

NiemanReports

January, 1958

Bernard DeVoto

By A. B. Guthrie

Twenty Years of Nieman Fellowships

Louis M. Lyons

The All-Day Newspaper

Victor J. Danilov

The Voice of the West

Alastair Scott

Denmark: Labor Press Puzzle

Max Awner

Access to Quasi-Public News

Charles-Gene McDaniel

Getting Through to Newspaper Readers

Byron H. Christian

Critic's Corner: Keen Rafferty — Reviews: Press of 1776 — Segregation-Integration
— John McL. Clark: Life of a Young Editor. Nieman Notes.

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; 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; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; Charlotte F. Robling, Norwalk, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; 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. XII; NO. 1

JANUARY, 1958

"Basic Issues in the News"

Columbia Opens a New Journalism Course

Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism opened last Fall with a new dean, Edward W. Barrett. One of his first moves was to establish a course, "Basic Issues in the News," described by Columbia as "a new program to enable young journalists to attain broader understanding of underlying currents in the news under the guidance of leading scholars."

The new course was announced as follows:

Six high-ranking members of other faculties of the University will join the Faculty of Journalism in conducting the course. With their help, the students will examine six major issues through background readings, lectures, seminars, writing assignments and the production of major research papers. The first year of the experimental program was made possible by a gift to the School of The New York Times Foundation.

The six visiting lectures will be:

Dr. John R. Dunning, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Professor of Physics.

Dr. Philip C. Jessup, Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law and Diplomacy.

Dr. Robert M. MacIver, Lieber Professor Emeritus of Political Philosophy and Sociology.

Dr. Wallace S. Sayre, Professor of Public Administration.

Dr. Herbert Wechsler, Harlan Fiske Stone Professor of Constitutional Law.

Dr. Leo Wolman, Professor of Economics.

Dean Barrett described the course as an effort to add some grounding in the substance of the news to the

School's training in journalistic skills. "The course should," the dean said, "enable the young journalist to see an event as it emerges from the stream of current history. It should stimulate him to read, to think, to place in intelligent perspective all the occurrences that are his to deal with. We believe the course will further Joseph Pulitzer's tradition of free inquiry, upon which the School was founded."

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of the University, called the new course "an example of significant pioneering in journalism education."

"You might call this an attempt to build bridges from the Graduate School of Journalism to the several faculties," President Kirk said. "The bridges, of course, will be broad enough to carry the two-way intellectual traffic. Ideas will flow both ways. The journalists will benefit greatly; but so, too, will the scholars of the other faculties, meeting the young newspapermen in their world of journalism."

The immediate objects of the course will be to give all of the School's 72 degree candidates an acquaintance with the six major issues and to drill them in the disciplines of scholarship as they prepare major papers and shorter articles.

The six subjects to be studied are:

ENERGY AND CONTROL. Dean Dunning, a pioneer in the development of the atomic bomb and a leading physicist, will survey the history of the development of physical energy, the physics of heat and fuel, the politics of nuclear energy, and the role of government in nuclear control and development. Collaborating with him will be Professor John Foster, Jr., of the Faculty of Journalism.

THE NATIONAL STATE AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY. Professor Jessup, formerly ambassador at large and United States Representative at the United Nations, will discuss international relations and organizations, American traditions of isolationism, and combinations and balances of power. His collaborator will be Professor John Hohenberg.

FREEDOM AND SECURITY. Professor MacIver, an author and sociologist, will examine national security and the limits of freedom, with special reference to freedom of opinion; and economic and social security and the rights of the individual.

THE CRISIS OF THE CITY. Professor Sayre, who has held positions in the New York City and Federal governments, will review urban history, the city's powers and limitations, its administration and financing, its politics, and its future problems. His collaborator will be Professor Richard T. Baker.

THE COURTS AND THE CONSTITUTION. Professor Wechsler, a former United States Assistant Attorney General and government adviser, will trace the development of the law and the judiciary, courts and their juris-

(Continued on page six)

DeVoto — A Memoir

by A. B. Guthrie

I am going to talk about Bernard DeVoto—Benny, as so many of us called him. It is a difficult subject. Any appraisal of DeVoto and his works is sure to be so much less than the man that I approach this assignment with misgivings and humility. The task is made all the harder because Benny was my friend.

