Eisenhower 31 per cent of their vote in 1952 and 50.7 per cent this year. White voters shifted the other way and cut the President's 1952 county margin of 10,000 votes down to 1,000 votes.

Copyright, 1956, The Washington Post Company

EDITOR'S NOTE:

This article on how Negro voters balanced on November 6, is a summary of telegraphic reports collected by the Washington Post and Times Herald from editors and correspondents in key American cities. Participating in this pooled news gathering operation were:

The Atlanta Constitution, the Chicago Daily News, the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Station WMBR in Jacksonville, Fla., the Kansas City Star, the Nashville Tennessean, the New York Herald Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Richard L. Lyons, who assembled the answers of cooperating editors and correspondents, has been a reporter on the Washington Post and Times Herald since 1947 and is assigned to Capitol Hill. During the recent campaign he covered for the Post the political speaking tours of both vice presidential candidates.

The Percentages

Following is a table showing how Negro voters in various cities switched to President Eisenhower this year. The figures compare the percentage of the total vote received by General Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956 in typical predominantly Negro voting districts. Figures were furnished by newspapers in each community except for Cleveland, Gary and Louisville. These were provided by the Republican National Committee.

City	No. of Negro Precincts checked	Percent Cast for Eisenhower	
		1952	1956
Atlanta	1	33.	87.
Baltimore	54	36.	54.
Chicago	2	26.5	37.5
Cleveland	1 ward	40.2	54.
Gary, Ind.	all	17.2	42.
Greensboro, N.C.	3	20.	59.
Jacksonville, Fla.	1	11.	50.5
Kansas City, Kan.	17	24.5	43.8
Kansas, City, Mo.	2	14.5	18.5
Louisville	all	43.	58.
Memphis	38	32.	54.
Montgomery, Ala.	all	Dem.	59.
Nashville	10	26.	52.
New York City	1 assembly dist.	18.	26.
Pittsburgh	2 wards	24.	39.
Norfolk	3	13.	83.
Richmond	6	16.	74.
St. Louis	3	21.1	24.8

Campaign Reporting

Which candidate will make the most news in the coming campaign, and which will capture most newspaper space and headlines, remains to be seen. Surely the one most favored will be the one who produces the most interesting and informative news stories. That is the single standard of judgment and choice in this paper and in many others.

* * *

The talk of equal space for both sides is nonsense. To try to run parallel columns of each side, to publish the propaganda of each side regardless of news content, would transform this newspaper and the American press generally into a dull-as-dishwater handbill.

Such fragile approaches would fail to inform the reader, would confuse and confound him and, worst of all, would be unrealistic.

An honest newspaper reports the news as it develops. It presents the results of surveys and attitudes. It publishes the reports of speeches by candidates. It uses pictures as the news warrants. It prints feature stories interpreting what happens. It offers its own editorial comments. It prints other views, perhaps critical of these editorials, in its Public Opinion column.

Thus is the market place of public opinion well-served. Thus are readers kept on top of what is new, what is interesting, what is important—and the material is presented objectively and truthfully, in a way to interest and inform, not to confuse.

How much space is devoted to all this may depend on the known appetites of readers, on the availability of material, on the availability of newsprint, on the self-established aims and goals of each paper.

—Yonkers Herald Statesman, July 6



The Foreign Correspondents

By Theodore E. Kruglak

We hear about the thousands of American correspondents abroad for events such as the Grace Kelly wedding or President Eisenhower's meeting at the Summit, and if you believe the sales promotional material of some of the agencies and syndicates you may be convinced that not a leaf can stir nor a worm turn without a hundred American newsmen on hand to gauge and report its significance.

I am not familiar with the day-to-day coverage of the international areas outside of Europe.

What I do know about European coverage convinces me that the manpower picture given to us by those in the business of selling news is largely fiction.

Before I embarked on my study of the foreign correspondents in Western Europe in 1952, I discussed the problem with many communications media people. I was warned that I was tackling a slippery object. The correspondents were scattered far and wide and to reach more than ten per cent would be an impossibility. One radio network executive told me of his 30 correspondents abroad; a news agency executive spoke of his 400 correspondents, etc., etc. In only one instance did I discover through actual nose counting that anyone had underestimated his manpower in Europe. That was the *New York Times*, which modestly omitted its London copy desk personnel on the theory that they were news processors instead of correspondents. It's interesting to note that the *Times* had more men on its London copy desk than any one American newspaper had to cover all of Europe.

When I got into the field I found a different story. The network correspondents shrank to two full-time reporters—the 400 resident and stringer correspondents shook down to considerably less.

I think you may be interested in my technique in extracting water from the bloated figures I had before leaving the States. Obviously the media people were including teletype operators, salesmen, translators, and stringers who may have filed one story a year. It seemed more realistic to check the sources and the groups dealing with correspondents for more accurate data. My first step was to obtain lists from

the foreign offices of each of the countries, then check against the lists of correspondents accredited to the USIA and the US Foreign Service offices. Wherever possible I also obtained the rosters of the foreign press associations and—in London and Paris—the membership rolls of the American Correspondent Associations. The Foreign Office lists were the least reliable. In most instances anyone who presented a letter from a local paper back home would be welcomed as a foreign correspondent. I checked this objectively after I discovered that my wife, who was armed with a letter of accreditation from the *New Canaan* (Conn.) *Advertiser*—a weekly with a circulation of 2000—started getting invitations to official cocktail parties. The USIA was the most accurate in terms of genuine working newsmen. The press officers in these offices—former news agency men for the most part—were experienced enough to weed out the tourists and students before issuing their official lists for local consumption. I think a good illustration of this was my discovery of three correspondents for one Boston newspaper in Rome. One was a student at a local art school, another ran a local advertising agency, and the third was one of those mysterious Middle European characters who did not seem to have any visible means of support. As far as I could discover, they never filed anything but merely used their accreditation letters to gain admittance to minor governmental functions.

I checked my lists in the course of conversations with correspondents and USIA officials while conducting interviews in London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, Frankfurt, Amsterdam, Brussels, Madrid, Lisbon—and my home bases of Geneva and Zurich.

In 1952 and 1953, there were 286 full-time correspondents for all the American media of communication in Western Europe. This included 169 wire service newsmen, 69 newspapermen, 34 magazine correspondents, and 14 radio and TV men.

Has there been any upward surge since that time? I cannot find any indications of it. I checked the USIA offices in all the Western European countries in May of this year. It showed no significant change.

In terms of the media represented with full-time correspondents in 1952 and 1953, the box score revealed 16 newspapers, nine magazines and three radio-TV networks, in addition to the wire services. It may be somewhat of a surprise—if not shock—to learn that newspapers we consider as leaders in the field are not doing the type of job abroad they are noted for in local and national news areas. These papers would no more think of depending exclusively up-

Professor Kruglak is the author of *The Foreign Correspondents: A Study of the Men and Women Reporting for the American Information Media in Western Europe*. A former newsman and advertising executive, he has been head of the Long Island University Journalism Department since 1947 and is now provost.

This is from a talk to the Association for Education in Journalism at Northwestern University last August.

on the syndicate or news agencies for Washington or State coverage. But they are content to use these services as their sole link with Europe. You can search in vain for permanent European correspondents for such newspapers as the *Washington Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, the *Cincinnati Star-Times*, the *Denver Post*, the *Atlanta Journal*, the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, the *Detroit Free Press*, the *Milwaukee Journal*—or that original incorporator of Press Wireless—the *San Francisco Chronicle*. There are still only 16 newspapers with correspondents in Western Europe.

In 1953 no individual radio or television station had a full-time correspondent in Western Europe. I'm still waiting for a colossus such as the Westinghouse stations, or any other locally owned station, to put a permanent correspondent overseas.

The picture in 1953 was even gloomier when you consider the geographical distribution of these foreign correspondents. Almost 92 per cent of the newspaper, magazine and radio correspondents were concentrated in four countries: England, France, Italy and Germany. In the spring of 1956, the situation had changed slightly—and for the worse. CBS had pulled its correspondents out of Vienna, the *Times* had transferred its correspondents from Belgrade to Prague. The *Times* changed its mind this summer and sent another correspondent to Belgrade. What we actually have today outside of these four countries, are the following: New York *Times*—correspondents in Vienna, Stockholm, Geneva, The Hague and Madrid; *Time*—a correspondent in Madrid; *The New Yorker*—a correspondent in Vienna. That's it in the way of individual correspondents. For the rest you depend upon the news agencies.

One of the significant findings in my study of the foreign correspondents in 1952 and 1953 was the high turnover rate. At that time I commented that there is a great waste resulting from this turnover. Some leave for better paying jobs; some are transferred to jobs in the United States as executives or Washington correspondents; some cannot adjust to European living conditions; and a few are fired for incompetence.

At that time I discovered that approximately a third of the American correspondents had been in their present posts for less than a year. The news agency proportion was the highest, 38.8 per cent. Among the *Elite*, it was 20 per cent. I was not too convinced that this was a valid figure. Perhaps I had stumbled into a period of change, perhaps with the small number of correspondents in Europe, a percentage figure was not valid.

I made a recheck this Spring on the *Elite* group of correspondents—the men and women who are bureau managers, or chief correspondents.

It is apparent that my figures were not inflated in 1952

and '53. Today, 72 per cent of the American news agency correspondents, 50 per cent of the magazine correspondents, 47 per cent of the radio correspondents, and 25 per cent of the newspaper correspondents were not in their posts in 1953.

The turnover among the non-American newspaper correspondents serving American media is not as great, but even there, the 33 per cent figure for news agency *Elite* is in line with my previous findings.

What is the reason for this turnover? I think the same reasons which applied in 1952 and 1953 are still valid.

The news agencies, with their low salaries, still provide a happy hunting ground for raiders. At least two bureau chiefs returned to the United States to work for newspapers or magazines; others were reassigned to the United States—some to do work in keeping with their foreign experience as cable desk editors. One of my prize exhibits is E. C. Daniel, who was stationed in Germany when I interviewed him, fresh from his London assignment and unfamiliar with the German language. Since 1952 he has made the rounds to Moscow, then to the *Times* foreign desk and Margaret. He at least is putting his knowledge of the foreign scene to use. But what about the *Times* London bureau head, a man fluent in many languages, a correspondent with excellent entree in Paris and London diplomatic circles, who is back in New York as assistant managing editor of *Sports Illustrated*? Or the UP London news chief, who is running a paper in Alabama?

Thus far I have been avoiding two touchy angles of foreign correspondence, the news agencies and the non-American correspondents. The latter subject is touchy because educators are apt to lean backward to avoid a charge of chauvinism. There are few non-Americans working for our newspapers, magazines or radio networks. They are concentrated in the news agencies. You recall that I mentioned that only the news agencies have full-time staffs outside of England, France, Italy and Germany. It is these areas that the non-American correspondents dominate. Approximately 82 per cent of the news agency personnel in these parts are non-Americans.

One news agency executive was quite indignant that I raised the question of non-Americans working for his agency. I was assured that a correspondent's passport should not be a criterion for judging his ability. I quite agree. But is ability the sole basis for hiring correspondents in those countries? The turnover of non-American correspondents outside the four major centers is quite low. You'll find that death or retirement accounts for most of the change.

The non-American correspondents are quite superior in education, language ability and knowledge of the country in which they reside.

My study, however, suggests that they are not up to par in knowledge of American history and politics or the

American idiom. Most of them are still convinced that American editors want sensational news.

News agencies hire these correspondents for reasons other than ability. A passport may not be a criterion for performance, but it certainly is a criterion for judging salaries and other expenses. The non-Americans are lucky to get half the pay of their American colleagues, and home leave with its added expense and nuisance is eliminated.

But this is not the basic reason for hiring non-Americans.

I do not wish to go into the infamous news cartel which more or less collapsed in 1933, but the aftermath of this experience is directly responsible for our greatest problems in Europe today.

In most of the European countries, the American news agencies are trying to carry water on both shoulders. They are gathering news for American consumption and at the same time are trying to compete with the European agencies in the sale of American news to the local press.

I think I can best express the dilemma by citing the case of one news agency reporter who was sent to Brussels to reopen the agency's office after the war. He soon discovered that news-gathering was the least of his duties. He was supposed to line up the Belgian newspapers as clients, arrange for unblocking funds, collect bad debts, and keep the editors happy with his incoming news service. When you consider that his knowledge of Flemish was non-existent, and his French the restaurant variety, you can understand his problems. I think he lasted about a year before asking for a transfer to a post where he could do the thing he was best qualified to do—report the news. Incidentally, he is now a highly paid magazine correspondent.

As you know, the foreign newspaper in most instances does not receive the news agency trunk wire. The trunk is edited and translated into the local language and then sent to the newspaper. While working on the IPI Flow of the News project, I had an opportunity to examine not only the trunks but also the national reports after being processed locally. There was quite a bit of difference in content and interpretation. Some of the changes could be defended on the basis of editorial judgment—others purely upon expediency. If we complain of the amount of crime and sensational news in the European press, it is not entirely the fault of the European newspaper editor. Nor is it the fault of the New York cable desk. Time after time we noticed the way the per cent of crime and sensational news changed between entering the bureau office and its final dispatch to the newspapers. Without being chauvinistic, I wonder whether an American sitting on the news desk in these smaller countries would play the stories the same way. It is not merely a question of sensationalism. Sometimes it's downright confusing. There's a bilingual paper in Strasbourg which receives the German and French wires of one American news agency. When it

comes to political news, you wonder whether the news agency translators had access to the same trunk.

Another aspect is the exclusive tieups with the State news agency. Some of these contracts are quite valuable, and the local news agency manager is sometimes hard put to decide where his allegiance lies. This is also true where the manager is an American. I'm thinking of Spain, for example, where one agency has an exclusive contract to supply incoming news to Spanish newspapers. How far out on a limb is the correspondent apt to go in digging into the local situation when his agency faces the loss of an important contract? Perhaps that is why the late Carmille Cianfarro of the *Times* scored beat after beat in Spain during the recent crisis.

I've not touched upon pressures. In Spain we're represented by Americans. At the worst they could be expelled. But this is not the situation in other countries. Perhaps the Dutch correspondents for the American news agencies had some nationalistic qualms when they reported the recent Queen Juliana story. But other than being cut dead by some of their stodgier colleagues, I doubt anything serious might happen.

But how free are the non-American correspondents in Lisbon, Belgrade, Helsinki, or even Austria to report news detrimental to their countries? In this respect, I think that both AP and UP were shortsighted in replacing their American staffers in Belgrade with local help last year.

In this respect I would like to quote a conversation I had with an Austrian news agency man. He recalled the Oatis case and commented bitterly that Oatis was eventually released but the non-Americans in the Prague bureau were executed or are still in prison. If Vienna turns red—and at that time there was a possibility—the non-Americans would be the scapegoats. While this possibility is remote today, I suspect that the psychology has not changed. Perhaps it is even more so in Vienna today. And there again the replacement of American bureau heads with local employees has taken place since 1953.

I suspect that this trend will continue as long as the news agencies follow their present practices.

Up to now I've painted a pretty dismal picture of our foreign correspondents. It's not really all bad.

We have some darn good correspondents abroad, men and women who are dedicated to their jobs. I would rate our newspaper correspondents top drawer without exception. If you're fortunate enough to live in a city where the New York *Times* or *Herald Tribune* circulates, or in a city where the local newspaper uses the Chicago *Daily News* or a similar service regularly, you have access to the best talent in foreign correspondence. But remember that few newspapers use more than a small fraction of the material sent by these syndicates.

I suppose there should be a summing up.

First, I am alarmed at the high turnover among the news agencies. It can be stopped by better screening before sending a man over. That requires not only a view of overseas service as an end in itself, but an examination of the candidate and his family. I would estimate that at least a third of the requests for reassignment to the States are directly attributable to the correspondent's wife. She's unhappy with the living accommodations, the food, the schools, the lack of companionship. And home looks good.

Secondly, and this again is a news agency problem, is the question of pay. My analysis of pay scales indicates that the news agency personnel are underpaid by the standards of other media. News agencies abroad just cannot keep their junior members at the present rate of pay.

And to complete the news agency angle—the business of trying to serve two masters. I cannot dwell too much on this fact. The two services must be separated, even if it means higher costs to American subscribers.

Getting back to our newspaper, magazine and radio correspondents: there's nothing wrong with the pay or the caliber of the men on the European front. My only complaint is that there aren't enough of them. Only five newspapers or syndicates and two magazines have correspondents in London, Paris, Rome, and Germany. The remaining papers or magazines depend upon one or two correspondents to cover the entire continent. Since my study in 1952, only one newspaper has opened another office—and this was offset when another newspaper closed its office in the same country.

But this is not my chief concern. I am worried about some 85 newspapers with over 100,000 circulation—and the scores of radio stations which could afford the services of foreign correspondents and do not do so.

These newspapers are prestige papers in the sense that they exercise national or regional influence in social or

political affairs. More than half of them are monopolies in the local field, nearly half of them own an important radio station, and a third own a television station in the same city.

I think these papers have a responsibility which cannot be discharged by relying upon the wire services. One way to achieve this would be the organization of correspondent pools. If the *Editor & Publisher* figures on editorial operations are correct, it would cost a newspaper in the 100,000 circulation class approximately one per cent added to its editorial budget to establish a four-man foreign correspondents staff. A pooling arrangement with four non-competing newspapers would produce a sixteen-man staff available for world coverage. This arrangement could cut across media lines where a newspaper also owned a radio or television station.

I do not think the problem of securing experienced correspondents is a barrier. I did not mention the hard core of free-lance American journalists abroad. There are enough to step into the breach without raiding the news agency ranks. And I venture to say that there are men on the home staffs of these newspapers who would volunteer for the assignment.

All this is perfectly feasible. But it requires a sincere desire upon the part of the publisher to consider Europe on a par with Washington as a news source, and to convince him that his own byliner could add not only circulation to the paper but perform a valuable service for the readers.

Just as long as the newspapers continue to think of foreign news as something to put into the paper after the local newshole is filled, we shall continue to have the burden of interpretive reporting carried by a mere sixteen papers and the news magazines.

The Supreme Court And Its Critics

By Luther Huston

The late Chief Justice Vinson once commented to me that the Supreme Court was almost *sui generis*. I got C-minus in Freshman Latin more than fifty years ago so I had to look it up.

As near as I could figure out, what Justice Vinson meant was that there was nothing like our Supreme Court anywhere else in the world. Much of our law derives from the common law of old England but our system of applying, administering and expounding our law is what Charles Evans Hughes called "distinctly American in conception and function."

I'd like to give you a few excerpts from a Britisher's appraisal of our highest Court. He is Max Freedman, the articulate and erudite Washington correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian*.

In a talk to the National Conference of Editorial Writers last spring Max said:

"The Supreme Court of the United States is the world's greatest Court. No other court can rival its range of judgment, its power of decision, its stature as a partner in government, its noble accumulation of creative precedents for the peaceful settlement of disputes in a Federal system."

I want to say a few things that may be trite about this court. I may coin a lot of cliches before I get through. But my primary purpose is to raise a voice in defense of a Court that is voiceless in its own defense. The justices speak only through their opinions. All they can do when the winds of controversy swirl around their heads is to keep still and take it.

If what I say leads some editors to come, now and then, to the defense of an institution that deserves to have the understanding and respect of every American, I shall not have bored you in vain.

What is the place of the Court in our system of government? Until one read some of the speeches in Congress and out of it, one might assume that no intelligent American was ignorant of the role of the Court. But that is by no means a safe assumption.

It should be understood, in the first place, that the Court is not the creature of Congress or the Executive Department. It was created by "we the people" in the Constitution our forefathers wrote in 1787.

Luther Huston, veteran correspondent of the New York *Times* in Washington, has covered the Supreme Court in its recent sessions. He is former national president of Sigma Delta Chi and this is from a Sigma Delta Chi address last summer at Southern Illinois University.

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," the Constitution says.

Congress may create or abolish lower courts. It cannot abolish or change the Supreme Court without an amendment to the Constitution that the people would have to approve.

The President may appoint and the Senate confirm the members of the high Court. But the President cannot remove them and Congress can do it only by impeachment. In the more than 167 years since the first justice was appointed, impeachment proceedings have been tried only once—and they failed.

In the early years of the 19th century, the great John Marshall, by the power and logic of his opinions, established the high Court as the interpreter of the Constitution and the laws. Marshall arrogated to the Court powers not specifically delegated by the Constitution.

It was a necessary thing to do, in the development of our Federal system. Without the pattern established by Marshall, Max Freedman could not have said that "one of the majestic virtues of the Supreme Court is that it can make the law a province of judicial statesmanship."

For a century and a half Congress and the people have had chances, if they wanted to, to change the pattern set by Marshall—to curb the powers he asserted as prerogatives of the Court. It is significant that in all that time no law has been passed, no constitutional amendment has been adopted to deprive the Court of its function as the interpreter of the Constitution and the laws.

In exercising that function the Court has pursued four basic principles.

First, it confines itself to the judicial duty of deciding actual cases. It gives no advisory opinions.

Second, it will not deal with questions regarded as purely political in nature. Matters presented to it have to have their basis in law, not in politics.

Third, it will not undertake to decide the Constitutional validity of legislation unless the question is presented in litigated cases. And even then it will avoid a Constitutional ruling if other grounds can be found on which to decide a case.

Fourth, it will not review questions of legislative policy. It does not question the power of Congress to legislate or the wisdom of its laws. It decides only whether in enacting a statute Congress adhered to the constitutionally defined limits of legislative power.

Justice Hughes said that the deliberate determination of the Court to confine itself to its judicial task was responsible for its success in maintaining the balance between state and nation and between individual rights as guaranteed by the Constitution and social interest as expressed in legislation.

But Mr. Hughes also said that "there have been many violent agitations over the action of the Supreme Court in determining questions of profound public interest." The Court "has had at all times the most severe critics," Mr. Hughes said.

Thomas Jefferson once charged that the judiciary was a "subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our Confederated fabric." He asserted that the courts were "construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone."

Could he have been thinking of states' rights? Have you heard anything lately of which that reminds you?

Times were turbulent in Jefferson's day. So were they in 1937 when President Roosevelt proposed his Court packing plan. It is well to remember that Congress rejected this, the most sweeping proposal put forward in a century and a half to curb the powers of the Court and make it more subservient to the Executive Branch.

Times are more turbulent now and another tempest beats upon the rock of this great and peculiarly American institution. Once more the clamor has arisen to curb the powers of the Court. Charges are hurled that the tribunal is usurping the legislative powers of Congress and trampling the rights of the states; interfering with the duties of the Executive Branch, and deciding cases on political and sociological philosophies, rather than the Constitution and the law.

Thirteen bills are pending in Congress that would set aside Court judgments, limit the tenure of justices, require a specified term of judicial experience before the appointment to the high Court, define or restrict the power of the Court to nullify state laws.

Some of those who support these proposals either have forgotten—or conveniently ignored—their own prior actions. Let's look at one little piece of the record.

James F. Byrnes, a distinguished gentleman who has served his state and the country well in great emergencies and in high places, including the Supreme Court, appears to think that the tribunal is free-wheeling along a super-highway of judicial power and it is time to "call a cop." He seems to agree with Carl Brent Swisher, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University, that the Court "stands exposed as a power group competing with

other groups wielding political power in our society."

But suppose we turn to 1941 and *Edwards v. California* (314 US 160). Earl Warren was then attorney general of California. Mr. Byrnes was an associate justice of the Supreme Court.

The case involved a Californian named Edwards who went to Texas and brought his brother-in-law back with him. The brother-in-law had been on relief in Texas and went on relief in California.

California had a law which made it a misdemeanor knowingly to bring an indigent person into the state. Although the Edwards case arose when the state was concerned over the influx of the "Okies," similar laws had been on the statute books since 1860. Some other states also had similar laws.

As far back as 1837, in *New York v. Miln*, the Supreme Court had ruled that it was "competent and necessary" for a state to "provide precautionary measures against the moral pestilence of paupers, vagabonds, and possibly convicts."

Edwards was arrested, convicted, and sentenced to six months in the county jail. He appealed and the California Supreme Court upheld the state law as a valid exercise of the state's police power.

Mr. Warren's name was on the brief when Edwards took the case to the Federal Supreme Court. He did not argue the case, however. Mr. Justice Byrnes wrote the Court's opinion.

He struck down the California law and held that *New York v. Miln* did not apply. The transportation of persons, he said, was "commerce" under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

There were boundaries to permissible areas of state legislation, Mr. Byrnes said, and "none is more certain than the prohibition against attempts on the part of any state to isolate itself from difficulties common to all of them by restraining transportation of persons and property across its borders."

Mr. Byrnes said that the California statute "was squarely in conflict" with the theory expounded by Justice Cardozo in an earlier opinion that "the peoples of the several states must sink or swim together and that in the long run prosperity and salvation are in union and not in division."

It would not require a legal magician to pull the white rabbits of racial discrimination and states' rights out of that hat. One wonders what Mr. Byrnes would have done if he had been on the bench when the school segregation cases were heard—although it is not hard to surmise that the Court's decision might not have been unanimous. One may also be entitled to wonder what Chief Justice Warren's position would be if—well, say a Mississippi law on all fours with the California statute Mr. Byrnes struck down came before the high Court today.

Supreme Court rulings are judgments of men and men are the children of their antecedents. It is not surprising, therefore, that men of one era set aside the judgments of men of another era. Times and thinking of men change—and should change.

Three judgments of men that some hold to violate the law, the Constitution, the rights of states, the prerogatives of the President and the hallowed precedents of the judiciary are currently stewing in the pot of public controversy.

One is the decision in the school segregation cases. I would find myself in controversy, I know, if I attempted much discussion of that historic ruling. My personal view, however, is that the nine justices exercised their function of interpreting the Constitution in those cases each according to his judicial conscience. If overtones of social and political philosophy happened to bulwark judicial thinking, that is a human factor, variable from age to age, that cannot be eradicated by draping a man in a black gown, any more than by electing him to Congress.

The second decision was the so-called Steve Nelson case, in which the Court ruled that Pennsylvania's sedition act had been nullified by the passage of the Smith Act. This ruling was interpreted as invalidating all state sedition laws and preempting that field for the Federal government.

The point in this ruling was that the Court discerned an intent of Congress not stated in the statute and, in fact, disavowed by the author of the bill.

No constitutional question was involved here—merely legislation. I think each member of the Supreme Court would acknowledge that if Congress passes a law restoring jurisdiction in the field of subversion to the states, the legislative right to enact the statute could not be constitutionally challenged. That would be a declaration of intent the Court could not, and would not, ignore.

Guns have been leveled by militant critics at the Court for discovering an intent Congress did not declare. Curiously enough, there has been some criticism of a subsequent ruling that was based on a Congressional declaration of intent.

That was in the so-called right to work case. The Railway Labor Act specifically stated that, all state laws to the contrary notwithstanding, railroads had the right to make union shop agreements with their employees. All the high Court did was to say that Congress had not exceeded its Constitutional powers in passing a Federal law that invalidated state statutes.

To get back to the Nelson case, the Court did not, in that decision, reach out for a chance to strike down a state law. It may have welcomed the opportunity but Pennsylvania's highest court had decided the issue. All the Federal Supreme Court did was affirm a state court ruling.

But, nonetheless, I think that this was one of the Court's mistakes. The Administration's position was that state activities in the field of prosecution for subversion did not hamper Federal operations and sometimes aided them. The Court could have reversed the Nelson conviction on the record of the trial.

In my opinion it would have been judicially correct and much wiser for the Court to have reversed the Pennsylvania ruling and avoided a needless controversy. Sometimes even a court can take in too much territory.

The third decision now under attack is the ruling in the Cole case. This was to the effect that the Government's loyalty-security program could not be applied to persons in nonsensitive jobs.

Not even the Administration has figured out exactly where this leaves the Government's employee-security program. I shall not attempt to do so.

I think, however, that the decision could be beneficial, not harmful, to the loyalty program if wise steps are taken to revamp it. I do not share the apprehensions of some that the decision may have let down the bars to widespread infiltration of Communists and subversives in government service. Even if it did, I'd bet J. Edgar Hoover could cope with the situation more competently than any Congressional Committee.

Any editor, legislator, lawyer, or just plain John Q. Citizen—or even another judge—has a right to criticize a Court ruling. Perhaps one of the most subtle criticisms I know about is attributed to Jennings Bailey, a rather blunt-spoken Federal judge in Washington.

Judge Bailey decided a case and it was appealed. When a colleague informed him that the Supreme Court had sustained his ruling, Judge Bailey grunted:

"Huh! I still think I was right."

The foundations of the Republic do not tremble when Joe McCarthy, although he will not say that Earl Warren is a Communist, asserts that there is something wrong with the Chief Justice and the Court.

It is not criticism of rulings, or of justices, that disturb me, but attacks on the Court as an institution. Those who would tear down the temples of justice would rend the whole fabric of our democratic society and destroy the very pillars upon which rests our government of laws, not men.

Our system has endured, and grown, and prospered, and protected its people for almost two centuries. "By the measuring rod of eternity," Chief Justice Warren once said, "a period of 200 years is but a grain of sand."

But where, except here, have the people preserved their freedoms as we have done? What branch of the government has done more than the Supreme Court, as the interpreter of the laws and the Constitution, to protect the rights

of the nation, preserve the rights of the states and bulwark the liberties of the people?

When suggestions are proposed that would restrict the power of the high Court to interpret the Constitution and the laws, some one is battering at the gates of a citadel of liberty. Despite recurrent agitation against rulings of the Court, Congress never has done anything to take away from the Court any part of its power to say what the Constitution means and whether laws conform to it.

I do not think it will do so now.

I am happy to take up the cudgels for a Court—an institution—that cannot defend itself.

I think editors have a duty to counteract criticism that breeds disrespect for the Court as an institution. This is a government of laws and without respect for laws and the judiciary, the fabric of our national life is weakened. Editors can perform a great service to their readers, and I think to their country, if now and then they write an editorial, or print a news story, that gives the readers an informative and honest picture of the tribunal and its work.

But to do that one has to understand the Court, its position in our scheme of government, and its historical background. Max Freedman, from whom I have quoted before, said in the same speech that "the Supreme Court is the worst reported and worst judged institution in the American system of government."

Max said he knew of only two editorial writers who had studied the Court with "sufficient scholarship and respect" to be able to pass intelligent judgment upon its actions. One was Merlo Pusey of the *Washington Post*. The other is my friend Irving Dilliard of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

So my plea to newspapermen is to study the Supreme Court and know as much about it as about Congress, or the Federal Communications Commission, or Social Security. Let us print more news of the high Court, even if you have to leave out a few political speeches. Let us make the Supreme Court, not the worst reported, but the best reported, institution in our American system.

That's my piece. But for a shirttail I'd like to recite the call of the crier when he announces a session of the Court.

Perhaps it makes more clear the main point I've been trying to make.

When the nine justices have ascended the bench in their shining temple on Capitol Hill dedicated to equal justice under law, the crier intones:

"Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! All persons having business before the honorable the Supreme Court of the United States draw near and give their attention for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this honorable Court."

It is an honorable Court and a great American institution. It is worthy of our respect and our support.

Technical Writing

By Harold K. Mintz

Technical writing is the fastest growing branch of the profession. Its rapid development was triggered by World War II, stimulated by the Korean conflict and nourished by America's postwar prosperity. Today there is probably less competition in technical writing than in any other area of the writing profession.

Job opportunities are plentiful, especially in the 6 billion-dollar electronics industry, where the term technical writing originated. The Federal Government is the biggest purchaser of electronic equipment in the world, and roughly 4 per cent of the cost of this equipment arises from instruction handbooks—technical writing. And 4 per cent of billions is big business.

Positions that pay \$5000-\$10,000 are multiplying in the automotive, chemical and aeronautical industries, in research organizations and in the Federal Civil Service. And prospects in the fast-growing nuclear power field look promising indeed.

What is technical writing? What is its importance and background and what are some of its underlying principles?

Science and engineering are the subjects of technical writing. Since most scientists and engineers do not have the time to write or do not write well, the need for technical writers becomes obvious.

Technical writing is impartial, factual, accurate, stimulating. It is designed for a specific purpose—to describe a technical device or process for engineers, management, customers, maintenance technicians, operators of complex equipment and readers of professional journals, popular magazines or newspapers.

Technical writing is also extremely flexible and appears in various forms: research reports, manuals for installation, operation and overhaul, contract proposals, parts catalogs, progress reports, news releases, instruction leaflets for some home appliances, and do-it-yourself kits.

IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL WRITING

How important is technical writing in our industrial society? Eminently well qualified to answer that question is Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of Carnegie Institution, author, educator and wartime director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This is what Dr. Bush says:

Harold K. Mintz is assistant editor, Publications Department, of the Raytheon Manufacturing Company's Laboratory, Wayland, Mass.

Had I invented a new dynamite and reaped a fortune from it, I should be inclined to establish a Nobel Prize for the interpreter of science, who can in these days often serve his fellows far more than the individual who merely adds one morsel to the accumulated factual knowledge.

In the same vein, Charles F. Kettering, retired director of General Motors Research Laboratories, says that scientific research is completed only when its results have been reported to others. Research without publication, he emphasizes, is unproductive.

BACKGROUND OF TECHNICAL WRITING

Technical writing is not a new art form; it did not spring up, full blown, in the 20th century. The first textbook on it appeared in 1908; from then to 1940 there was just a trickle of literature. From 1940 to 1950 the trickle broadened into a stream, and since 1950 the stream has developed into a river.

Technical writing of a classic stature dates back to the 1st century A. D. to a Roman author, Vitruvius, who produced a ten-volume work on city planning and architecture. About the same era, Frontinus, a water commissioner of Rome, wrote a celebrated report on the aqueducts of the Eternal City. In the 16th century, Georg Agricola (born Georg Bauer), a German physician and scientist and the father of mineralogy, authored his masterpiece, *De re metallica*. Some 350 years later, it was translated into English by an American mining engineer (and his wife), who later became President of the United States, Herbert Hoover.

From the days of Rome to the 19th century, science progressed slowly and writers kept pace with it. However, since 1900, science has marched forward in seven-league boots, pushing back undreamed of frontiers of knowledge. Information has accumulated at a rate far outdistancing our ability to publish, distribute and assimilate. This unbalanced condition drives home with sledgehammer force the crying need today for interpreters of science and technology—in short, technical writers.

In the past centuries, engineers and scientists were the elite, the few highly educated people of their times. They worked alone or in small groups, in sharp contrast to the current practice. Engineers and scientists today pool their specialized knowledge and pull together as members of project teams in research, development, design and production. Their success hinges on two factors: technical proficiency and skill in communicating ideas with one another and with the outside world.

Before World War II, technical writing did not exist as a recognized profession and few companies employed

full-time technical writers. Engineers and scientists did their own writing of reports, very often their second most important duty. But when war came, the pressure of accelerated industrial research and production programs forced scientists to relinquish most of their writing activities to specialists. The Armed Forces needed mountains of equipment and instruction manuals. How else could soldiers and sailors operate and maintain tanks, planes and battleships at peak performance?

When the war ended, an increasingly wide segment of industry realized the importance and value of technical writing. More and more companies began to employ writers, more books and articles started to appear, and more colleges began to give courses in engineering writing.

AGENCIES PROMOTING TECHNICAL WRITING

One of the more aggressive agencies in advancing the profession of technical writing is the Society of Technical Writers, founded in Boston (a beehive of electronics) in 1953. The society now consists of 14 chapters throughout the United States and represents over 450 members in this country, Canada, South America and Europe.

The Society of Technical Writers defines a technical writer as one who:

- "A. as his principal function
 - (1) secures, organizes, and presents scientific or engineering information; or
 - (2) edits, reorganizes, and rewrites such information; or
- "B. (1) teaches the principles and practices of technical writing, and
- (2) has had practical experience in technical writing or editing."

The society, which issues a quarterly entitled *Technical Writing Review*, was organized to promote four objectives:

1. Developing and establishing standards. A project is now underway that will result in a glossary of terms and abbreviations common to the technical writing profession.
2. Stimulating an exchange of information in technical writing and allied fields such as technical publishing and illustrating.
3. Encouraging the development of technical writers.
4. Acquainting others with the profession.

Other agencies aiding the cause of technical writing are: the National Association of Science Writers, and the Society of Technical Writers and Editors (both in New York City); Science Service and American Documentation Institute (both in Washington, D. C.); and the Technical Publishing Society in Los Angeles.

Many colleges and universities offer courses in technical writing, including the United States Military and Naval Academies. However, the school that has captured all honors is Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. R. P. I. offers a one-year graduate program, available also in the evening division, leading to a degree of master of science in technical writing. To be eligible for this program, students must hold degrees in science or engineering, and once enrolled, must continue with science studies. A plan is now being drawn up for giving parts of this graduate course, under short-term periods, to industrial writers.

Since June, 1953, Rensselaer has sponsored a Technical Writers' Institute that includes lectures, discussions, writing exercises and personal consultations with authorities. This annual one-week conference is open to representatives of industry and government.

In addition to the stimulus afforded by colleges and societies, the technical writing profession is also benefiting from a new phenomenon mushrooming on the business horizon—technical writing organizations. There are about 100 such firms in the country with a business volume estimated at around \$75 million. New York City alone has about 40 such agencies and one of them employs more than 1000 people.

Many manufacturers of complicated apparatus prefer to hire such agencies on a part-time basis rather than try to train their own full-time writers. This condition prevails, especially if the writing must conform to government specifications, a painstaking task.

Handbooks written to the specifications of the Armed Forces must be engineered as precisely as the equipment they explain. Because so much skilled effort goes into those manuals, it is estimated they cost more than \$100 a page before printing.

Advertising agencies, of course, grind out reams of technical copy, but it differs in one major respect—it aims to sell, not to inform. Nevertheless, much of their writing ranks high in content and style, and deserves study.

QUALIFICATIONS OF A TECHNICAL WRITER

1. If you write for a living and monthly bills plague you, technical writing may be the answer. It provides you with a regular income and with research experience, both of which help smooth the way for your part-time creative writing projects.

Should you decide to become a technical writer (also known as engineering writer, specifications writer or publications engineer), you will need five major qualifications. The first of these is a general knowledge of science, particularly physics, mathematics and chemistry, since one or the other enters all science news today. If you are familiar with a branch of engineering, your horizons will be that much broader and deeper.

2. Besides this general background, you will have to specialize. For example, if physics is your field, you should decide on what area in the physical world you will devote yourself to—nuclear power applications, electronics, electricity, mechanics, heat, light or sound. Any one of those sub-groups will occupy you for a lifetime of study.

3. However, knowledge by itself is not enough; it must be backed up by acute observation, thorough analysis, mature judgment. You should be able to evaluate what a scientist tells you or what he does in a laboratory or plant. You need not be able to perform experiments or other techniques of the scientist, but asking intelligent questions about them and understanding the answers—those tasks are yours.

Practical experience as an engineer, technician or even as a hobbyist sharpens your ability to analyze and sift data. You should not accept as gospel all statements of scientists; they make mistakes too and your experience helps you detect them.

4. The next trait of a technical writer—understanding of the reader—is one of the obstacles that trips up scientists when they take pen in hand. Jargon is their technical language and they tend to think that everybody understands it. Scientists usually write as they speak—technically, leaving the readers on their own to mine the ore. And very few readers have the capability or inclination to do so.

In order to hold your readers, you should put yourself in their place. Remember, they are always asking—how? why? what? An old axiom points the way: Never underestimate your readers' intelligence or overestimate their knowledge.

If you tend to say "conflagration" for "fire," "prognostication" for "prediction," or "illumination" for "light," then you should burn into your mind a few astonishing statistics from the Department of Defense. Do you know that 45 per cent of enlisted military personnel now in the Armed Forces have not graduated from high school? And that only about 3½ per cent have graduated from college? These statistics probably typify our entire population, which brings us to the final major requirement of a technical writer:

5. Writing ability. You may be blessed with an abundance of the other qualifications; but if you lack the art of writing simply and clearly, you had better learn it.

TECHNICAL EDITOR

The technical editor, usually an experienced technical writer, supervises the writing activities of many people in many departments of an organization. He knows how to work with scientific personnel and how to direct photographers, illustrators, typists and printers in producing a finished book. His value to the company depends largely on how fast he grasps the overall technical picture.

In addition, an editor should be somewhat versed in copy

layout, printing processes, photography, art, copyright law, trade organs in his industry and government "specs" (if his company sells to the government). Above all, a successful editor must be a diplomat, for in rewriting and checking accuracy and English usage, three of his chief functions, he may be treading on someone's toes. And the poorest writers are often the most sensitive and belligerent about their literary aptitude.

There are, of course, other minor skills that editors and writers would do well to cultivate. A flair for the spoken word proves an asset in interviewing, conferences, perhaps an occasional speech, and also for tape-recording of technical data—a distinct possibility in the near future. A well-rounded editor and writer should be able to check advertising copy and contribute ideas to it, to snap a photograph, to sketch passably well.

Opportunities for technical editors are not nearly so legion as for technical writers but they are increasing, especially in large industrials.

GUIDEPOSTS IN TECHNICAL WRITING

Basically, the principles of good technical writing parallel the principles of any other form of good writing. Yet there are some techniques worth mentioning:

1. Before starting to write, you should gather your information, study equipment and processes, form an outline with heads and subheads, and plan illustrations. These steps will consume at least half your time but they will minimize your rewriting task, save you much waste motion and help get you off to a running start—a traditional stumbling block.

2. Brevity is highly desirable and hard to achieve, but don't attain it at the expense of clarity. Because technical writing is so often packed with intricate ideas, physics formulas and calculus equations, clarity of expression assumes crucial importance, almost on a par with accuracy.

To insure reader understanding, use diagrams and charts, tables and photographs freely. Such visual aids should be captioned and numbered, placed in the text where they are most pertinent and specifically mentioned in the text. Other means of needling your readers' attention are the "you" approach and news-peg tie-ins.