In the beginning we talked of having two pieces about him, perhaps on the subjects of DeVoto, the historian, and DeVoto, the militant and critical friend of the American West. I found him indivisible. In addition, I found other aspects of his personality and his life that I wanted to talk about.

I am not going to say much about his contributions to the craft of fiction. They were great. Due to him, we know something about the actual visceral workings of fiction. Others have added to it, amended it—but the first and greatest indebtedness is to him. If you want really to know the basis on which most of us teachers operate, read DeVoto's *World of Fiction*. Just about everything that we know and believe is expanded in it.

We know more about fiction than non-fiction. That is, we have developed principles that we consider aids to writers, beginning and established. And it is one of the losses in DeVoto's death that he had not the time to bring his powers of mind to bear on the subject of non-fiction. He had agreed to do so in that summer before he died, and I am sure as I am sure of anything that he would have analyzed, organized, and articulated theories as valuable as the theories of fiction that make Bread Loaf the finest writers' conference in America.

A. B. (Bud) Guthrie talks about his friend Bernard DeVoto, historian, journalist, crusader, teacher, and great personality. DeVoto and Guthrie have each given us a trilogy on the West. Guthrie's is the more recent, but on the same path—*The Big Sky*, *The Way West*, *These Thousand Hills*. *The Way West* was the Pulitzer prize novel of 1949. A newspaperman for 21 years on the Lexington (Ky.) *Leader* and a Nieman Fellow from that paper in 1944-45, he was executive editor when he resigned to join the faculty of the University of Kentucky in 1947. He has just completed a motion picture of *These Thousand Hills*. He lives now in his native Montana and is a member of its State Board of Education. This memoir of DeVoto was first a lecture at the Bread Loaf Writers Conference in Vermont where both DeVoto and Guthrie taught their craft.

Let's have a look at DeVoto. He was a Westerner who in a sense renounced the West but still loved it. I told him once that he was in the position of a man who had left his wife only to find that if he couldn't get along with her neither could he get along without her, and Benny gave me his little knowing grin and agreed that it was so.

But to begin to understand Benny, you have to read the Preface to one book of his trilogy. That book is *The Year of Decision*, and he opens it with what he titles an Invocation by Henry Thoreau. I am going to read what Thoreau wrote and what DeVoto uses:

When I go out of the house for a walk, uncertain as yet whither I will bend my steps, and submit myself to my instinct to decide for me, I find, strange and whimsical as it may seem, that I finally and inevitably settle southwest, toward some particular wood or meadow or deserted pasture or hill in that direction. My needle is slow to settle—varies a few degrees and does not always point due southwest, it is true, and it has good authority for this variation, but it always settles between west and south-southwest. The future lies that way to me, and the earth seems more unexhausted and richer on that side. . . . Let me live where I will, on this side is the city, on that the wilderness, and ever I am leaving the city more and more and withdrawing into the wilderness. I should not lay so much stress on this fact if I did not believe that something like this is the prevailing tendency of my countrymen. I must walk toward Oregon, and not toward Europe.

In a sense, that describes DeVoto. He always walked West.

Or, let's go a little further and say that while DeVoto's outrage, indignation, or mere fretfulness was with the present culture of all America, his heart lay in the early West of the mountain man and the prairie schooner.

He came out of the West, and he was the half-horse and the half-alligator of the keel-boat days he loved to talk about. He was a ring-tailed screamer—which isn't the same thing as saying he was by parentage half-Catholic and half-Mormon, though he was that. He wound up believing in neither creed and never finding a creed he could embrace or that would embrace him.

He was a man, as one friend has put it, of ready indignation. In his private tantrums, and he had them, he was likely to say that all Westerners were fools or that it was the wheelbarrow that taught the Irish to stand on their hind

legs. But when his sentiments, disciplined and reasoned on second thought, appeared in print they were judicious and usually unassailable if still hot with feeling.