3. Words are the essential tool in writing and the way you use them can make or break you. To paint word-pictures, it is better to use two-syllable words (Anglo-Saxon preferred) than five-syllable words, plain words than technical ones, concrete words than abstract ones. Try to avoid weak, colorless verbs and use adjectives and adverbs sparingly for they don't carry weight in technical writing.

Science is constantly enlarging its vocabulary, largely

from Latin and Greek. And nothing causes more grief for readers than strange-looking words they don't understand. But how many writers commit that blunder! They forget that as writers, they are primarily teachers and the aim of teaching is to inform, not to befog.

4. When introducing a scientific term, you should define it immediately. For example: When an electron, a very tiny particle of negative electricity, strikes a . . .

On the other hand, a physicist may explain a calorie as "the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of one gram of water one degree centigrade." Such a description would leave your readers cold. It would be much more compelling to say: "A man digging ditches burns 160 calories an hour, or a pat of butter equals 100 calories." By explaining the unknown in terms of the known, your message breaks through the knowledge barrier.

However, it is easy to overwork definitions and to clutter up an article with them. Too many definitions bog down the reader and cause his interest to lag.

5. Another difficulty may arise in dramatizing scientific achievements. If you write, for instance, that the latest jet plane streaks through space at Mach II, many of your readers will be unimpressed. You therefore point out that Mach II is twice the speed of sound and the speed of sound is about 740 miles an hour. But you don't stop there. You explain to your readers that when they zip along at 60—breaking the law, naturally—they cover one mile while the jet sweeps through 24 miles!

6. As you remember, your sole purpose as a technical writer is to describe a technical device or process for your particular class of readers. To produce a live readable report, you should get as close to your project as possible, even if you only tighten nuts and bolts. It's this "in-the-field" and "on-the-spot" coverage—not shuffling papers in an ivory tower—that will best equip you with an understanding of the practical aspects and theory of the whole picture.

If you have a general science background and a science specialty, keen powers of analysis and judgment, understanding of your readers and a knack for clear, concise writing—there are challenging and well-paying positions for you in technical writing.

As a technical writer your key objective is not to record facts on paper; it is to slant the right information to the right people at the right time in such a way that they can grasp it with the least difficulty.

An old adage buttons up the introduction, body and conclusion in a neat package: Tell your readers what you're going to tell them, then tell them and finally tell them what you've told them.

American Scene—from Down Under

BY
**DESMOND
STONE**

**1955-56 Associate
Nieman Fellow
from New Zealand**

Although its distinctive features stand out as boldly as Jimmy Durante's "schnozzle," it is scarcely true any more to talk of the uniqueness of the American way of life. Differences of kind have in many cases become differences of degree. The New Zealander, for instance, walks abroad in the United States today with probably less strangeness than ever before. His sense of community is strong—much stronger than he has been led to believe.

Obsessed with the trivialities of life and with the sensational, the unusual and the untypical, American magazines, films and news reports have told him more than he wants to know about murder, divorce, graft, corruption, wealth, and, of course, Marilyn Monroe.

They have, in short, given him a picture of a way of life that simply does not exist for the ordinary citizen.

They have braced him for a shock he never really feels. Once he has ceased to marvel at self-sealing envelopes, doors that fly open at a footfall, machines that pour three kinds of coffee and all the hundred and one more gadgets that make America the world's happiest hunting ground for inventors, the New Zealander finds himself leading a life fundamentally the same as his own.

Its rhythm is different and it often assumes different forms, but it is basically alike in its purpose, its exactions, and its rewards. The people are much less alien than he had imagined and he mixes among them with little embarrassment.

It would be absurd to pretend that differences do not abound. No New Zealander feels very comfortable peering into the depths of the Grand Canyon, standing in the middle of the Great Plains, or sitting on a cactus in the Arizona desert. He misses the sea and the sheep, even the gorse.

And he can point to any number of characteristics that distinguish Americans from New Zealanders.

The American man, for example, is at once more gregarious, more dynamic, more rootless and restless than the New Zealander. He is more tolerant of fraud and political patronage, more often given to violent action, bolder in his vision, more

acquisitive, more optimistic and more often dominated by his wife and brow-beaten by his children.

Ballyhooed Female Can't Bake a Cake

As many points of contrast can be found in the character of the American woman, perhaps the world's most ballyhooed female (contrary to the evidence of the pinups, she only occasionally has the figure of a sylph, though she tends to be more conscious of calories).

By and large, she is much less competent in the home than the New Zealand wife, though less frenzied in her pursuit of dirt.

She is, on the whole, less feminine, more interested in men as moneymakers than as males, more ambitious for her husband, more capable in business, more interested in the world outside, and, as a result of the arrival of cake mixes and other prepared foods, a much inferior baker.

Thus, although they can make more common cause than ever before, Americans and New Zealanders remain two quite distinct peoples. Nor it is necessary to look far for differences in their ways of life.

A home of their own, for instance, is less important and less central to an American couple, and much more of their living and eating is done outside its four walls. No contrast is greater than in the pace of life.

Americans are attuned to a faster living; they face more stresses and strains in a fiercely competitive society; they tend to work harder for their wages; and as a result of all this perhaps they relax less often and die earlier.

Because he more often lives in a crowded city that has grown up too fast, the

average American spends less time in his garden, if he has one, and travels further to his work.

But inhabiting a continent as he does, his conception of distance is different, and he thinks nothing of travelling four hundred miles at a week-end, or of going fifty miles to see a film.

Consumer's Paradise

All these things continue to place the United States apart. And the list could be extended indefinitely. With its state of full employment and its dedication to unionised labour, New Zealand might be described as a paradise for the worker.

America, by comparison, is a paradise for the consumer, a country where the customer receives every conceivable service, and where competition is as keen as the edge of a whetted knife.

The United States can boast a lot more small conveniences than New Zealand. But it is also a country of extremes and inequalities.

New Zealand today can reasonably claim to be one of the most equalitarian societies in the world, a country devoted to equal sharing of wealth and opportunity.

Even in the United States, traditionally the land of unfettered individualism, the economic security of the individual is becoming more and more the concern of the Federal Government.

But there is still nothing like the equality that exists in New Zealand. The United States has many more millionaires and more poor as well. Partly because the Federal Administration makes a comparatively small contribution to costs, educational standards fluctuate wildly.

In a comparatively poor state such as Mississippi, only 126 dollars are spent annually on each pupil; in New York State, expenditure a pupil rises as high as 472 dollars. Extremes such as these run right through American life, applying alike to climate, behaviour, and standards of living.

Little Want

Materially, the American people want for very little. After fifteen years of almost unbroken prosperity, the great ma-

jority of them live extremely well. Cars, washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, deep freezes, and cake mixers are all standard equipment and they make life more convenient than it is in New Zealand.

It can be argued, of course, that the American economy is to a large extent based on waste. The depreciation on new cars is absurdly high (as much as 300 to 400 dollars a year), and the pressure on people to buy a new model each year is strong and insidious.

Housewives spend lavishly buying food they once used to prepare themselves. And to give one more example of waste, paper tissues and paper towels are fast displacing linen handkerchiefs and cotton towels.

But while most Americans today enjoy what is unquestionably the highest standard of living in the world, there is still a minority living in conditions far worse than anything existing in New Zealand.

There are still many scores of thousands of America homes without running hot and cold water or adequate toilet facilities. It is inequalities like these that provide the sharpest contrasts between the United States and New Zealand.

These differences in conditions and outlooks should not be allowed to obscure the larger likeness of Americans and New Zealanders and of the life they lead.

Urbanites All

Among the things the New Zealander misses most in the United States is the unconfined space of the outdoors. Wherever he is in his own country, he has mountains, the rivers, the fields, and the beaches at his elbow.

Because some 65 per cent of the population are urban dwellers (and, more to the point, in many cases residents of big cities), the average American lives in a much more crowded and confined existence than the map would suggest.

The wide open spaces are still there. But before the American can get out into the country he has to thread through miles and miles of built-up areas and heavy traffic.

In cities like New York, Chicago, Boston, or Philadelphia, it is for all the world trying to burst the sound barrier.

A New Zealand war bride in Connecticut

has no doubt at all that America is a matriarchal society where men dance attendance on their wives, extending those little courtesies that won them so much favour in New Zealand.

Said one New Zealand woman bluntly:

"Women run the house, the pocket book, the children, and their husbands. I think they wear the pants in this country . . . American husbands and fathers have a great sense of responsibility to their families.

"Most of them are not only happy to work forty-four hours a week for their pay cheque, but they will also take on an extra job if it means more luxuries for their wives and children. And even after holding down two jobs, they work around the house, fixing the plumbing, even to building additional rooms if their families increase.

"They help their wives with the housework and the kids. They are slightly henpecked and very proud fathers.

"They put their wives on pedestals and there they stay, even when they get to be grandmothers. The wives and mothers on the whole are spoilt and pampered."

Education in the United States is such a complex subject, with so much variation in standards from State to State and county to county, that it is impossible to draw sweeping conclusions.

But two war brides are impressed with the primary school system, liking the way the schools encourage a parent-teacher understanding.

"They encourage you to visit school regularly and to observe your child at work. There is also in most schools a very well-organized cafeteria where the children can have a hot dinner."

One of the Connecticut brides is equally appreciative. "I think parents get to know what their children think and learn and are capable of. They come to understand their children better."

Children Spoiled But —

This leads on naturally to a feature of family life that impresses all visitors to America.

It is a notorious fact, of course, that American children are precocious and spoilt, but this is not the only side to the story.

It is also a fact in many homes that an unusually close comradeship exists between parents and children.

American parents have the happy knack of being young with their children and of treating them as equals.

"The rule in my home in New Zealand," recalls one bride, "was that children should be seen and not heard. We had our family gatherings and such; but I think children here have much more of a sense of belonging and love and security—perhaps because they have greater opportunity to express their views on what they do and do not want to do."

Aspect That Dismays

One aspect of American life that dismays nearly all New Zealanders is the comparative absence of medical and sickness benefits.

It is true that social security in the United States today is expanding and seems likely to keep on expanding, but the average American enjoys nothing like the degree of protection extended to New Zealanders.

Private insurance schemes do not go nearly far enough and illness in the family is the number one fear of many American households.

One war bride probably speaks for many when she says: "I think my biggest problem, as is that of my neighbours, is trying to keep up with the cost of doctors, drugs, hospitals, and dentists.

"Even though most families have a medical and hospital insurance plan that costs about 120 dollars, it is not enough. I think the system they have in New Zealand is better by far.

"Here the average person hesitates to call a doctor because of the cost."

The strongest single impression a visitor receives from the United States these days is of a general consolidation, of a slow settling down into maturity, of a steady movement away from the forces of turbulence.

Many of those things which have most sharply distinguished the United States from New Zealand in the past are losing their edge—such factors for example as the lawlessness of the people, faith in a laissez-faire economy where only the fittest survive, racial discrimination, rejection of State control and of social security, and the persistence of sharp extremes of income.

Some people may debate the decline in lawlessness. And it would be hard to find figures showing that crime in the United States is on the wane. But statistics here are unreliable, for they do not take into account the variations in the method of collection, improved means of crime detection, and so on.

The important thing to remember is that the days of gang warfare and of mob violence belong to the past. Although the police still wear firearms, and although there is still nothing like the orderliness of behaviour that is to be found in New Zealand, the American citizen today does not resort nearly as readily to violence.

As the roaring days of the frontier recede into the past, the people tend to take the law less and less into their own hands.

Taxes Level U. S.

In few places in the world today is income as evenly distributed as it is in New Zealand. To the extent that skill is not always adequately rewarded, it can be argued that this is not altogether a good thing.

Yet New Zealand's homespun philosophy of a fair share for all has spared its workers many of the miseries that labour in the United States has had to endure.

And yet the inequalities associated with America's competitive economy are not nearly as glaring today.

There are still big variations in income, not only between North and South, but between industry and industry. But the graduated income tax has had a big leveling influence; millionaires are becoming poorer and the poor becoming richer.

Colour Bar

Racial discrimination provides another instance of the changes taking place in American life.

Basking in their own happy relations with the Maori, New Zealanders have always tended to feel complacent when they have read reports of lynchings and riots in the United States.

They have not always made enough allowance for the sheer pressure of numbers and for the Negro's deep embedment in the social and economic consciousness of the South.

They have been right, of course, in maintaining that discriminations

negate the freedoms for which the United States stands. And no one who visits the South today and talks with the people can seriously doubt that the situation is improving.

Reaction to the Supreme Court's desegregation decision has been stormy in the South, but the essential thing to remember here is that such a decision could not even have been contemplated in the past.

The American Negro is still a problem. But for the first time in American history the problem today is national rather than regional.

New York now has more Negroes than such States as Florida, Tennessee, or Arkansas, and New Jersey has a larger Negro population than Kentucky.

This thinning of Negro numbers is doing much to encourage toleration in the South and to integrate the South politically with the North.

Racial relations are too complex to permit an early end to tension. But progress through friction is infinitely to be preferred to no progress at all.

Australasians? Who?

"So you come from New Zealand," mused the old lady. "Well you know, I've always had the greatest admiration for Winston Churchill."

For any New Zealander who takes himself and his country seriously, it is chastening to discover how little Americans know about the Southwest Pacific.

It is not uncommon even today to run across Americans who put New Zealand somewhere up near Greenland, or who want to know how long it has taken you to motor across.

In a year's study of Boston's half a dozen newspapers, I saw only six or seven references to New Zealand. Most of them were stories giving the impression that New Zealand is some kind of strange zoological freak.

One story, for example, was devoted to the arrival in New York of two tuataras, another concerned Harvey the pet trout, and yet another Opo the gay dolphin.

Ignorance of New Zealand and the Pacific generally is not as profound as it once was. War took many American servicemen to New Zealand and Australia and the post-war defense pacts have made others better informed.

So knowledge of New Zealand is spread a little wider. But only a little.

It could be said that, whereas before the war only 10 per cent of Americans knew anything at all about New Zealand, today the percentage may be 15. Here and there one finds areas of enlightenment.

Some New England families have links with the sealers and whalers of early days, and at Harvard University it is possible to meet people who know and admire the short stories of Katherine Mansfield, though sometimes without identifying her as a New Zealander.

It is also a sign of rising interest in the Pacific that Harvard University this year introduced for the first time in its history a course on Australian and New Zealand history. Admittedly only eighteen students enrolled for the lectures, but the number is likely to increase (and at least the numbers were better than in the case of Canadian history).

Some idea of the difficulties that face New Zealand in maintaining a separate identity in the eyes of the world can be gathered from the title of the new Harvard course—Australasian History. Knowing something of New Zealand's sensitiveness on this point, I was not surprised when a letter arrived at Harvard from our Embassy, pointing out that New Zealand was part neither of Australia nor of Asia and suggesting that perhaps a more accurate title could be found.

Nearly all Americans, of course, assume that New Zealand is only a hop and skip from Australia.

They think the two Dominions are near enough to be connected by the Sydney bridge, and nothing surprises them more than to learn that 1300 miles of stormy ocean lies between.

Understandably, New Zealanders resent being dismissed as Australasians. But they might be fighting a losing battle.

Time and again during my year in America I was forced onto the defensive in explaining where I came from. Unless I identified New Zealand in geographical relation to Australia, I was simply wasting my breath.

Dangerous Apathy

For this, American newspapers must accept part of the blame. With the outstanding exception of such papers as the

New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and so on, foreign news occupies a very small part of the daily columns. I believe the national average is something less than half a column a day.

This would not be such a serious matter if the United States did not have so high a responsibility today to the Western world. As the most powerful nation on earth and unquestioned leader of the democracies, the United States is in a position to affect the destinies of us all. Upon its actions may depend our very survival.

The people of the United States in general are not nearly as conscious as they should be of the role that has been thrust upon them. There is a dangerous apathy in their attitude to the world outside.

The Anonymous American

It is impossible to explain to any American how the people of New Zealand can have so much State control and yet retain so large a measure of sturdy independence. He cannot conceive how any people could allow a government to minister to its every want without sacrificing all that is worth while in life.

And many New Zealanders themselves will agree that the search for security has been accompanied by a loss of enterprise and initiative.

But even if the point is conceded, it has not been a disabling loss. In spite of the Welfare State and the inevitable growth of the bureaucracy, New Zealanders have by no means surrendered their capacity to act independently and to think for themselves.

The uniformity of life has not led to the demise of the individual.

And one of the key factors here remains the smallness of country and population. In a nation of only 2,000,000 people, electors and political representatives stay close to each other.

The intimate relationship that exists between government and governed is one of the strengths of democracy in New Zealand. The people see the Government as an extension of themselves and they feel secure from the abuse of power.

It is far different in the United States, where the population has already reached

166,000,000. There, the Federal Government is much more remote from the people and the gap is likely to increase as the structure of government grows higher.

As the Republicans have discovered, it is not an easy process to curtail.

With the cost and complexity of government increasing all the time, with the Federal Administration accepting more and more foreign responsibilities, with the range of Social Security being slowly extended, the trend is inevitably towards the enlargement of power at the centre and the diminishment of the functions of the States.

More and more controls and regulations are being imposed upon the American people and the consequent decline of individualism may have more serious results for the United States than it has so far had for New Zealand.

The enormous size of the population, for instance, sets up pressures that have no real counterpart in this country. And it is not only the size, but the distribution of the population that causes tensions.

It is impossible to walk along the streets of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles or Boston without realising that the American citizen is being marched faster towards anonymity than the people of most countries.

Although the influence of the State is nowhere as pervasive in the United States as it is in New Zealand, the pressures of a highly-industrialized and increasingly urban population are a greater threat to the freedom of the individual than is true of this country.

And the forces that make for conformity and standardisation have been strengthened by nothing so much as the devouring growth of mass communications.

Mass Influence

The influence of the press, of mass-beamed television, of radio, and of mass-produced books and magazines has been decisive in producing the atmosphere of intellectual conformity that had its most serious outgrowth in the rise of McCarthyism.

Today, the hysteria has died down and Communism is no longer a word with paralysing connotations. But has the lesson been learnt?

It is discouraging to meet Americans who look back upon the worst days of McCarthyism and see the drama and little of the evil.

The factors that make for tyranny of centralization, for the restriction of individual freedom and for the growth of conformity have not yet undergone any fundamental change.

No one who has felt the surge of American life and who knows how powerful is the people's sense of right and wrong will underestimate the nation's capacity for finding a way out of its dilemma.

For the moment, they are confused and bewildered, unsure as they have never been before, all of them "liking Ike" and yet too seldom being lifted to a clear vision of the tasks that wait them in the world community.

The need is clear and urgent.

Democratic world leadership must become a faith for America as well as a fact. With opportunity narrowing in their own country and with individualism declining, the American people need to be lifted to new endeavour within the world community.

The political parties hold the key in their own hands.

When they decide to stop subordinating the needs of foreign policy to domestic policy, they will not find the nation lacking in response.

The American people need only the right leadership to be stirred to a new sense of destiny.

An Old Flaw

One of the most tragic of the post-war dilemmas has been that of colonialism. Caught between the need to support the colonial powers in the Atlantic Alliance and the desire to oppose colonialism in Asia, the American nation has not known which way to turn.

And this has been only one factor in the situation.

It is an old flaw in his character that the American has always expected quick and dramatic decisions. And this tendency to demand easy, total solutions in a world situation that cries aloud for patience and understanding, to say nothing of infinite guile, helps neither America nor the West.

The flaw could be corrected easily

enough if the American people were genuinely and vitally concerned with the fate of the world community.

It remains perfectly true that the old isolationism has gone. But there has not been a total rejection.

The American people have not immersed themselves in the affairs of the world in the way that the responsibilities of leadership demand. Foreign policy remains at the periphery, not at the centre.

Political Absurdities

For this, the people themselves should not be blamed too harshly. They have not had the kind of imaginative leadership they need.

Part of the fault belongs with the political parties and their absurdly unreal preoccupation with domestic affairs.

Except in situations of obvious crisis, Republicans and Democrats persist in concentrating their political energies on national issues on which there is no longer any real disagreement.

One would imagine, listening to the hubbub of voices crying socialism, that the battle for the Welfare State has still to be fought in America.

In fact, it was decided long ago—as long ago as the New Deal.

No one seriously disagrees today that it is the task of the Federal Government to assure each member of society a minimum of economic security and to promote the fullest possible employment. Nor is it denied that the Administration must be equipped with the powers to perform these tasks.

The critical new questions of world leadership and survival lie dangerously neglected.

An alert and enlightened public opinion might demand that the political parties focus their attention where it belongs. But before this could happen many more Americans would have to become politically educated.

Voter Indifference

It is distressing to a visitor to discover how ignorant are the American people

of the functions of their own democracy. Nothing so surprises a New Zealander as the low percentage of voters who go to the polls.

Whereas in New Zealand more than 90 per cent of electors vote in the three-yearly general election, only 65 per cent of electors record their votes in the United States presidential election.

In the off-year Congressional elections, the percentage drops to 40 and in local body elections the figure is sometimes as low as 10 per cent.

The record has been improved gradually over the years, but as long as so many people remain indifferent to their own political processes they are unlikely to take a close and intelligent interest in the nations of Europe and Asia.

It should surprise no one to learn that 23 per cent of Americans cannot correctly point out on a map any of the following eight European countries—Austria, Bulgaria, England, France, Poland, Rumania, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

The problem of political education in the United States is a serious one and it has not been made easier by the arrival of "big" government, for the greater the aggregation of powers the greater the separation of the central administration and the citizen.

It was suggested earlier in this series that the United States is moving closer to the path New Zealand has been travelling for some years—and one can point specifically to the tremendous extension of Federal Government controls, the growth of social security, the acceptance of a policy of full employment, the narrowing gap between rich and poor, the change in emphasis from liberty to equality and so on.

Rank Individualists

Possibly the most important of the changes in American life is to be found in the relations between the people and the Federal Government. Throughout his history, the American has been an indi-

vidualist of the rankest kind, insisting on his right to live his own life in his own way.

It was an old tradition of the frontier to reject Government intervention, and ever since the American has prized his independence above almost everything else. But this heritage of individualism is fast slipping away from him.

The process began with the passing of the frontier and it was accelerated by the rise of the city, the mushrooming growth of industry, and the growing complexity of the business of the Federal Government.

The powers the Administration took to itself in the war extended these central controls and today they are being rapidly multiplied as the Government accepts more and more responsibility for public health, scientific research, and so on.

Even in the much despised field of social security, the American is far more dependent upon Government aid than he is prepared to admit.

Business men keep crying "creeping socialism" without realising how far it has crept over the years.

Nothing could be more foreign, for example, to the old laissez faire economy than price supports for farmers. Yet the principle of a guaranteed income for the farmer is now accepted by nearly all sections of the community.

In all these respects, then, society in America is changing, and changing in a manner that is reducing the gap between the American and the New Zealand way of life.

The New Zealander who visits the United States today feels himself less of a stranger than he has ever done before.

Desmond Stone is literary editor of the *Southland Times*, Invercargill, New Zealand. This is a condensation of half a dozen articles, syndicated in New Zealand papers, of his American impressions while an Associate Nieman Fellow last year.

The Loma Tribe Is In The Know "If The Rumor Is True It Is In The Paper"

The Story of Liberia's Only Non-English Paper

By James W. Carty Jr.

A visitor to Wozi, Liberia, West Africa, brought a rumor that all 60 houses in the nearby community of Masawu had burned.

Dr. Wesley Sadler dispatched a runner on the five-hour-and-a-half, 18-mile trip from Wozi to Masawu. The runner found that only 12 houses had burned.

He reported the facts back to Dr. Sadler, noted missionary-linguist, who printed them in the *Loma Weekly*, only non-English paper in Liberia.

"People in our village had relatives in Masawu," Dr. Sadler said recently in an interview. "While they were sad at the tragedy, they were relieved that the whole village was not wiped out."

"Our weekly newspaper is valuable for spiking untrue rumors and spreading the truth.

"People also are learning to distinguish between rumor and fact. When a certain story is not printed in the paper, they reason that it is probably a rumor."

Dr. Sadler visited the Firestone rubber plantation company, which is about 35 miles southeast of Monrovia, capital city. Two employees came up to tell Dr. Sadler they heard the rumor that lightning had struck and destroyed the village of Zorzor, big government and mission center.

But since they had not seen anything about the incident in the *Loma Weekly*, they did not believe the rumor to be true. Dr. Sadler confirmed their suspicions—that there was nothing to the story.

Wozi is the headquarters of the linguistics and missionary work of Dr. Sadler, church-literacy-literature worker of the United Lutheran Church of America. Wozi also is the headquarters of his weekly paper.

Wozi is a village of 100 houses, surrounded by high forests in the interior of Africa's only republic. This community is about 150 miles northeast of Monrovia.

The newspaper, published in the Loma language of the tribe of that name, is the only non-English newspaper in a nation of 26 language groups and 23 tribes.

"It is an experimental project which heralds the opening of a whole new aspect of communications in Africa—the community newspaper," Dr. Sadler said.

"The weekly helps tie the people to the rest of the country. The paper goes to 32 Loma villages and also to other coastal and interior communities."

The paper comes out on Friday. In three issues a month, it contains one large page, mimeographed on both sides, and on the fourth week, the paper has four pages.

Plans are in 1957 to have at least four pages each issue. Miss Margaret Miller, Liberian missionary now in the United States on a furlough, will edit the paper starting in the summer of '57, when the Sadlers return to the United States on their next furlough.

Eventually, Dr. Sadler envisions the acquisition of a small printing press on which to publish the paper.

Liberia has Africa's only indigenous democracy—where occasionally a woman is elected to a chieftainship. This country with Abyssinia and Egypt form the continent's only sovereign states; and Liberia and Haiti are the only two Negro republics in the world.

"In a democracy, the communications of the community newspaper valuably gives people facts and features on which to form intelligent opinions and decisions. The village publication is a real asset to the unity of a country," Dr. Sadler said.

"Our weekly paper keeps people abreast of the news in Loma land and elsewhere in the world."

Dr. Sadler's normal contact with the outside world—outside of the 9-month furloughs he and his wife, Roslyn, get every 27 months—is the occasional mail drop of William McKay, Lutheran missionary pilot. McKay makes twice weekly visits to a nearby mission, 12 miles away, which also has a two-way radio communications system with missions people in Monrovia.

The mail brings weekly news magazines and other periodicals from the states. From these, Dr. Sadler can glean world events.

"The Loma people, a tribe of 30,000, gather news for our paper, and have a great amount of fun doing it," Dr. Sadler said. "They gain a new sense of the spirit of inquiry by asking themselves what is news and what would their friends like to read about."

When the Sadlers first began the paper back in 1951, news was hard to find—they thought. But, after the paper began to make headway, they were flooded with stories. Now they have to condense and squeeze to fit all the news in each issue.

"People like to read about themselves, their loved ones and friends in the paper," Dr. Sadler said. "It gives them a sense of dignity and personal worth."

The Loma people, he added, "are proud that they are in the know."

It used to be that the Madingos, traveling traders, brought rumor and stories and news, along with their packs of needles, matches, cloth, buttons and utensils. The coastal people or returning villagers, who had been away to work, also brought the latest gossip.

But now when the Madingos and other visitors come to our Loma villages, they find with surprise that the people often have heard the news, and it is accurate.

"The people are so eager to read the weekly that they won't let us waste one copy," Mrs. Sadler said in the same interview.

One day a copy of the paper was spoiled as it came off the mimeograph machine. So Mrs. Sadler crumpled it up and threw the sheet on the floor.

A brown hand of a Loma tribesman reached through the open door of the adobe, thatched-roof house, picked up the paper, and hastily drew it out the door. Mrs. Sadler stepped out the door in time to see a man avidly reading the latest issue.

The paper sells for 12 cents a year—Liberia uses American currency—and teachers distribute it.

"One week a teacher was sick and the papers were slow being distributed to his village," Dr. Sadler said. "In came people anxious to see what had happened—disappointed at the lateness—but wanting their paper."

In that, perhaps, the subscribers are as anxious as any back in the United States, when a newsboy occasionally misses the front doorstep.

The *Loma Weekly*, in its folksy, personal approach, is similar to the community newspaper in the small towns of the United States. It has world news, religious news, personal items, obituaries, personality sketches, health features, and stories of new developments in the country.

One issue contained an article about fishermen who were chased and treed by elephants.

Another item was a personality feature of Dr. William Tubman, the president of Liberia, whom Dr. Sadler considers a "keen, able, forward-looking leader."

Still another article was an obituary about the oldest man in Fisibu village. His son, working at the Firestone plantation, noted the item, and came home to pay his respects to the grave, as well as to console his bereaved relatives.

During an outbreak of heavy coughing, Mrs. Sadler wrote a health feature about how germs are spread through coughing. She suggested that people cover their mouths or turn their heads when coughing. She also has written about anti-malarial measures, boiling water, and other health matters.

There is entertainment news, such as the item about a performer who rode two bicycles during an exhibition. When the Sadlers returned from a trip aboard a steamer,

they wrote an item about their rooms and food on ship. "Some of our readers," Dr. Sadler said, "were surprised to learn that cabin rooms exist, that food is served on ship."

Dr. Sadler believes that the movement to start village papers is one of the most hopeful signs in Africa. He said, "It will help break down the isolation which separates hundreds of tribes.

"It will give them knowledge about and trust and faith in people of differing tribes," he added. "The result will be even greater national unity and greater economic interdependence and growth."

The weekly is only part of the vast reading program Dr. and Mrs. Sadler have prepared for the Loma people. They have prepared 62 booklets of readers which, with the newspaper, total approximately 250,000 words. In fact, the total written words of the Loma include only five books not done by Dr. and Mrs. Sadler in their 15 years in Liberia. And those other five were prepared by missionaries who had studied the Loma language in Wozi. The 62 booklets include translations of the New Testament gospels of Mark and John, readers on religion like "God Our Father," fables, books on individual, family and village improvement, and adventure and journey travel stories which enlarge the knowledge and world view of readers. He now is doing a 1000-page Loma dictionary.

"We sell between 15,000 and 17,000 books a year," Dr. Sadler said. "Despite this extensive production of literature, the people kept coming and asking for more and more."

Their requests became more and more frequent back in 1951 when Dr. Sadler was working on the first—and still the only—grammar textbook in Loma. Dr. Sadler remembered that when he is on furlough back in the U. S., one of his favorite pastimes is a long, leisurely breakfast, sipping coffee and reading his morning newspaper.

So, he began the weekly, and his breakfast table in Liberia became the forum for planning the paper.

"Reading can be one of the big avenues of growth of the African," Dr. Sadler concluded.

James W. Carty, Jr., is religious news editor of the Nashville *Tennessean* and instructor in journalism at Scarritt College. He and Dr. Wesley Sadler, subject of this article, recently took part in a three-month campaign which prepared Swahili, Iramba, and Turu language primers and graded readers which would be used in an adult literary campaign in Tanganyika, East Africa. The project was sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., in cooperation with the interdenominational, Christian council of Tanganyika.

The Press and the Fund for the Republic

By Frank K. Kelly

Frank Kelly suggested that this report is long and could be cut. It was not cut. It is a case study in the shaping of public opinion that depends on its full factual detail. The questions it raises are basic to confidence in the communications industry to transmit an honest report on news as fundamental as the state of American liberty. Mr. Kelly states his own newspaper experience. His complete integrity and good sense are known to hundreds of newspapermen, librarians and members of Congress. His war service interrupted his Nieman Fellowship between 1943 and 1946.

In March of 1956, the directors of the Fund for the Republic asked me to help them make the Fund's purposes and program clearer to the American public. Many Americans did not seem to understand what the Fund was doing. Some radio commentators and newspaper columnists were misrepresenting the Fund, and some leaders of the American Legion were castigating it. Some members of Congress also had attacked it.

I studied the Fund's reports and the list of directors. The directors included some of the notable citizens of the United States—Paul Hoffman, former administrator of the Marshall Plan; Chester Bowles, former governor of Connecticut; Elmo Roper, the opinion analyst; George Shuster, a noted Catholic educator, president of Hunter College; Oscar Hammerstein, II, co-author of "South Pacific" and "Oklahoma"; Erwin Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School; Russell Dearmont, vice-president of the Missouri Pacific Railroad; Roger Lapham, former mayor of San Francisco; Jubal R. Parten, president of a Texas oil company; Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago—and others equally outstanding. The reports indicated that the Fund was aiding Americans to preserve their rights under the Constitution.

It seemed to me that here was an all-star cast, doing a fine job. The Fund was dedicated to the great principles of liberty in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. So every American should be for the Fund. The Fund was run by brilliant and successful people, admired by their fellow citizens. So the Fund should be universally accepted in American life.

But it hadn't worked out that way. The Fund was in trouble.

By its very nature, the Fund was bound to get into controversies—upholding the principles of freedom meant upholding the rights of dissenters and minorities. Dissenters and minorities were viewed with suspicion by those who re-

garded themselves as the true guardians of Americanism.

A few controversial actions by the Fund, a few controversial statements by the Fund's President, Robert Hutchins, had been taken by critics and puffed up into a cloud of confusion. The real achievements of Hutchins and the Fund were obscured and overlooked.

Covering the Fund in routine style, the leading news agencies and top newspapers of the country hadn't done much to penetrate the cloud. Some of the confusion was due to sloppy coverage in the press and the repetition of inaccurate charges about the Fund. Some of it was due to the biased broadcasts and columns written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., a right-wing commentator who spent a large part of his time in making personal attacks on Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins.

My own study of the Fund's record convinced me that its few mistakes were far outweighed by its many achievements. It deserved the support of every American who understood the meaning of liberty. I thought that only one thing was necessary to get that support. The vital thing was to call the facts to the attention of as many people as possible.

That was easier to say than to do. As an ex-newspaperman, I knew my own limitations and the difficulties of the press. As a reporter for a good paper, the *Kansas City Star*, and later for a good news agency, the Associated Press, I had learned how hard it was to cover a complicated story at high speed with full accuracy. But I knew the overwhelming majority of reporters and editors wanted to get the complete story and tell it straight.

When I went to work for the Fund—with faith in its record and with some hope of being able to help in getting that record recognized—I found Robert Hutchins pretty pessimistic about the press. His pessimism dated back to his experiences as president of the University of Chicago, and the battering he had taken as head of a commission which had made a critical study of the press in the 1940's. He had been accused of advocating government regulation of the press—although he had never advocated any such thing—and he had been lashed by editorial critics for supposedly making other charges he had not made.

In 1956, there were four major news stories in which the Fund was involved. In each case, the handling of the stories in too many instances justified the fundamental criticisms Hutchins had made of the press. In each case, too, there were some examples of what good reporters and good editors could do—enough to give proof of how effective the press could be at its highest level.

These were the four events: (1) the investigation of the Fund by Representative Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) the publication of John Cogley's *Report on Blacklisting*; (3) the issuance of a report by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on the government's loyalty-security program; and (4) the release of a comprehensive report by the Fund, describing in detail its first three years of activity.

Here is my estimate of the coverage of these four events.

Mr. Walter's Investigation

In a news release for morning papers of June 11, Representative Walter announced that he planned to hold hearings on the Fund to determine "whether it was a friend or foe of America in the struggle against the Communist conspiracy." Mr. Walter said he was not passing judgment on the Fund in advance of the hearings but was simply seeking the "objective facts."

No official notice of Mr. Walter's plans reached the Fund before his declaration became public. However, I had happened to be in Washington during the first week in June and a friend had informed me that Mr. Walter intended to make such an announcement. Consequently the Fund was ready with a statement, in which President Hutchins asked the American people to judge the Fund on the basis of the complete record of its three years of operation.

Since the Fund's statement reached the wire services in time for them to include some quotations from Hutchins along with Congressman Walter's declaration, the news agencies gave fair coverage to both sides. Since most papers rely on the agencies for most of their news, the Fund got a fair break in most of the stories I saw.

The New York *Times*, of course, gave the background on Mr. Walter's announcement, made it clear that Mr. Walter had been threatening to hold hearings for some months, listed some of the prominent Americans serving as directors of the Fund, and carried a statement by the trustees of the Ford Foundation defending the integrity and patriotism of the Fund's leaders. Since the Fund's endowment of 15 million dollars came from the Foundation, and since the trustees had played a part in establishing the Fund, they were inevitably involved.

In addition to the *Times*, other papers carried the Ford Foundation statement and some background information about the Fund. The Louisville *Times*, alone among the papers I read, brought out the fact that Mr. Walter had already revealed his prejudice against the Fund in a declaration made in November, 1955. The *Times* carried an editorial entitled "Walter Won't Be Unbiased As a Judge," and gave a sharp picture of what the public could expect from Mr. Walter's investigation.

It does seem possible that the news agencies and many of

the newspapers might have inquired more deeply into Mr. Walter's attitude. They might have recalled that Mr. Walter had said, eight months before his announcement of June 11, that "the Fund deliberately intends to obstruct all investigation and control of the Communist conspiracy and to strengthen thereby the forces bent on the overthrow of this nation and its institutions." The Fund, of course, had not attempted to obstruct or control investigation of the Communist conspiracy. A little checking by reporters would have brought out these facts.

Such checking might also have disclosed that on November 23, 1955, Mr. Walter had made another false statement about the Fund. According to a dispatch from Washington printed in the New York *Times*, Mr. Walter said that a Fund report had "criticized the Congress for legislation branding the Communist party as an 'international conspiracy.'" The Fund had never done so, in any report.

The press also failed to discover that Mr. Walter had a personal motive in launching the investigation. In conversations with directors and representatives of the Fund, Mr. Walter showed that he was concerned about whether the Fund was considering the preparation of an immigration handbook which would give immigrants basic information about their rights. Mr. Walter did not seem to think that the Fund should go into the immigration field at all.

With the exception of the Chicago *Tribune*, the press did not disclose that the staff investigator working on the Fund for Mr. Walter was Karl Baarslag, a former staff member of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee under Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. The press did not bring out the fact that before Baarslag joined Congressman Walter's staff he had published a newsletter in Dallas, Texas—and had attacked the Fund for the Republic and a number of prominent Texans for supposedly being "soft on Communism."

The revelation of these facts would have given the American people a clearer vision of whether Mr. Walter and Mr. Baarslag were actually looking for "the objective facts."

Cogley's "Report on Blacklisting"

Long before the publication of John Cogley's *Report on Blacklisting*, Baarslag and Richard Arens, the staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, showed a keen interest in it. They asked the Fund to supply them with copies of the manuscript and the two volumes in galley form.

Three days after the Cogley Report was published, a staff member from the House Committee arrived at the Fund's office in New York City with a subpoena for Cogley. Cogley was later told by Arens that the Committee had a lot of questions to ask him about his report.

In an interview with a reporter for *Newsday*, Mr. Walter admitted that he hadn't read the two-volume report but he wanted to find out "what the purposes of the Fund and Mr.

Cogley truly are." Here was the chairman of a committee of the House of Representatives ordering a journalist to come down to Washington to explain why he had written a report which neither he nor any other member of the committee had read.

Generally speaking, the press did a good job on the *Report on Blacklisting*. The news agencies carried careful summaries of the main points. Many editorial writers commented thoughtfully on the issues raised by Cogley's depiction of blacklisting in the entertainment industry.

The principal attacks on the Cogley Report came from Fulton Lewis, Jr., the Hearst press and Frederick Woltman of the Scripps-Howard papers.

Mr. Cogley had quoted an unnamed "public relations expert" in the Report. This source said that he had guided more than a dozen once-blacklisted performers to the "right people." He said he told those who came to him for help to go to the FBI with any information they had on the Communist movement. Then it was necessary for them to prepare a statement, attesting either to complete innocence of Communist activities or establishing that, though once involved, they now had a change of heart. This statement, the source said, had to be satisfactory to two different groups of people—those in the industry who were keeping the blacklisted from working and those outside the industry who could keep them controversial. It was important, he said, to convince the latter group that the change of heart was sincere because they could "hold off right-wing criticism" and cut off the pressure on sponsors and networks when controversial persons were put back to work.

Among those the "public relations expert" said he went to with such statements were Woltman, George Sokolsky and Victor Riesel. Woltman vehemently challenged the Report on this point. At first he denied flatly that there was any truth to the account. Later he extended his challenge to cover charges not made in the Report. He had never participated in any vicious "clearance ring," both he and the *World Telegram* stated. By this time the paper took to using the words "clearance ring," though they do not appear anywhere in the Report.

Mr. Woltman demanded that Hutchins name the "public relations expert." Hutchins, who did not know who the man was, referred Woltman to Cogley. Cogley refused. He declared: "It is journalistic tradition that reporters are not required to divulge the name of a 'confidential source.'" The *World Telegram* suggested then that the source was a creature of Cogley's own imagination and encouraged the House Committee on Un-American Activities to grill him on the point.

Arnold Forster, chief counsel for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, then entered the picture. Forster wrote to Woltman: "I recognize some material . . . as

things which I told an interviewer," and recalled that from time to time he had called upon the columnist in an effort to test the bona fides of persons the Anti-Defamation League was trying to help.

Because Forster had made it known that he was the source quoted in the Report, Cogley testified at Mr. Walter's hearing in Washington that the references to Woltman were based on what Forster had told one of Cogley's assistants. Forster later testified that the quotations attributed to him were accurate. Forster praised the Fund for publishing the Cogley Report and stimulating public discussion of the blacklisting problem.

Woltman covered Cogley's appearance before the Walter Committee on July 10 as a Scripps Howard reporter, and then went on the witness stand the next day to attack Cogley and question the validity of the study.

The effort made by Woltman and the *World Telegram* to make Hutchins compel Cogley to abandon the journalistic tradition of protecting a source of information was astonishing to me and to other newspapermen with whom I talked. They could not recall any similar attempt in American history.

Woltman and Fulton Lewis were the most vociferous attackers of Cogley. The Hearst papers joined the assault with an editorial entitled "Slanted Left," which appeared in the *New York Journal American* and other Hearst publications.