I am trying to talk about DeVoto, the various personality that he was. I suppose submitting a hodge-podge is a consequence, but he was so many things!

Was he an historian or historiographer? I wrote to several people about this to get their ideas. Their names I won't mention. One of them answered, "As he rode along through the years it seems to me that he always had either embryonically or fully born, the idea of the sweeping continuum of history and that this flow could be seen through the analysis of moments of time—a year of decision. Looking at his western river, he would select a spot on its bank from which to describe the whole. I should say also that Benny had a very special kind of feeling about individual people. After all, the West was explored and traversed and opened up by a handful of people, and to the end of his life Benny maintained this grasp on the effect and value of an individual in the processes of history, more especially his kind of history."

Another correspondent reported, "Benny has talked hours about his horizontal theory of history, but in some way his talk when he is communicating goes into one's mind, becoming a part of one's own thinking and is therefore quite impossible to put on paper."

Still another correspondent wrote me, "The other thing I want to see said is on the DeVoto that would have been. I think you can almost see the outlines of his speech to America that was still to come, and in respect and humility it would nonetheless be fair and fun to try to see what that speech might have been."

I am still asking: Was he a writer of history?

I am afraid the academic historians or historiographers would say no, and I am afraid they would say it for a compelling but bad first reason. He could write so much better than they, except for a handful at most.

Who of them could write this way—as Benny wrote as he was describing the Battle of Palo Alto in the Mexican War?

Throughout the war the Mexicans had difficulty getting soldiers who could shoot and greater difficulty in supplying them with food and powder, but their armies were beautifully costumed. These are the shakos, pompons, plumes, buckles, aiguillettes, pennons, epaulets, and saber slashes you saw pictured in your grandfather's books when you were a child. They glittered in the noon sun like a battle piece by Benjamin West, and, after tranquilly watering his troops, Taylor formed a line and moved out to attack the haberdashery.

In all the books of DeVoto's trilogy there is instance after instance of this effective, imaginative, but accurate

writing. No wonder that the dull pedantic historiographer should look on him as a rare sparrow, not to be granted the boon of brotherhood.

I am a little critical myself but for different reasons. Benny would resent what I have to say—but he would kill me if I did not speak my mind.

Let's start with a footnote in *The Easy Chair*, a footnote written only partly with tongue in cheek. "The three books (*Course of Empire*, *Year of Decision* and *Across the Wide Missouri*,) may be regarded as my solution of the problem of how to avoid writing a history of the Civil War, to the study of which I devoted my first years of historical research. I regard them as a treatise on the causes, outcome, and meaning of the Civil War."

That statement certainly is right, but right only for people with unusual information, knowledge, background. Of course Benny was a great historiographer, and if I am bothered about certain aspects of his histories, it is because of my own limitations. Yet lack of full communication is a legitimate criticism.

In each of the books of his trilogy, he assumes much, or, let's say, he asks much of us as readers. He proceeds on the theory that our frame of reference will be as comprehensive as his own. The result is that many of his allusions puzzle us. We don't know as much as he did. His reach exceeds our grasp.

If you were to ask me what Benny's greatest contributions were to America I would have to say the quickly forgotten but enduringly effective journalistic pieces, like "Due Notice to the F. B. I." Even more important are the articles that sought to preserve our West. Benny was a journalist and a pro. He would like to hear me say that. I am not sure that he would like to hear me say that he was a crusader, though he was.

Who was, if not the first to see the importance of water to the West, the first to impress that importance on all of us? Who attacked and exposed the efforts of the sheep and cattle men to destroy the Forest Service and appropriate our public lands?

It was Benny. Benny made outrage articulate in a way that no one else could. The result—the land grabbers failed; some of those in the Congress lost their seats; the public lands still belong to all of us; the Forest Service is stronger than before.

Benny himself took too pessimistic a view of what was to follow. In his last book he wrote a doleful chapter called "Conservation Down and on the Way Out." He didn't know what he had done.

I have a letter fresh from Washington. I can't tell you from whom. It goes:

The Forest Service has not had a lot of trouble in the last five years. D'Ewart and some of his constituents

who were extra greedy took a real beating when they introduced the Grazing Bill. They learned quite a lesson, and because of it similar interests and groups are being more cautious than they used to be. To my knowledge, other agencies, like the Bureau of Land Management, have experienced a similar quiet period.

If there is still trouble to be faced, it has been reduced by Benny.

What troubles? The move to give special privileges in what are called National Wilderness Areas, the power controversy, the sentiment to *free* the Indians because oil, gas, and uranium have been found on reservations. We still need Benny.

What do we come to finally with regard to Bernard DeVoto? What was he, what is he, aside from being journalist, historian, historiographer and fighter for the rights of the Bill of Rights?

My own conclusion, and this I say with immense admiration, is that in his historical writing he was a re-creator. No one in my knowledge so has made history come alive. He understood, and his books understand, that history is a sweep from start to present to future. It is all one. A lesser mind said: "There is no past. The past is now." Benny showed this to be true, especially in our national terms, especially in his treatment of the westward movement.

I want to quote you some of the things he said which put you where people were.

Of Sir William Drummond Stewart, a Briton for whom the fur-trade rendezvous shone brighter than all the glitter of court, DeVoto wrote:

Something moves in the willows and the Manton is cocked and Sir William stands up in his stirrups—Ephraim is there, Old Caleb, the white bear of the mountains, so terrible that to kill one is a coup as glorious as striking with your bare hand an enemy in his own tipi. For half a mile mules and wagons are stretched out in flat light, dust above the caravan like an opening umbrella, emptiness everywhere, the earth flowing like water at its edges, a false lake hung with groves that have no reality. Here are the braves riding in from the hunt; their faces are like a sorcerer's mask, they are naked to a g-string, the blood of buffalo has soaked their moccasins and dyed their forearms and calves, the squaws wait for them with basins of clear cold water from the Siskadee. At night the campfire will be carmine and Black Harris describing the landscape of fable and Old Gabe continuing his dictations on the Blackfoot wars. Tom Fitzpatrick, Andy Drips, Henry Fraeb, Joe Meek, Doc Newell, Kit Carson, Bill Williams, Jack Walker. And Lucien Fontenelle. Dead?—Jesu! Jesu! a' drew a good bow; and dead! a' shot a fine shoot!

A snake girl with a look in her eyes, the young breasts, the fine thighs—a glance toward the willows and a hand flung up meaning when the seven stars line up with the peak. Waking on a mountainside just when the sky turns gray, the horses cropping grass at the end of lariats, a level smoke above the dead fire, a wind cutting to the bone, and below you the earth falling away and the dark shrinking into pools at the front of distant rocks.

And there was Narcissa Whitman, the fair one, wife of Dr. Marcus Whitman, who joined with him in the high-minded but foredoomed effort to bring the western Indians immediately to God. What happened to her as the years wore on, before the Cayuse tribesman butchered them both? DeVoto knew. Listen!

"Mrs. Whitman plenty jaw at me," Mary Walker wrote toward the end of December. This may be anyone's impatience with Mary's whining about her sore breasts (which spills self-pity down the pages of her diary) or with her talent for perceiving sinfulness in her companions. Or it may be the erosion of Narcissa Whitman. That had begun. Waiilatpu was reducing the gay, beautiful blond to a type-specimen of the frontier wife broken in service. Waiilatpu, a pinpoint, was a wilderness station—and what that implies. There was never an end to labor. Or to anxiety, disappointment, heartbreak. Their teeth got bad, their shoulders grew humped and stooped, their knuckles thickened, their cheeks and necks grew hollow, spectacles received from the States two years after they were sent for never properly corrected eyes that peered at blurring print by candlelight. The voices raised in hymns came to have an undertone of sadness that broke your heart, and the gallantry and eagerness of young womanhood fell away till a visit from the half-breed woman a few miles up-country could make the whole week memorable. Till worn and shabby women grew tremulous at the prospect of leaving home for a visit downriver. Till they clung to the familiar hideousness of home as safer than the unfamiliar and were afraid to meet the gaze of women in small frontier villages that were nevertheless the world outside. And they were forever picturing the kitchens of Maine or Ohio or Illinois, and known fields, and the waterbrooks of childhood, and two thousand miles away the forgotten folk crowded in laughing groups to speak the beloved trivialities which no tongue of friend or family would ever speak in Oregon.