The editorial was brief but belligerent. It read, in part: "The thinking and activities of the 15 million dollar Fund for the Republic have been since its beginning preponderantly along anti-anti-Communist lines. The latest *Report on Blacklisting: Radio-Television* is further conclusive evidence of the anti-anti-Communist slant.

"Despite the protestations of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund, and Paul Hoffman, its chairman, that the report is impartial and factual, it is not. It is a subtle and sometimes not so subtle attack on the efforts of the radio, television and motion picture industries to keep Communists and Communist camp followers out of their fields of communication. . . ."

It struck me as puzzling that this editorial referred to a report entitled *Report on Blacklisting: Radio-Television*, and then went on to talk about a "subtle and sometimes not so subtle attack on the efforts of the radio, television and motion picture industries" to keep Communists out of their fields. I wondered whether the editorial writer realized that the Cogley Report had been issued in two volumes totalling nearly 600 pages—and the first volume, dealing entirely with the movies, contained a detailed description of the efforts of the Communists to infiltrate the film industry. It included cases of anti-Communists who were blacklisted by Communists. The second volume also dealt with the at-

tempts of Communists to move into radio and television.

I called Seymour Berkson, publisher of the *Journal American*. I knew he was an intelligent man, who wanted to deal fairly with everybody. When I got him on the phone, I asked whether he had read the Cogley Report. He said he hadn't; he was very busy and he hadn't time to read it. But he declared that he was sure that the editorial writer had gone "into it very deeply."

I asked whether I could discuss it with the editorial writer. Mr. Berkson said I certainly could. He switched me over to the writer. I expressed astonishment at the tone of the editorial, and asked: "Have you read the whole Cogley Report?"

"Oh, no, I haven't read it," the editorial writer said.

"But you wrote the editorial."

"Well, I read a news story, a clipping about it, and I got a note from Mr. Hearst, suggesting an editorial."

Here was an editorial, attacking the *Report on Blacklisting* and the Fund for the Republic—written by a man who hadn't read the Report he was denouncing! I am willing to bet that Mr. Hearst hadn't read it either.

Another development which astonished me was a United Press dispatch authored by Lyle Wilson, a UP vice-president with headquarters in Washington. Wilson declared: "American Communists are trying to use the latest report of the Fund for the Republic to make the United States a little safer for fellow travelers." His authority for this was an article in the *Daily Worker*.

After asserting that the Communists were trying to use the Cogley Report, Wilson referred to statements by various people about the Communist penetration into the film industry. He referred to the "Hollywood Ten" and the personal history of John Howard Lawson, one of the film writers called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. His implication seemed to be that Mr. Cogley and the Fund were totally naive about these things, and it was his duty to give the actual background.

When I read Mr. Wilson's article I again had a strong feeling that here was a man who had not read the report he was writing about. If he had read it, he had failed to give Cogley credit for reporting in Volume I—*Blacklisting in the Movies*—a complete picture of the behavior of the "Hollywood Ten" and the background of John Howard Lawson. Actually, Cogley gave all the facts about Communist activities which Wilson gave in his article—and many more facts which Wilson did not report.

I wrote to Wilson August 2, asking: "Have you actually read the Cogley Report?" I got a reply from his secretary, saying that he was going to be busy covering the national political conventions and then would be away on a vacation.

(In justice to Wilson and the United Press, however, I must acknowledge the forthright manner in which the UP

sent out corrections when it became evident that they had carried some erroneous statements about the Fund. The UP had carried a story quoting Senator Stennis of Mississippi as saying that the Fund had called the Communist Party just another political party and the Fund had financed recordings of jury proceedings in Wichita, Kansas. When I wrote to Wilson, pointing out that these statements were false, he carried a story from Washington quoting my letter.)

Wilson, Woltman, and the Hearst editorialist were among the commentators who felt that the *Report on Blacklisting* gave comfort in some way to the Communists. Most of the editorial comments I saw, however, declared that Cogley and the Fund deserved praise for throwing light on the growth of blacklisting in an American industry.

Robert J. Landry, writing in *Variety*, asserted: "Writer-editor Cogley had 10 research aides. What he and his team accomplished is the sort of exhaustive research which, in our generation, only a great Foundation or perhaps a great publishing enterprise like *Time-Life-Fortune* could muster. The value of these reports undoubtedly lies in the collation of so much data in handy reference form. This sort of stuff is heaven-sent to future scholars. It immediately becomes a glistening documentation for social historians."

The *New York Times* said: "If the House Committee on Un-American Activities were really interested in examining all un-American activities it might long ago have used its great powers as an investigative arm of Congress to look into the thoroughly un-American art of blacklisting in the entertainment industry. Instead, it left that thankless job to the Fund for the Republic, but it has now suddenly raised its hackles because it didn't like what the Fund's independent inquiry produced."

"The practice of blacklisting is certainly an un-American one," declared the *Denver Post*. "Controversial as the blacklist report may be, and annoying to a lot of self-appointed sleuths and overeager beavers and too-cautious employers in the entertainment industry, it is a valuable collection of information and one that somebody should have made long ago to clarify what is going on."

"The Fund for the Republic does a valuable service by condemning the unjust blacklisting of alleged Communists and Red sympathizers in much of the entertainment industry," the *Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator* asserted. "As the Fund's report shows, blacklists are completely unfair in many cases."

The *Washington Post & Times-Herald* said: "Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of the Fund for the Republic, is quite right in saying that blacklisting has raised 'questions of freedom of thought and speech, of due process, of the protection of the individual against group pressures and of the community against the disloyalty of the indi-

vidual.' It is salutary to have these questions brought into the open."

Tackling the question of whether the Cogley Report had reaffirmed "the Fund's anti-anti-Communism," the *Indiana Catholic and Record* said, "the factual job done by Cogley for the Fund is a public and patriotic service of no little consequence."

This Catholic paper stated: "One does not have to be the least bit un-American or anti-anti-Communist to perceive that it is dangerously wrong for a man's reputation and job to be at the mercy of a self-appointed 'shadow court' which judges his political purity and his loyalty on rules of its own devising. . . . We Catholics have every reason not to throw out in an anti-Communist panic either the principles of natural justice or the special legal safeguards of justice embodied in American judicial practice."

Dozens of papers carried favorable articles on the Cogley Report. Among them were—in addition to those quoted earlier—the *Louisville Times*, the *Commonweal*, the *Christian Century*, the *Boston Herald*, the *Holyoke* (Mass.) *Transcript-Telegram*, the *Hartford Courant*, the *Worcester* (Mass.) *Gazette*, the *Hackensack* (N. J.) *Bergen Evening Record*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Lynchburg* (Va.) *News*, the *Long Island Newsday*, the *Claremont* (N. H.) *Eagle*, the *Anniston* (Ala.) *Star*, the *Toledo Blade*, the *Greensboro* (N. C.) *News*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Des Moines Register*, the *Stockton* (Calif.) *Record*, the *Providence Bulletin*, the *Pilot* (official paper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston), the *Register* (official paper of the Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis), the *Wilmington* (Del.) *Journal-Every Evening*, the *Boston Traveler*, the *Toronto Globe & Mail*, and others. Editorial concern about the problems of blacklisting appeared in every section of the United States.

Many of the comments supporting Cogley and the Fund were published after Representative Walter announced that he had summoned Cogley to Washington to find out "*what your sources were in order to determine whether or not your conclusions were the conclusions we would have reached had we embarked on this sort of project.*" Many papers saw a threat to freedom of the press in the Walter Committee's heavy-handed examination of Cogley.

Time Magazine was one of the few publications which seemed to feel no alarm over the summoning of Cogley to explain what he had written. *Time's* story on the Cogley hearing in its July 23 issue concluded: ". . . There was little doubt that Congress had every right to eye the major activities of a tax-exempt foundation, that the hearing had strongly suggested that Cogley's report was inept journalism at best. As Reporter Woltman put it: 'Any newspaper that proceeded the way Cogley did would be subject to grave criticism.'"

The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*—and many other publications—felt that the hearings proved that Mr. Cogley's journalism had been generally sound. The *Post-Dispatch* said in an editorial: "After Mr. Cogley appeared before the committee, his testimony was subjected to violent criticism from witnesses whom he had mentioned in his reports. Both Vincent Hartnett, who wrote the introduction for 'Red Channels,' and James F. O'Neil, publisher of the *American Legion* magazine, denied vehemently that they helped 'clear' anyone. They merely tried to 'rehabilitate' entertainers once associated with Communism, they said. The difference is one of words only. An actor who is rehabilitated in this parlance is also cleared; unrehabilitated, he has difficulty finding a job. *But if the committee hearings seem only to prove Mr. Cogley's point, that certainly was not their purpose.* Mr. Cogley was not invited to appear; he was ordered by subpoena. He was questioned sharply. Later witnesses were permitted to impugn his motives. He was treated more as a defendant than as an editor with a right to publish what he thought or saw."

Report on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program

Not long after the publication of Cogley's *Report on Blacklisting*, another important study financed by the Fund was released to the public.

This was the report of the Special Committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. The committee was headed by Dudley B. Bonsal of New York, and included distinguished lawyers from New York, Chicago, Washington, New Orleans and Los Angeles. The staff members were attorneys from New York, Philadelphia, Austin, Texas, and Chatham, New Jersey.

The committee worked with complete independence, as it indicated in a foreword to its report: "No official or representative of the Fund has in any way sought to suggest or advise us as to the appointments to the Committee, nor has the Fund in any way interfered with the choice of our research staff or sought to influence our findings or conclusions."

In the course of the study, the Bonsal Committee consulted top officials of the federal government responsible for the operations of the loyalty-security program; counsel and staff members of committees of Congress which had investigated Communist activities or the loyalty-security system; leaders of business and labor and of universities and research institutions who had observed the impact of the program; lawyers who had taken part in the preparation and hearing of security cases for the government or for employees; and observers and commentators who supported or criticized the program. The committee staff interviewed hundreds of persons.

The committee came up with recommendations in four

principal areas: (1) reduction of the scope of the program, to reduce the number of civilian Americans covered by security investigations from 6 million to about 1½ million; (2) clarification of the standards which employees must meet; (3) improvement in procedure to assure more efficiency and fairness; and (4) the appointment of a Director to review and coordinate the entire program.

The recommendation which attracted most attention in the news columns and on the editorial pages was the suggestion that clearance should be required only for "sensitive" positions—that is, for jobs in which the employees would have access to secret or top secret material or would have a policy-making function with a substantial relation to national security. This hit the front pages in many parts of the country.

Another recommendation which got full coverage was the statement that "the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations should be abolished" unless it could be drastically modified and revised. The committee pointed out that the list was out of date in many respects, and should "include only those organizations which have been given notice and an opportunity to be heard in conformity with the requirements of due process of law."

The report of the Bonsal Committee was published after the Supreme Court had ruled, in the Cole case, that the loyalty-security program should be confined to "sensitive positions." After this decision the Court was attacked by Senator McCarthy and Senator Eastland as "pro-Communist," "insolent," "willful," and "irresponsible."

There was no great outcry in the Senate about the Bonsal Report, prepared by the committee of eminent lawyers for the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. The big news agencies and the leading newspapers gave it respectful treatment; editorial comments were generally favorable—and then it faded from the news.

Some editors gave the Fund credit for financing the report and for agreeing to the complete independence with which the study was conducted. Some did not. Hearst papers scolded Mr. Bonsal and the other noted lawyers for being in "bad company"—the "bad company" being the Fund for the Republic and the Supreme Court of the United States. (After my experience with the Cogley Report, I did not try to find out whether the man who wrote the "Bad Company" editorial had actually read the Bonsal Report. I was afraid of becoming completely disillusioned.)

The Bonsal Report on the loyalty-security program—dealing with matters affecting the livelihood and reputation of millions of Americans—did not stir up as much discussion in many quarters as the Cogley Report, which dealt with a relatively small number of Americans employed in the entertainment industry.

Perhaps the more extensive discussion of the *Report on*

Blacklisting was due to the fact that it contained the names of Hollywood stars, stage and screen actors, people with some "glamour." Perhaps it was due to the fact that editors in many cities saw a danger to the freedom of the press in the treatment given Cogley by the Walter Committee. Issues involving freedom of the press often seem to arouse editors who do not get very excited about other civil liberties issues.

The Fund's Three-Year Report

The fourth major news event in which the Fund was a center of interest was the publication of a detailed review of the foundation's three years of operation, from the spring of 1953 to the spring of 1956.

Speaking for the Board, Chairman Paul G. Hoffman declared in a foreword: "Despite the occasional and inevitable mistake or failure, the Board believes that the work of the Fund has been urgently needed and well done. The Board is grateful to the many church groups, educational institutions, voluntary organizations and individual scholars and workers who have made the . . . record possible."

Copies of this report were sent to all the daily newspapers in the United States. Most of the papers which carried any news about it printed the dispatches distributed by the wire services. Some papers—such as the *New York Times*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Daily News*, and other metropolitan journals—carried articles written by their own reporters. These were generally fair and accurate.

The Newsweek Story

It was my hope that one of the large news magazines, with enough resources to do a thorough job, would do a story on the Fund's three-year record which would make its accomplishments and its value to Americans unmistakably clear to people across the country.

Consequently, when I heard that *Newsweek* was planning to run a special story on the Fund, I welcomed the idea. When I had worked in Washington from 1949 to 1952 as the press relations consultant for two Senate Majority Leaders—Scott Lucas and Ernest McFarland—I had been impressed by the caliber of *Newsweek's* Washington correspondents. So I felt certain the magazine would do a high-quality job on the Fund story.

The *Newsweek* story which appeared in the July 2 issue of the magazine shocked and saddened me. I was in Washington when the magazine came out. I went to see one of the Washington correspondents and protested: "This is a terrible story. It has a lot of glaring errors in it. It's full of bias and distortion." He said: "I think it's lousy myself."

I want to deal with the *Newsweek* story at some length because it contains nearly every major criticism made of

Hutchins and the Fund—and in nearly every case the picture is distorted and unfair.

Here was the headline on the story, running across nearly two pages in the magazine:

THE PRODIGY GROWN OLDER — AND THE STRINGS HE HOLDS ON FUND'S MILLIONS

Down at the bottom of the layout were two photographs, one of Hutchins over a quotation: "I don't give a damn" and one of Legion Commander J. Addington Wagner with this line: *He issued a warning.*

The text of the story contained every cliché Hutchins had told me to expect. Hutchins was described as "the boy prodigy," "the enfant terrible of U.S. education," a man who "got in bad with practically everybody," a "middle-aged boy wonder ready for fight or frolic," a man who issued "pixilated handouts," and a fellow who seemed to many people "a trigger-tongued zealot who misunderstood what he was fighting about, or simply a well-heeled fool who was doing civil rights more harm than good."

The headlines and the text of the entire article gave the utterly false impression that Hutchins had absolute control of the Fund's assets. The story did not even mention the existence of the Board of Directors or the fact that Hutchins had just one vote out of 18 when the Board voted on projects. I had been an officer of the Fund since March 22, and had sat in several Board meetings. I knew from personal observation that the members of the Board were well-informed on the work of the Fund and went over every proposal with great care.

Since the directors were well aware of the controversial possibilities of every action in the civil liberties field, they realized that their own reputations were at stake. They were all people of distinguished reputations, which they had earned and which they wanted to keep. So they put a great deal of time and thought into the Fund's program.

In addition to Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins and the men I have named earlier, the directors included Charles W. Cole, president of Amhrest College; William H. Joyce, Jr., chairman of the board of Joyce, Inc.; Meyer Kestnbaum, president of Hart Schaffner & Marx; M. Albert Linton, chairman of the board, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.; J. Howard Marshall, vice-president of the Signal Oil & Gas Co.; John Lord O'Brian, noted lawyer; Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, wife of the president of Oberlin College; and James D. Zellerbach, president of the Crown Zellerbach Corporation.

The *Newsweek* story stated that the Fund had been "widely attacked by conservatives as a blatant apologist for the left." The two "conservatives" later cited by name were Fulton Lewis, Jr.—who had also attacked many noted

Americans, including General Eisenhower, General Lucius Clay, Robert P. Patterson, General Marshall, President Roosevelt, President Truman, and others—and Seaborn P. Collins, a former Legion commander.

Actually the Fund's Board of Directors included men who could speak for "conservatives" with far more authority than Lewis or Collins—such men as Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School; Meyer Kestnbaum; M. Albert Linton; Russell Dearmont of the Missouri Pacific Railroad. Under their direction the Fund could not be justly accused of being a "blatant apologist for the left."

Newsweek's statement that Robert Hutchins "got in bad with practically everybody" is not true in the light of Hutchins' career. He served as president and chancellor of the University of Chicago for a period of twenty-two years—and became famous throughout the world as an American educator with ideas and creative drive. He managed to get along well with a very conservative board of trustees, including Sewell Avery, the very conservative head of Montgomery Ward & Co. While he had critics, he had friends and supporters as well. He was given many honorary degrees by colleges and universities.

In *Newsweek's* story the attitudes toward Hutchins of some progressive educators, some conservative alumni, some faculty members, suddenly became the attitudes of all progressive educators, all conservative alumni, all faculty members.

The *Newsweek* story declared: "The Fund was necessary, (Hutchins said), to guard the Bill of Rights. These were all worthy goals, but, to attain them, Hutchins took up a dangerously exposed position: that Communist Party membership should not, by itself, disqualify any man for a job either in private business or government. Speaking for himself—and presumably for the Fund—he declared: 'I wouldn't hesitate to hire a Communist, if he were qualified for his job, and I were in a position to see that he did it.'"

Hutchins had clarified his position on this point by saying that his view was essentially that expressed by the late Senator Robert A. Taft and by Scott McLeod, a security officer for the State Department, who had testified that the employment of Communists in jobs where they could be watched sometimes proved to be useful to the government. Hutchins had also made it clear that his position was theoretical: he had never encountered a Communist he wanted to hire. *Newsweek* did not bring out these facts.

In a letter to *Time Magazine* dated November 25, 1955, Hutchins said:

"Your statement that I had said I wouldn't hesitate to hire a Communist omits one of my qualifications and omits the point. I was discussing a theoretical possibility, not something I had done or planned to do. I said that any such appointment would have to be made by the

Board and that I did not know what the Board would do if the question arose.

"The reason I was willing to answer a hypothetical question about a theoretical possibility is that the point is basic. The practice of judging people in terms of labels rather than in terms of themselves is contrary to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. It may deprive a man of his livelihood and reputation without regard to his individual case and without due process of law. The practice of disposing of people by condemning the organizations, churches, nationalities, and races to which they or their relatives or acquaintances belong is contrary to the American tradition of fair play. It cost Al Smith the Presidency. It cost Emmett Till his life.

"Individuals vary widely in their understanding and adherence to the purposes of organizations they belong to. Jobs vary widely in their 'sensitivity.' There is a theoretical possibility that I might sometime meet some sort of Communist qualified for some sort of job. I have not yet and do not expect to. Yet the possibility exists. Others to take this position include the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and more recently, Mr. Scott McLeod, Administrator of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in March of this year.

"As you pointed out, I am against Communism. I am for justice, even justice for Communists. I have stated my position publicly many times in the last 20 years."

(In a conversation with Hutchins on this question, I told him I did not believe any conspiratorial Communist could honestly work for the Fund, since the Fund was dedicated to the maintenance of a free way of life. Hutchins said: "If I had any evidence that a man was a conspirator against our government, I certainly would not hire him.")

The *Newsweek* story asserted that Hutchins had alienated "his own potential allies, the militant libertarians." As substantiation, the magazine offered an attack made by Professor Sidney Hook of New York University and a "storm" that "really broke over Hutchins when the Fund published its first major work, a 'Bibliography of the Communist Problem in the U.S.'" Actually, Hutchins had nothing to do with the Bibliography. It was prepared under the supervision of a committee headed by a Harvard law professor, Arthur E. Sutherland. Other members were Professor Clinton Rossiter of Cornell, and Rev. Joseph M. Snee, S.J.

The Hook attack on Hutchins was not joined by the leaders of militant organizations in the civil liberties field. The American Jewish Congress had given Hutchins an award for outstanding service to the cause of freedom. The American Veterans Committee had given him an award.

The Urban League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and other groups were friendly to the Fund. *Newsweek* omitted all these facts.

Newsweek declared that "almost no one had a good word for" the Bibliography. Actually, the *Library Journal*, the *Harvard Law Record*, the *New York Law Journal*, and other publications had called it a very useful and valuable piece of work. Representatives of dozens of civic, educational and professional organizations—and officers of government agencies—requested copies and wrote to the Fund of its value.

The *Newsweek* story sank to its lowest level when it carried a statement by Professor Philip Taft declaring that those who prepared the Bibliography deserved "a vote of thanks from the Communist Party"—without going on to tell *Newsweek* readers that Taft had later reconsidered his statement and had declared, in a letter published in the *New York Times* of November 2, 1955, that he did not "wish to attribute to Professor Rossiter any unpatriotic or disloyal motives, or the remotest connection with or sympathy for Communism."

The slanted character of the story also became evident in a paragraph about the Fund's award of \$5,000 to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers).

Newsweek said: "... an obscure Quaker library, in Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, considered discharging an employee who pleaded the Fifth Amendment rather than testify about prior Communist associations, but decided not to. The Fund for the Republic promptly awarded the library a \$5,000 grant."

Here are the facts. The library committee of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting employed as librarian a Mrs. Mary Knowles, after checking her references and learning from Mrs. Knowles that she had pleaded the First Amendment in a Congressional hearing. A woman in the community who was not a Quaker decided that Mrs. Knowles was a dangerous person and succeeded in getting groups in the community to bring pressure on the Quakers to dismiss her. The Quakers refused to give way to these pressures.

The permanent appointment of Mrs. Knowles was made in 1954, after she had served for several months on a temporary basis. On May 19, 1955, on the basis of an investigation made by a Fund researcher, the Board of Directors authorized the award to the Plymouth Meeting for its "forthright stand in defense of individual freedom." (Consider the time sequence; and consider *Newsweek's* statement that the Fund "promptly" awarded the library \$5,000.)

Newsweek went on to say: "Hutchins' attitude was that the Fifth Amendment is a vital part of the Bill of Rights,

and that by retaining the employee the library had struck a blow for civil liberties. Again, the fact that the employee had used the Bill of Rights to protect Communists did not bother him." No one knew, except Mrs. Knowles, why she was using the Fifth Amendment. Whatever her reasons, she was entitled to the protection of the Bill of Rights.

Newsweek ignored the fact that the 276th Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends gave its support, in principle, to the stand taken by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting. The Yearly Meeting's action came in the form of unanimous endorsement by 500 representatives of 93 local Meetings of the report of its Civil Liberties Committee.

The *Newsweek* story was an example of prejudiced journalism at its worst. It was apparently written or edited by someone who felt a strong personal antagonism toward Robert Hutchins and the Fund.

The Fund's Future—and the Press

The future of the Fund for the Republic depends to some extent upon the treatment given the Fund's activities by the American press.

In a preface to the comprehensive report on its first three years, Hutchins pointed out: "The Fund is the only foundation of considerable size that is working, or that ever has worked, exclusively in the area of civil liberties. It is a pioneer venture in uncharted and dangerous territory."

The American attitude toward the Bill of Rights and toward a foundation dedicated to preserving these Rights—even for dissenters, even for people who advocate things most Americans hate—depends upon the understanding and education of adult citizens.

The greatest instrument of adult education in America is the press. If the press helps Americans to understand that civil liberties involve controversies—as most of the press did in the case of John Cogley's *Report on Black-listing*—the Fund will be recognized as a protector of the American heritage. If the press sinks to the level reached by *Newsweek* in its story on the Fund, the people may become confused and disgusted—and the Fund will suffer in the welter of confusion.

Newspaper Sins Against Privacy

By Ignaz Rothenberg

Most daily newspapers, by habit or thoughtlessness, feature certain reports in such a way that they may hurt people who, sometimes without being guilty, have come into the news. This is not the result of evil intent on the part of reporters but rather of the journalistic technique used with stories of this kind.

NO FORGIVENESS

It is common practice to revive the record of a person who has served a prison sentence and has since lived a decent life, whenever he is mentioned in the press. His past should, of course, sink into oblivion, according to a principle deeply rooted in religious and moral law. The press does not acknowledge it.

In August, 1953, a 21-year-old West Point cadet died in a fire while on leave at his home in Virginia. A year before, his father, a general, was convicted in a court martial of failing to safeguard his diary that contained military secrets and was relieved of command of troops for six months. Soon afterwards he retired.

The press, reporting the death of the young man, warmed up the case of the general. "Father Was Court-Martialed for Slack Care of Diary" shouted a subhead of the report in one of the most prominent papers. With the exception of the local press, the fatal accident would most probably not have been mentioned at all but for the father.

What a cruelty to bring up the old story in that hour of grief! Some papers went to great lengths in retelling the abrupt end of the general's career although the case had been legally closed. Whatever the general may do in the future that deserves press publicity, he may be sure that a repetition of that account will accompany the story.

Journalists contend that the complete background is published for the benefit of the public. Many readers must loathe such benefits. They don't want to see those who have paid the penalty for their errors constantly exposed to contempt.

The Old Testament says: "I, even I, am He that blot-teth out thy transgressions, and I will not remember thy sins" (Isaiah 43:25).

In the New Testament, repentance was more than feeling; it was a total change of mind and will. "God was willing to receive men, who wished to get ready for His Kingdom, to forgive them and take them into fellowship with Himself, so that they, too, might be children with the spirit of Their Father."

The climax of these teachings is reached in Matthew 12:31: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men."

Traces of such doctrines may be found in the legislation

of some European countries where it is forbidden by law to recall by word of mouth or in writing previous convictions or criminal acts if the person paid the penalty and has not been in trouble again. In Austria, according to section 497, Criminal Code, a violator of this law cannot get away with a fine; he is imprisoned from one day to a week. Similar regulations are to be found in other countries of Central Europe. The New Criminal Code of Yugoslavia has recently resumed this old rule as Article 172 and fixes the penalty with detention for up to two months.

While a law of this kind is not in force in Switzerland, its Supreme Court has laid down that a sentence which has been completed ought not to be made the subject of talk for an unlimited time. The Court had not assumed that such reproaches would pass over the sphere of gossip and become the subject of publications.

In the United States the press constantly revives expiated violations of the law. A few other examples are indicative.

In a recent murder trial that aroused nation-wide attention, a press reporter found out that a juror had been convicted of a misdemeanor eleven years back. Since he was not asked whether he ever had been a principal in a criminal case, he had not told the Court and was sworn in. In the State where the trial took place, previous conviction of a crime is not among the grounds for challenging a juror.

For two days the sensational murder recessed and the poor juror's story stood in the limelight, receiving a publicity that neither the man nor his old misdemeanor with its painful details deserved. The press reported that the juror had been charged with "occupying an automobile for an immoral purpose" with a 16-year-old boy. He had been found guilty but after being given a suspended sentence for six months, he was referred to the county psychiatric clinic for examination. The newspapers also quoted the detailed report of the psychiatrist. For a while, the little sex offender seemed to have taken the place of the murderer.

He is a married man, father of three children, and most probably cured of homosexuality. Except for that conviction, his record is clean. All the same, the press listed his name, age, address and occupation and even interviewed his wife.

Stunned by this performance, he asked the judge to be excused from serving with the jury. "I feel," he said, "I would be a sub-headline as long as this trial goes on." The juror's story could certainly have been told, if necessary, without lifting his anonymity.

A former member of the Capone gang who, for years, has been living an orderly life as part owner of a dress

company in Brooklyn, was held up and robbed of \$835 by two young thugs, in front of his business.

In one newspaper, the story, headlined "Ex-Capone Gangster Meekly Yields \$835," was devoted mostly to the record of the robbed man, his many arrests "but only four minor convictions," his "crime apprenticeship with Al Capone and Frankie Uale in prohibition days," everything told in a sarcastic way as if he were still the gangster of old. Even his present occupation—he "has settled down in recent years to a less violent life"—was viewed ironically. Is this language justified? Does the turning away from crime deserve mockery? There was no reason to add the name and address of the business which now helps him earn his livelihood honestly.

A recent case (April 15, 1956) concerns a retired policeman in Washington whose record, apart from a disciplinary action, is straight. He was robbed near his home of \$18. The story received much space and the man's heart condition was mentioned twice. The last paragraph of the report ran: "(He) had been reduced in rank from sergeant in 1952 after a trial board found him guilty of misconduct." To refresh the memory of acquaintances, his picture was printed. Not even his heart condition could save him from the pillory.

EXPOSURE OF FIRST OFFENDERS

Being a first offender is a mitigating circumstance which, if the transgression is not serious, may lead to a mild or suspended sentence. Sometimes the charge is set aside and the accused not only escapes punishment but also retains his reputation unblemished. The press, however, gives the case, owing to its human interest, prominence and prints the defendant's name, age and address. Thereby the pardoned culprit is pushed into a merciless limelight and the good intentions of the court that wanted to put him again on the right way are frustrated.

Owing to this practice, it may happen that the habitual thief is hardly mentioned when he stands for trial, while the repentant sinner who deserves pity is exposed. With millions reading the daily press, publicity has become a terrible aggravation of punishment. In many cases it means economic and social misfortune. Many who are called to account for an offence dread the trial less than the report of it and would be prepared to accept a heavier penalty if it could be kept secret. Still greater must be the pain of those who have just received mercy from the court and, some hours later, are identified by the press and maybe deprived from getting employment within the range of that publicity.

For this reason, in most countries stories of first offenders are either published anonymously or with the initials only, while address and other items that would help to identify them are omitted altogether.

It is not true that the public is served by this kind of reporting. No reader would insist on an accuracy that brings hardship upon harmless wrongdoers. Newspapermen say that publicity occasionally enables a private benefactor to help an individual and thus compensate the evil effect of identification. But anonymity does not preclude such acts of charity, since the press has the information and does act in other countries as an intermediary between donor and beneficiary.

Out of countless examples, two may be quoted. There is the case of the young veteran who served as a paratrooper in the Korean war and came to court after he had confessed to a priest that he had stolen \$25 in a Brooklyn cleaning store. The minister advised him to talk to the police. He was, at the time, in distress. An ailment, contracted in Korea, had forced him to give up his occupation. Since he could not pay the rent, he was evicted with his wife and three children. The prosecutor was moved and said: "The district attorney's office has a heart, even if people don't think so. In a case of this kind we suggest leniency." No doubt the journalists who handled this copy also felt sympathy with the veteran but in their blind eagerness for precision they revealed his full identity and included the address. How much would such a story have gained in human interest if the man's name had remained unknown and, thus, no obstacle had been put on his road to a new life.

In another case a young woman was charged with forging and cashing a \$300 check. The district attorney declined to prosecute "because full restitution had been made and the tearful defendant had no previous record." The newspapers identified her and added that she was the wife of a Naval Laboratory physicist and mother of a 21-month-old infant. Now everyone in the neighborhood knew who she was.

QUESTIONABLE PRE-TRIAL PUBLICATIONS

Rich in shocking statements was a report of a big news agency concerning a court martial to be convened towards the end of 1954. In one great newspaper the headline, covering four lines, ran: "Court Martialed—Morals Case Trial Faced by Colonel." The Army's Military District of Washington, D. C., it was asserted in the story, announced that a general court martial will hear charges against a colonel accused of "conduct unbecoming an officer." His name, age, and assignment were disclosed and, as is usual in big cases, his record in the Army was mentioned. The make-up of the story indicated that a cause célèbre was being prepared.

"A spokesman for the Military District said," the report went on, "Colonel X is charged with violation of Article 133 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. He is accused," the spokesman continued, "of having been intimate with a married woman not his wife." Another charge

was that he registered last July "as man and wife at a motor court in . . . with the woman with attempt to deceive."

The last paragraph of this story ominously hinted that "conviction carries such penalties as the court martial may direct." The military spokesman must have known and the paper could easily have discovered that court martials, in imposing penalties, are bound by limitations outlined by the President. The spokesman appears also to have failed to mention that the Army and Air Force provision of 1920, Article 95, says: "Any officer . . . who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be dismissed from the service." Dismissal thus is the maximum penalty and one may wonder why this part of the information, otherwise so profusely offered in newspapers, was withheld.

The colonel was not found guilty of dishonorable conduct. After that scathing account of his alleged immoral acts had governed public opinion for almost two months, he was sentenced to a \$400 pay forfeiture and a reprimand because of "having registered falsely." One Congressman, two generals and several Army chaplains "either testified or sent depositions to the effect that they had known [the colonel] as a man of outstanding morality." On the other hand, the credibility of his accusers was severely attacked.

This pre-trial report should never have been printed. In fact, quite a few papers recognized its character and tossed the copy in the waste basket.

INROADS INTO PRIVACY

In the rare cases when names are withheld, reporters are not always happy about it. An irresistible habit seems to induce them to lift the veil of secrecy to such a degree as to induce them to enable the inquisitive reader to follow up the clue.

An elderly couple in New York City were found poisoned by a champagne cocktail in 1953. It was assumed that both committed suicide. Some months afterwards, however, a young woman told the police that the son and a friend of his were the slayers.

"The woman's identity," said a news agency, "has been kept secret by the authorities. She is known only as an attractive, 22-year-old brunette who once studied at the Sorbonne in Paris and worked briefly as a United Nations receptionist."

With the help of these particulars, it was not too difficult to find out who the girl was. The name of the university where she had studied considerably narrowed the group of persons who came into question. When she saw her description in the papers, she was "virtually at the brink of collapse"—one of the responsible papers admitted—and her doctor sent her away for a month's rest. Here, accuracy has lost its virtue and become pernicious.

To list innocent relatives of persons suspected of a crime is another kind of inroad into privacy.

A 21-year-old teller in Florida stole bank funds amounting to \$26,000 and went on a three-day spending spree in a large city of another southern state where his married sister lived. He did not get in touch with her, and, consequently, she was not aware of his arrival.

After he was seized by the FBI, a news agency issued a lengthy story which concluded as follows: "His sister, Mrs. . . . [full name], wife of a wholesale department store executive here . . . [full name], was notified by the FBI."

One cannot help thinking that the publication of this sentence served no other purpose but to distress an innocent family.

The range of stories bound to cause embarrassment to the persons concerned—particularly love and marital affairs—is very wide. If the names are of no public interest, newspapers could easily abstain from revealing their identity, as is often done abroad. This charitable secrecy is most expedient when an unsuccessful attempt at suicide is made. The return to normal life is easier if, in resuming the social and professional activities, one need not be afraid of gossip.

At the present time, suicides, accomplished or tried, are fully identified in the press. When the coroner has not yet made his statement, the expression "suicide" is not used, but all of its indications are mentioned. In a recent case in Washington the headline ran: "Leaves Three Notes," and in the text financial troubles were hinted at. After having identified the dead man, who was found with a "pistol between his legs," the paper disclosed the surviving relatives, among them a daughter, "22, at Yale University, New Haven, Conn.," and a son "15, a student at Kent School, Kent, Conn.," also the man's father, brothers, sisters—all with the exact addresses. A perfect mailing list.

One of the worst violations of privacy was recently (April 6, 1956) committed by a news agency that issued, and by some newspapers that printed, a story about a woman, who had worked for the FBI in the Communist Party in Minneapolis. When she was revealed as a plant of the police, she disappeared. One day it was discovered that she was working as a barmaid in Houston, Texas. This was made public and the woman was quoted as saying she "wanted to find a place where she could live without fear of the Communists." Now the Communists know where to find her unless she escaped again. Unfortunately, this would not be as simple as before since her picture was printed.

Easily, without impairing the quality of their reports, newspapermen could put an end to these practices. They would unburden their conscience and make a host of helpless individuals somewhat happier.

Dr. Rothenberg is the author of *The Newspaper* (Staples Press 1948), and of periodical articles on journalism.

Who Says So?

By Carey McWilliams

I equate the function of critical journals of opinion with the spirit and method of science. Dissent is the journalist's way of asking the scientist's question: "Who says so?", "Can you prove it?" or, simply, "I don't believe it." It is the way by which individuals and societies protect themselves not only against oppressive orthodoxies but against foolish fallacies. Modern secular societies are not without their own special tribal idols and their own brands of fetishism. Present-day advertising constitutes a form of sorcery that is often successful in inducing even well-educated people to believe that the moon is made of green cheese. Today as yesterday it is very important that we have some dissenters around who, in their outspoken candor, will call attention to the fact that the magnificent emperor is without clothes. In theory, we recognize the fact that a free press is supposed to be critical, to present all points of view, all shades of opinion, and to offer alternative proposals. Indeed this is why freedom of the press is guaranteed by the First Amendment. The value of dissent is not purely negative; it does more than protect us from error. It often points to the truth.

Today there is good reason to believe that the critical journal of opinion in America is finally coming into its own. For one reason, people are becoming bored with the standardized, stereotyped treatment of the news and of opinion which they get in the newsweeklies and in radio and television newscasts. A much more important consideration, however, is the fact that for nearly three decades—a full generation—we have been at war in one form or another. In time of war opinion crystallizes. In time of stress and strain, we stop asking questions. The emphasis is on unity. Thus without being aware of the fact we have been building up a large accumulation of propositions that need to be questioned, discussed, analyzed, kicked around. Only in recent years are we beginning to realize slowly, hesitantly, cautiously, that it is perfectly all right to ask questions, that it is safe to dissent.

Boredom alone will eventually breed a revolt against the passion for trivia, the baby-talk prattle of TV commercials, and the tall tales told by Madison Avenue hucksters. If it comes, it will be a revolt against those aspects of a mass culture that rob the individual of a sense of identity, of a sense of dignity, of a feeling of power in his own ability to influence events. Such a revolt is almost certain to occur—and soon. When it does, the critical journal of opinion will, at long last, come into its own in the United States.

Mr. McWilliams is editor of *The Nation*. This is from a talk to the Associated Collegiate Press Conference.

Pride of Race

By William Worthy

AFRICA'S CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

CA. By Chester Bowles. 134 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. \$2.75.

A few months ago in Kingston, during a discussion ranging from Algeria and Mau Mau to Autherine Lucy and the Montgomery bus boycott, a reporter on one of the Jamaica weeklies observed:

"People all over the world are tired of being lackeys. That's what much of the 'trouble' today is all about."

For the past several years Chester Bowles has valiantly tried to bridge a vast gulf that is simultaneously international, intrracial and intercultural: the gulf between a billion colored "trouble-makers" and an overprivileged Caucasian land which takes for granted the unbalanced world distribution of the good things in life.

Readers familiar with the unprecedented rapport Ambassador Bowles established with a skeptical and distrustful India will not be surprised by his more recent success in eliciting honest and frank answers from Africans. He fears, with Gandhi, that "the white man's pride of race may prove incurable." But verbatim conversations in the book make clear that the Africans he met accepted him intuitively as a man who has risen above ingrained Western myths of superiority. It is equally apparent that he did not limit his contacts to the safe, "good" and hand-picked Africans whom the colonial press officers palm off on gullible visiting firemen.

To Mr. Bowles the challenge of Africa consists of two parts. First, there is the challenge, however painful, to look nationalism in the eye and learn what makes it tick. At several points he reiterates that the foreign-policy problems created by nationalism are not made in Moscow. In one of several swipes at policy-makers in Washington he dismisses this over-simplification which, he writes, "presumably led Mr. Dulles . . . to suggest that the Soviet Union is *creating* the revolutionary unrest which is now keeping so much of Africa in ferment."

The second part of the challenge involves an eleventh-hour need to formulate, with humility, a political and economic program to satisfy the Revolu-

tion of Rising Expectations. In a continent 95 per cent illiterate many Africans just assume that, come the day of independence and self-determination, the higher living standards to which they aspire will be delivered to them, neatly packaged and ready to be savored. Faced with unrealistic demands from their people and only a limited time in which to meet them, newly independent governments will be particularly vulnerable to the Communists when the disillusionment of the rank-and-file freedom fighters sets in. The people, Bowles writes, will be "harried by their own fellow-African landlords, tax collectors, lawyers and entrepreneurs, many of whom will be at least as ruthless in their methods of exploitation as the Europeans." After the transfer of power the author expects that the level of governmental efficiency will go down. Unlike India, which has concentrated so much energy on decentralized village reconstruction, most of Africa's schemes for development call for direction at the center. A decline in administrative efficiency in the capitals will therefore render that much more difficult the attacks on poverty and squalor and illiteracy in the countryside.

Overwhelming though the problems be, Mr. Bowles does not suggest that our Point Four experts and Office of Education draw up ambitious blueprints for presentation to African leaders with an all-too-familiar American presumptuousness. In "Teahouse of the August Moon" we saw the futility of the "Plan B" approach, and we are forewarned that the situation in Africa is not a simple one that will respond quickly to good will, money and new slogans. Indeed, Mr. Bowles declares that the American impact will at most be marginal. He spent sufficient time in India to realize the sensitivity of any people just emerging from colonial status and determined to make their own mistakes for a change. Rather than an effort to spell out a unilateral made-in-Washington program his book is a plea to Americans to wipe clean the slate of preconceptions and color hauteur, to cast aside our cold-war, one-track approach to the mineral-rich continent, and to prepare to work as partners with proud Africans who have no time to be choosing sides in the East-West struggle.

Mr. Bowles appears to be less than optimistic about a change in Western policies earnest enough and rapid enough to help African leaders cope with clear and present crises of land hunger in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, tribalism in Nigeria and the Gold Coast, and color bars in many parts of the continent. In the Belgian Congo he asked the governor-general what it would take to put that colony and its uranium under Communist rule. The reply: "One hundred thousand white European settlers."

Still another Belgian colonial official told what he would do if he were governor of Kenya. "I would float a loan, buy the land, and move the white settlers out—even if it required all the NATO armies. If the settlers are allowed to keep control, they will bring all of Africa tumbling down about our ears."

Because Mr. Bowles has so often been prescient about the colonial world his views in this book deserve a respectful hearing now before new calamities are upon us. A foreword to the book reminds us that in April 1942 the author proposed that Roosevelt and Churchill (or Roosevelt alone if the King's First Minister refused to accede) expand the Atlantic Charter to include the colonial areas. In 1952 and 1953, while serving as ambassador to India, he predicted a new era of "ruble diplomacy"—a prophecy widely ridiculed until the traveling troupe of B & K whistle-stopped through Asia, lading out aid agreements at every capital.

In his present book I was glad that he noted one sidelight of the Asian-African Conference which, at the time, received far too little attention. He writes of "the curious mixture of self-deception, nervousness and arrogance" with which the Atlantic powers viewed the gathering. Washington's nervousness and guilty anticipation of anti-Americanism were so profound that Bandung was overrun with obnoxious "correspondents" clumsily ferreting out "intelligence" which was readily available in the pages of the *New York Times*. In the weeks before Bandung, when word got around that several colored Americans were dollar-deep in these jake journalistic assignments, African delegations at the United Nations rushed

to Negro newsmen and said: "Please say it isn't so."

In a concluding argument for reassessment and rethinking in Washington the author dismisses as futile and outmoded the present reliance on Realpolitik. He then goes on to observe:

"Such factors as people, ideas and faith are emerging as major and often decisive components of national power. Moral considerations, always fundamental in shaping individual human behavior, have, therefore, become crucial elements in determining relationships between whole peoples.

"Of one thing I am sure: if American foreign policy continues to fly in the face of these ideological forces, it will ultimately come to grief."

Conflict on Race

By Marvin Wall

SEGREGATION: The Inner Conflict in the South. By Robert Penn Warren. Random House, N. Y. 66 pp. \$1.95.

For obvious reasons, current American literature is riding the crest of a segregation cycle, and among the more readable recent entries in the field is that of the well-known Kentucky-born author, Robert Penn Warren.

Warren gathered material for his report on segregation in five Southern states. There he listened to, participated in, and noted down the conversations of both races about the smoldering segregation issue. Using these interviews, combined with his writing skill and knowledge of the region. Warren ably develops his stated theme—the South's "inner conflict."

To a Southern reader, some of the conversations reported by Warren ring all too familiar. These are the old arguments, the old fears, and the old resentments in a region stiffening against new pressures, external and internal, for desegregation.

However, some quotations in Warren's book were at least mildly surprising to this Southern reviewer. For example, at one eye-opening point in the book, a youth voices a bitter hatred for Negroes that sounds extreme even in the context of the present-day South's racial

tensions. His animosity would have sounded even more extreme before the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. It seems to this reviewer that the teen-ager's outburst is striking evidence that the high court's decision has seriously exacerbated racial differences in the South.

As journalists, readers of *Nieman Reports* will be particularly interested in the statements of ministers, newspapermen, and others backing up the widespread Southern feeling that the Northern press treats the South unfairly.

In his conclusion, Warren predicts that the South will not desegregate soon.

"When enough people, in a particular place, a particular county or state, cannot live with themselves any more," he says, desegregation will come.

But this book is largely an interpretive reporting job, and a good one, by the author whose *All the King's Men* won a Pulitzer Prize. Warren's Dixie tour took him to parts of the South with which he is most familiar—Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Arkansas.

Our City Traffic

By Fred Pillsbury

THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM. By Wilfred Owen. The Brookings Institution. 301 pp. \$4.50.

The American city is becoming increasingly difficult to live and work in, "largely," says Wilfred Owen in *The Metropolitan Transportation Problem*, because they are difficult to move around in."

This is a simple truth with complicated implications. More than 100 million people live in the cities and suburbs of America. Urban America increases by a million acres annually.

The problem, quite literally, is getting bigger and bigger every year.

And it is getting bigger, ironically, because we are getting more mobile. "The capacity of the transportation system and the low cost and dependability of transport services have enabled an increasing number of people to seek the economic, social, and cultural opportunities that

urban living provides," Mr. Owen writes. "But paradoxically, metropolitan cities have grown to the point where they threaten to strangle the transportation that made them possible."

We are not doing enough to solve the problem. "Few urban highways have been built to anything resembling adequate standards. Traffic must still move on an antiquated gridiron of streets laid out long before the needs of the automobile were known. . . . Despite the congestion of city thoroughfares, the automobile and truck have been left to park haphazardly along the curb and to load and unload in the street where space is badly needed for movement. . . . The modern highway . . . often degenerates at the city limits to an obsolete right of way crowded on both sides with commercial activities strung out in unsightly array to create what has been aptly called America's longest slums. . . . Since the turn of the century, one third of a million people have been killed in motor vehicle accidents on city streets. . . ."

What is to be done? The situation is going to get worse before it gets better. That is a real emergency, as Owen sees it. If we do not take adequate action before long we will have succeeded in drowning our transportation system in its own spit.

The worst problem is the morning and evening rush hour jam between city and suburb. Mr. Owen does not believe transit systems can be developed to do the entire job. He puts more faith in the development of highways and parking. He also suggests staggering hours for working, shopping and school in order to spread the traffic load.

But his chief point is that we will never be able to reach a solution if we go on with "planless growth." Transportation and urban planning must go together. "We will have to use transportation resources to achieve better communities and community planning techniques to achieve better transportation," he concludes.

The Metropolitan Transportation Problem is an intelligent indictment of this country's apparent unwillingness to face the facts of modern urban living. Mr. Owens presents facts and figures to support his thesis and, unlike all too many writers on problems of this type, is very readable.

Inside Russia

By John Dougherty

Nieman Notes

HOW THE SOVIET SYSTEM WORKS. By Raymond A. Bauer, Alex Inkeles, Clyde Kluckhohn. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 251 pp. \$4.75. This book is as fascinating as its title. Newspapermen, especially those who write or edit wire copy, will find it extremely useful.

Some years ago, scholars of Harvard's Russian Research Center interviewed thousands of Soviet refugees in a project sponsored by the Air Force. The aim: to find out how the individual reacts to the Soviet system and how the system treats the individual. This was no Gallup poll; it was done with the skills that the social scientists have developed in their pursuit of the truths they believe can be found in collectible data. The authors made allowances for the bias to be found in many defectors.

First, the authors describe "operating characteristics" of the Soviet system such as "problem-solving" and the refusal to allow independent power centers. Then they turn to the state's attitude toward the individual and the individual's reaction to the regime. Finally, the results are evaluated and the authors hazard some forecasts. It is impossible to summarize them in a review. Two principal conclusions: the citizen hates, above all, (1) the terror and (2) the collective farm system. Can the leadership do anything about these without destroying itself? This is the most interesting discussion in the book; the writers' short-run prediction is that at "worst" the regime may revert to Stalinism and at "best" may become a less-resented but no less totalitarian government.

The book is a version for the general public of the final report on the research project. It is not hard reading, despite an occasional lapse into the jargon of sociology such as "relatively undifferentiated cultural residue." It is a long step toward communicating scholarship to the public on matters of vital concern. A sharp black pencil, some copy-desk synonyms, plus the addition of a few quotes from Refugees A, B and Z could get it a wider public audience.

1939

Nicholas Hopkins, son of Frank S. Hopkins, is a freshman at Harvard. His prep school years were largely in Switzerland while his father was on foreign service assignment in Germany.

At the end of November Edwin A. Lahey was in Poland for the *Chicago Daily News*, covering the troubles in the satellites. This is one of the few parts of the world Ed hadn't worked. On December 8 Lahey was elected (in absentia) a member of the Gridiron Club.

1940

Carroll Kilpatrick moved off the editorial page of the *Washington Post* to cover vice presidential candidates in the campaign and has since then continued on the political reporting staff.

1942

Harry S. Ashmore was elected a director of the Fund for the Republic at their November meeting. He had served as director before but resigned when he joined the Stevenson campaign organization. Ashmore is executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*.

Thomas Sancton has a novel about his native city of New Orleans, published by Doubleday & Company Dec. 27—*Count Roller Skates*. Former AP man in New York, managing editor of the *New Republic*, staff writer for *Life* and contributor to other magazines, Sancton is a staff writer on the *New Orleans Item*. He has published short stories, but this is his first novel.

1943

A new book by Frank K. Kelly, *Reporters Around the World*, is scheduled for January publication by the Atlantic Monthly Press. It is a juvenile and has been selected as the book of the month by the Young People's Division of the Literary Guild. Kelly is vice president of the Fund for the Republic.

1944

Theodore Andrica, nationalities editor of the *Cleveland Press* suggested sending a plane load of clothing to Hungarian refugees. The *Press* and the community supported the idea, started a \$50,000 fund and within a week had America and his city editor and 15,000 pounds of cloth-

ing on a plane for Vienna where they landed Dec. 11.

Theodore Andrica, nationalities editor of the *Cleveland Press* was honored by the Cleveland Folk Arts Association for his 30 years of writing the news of nationality groups.

"Kit" Yahraes, daughter of Dixie and Herbert Yahraes, was married December 15 to Alvin C. Johnson in Bangall, New York.

1945

A new anthology, *Treasury of Snake Lore*, (Greenberg, \$5), includes a story by Robert Bordner of the *Cleveland Press*, entitled "The Peninsula Python—an Absolutely True Story." Bordner's story was originally published in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

These Thousand Hills, A. B. (Bud) Guthrie's new novel, was out in time for Christmas, and a book of the month and on the best seller list by December. Published by Houghton Mifflin Co., it is the third in his series on the development of the West. The first, *The Big Sky*, was on the mountain man. The second, *The Way West*, was on the Western settlers. The new novel is on the cattlemen who opened up the ranges of Montana, which is Bud's home state.

Houstoun Waring, editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, was a member of the American Assembly at Arden House, New York, for their December meeting. The topic: foreign policy. Another newspaper member of the Assembly was Tillman Durdin (1949) veteran Far Eastern correspondent of the *New York Times*.

James Batal has an article "Aub Mother" in the *Arab World* for October, 1956. "Aub Mother" is the affectionate title that generations of undergraduates at the American University of Beirut have conferred on Mrs. Sarah Shahla for her long and devoted care of the sick at the University.

1946

Arthur Hepner reports a new assignment with NBC as a member of the writing group on the Huntley-Brinkley news programs weekdays and the "Outlook" program Sunday afternoons.

1948

Charles W. Gilmore has moved from the staff of the *Toledo Times* (morning) to the *Blade* (evening).

Carl W. Larsen left the news staff of the *Chicago Sun-Times* in November to join the United States Information Agency as Mid-Western representative. Larsen served the agency in Scandinavia several years ago.

Robert M. Shaplen spent more than half of 1956 on a tour of Europe for *The New Yorker*. It produced a variety of copy, including a Far-flung Correspondent's day with Ambassador James B. Conant in Germany. This should have increased *New Yorker* circulation among ten thousand men of Harvard, for to his old Nieman pupil, Mr. Conant uncorked more candid talk about being a college president and what he thought of it than he had yielded in any previous journalistic encounter.

1949

As soon as he had finished covering the American election campaign, Peter Lisagor moved to eastern Europe for the *Chicago Daily News* to report the struggle between Soviet and Satellites. In December he was filing dispatches from Yugoslavia.

1950

The *Washington Post* assigned Murrey Marder to London at the end of the year. He has been covering the "security" story in Washington consistently for five years.

1951

Bob Eddy, with Carrinne and children returned to the St. Paul *Pioneer Press*, after a Reid Fellowship year in England, in time for Bob to tell their adventure abroad in the *Saturday Evening Post* for Dec. 22.

Dwight Sargent, editorial page editor of the Portland, Maine, newspapers, was the speaker at a Nieman dinner November 2. He served on the committee that selected the current group of Nieman Fellows.

1952

Mary Moore and Charles Molony had a six week vacation trip in Italy in October and November.

Louise and John Steele were in Cambridge for the Harvard-Yale game.

1953

Donald D. Janson went off the copy desk of the *New York Times* to work on

one of its campaign survey teams through the Fall and then was stationed at Des Moines as the *Times'* regional correspondent.

The Rochester *Times-Union* ran a six-part series by Calvin Mayne on "Suburbia" in late October. Mayne qualified as an expert, as one of the newest residents of one of the newest houses in the newest suburban development outside Rochester.

Watson Sims was moved from the New York office of AP to London in time to handle the impact of Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal in mid-Summer. He had been in the New York bureau two years, moving up from Chattanooga at the end of his Nieman year.

Wally writes (Nov. 6):

It's amazing how much the Suez Canal has come to mean to us. The darned thing gets down to a personal basis here. Just now the immediate concern is that because of the canal issue the kerosene (which we faithfully call paraffin) we used to try and heat our house and the petrol for our English car are in increasingly short supply. It looks like a cold winter at best, and if the canal is blocked for long the results may show up on the dinner table. Eggs, butter and many other food products are shipped in from Australia and New Zealand.

One professional note which may or may not reach you from other sources involves the effects of Suez on an ancient (1791) and respected Sunday Newspaper—the *Observer*.

On Nov. 4 the *Observer* published a vigorous attack on Eden and on "the government's war." A week later, the *Observer* announced that three of its eight-member board of trustees have resigned in protest. The *Observer* is sticking to its guns, although it appears somewhat shaken. Today's editorial includes a defensive statement on "a newspaper's right to examine its government's aims and actions, once military operations have been embarked upon."

The *Observer* also publishes a scoreboard today of letters received from last Sunday—866 against its editorial and 302 for.

Actually, I've found even greater backing for the government among the people with whom I have talked than

the *Observer* scoreboard would indicate.

The arguments are usually emotional rather than logical. English friends seem to accept, with varying degrees of tolerance, that an American wouldn't understand why the Suez invasion was necessary. But when you get down to the ground floor, they aren't arguing that Britain was trying to separate the combatants or stop a small war by blasting the dickens out of a nation already under attack. They're arguing that it was high time somebody put Nasser in his place and that England just had to do something about the canal.

If I run out of petrol or paraffin in January, I might join 'em.

1954

A second daughter, Katherine Curry Eberhardt, was born October 25 to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Eberhardt in Washington, where Eberhardt is on the staff of the Voice of America.

Richard Dudman started for Israel from the Washington bureau of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* as soon as shooting started in the Sinai Desert and continued covering the Middle East, a recurring assignment with him. He was out there last Spring. His family hoped he'd be home by Christmas.

Douglas Leiterman, Ottawa correspondent for the Southam Newspapers of Canada, started a two month world tour, November 11, to include assignments to the Olympics, to a Colombo Plan meeting in Wellington, N. Z., to Vietnam where a Canadian truce team is operating, to Pakistan where Canada helped build a dam at Peshawar, and to Bombay where Canada has given India an atomic reactor. He expected to visit his Commonwealth associates, Lionel Hudson in Australia and Garth Mead in New Zealand. He had news for them, a daughter, Catherine, born October 16.

Robert E. Farrell has been appointed chief of the Paris Bureau of McGraw-Hill World News, to cover *Business Week*, *Petroleum Week* and the rest of the 34 trade papers in the group. Farrell served in New York and Washington for the *Wall Street Journal* four years. After his fellowship year at Harvard he went to Europe and did free-lance writing from Paris.

Barry Brown, chief editorial writer of the *Providence Journal*, announces a third son and fourth child, Victor Dean, born July 23.

1955

Harcourt, Brace is publishing a first novel next Summer by **Ian Cross**, called *The God Boy*. Cross was Associate Fellow from New Zealand. He calls his novel "the first tangible result of my Nieman year," and credits Theodore Morrison at Harvard with "teaching me how to go about the business of writing before I could start it."

Thomas G. Karsell has joined the staff of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, moving from the *Indianapolis Times* where he was Sunday editor.

Mort Stern and his wife visited Cambridge in November, en route to Philadelphia for the AP Managing Editors conference.

Fred C. Flowers of the Melbourne *Herald* returned to America in December to make a study of television news, in preparation for Australian television development.

The quarterly, *Foreign Affairs*, carried an article in its July, 1956, issue by **Selig Harrison**, "The Challenge to Indian Nationalism." Harrison spent three years in India for the Associated Press and returned with Walter Reuther for a trip in 1956. He is now associate editor of the *New Republic*.

Arch Parsons of the New York *Herald Tribune* covered the British-French expedition to Egypt. He has been in the Middle-East for a year.

Henry Tanner, foreign affairs columnist of the *Houston Post*, spent September and October in the Middle East and

sent back a series of 23 articles, which were widely syndicated by the New York *Herald Tribune* News Service in this country and Canada.

Sam Zagoria, administrative assistant to Senator Case of New Jersey, took a time-out from his job to campaign for another Eisenhower Republican, John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, for the last three weeks before election. Sam writes:

"Campaigning in the hills and villages of Kentucky is rough on the bottom. Constant driving, and when not, fluttering about in tiny planes to land on grass meadows and sometimes not to land at all (no lights on the field) but to head back and start hitchhiking to scheduled events. The man was great and will be a great contribution to the Senate. Bumped into **Hugh Morris** of the C-J (1951) and learned more about Kentucky in a short time than I could otherwise in years. Managed to duck **Dick Harwood** of the C-J (1956) who wrote about foreigners from New York and Washington working for Cooper and Morton. Fortunately he didn't hear about me or couldn't spell my name."

1956

John Dougherty now does a Saturday night double-page roundup of the week's news in the *Rochester Times-Union*, on top of his regular chores as telegraph editor. He says he counts on helpful contributions from **Harry Schmeck** (1954) on science and **Calvin Mayne** (1953) from city hall.

A son, James Coleman Mooney, was born to Mr. and Mrs. **Richard E. Mooney** in Washington, July 12. Mooney worked on the conventions and the campaign for

United Press. The Mooneys have a new home: 5251 43d St., N.W., Washington, D. C.

Harry N. Press has been city editor of the *San Francisco News* since last September.

Robert Hanson has been having a rough siege with Hodgkin's disease, an insidious ailment that had crept up on him over a long painful stretch. He has been in New York for treatments at New York Memorial Center and expected to be through with the treatments by Christmas, then to spend some time in the sun in Arizona and expected to be able to get back on his job at the *Denver Post* early in the New Year.

The Miamian, a new magazine, has been established by Mr. and Mrs. **Edgar F. Seney, Jr.** Its first issue was December, a monthly, with 28 pages, its purpose, the editors explain, is to "interpret the meaning behind the news"; and also to entertain. Ed Seney founded a weekly paper, the *Florida Keys Keynoter*, in 1951, and with it won the Florida Press Association's 1954 award for the best editorial that year. He sold it last year and has recently been on the staff of the *Miami Daily News*.

1957

Marvin Wall, on a Nieman Fellowship from the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*, opened his mail one day to learn he had been appointed city editor in absentia, to take over when he returns in June. City Editor **Carlton Johnson**, a Fellow of two years ago, was made managing editor. Editor **Robert W. Brown**, who announced these appointments, was a Nieman Fellow himself in 1952.

Working Press-Back to School

By Robert L. Perkin

Many of us have watched with growing concern the departure of an increasing number of our best men and women to allied fields or to new careers entirely unrelated to journalism.

It has seemed, sometimes, that they have left the profession just as they reached or were reaching a peak of professional competence.

They have been good men, leaders and potential leaders. Their training has cost time and money. They are needed, and they are wanted. But they still leave.

Their continued departures raise a problem fundamental to the continued advance of our profession: How can we improve newspapers if we can't hang on to our best men?

Probably there are a number of factors involved, not the least of which is economic, but quite aside from the figure on the paycheck one other basic consideration suggests itself. After all, many of these men and women originally entered the profession with full knowledge they probably wouldn't make a lot of money.

Other values and considerations were involved in their choice of a career. One of these probably was the intellectual stimulation and challenge of newspapering.

If so, the challenge quite apparently wears thin for a lot of the men and women we would most like to keep as colleagues.

How can we restore it?

A look at how other professions achieve the same goal we seek offers one suggestion: continuing education to keep challenges sharp and horizons broad. In the medical profession, for example, post-graduate studies, short courses and refresher conferences are very much the rule. No physician assumes that his professional education is complete when he wins his M.D.

Does this sort of avenue offer a hope for professional progress in journalism? Certainly a vital, progressing profession does not want for stimulations and new challenges to its practitioners.

Reflections of this sort have arisen out of the concern of your journalism education advisory committee for ways, not

alone to attract able young people to our profession and to train them well, but also to avoid defeat of good basic education by the apparent failure of journalism to hold on to many of its best-educated, most competent men.

The committee for several years has grappled with this problem. It occupied a forefront position in the discussions of the current committee during two sessions held in connection with newspaper week in Boulder this month.

One of the suggested solutions which has been taking shape has been for a program of short-term fellowships for working newspapermen at the University of Colorado. Thinking on such a program now has reached a point where it seems desirable to seek a wide discussion of its merits.

The program, in effect a "Little Nieman plan," has been under study by the faculty of the C. U. college of journalism for several years. Floyd K. Baskette, who was acting director of the college until the return this fall of Gayle Waldrop from an exchange professorship in Finland, presented to your committee a detailed outline of the tentative planning to date.

The program would be modestly similar to the Nieman fellowships now maintained at Harvard University by the Lucius W. Nieman and Agnes Wahl Nieman fund.

It is proposed that ten practicing newspapermen from Colorado or the region be brought to the C. U. campus for a period of five weeks each summer.

The C. U. program would be smaller in scale than the Nieman fellowships, but would have the same objective. "We want to help qualified newspapermen reinforce their background for dealing with the complex pattern of events which makes the news," Baskette said.

Newspaper editors and reporters who were selected for the C. U. fellowships would be offered the time and opportunity to study state, regional and larger problems of their own choosing while they were on the C. U. campus.

Men who have had several years of newspaper experience have in the process learned to do purposeful reading and re-

search and to absorb information and ideas. But immersed in the routine of their work they have little time or energy for study and reappraisal—and possibly this is where some of the stimulation dwindles.

A "sabbatical leave" from their newspapers as a C. U. fellow would offer an opportunity to fill gaps in their knowledge and experience which most of us become aware of only after several years in the profession.

Close association of the fellows during the five weeks at the university would provide a needed chance for exchange of experience and ideas and to learn from a comparison of problems and solutions.

In addition, association with the regular C. U. faculty as well as with visiting specialists on the campus each summer would further expand personal horizons in many fields. In classrooms, seminars and informal discussions, the fellows would enjoy contacts that would stir new ideas, new enthusiasms, fresh viewpoints.

Objectives would be individual, just as in the Nieman fellowships. Each fellow would develop his own program to make use of such resources of a great university as he might find serviceable to his ends.

Some undoubtedly would arrive with gaps to fill in previous formal education. Others would want to catch up on the changing world in science, economics, world affairs or any other field. Some might want to study special regional or community problems, to prepare for new assignments, to prepare themselves in areas where modern journalism now increasingly calls for specialization: labor, economics, agriculture, science, city government.

No requirements would be laid upon the fellows for class attendance or examinations. They would be offered no degrees and no academic credits. They would divide their time as they chose among lecture and library, conference and laboratory, discussion and cogitation.

Elements of the program for all fellows would include:

1. Free access to all resources of the university library.
2. Two special seminars a week arranged by the director of the program, with a different professor or guest lecturer

on each occasion. Topics to be geared to current questions.

3. A weekly dinner meeting, with invited faculty members and special guests for discussions of newspaper problems.

4. Housing in a C. U. dormitory to provide for maximum opportunity for informal discussion and exchange of ideas.

Beyond these four arrangements, each fellow would be free to operate as he sees fit, although he would be required to indicate a field of interest and the uses to which his period of study at the university would be put.

It is proposed that the number of fellows be limited to ten, with two alternates chosen annually in event of vacancies. The program might be a strictly Colorado plan, or it might be regional in scope.

The fellows would be chosen from among applicants by a committee which might include the president and past president of the Colorado Press Association, the director of the college of journalism and one professor selected by the president of the university.

At the close of the five-week fellowship period each summer, an annual banquet would be held to which all former fellows would be invited. An outstanding speaker would be called in for this meeting. In addition former fellows would be linked by an annual publication including articles written by fellows, former fellows and other newspapermen on current affairs and newspaper problems.

Tentatively, the program would be given a five-year trial run, after which its merits would be re-evaluated.

It is calculated that to launch the program a fund of \$25,000 would be needed. This would be expended at the rate of \$5000 a year as follows:

Ten fellowship grants at \$400 each \$4000
Administrative expenses, special
dinners, speakers, etc. . . . \$1000

Since the program would be held during the summer, many if not all of the fellows would be using their regular vacation periods to cover part of the time they are away from their jobs.

—Colorado Editor, Oct. 1956

Robert L. Perkin of the staff of the *Rocky Mountain News* is chairman of the journalism education advisory committee of the University of Colorado.

A Lawyer Looks at Suez

Emotionally charged phrases have been used to describe the Suez Canal. But in the deglamorized language of the law, Suez is an "international waterway," presenting legal problems inextricably bound up in explosive political ones.

About two years ago, with support of a small grant from Carnegie Corporation, Richard R. Baxter, assistant professor of law at the Harvard Law School, started research into the legal status of the Canal as part of the School's program of international legal studies. His work is an analysis of the recurrent problems posed by international waterways, the solutions reached, and the procedures devised to deal with such problems. Although it deals with all international waterways, including straits and rivers, it is particularly concerned with canals and, within that category, particularly with Suez.

In the case of Suez, as in that of international waterways generally, the interests of three major groups are involved: those of the user, those of the operating agency, and those of the state through which the waterway runs. As most of the world has learned during recent months, the "user" of Suez is plural, to the extent of 14,666 transits during 1955 by ships of more than 45 nations involving the transport of 107,508,000 tons of goods. The "operating agency," until its nationalization by the Egyptian government, was the *Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez*, a company incorporated in Egypt with headquarters in Paris, whose stock is held by the British government and many private investors. The "state through which the waterway runs" is, of course, Egypt.

The reconciliation of these interests—even in the absence of such a crisis as now envelops Suez—is by nature complicated in the extreme. It involves the application of both national and international law, and ranges from matters heavily freighted with political and strategic importance to seemingly mundane practical problems. And as Mr. Baxter points out in one chapter of the monograph he is now preparing, there are some vexing issues which any administering authority—be it an international commission, operating company, or national government—has to meet in

the day-to-day operations of a waterway.

From Port Said to Ismailia

Some of these problems, large and small, Mr. Baxter saw for himself during a visit to the Suez area in the spring of 1955. He made his headquarters at Ismailia, about midway in the 100-mile-long waterway between Suez, at the Red Sea entrance, and Port Said, on the Mediterranean. Ismailia is literally a flowerland blooming in the desert; luxurious and colorful gardens seem even more brilliant in contrast with the white sand of the desert beyond. The flowers—and the thin border of vegetation which lines the waterway throughout most of its length—owe their life to the freshwater canals which were needed before the building of the big Canal could begin during the past century. The maintenance of these small arteries, carrying precious water from the Nile many miles away, is a *sine qua non* to the maintenance of the Canal itself. Ironically, the irrigation necessary to support life along the Canal has given rise to one of the dangers that plague navigation—the thick fogs which periodically blanket the treacherous passage.

But on many nights the desert sky is crystal clear, and then another practical problem arises. A highway, fairly heavily traveled by trucks and automobiles, runs along the bank of the Canal. It is essential that motorists dim their headlights so that ships' pilots will not be blinded by the glare from these vehicles. This is one of many instances in which one major interest (the state) must enact and enforce laws regulating its own population for the benefit of another interest (the user). There are many other situations which demand cooperation and coordination between sometimes conflicting interests.

Of Bridges and Camels

For example, the railway crossing Egypt from east to west must, of course, cross the Canal, which it does by means of a bridge. Extremely close coordination of time schedules is necessary to permit reasonable operation of the railway, on the one hand, without the dangerous and expensive stoppage of a convoy which would result if the swing-bridge were across the Canal at the wrong moment.

The impact of local laws upon the op-

eration of a waterway is bound to be profound. This is true in more than just the obvious cases, such as the right of the sovereign state to make customs and sanitary inspections—and a state bent on harassing canal traffic might choose to be highly exacting about cleanliness. It is true also in more bizarre circumstances. The long reaches of the desert used to be a favorite route for the smuggling of drugs from the East into the heavily populated areas along the Nile. The Canal presented something of a barrier, which was sometimes surmounted in novel ways. One extreme expedient employed by smugglers was to force a camel to swallow a container holding the drug, ferry him across the Canal, and slaughter him on the other side. In trying to smash the drug ring the Egyptian government had to have some control over the laborers along the Canal.

The whole question of labor raises sensitive issues between the operating agency and the local government. Most American newspaper readers are aware of the momentary dearth of pilots to navigate vessels through Suez that developed when the company was nationalized. Even aside from the high degree of navigational skill required, the pilots need other peripheral gifts. Mr. Baxter made a trip through half the Canal, from Port Said to Ismailia, on a Greek ship piloted by a Frenchman who, perfectly bilingual in French and English, called orders to the helmsman in Greek and was capable of giving nautical instructions in nine or ten other languages.

The 200 skilled pilots, however, represent but a fraction of the number of men needed for the constant upkeep of the Canal. Relations with the host country must be cordial, or at least not hostile, if the operating agency is to obtain cooperative local workers. And the same is true when it is necessary to import skilled labor for certain jobs, since the sovereign nation has the right to issue or withhold visas.

In addition to labor and the reasonable application of local law, the state must be willing to provide—or allow to be provided—other facilities, such as ports, sup-

plies of water, the furnishing of stores and fuel, and means for the transshipment of goods (such as the free zone in Port Said).

In short, as Mr. Baxter points out, it is not enough merely to establish an agency to run a waterway. Other facilities and labor are needed, and the denial of these can as effectively choke off the use of a waterway as the literal closing of the passage.

The practical considerations reported in this account comprise only a small section of the study Mr. Baxter is preparing. His monograph, which he expects to complete by the end of the year, deals with the traditional roles of the operating or supervising agency, fiscal regimes, problems of free passage in times of peace as well as war, and questions of neutralization and defense. One portion of the study, "The Passage of Ships Through International Waterways in Time of War," has already been published in *The British Yearbook of International Law* for 1954.

Today's Suez Canal—a modern and usable version of the link between the two great seas that existed in the days of the Pharaohs—is a feat of engineering skill. Its management requires other skills of equal magnitude. The importance of Mr. Baxter's study is that it suggests all those things which must be taken into account when a political settlement is reached about the status of an international waterway, be it Suez or any other.

—Quarterly Report of the Carnegie Corporation, Oct. 1956

Reviewers

Our reviewers are:

William Worthy, special writer and foreign correspondent, Afro-American. He toured Africa last Summer:

Marvin Wall, city editor, Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*. He has covered the segregation issue the past two years.

Fred Pillsbury, editorial writer, the Boston *Herald*.

John Dougherty, telegraph editor of the Rochester *Times-Union*.

The first three are currently Nieman Fellows. Dougherty was a year ago.

Negro Press Reduced by 12 in Year

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.—From 202 a year ago the number of Negro newspapers operating in the United States has dropped to 190 today, according to the annual count by the Lincoln University School of Journalism. One is a daily, four are semi-weekly, three bi-weekly, and 182 weekly.

The School of Journalism compilation, available free on request, lists papers for 32 states, the District of Columbia and Alaska. The lists omits specialized publications and includes only commercial newspapers.

Alabama leads the country with 16 newspapers, three less than it had at the start of 1954. Following in order are: Tennessee, with 13; California, 12; Ohio, 11, and Florida and Texas, 10 each. Sixteen states have no Negro newspapers: Arizona, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Montana, Wyoming, Connecticut, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Idaho, Maine, West Virginia, and, one which joined the group this year, Delaware.

Twenty-nine titles were added to the Lincoln University list during the year, including the *Alaska Spotlight*, at Anchorage; the *Arizona Sun* at Phoenix; the *Southwest Georgian* at Albany; the *Southern Sun* at Sikeston, Mo.; the *Star Review* at Los Angeles, and the *Florida Star* at Jacksonville.

Meanwhile, forty-two titles were dropped from the listing during 1954, including four that started during the year. Among those discontinuing publication in 1954 were the *Progressive News* at Jacksonville, Fla.; the *Call and Tropical Dispatch* at Miami; the *Record Dispatch* at Tallahassee; the *Macon (Ga.) World*; *Chicago Enterprise*; *Iowa Observer*; *Hutchinson (Kan.) Blade*; *Southern News* at Asheville, N. C.; the *Canton (Ohio) Educator*; the *Cleveland Herald*, *Ohio Daily Express* at Dayton; the *Tulsa Appeal*; *Houston (Texas) Defender*, and *Charlottesville (Va.) Tribune*.

Scrapbook— Pinnell Blames Paper In Weinberger Kidnap

MINEOLA, L. I., Sept. 17.—Stuyvesant Pinnell, Nassau County detective chief in charge of the Peter Weinberger kidnaping case, refused tonight "to be charged with the death of a child whose life we did everything to save, while the real responsibility rests elsewhere."

That responsibility, Mr. Pinnell said, rests with "one metropolitan newspaper when that newspaper refused to cooperate in withholding the news to help us get the baby back unharmed and possibly apprehend the kidnaper."

Mr. Pinnell, who has been the target of criticism in his handling of the case, did not identify the newspaper. But John McDonald, secretary of the Nassau County police department, made it clear that the detective chief referred to the New York *Daily News*, the first paper on the street with the story on July 4.

[In its editions today, the *Daily News* carried a story by Ben White, its Long Island staff reporter, giving his account of the incident. An editor's note at the end of this story stated:

"John McDonald . . . officially asked the *News* to withhold the kidnaping story in a telephone call to the city desk at approximately 9:15 p.m. At that time the edition carrying the story had been on the streets for about forty-five minutes. McDonald, in making the call, remarked that he had already phoned two other New York morning newspapers and one afternoon paper."]

"That's not true," Mr. McDonald replied tonight. He asserted that, at 7:45 p.m. on July 4, he had telephoned Mr. White and asked him to call his paper and request that it withhold the kidnaping story.

He said he told the reporter to suggest that his paper call Mr. Pinnell if any further explanation of the request was desired.

Mr. Pinnell, in the statement he issued today, said the paper called him back (Mr. McDonald put the time at shortly after 8 p.m.) and gave this account of the conversation:

"One newspaper, which had been con-

tacted one-half hour before its second edition, notified me that despite an urgent plea from its Nassau reporter, it was going ahead anyway and print the full story.

"I asked: 'Isn't a human life worth more to you than a story?' The answer was: 'I agree, but I was told to call you to tell you that we can't hold the story.'

"Somebody had made a fateful decision utterly destroying our efforts at secrecy, the secrecy needed to help us get back the baby unharmed. I would not want such a decision on my conscience."

Shortly after the kidnaping, Robert G. Shand, managing editor of the *Daily News*, said that his paper was not aware of any police request to withhold the kid-

napping story when the *News* published it in its 8:30 p.m. edition.

In his account, Mr. White said he had told Mr. McDonald about 8:15 p.m. to have Mr. Pinnell call the *Daily News* and request that the story be withheld. "I pointed out to McDonald," he stated, "that there undoubtedly would be some questions concerning this requested suppression that my newspaper would want answered and which Pinnell would be better able to answer than I."

Asked who is was from the *Daily News* who had called Mr. Pinnell shortly after 8 p.m., Mr. McDonald replied that he did not know.

—New York *Herald Tribune*, Sept. 18

Mr. Dulles Corrects the Record

Washington, Oct. 16 (AP)—Secretary of State Dulles insisted today he must retain the right—in order to protect the foreign relations of the United States—to edit the transcripts of his news conferences and correct any blunders he may have made.

Dulles told reporters he could not be put in the invariable position of being held literally to the precise words he used in reply to every question asked at news conferences.

What is of paramount importance, he said, is that words going into the permanent record should represent what he intended to say—not what he might in fact have said due to some error of expression or, as Dulles himself called it, a blunder.

The question was raised at today's meeting with newsmen because of events after an Oct. 2 news conference when Dulles made statements which linked the issue of colonialism with the Suez Canal crisis and with differences the United States has had with Britain and France over the Suez issue.

After that conference, aides discussed with Dulles the possibility the British and French might react sourly to being tagged with a "colonial powers" label. Dulles changed several lines in the transcript so that his remarks in the edited record were not what he had said. The editing separated the colonialism comments from the Suez issue almost entirely.

When the matter of these changes was

raised today by Chalmers M. Roberts of the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*, Dulles responded with a tight voice and rapid fire of words which left no doubt that he was at least momentarily displeased that the subject was brought up. He said there might be times when he blundered and he had to reserve the right to correct those blunders.

At one point, Dulles said he would review the whole business of whether to have news conferences at all if it appeared they were to be used to trap the secretary in a blunder. Later, he said in a more relaxed and smiling manner that he did not in fact believe that newsmen attended conferences and questioned him with a view to entrapment but rather in order to obtain information about U. S. policy and report it to the world.

Dulles was reminded that the White House usually authorizes direct quotation of President Eisenhower's news conference statements as soon as the record can be prepared.

John A. Scali of the Associated Press asked Dulles whether he would give assurance that whenever a transcript was changed it would be labeled in such a way that the change would be unmistakable. Dulles said he did not object to the notion that a record which he had in fact changed might, for example, be designated as a "corrected transcript."

John M. Hightower of the Associated

Press told Dulles that reporters were disturbed about the changing of a transcript because this meant in fact rewriting the record of what had happened to create an impression different from the actual fact. Hightower noted that the first news of every conference comes from the reporters' own accounts of the questions and answers, and said the changing of answers for the official version of a conference made it appear that what had in fact happened was not what happened.

Dulles said he did not question the right of reporters to use whatever he said in indirect quotation as soon as his conference ended, but that he did insist on the necessity of being able to correct his words when later released for direct quotation.

Southern Editors on Travel Grants

Selecting of three Southern journalists for a travel fellowship for assignments in foreign countries was announced Oct. 6 by the Southern Association of Nieman Fellows. They are:

Thomas E. Waring, editor of the *Charleston News and Courier*.

Thomas Abernethy, editor of the *Daily Home*, Talladega, Alabama.

Louis Harris, executive editor, the *Augusta Chronicle-Herald*.

Waring will study the impact of the American military on the economy of Spain, England, France and Germany. He plans to go to the foreign countries next spring.

Abernethy will investigate the history and application of press freedom in non-metropolitan areas in England. He will leave in November.

Harris, also leaving in November, will go to Japan to study the living conditions among industrial workers, with special attention to the textile industry.

The newsmen are the first of 12-15 Southern journalists who will be chosen for foreign travel and study with expenses paid, in the recently inaugurated association program.

Association President Robert W. Brown, editor of the *Columbus Ledger*, announced the selections. Serving with him on the board of judges were Sylvan Meyer, editor of the *Daily Times*, Gainesville, Georgia, and E. L. Holland, editorial writer, the *Birmingham News*.

What to Teach in Journalism

May I add a postscript to Prof. Warner's defense of advertising as a journalism subject (N. R. Jan. '56) in his answer to Mr. Stern's recent article on what schools should teach about journalism. (N. R. Oct. '55).

Perhaps Mr. Stern is not aware that the concept of journalism education has broadened considerably in the last fifty years. Where it was once confined to metropolitan newspaper training, with perhaps a bow to the weekly press, it now covers such diverse areas as radio and television, magazine writing and editing, the trade press, house periodicals and publications, advertising and public relations. In fact, some of our leading schools of journalism are now "schools of communications," a phrase that had to be coined as the education moved from the confines of newspaper training.

One of my eminent colleagues, with a good deal of experience in teaching, has defined journalism as "the transmission belt between the source of information, ideas, and opinion; and the public." Surely that covers all the media heretofore mentioned. If that interpretation of journalism were accepted it would not be necessary to use the broader term of communications. Unfortunately folks like Mr. Stern insist on taking the narrow view.

Mr. Stern would prepare his students for all of these fields of communication by subjecting them to a few simple core courses. Now I am strong for core courses if they are basic to all media, but there is an implication in Mr. Stern's article that his core courses are geared almost entirely to the daily newspaper.

He would give students "an indoctrination course in what journalism is and what it used to be." (Presumably, this would cover the journalistic activities of Bennett, Dana, Pulitzer, Knight and Sulzberger, but would the students learn anything about George Creel, Elmer Davis, Henry Luce, or Edward R. Murrow? Certainly their contributions to the transmission of information, ideas, and opinions are worth mentioning.)

Mr. Stern would follow this with a substantial course in "basic journalistic writing and reporting." (Good, but why not

simply a course in basic writing and reporting to fit all media?)

"There must also be a course covering such things as copyreading, typography, headline writing, picture editing, mackup and the mechanics and problems of newspaper and magazine production," says Mr. Stern. (These terms certainly have a daily newspaper flavor. Moreover, I'm greatly surprised that Mr. Stern recognizes magazines as a part of journalism. Later he decries such things as magazine writing courses.)

I would go along with his course in Logic, but why a course in "newspaper law?" Aren't there laws and regulations applying to other media?

Finally, Mr. Stern would rout out such "trade courses" as radio, TV and magazine writing, editorial writing and feature writing. He would substitute for them a course in "creative writing." (This is a confusing term. In our catalogue, it means fiction writing. Surely, this isn't what Mr. Stern means, or does he?) For he says: "A journalist is concerned with facts, but he must present them to an audience which is preoccupied with fables."

Public relations and advertising he would consign to the business school. Prof. Warner has made the case for advertising as a journalism subject. I would make a similar plea for public relations, not primarily as a technique, but as a vital force in our communications system of today.

I confess sympathy with Mr. Stern's emphasis on the daily newspaper, for most of my experience has been in this field. And 25 years ago I felt much as he does. I might say, too, that I have a high personal regard for Mr. Stern's boss, E. Palmer Hoyt, who has transformed the *Denver Post* from one of the worst newspapers in America to a journal of considerable regional and national prestige. But not even the *Denver Post's* staff instructor is entitled to speak for all education in journalism and communications.

Bryon H. Christian
Professor of Journalism
University of Washington