A personal experience will wind up these too-random reflections.

In 1951 Benny and I took a trip with the Army Engineers, by plane, water craft and automobile from the headwaters to the mouth of the Missouri. At Fork Peck, to which we had flown from the Three Forks, we asked about a small

boat, for we wanted the experience of traveling at least a portion of the river in a manner approximating that of travelers long before our time. The engineers looked at us but after a while produced a flat-bottom of less than twenty feet which Benny and I and three companions pushed off just below Fort Peck dam.

It was early spring, and the mallards were pairing off, and the great gray geese, and the red and diamond willows, not yet in leaf, showed the reviving shades of salmon and tan and gold. To look at them was to look at the hues of sunrise.

There on the bosom of the Missouri, we were explorers. No fences came to view, no cultivated fields, and if occasionally we saw a solitary cow, it was a buffalo. Only old things in sight—the wood cuttings of beaver, the bark of cotton-woods gashed high by the ice that had just gone out, the white pelicans of ancient record, a beaver on the shore and then in the stream, his tail spanking water like a pistol shot. Then he would be gone, leaving for a moment the rippled history of his going. And of a sudden a great willow-fretted sandbar yielded to the river and fell churning close to us, and the Missouri took over its tenancy. It had changed its course.

Just as of old. Just as if the old were now. And Benny and I were Lewis and Clark, seeing as they saw, running aground as they did, getting sun-burned and calloused and developing that look of wonder that stares at you from old reports. We looked at each other. He called me Deacon. I called him Pope or Brigham Young. But we were Lewis

and Clark. Or we were Maximillian or Bradbury or Brackenridge or any of those old explorers, now reincarnated. We were mountain men.

The Army Engineers wouldn't believe it. Who but a couple of irresponsible and visionary writers would want to ride a small flat boat down the stream they meant to dam and dam into a dull, internal sea? So three times a day they sent a DC-3 over to make sure we hadn't fallen victim to wind or ripple or the varmints of the wild.

The plane would dip its wings, and Benny and I would wave, grinning at each other, and the plane would fly back to report that all was right with literature. Benny and I kept on grinning. We knew how to get along in the open. We were better than Boy Scouts. The one thing we missed, perhaps was Sacajawea.

We drifted on. We knew where we were, in a sense, in the old sense, but we had little idea of our position with reference to the upstart towns that had been established during the century and a half we had so happily erased.

But on a high bank, a little boy was fishing all alone, his eye fixed on the red bobber below him.

We pulled closer to him, and Benny yelled, "Say, son, can you tell us where we are?"

To the author of *Across the Wide Missouri*, the boy yelled back, "Mister, you're on the Missouri River."

That's all I have to say except for this: Wherever Benny is, I hope there is a West there. I hope there is a wide Missouri.

Basic Issues in the News

(Continued from page two)

dictions, the Supreme Court in United States history, the relations of the press and the courts. His collaborator will be Professor Roscoe B. Ellard.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT. Professor Wolman, a noted economist and government adviser and a former member of the National Labor Board, will outline the history of labor organization, theories and politics of union labor, relations of government to labor unions, balances of economic power, and the effects of full employment and unemployment. His collaborator will be Stanley V. Levey, Associate in Journalism and a labor reporter for the *New York Times*.

Before the first sessions of the course proper, the students will receive instruction from members of the Journalism Faculty in the sources and techniques of interpretive writing. They will also be required to study compilations of up to 20,000 words of basic readings prepared

by each of the visiting lecturers, as well as books in each field.

During the Winter Session, or first term, each lecturer will, on two successive Friday mornings, discuss and amplify the material the students have read. At the conclusion of his lecture, the collaborating journalism professor and the class will question him on applications of his subject matter to the news.

On the afternoons of the same days, the lecturer and his journalist-collaborator will preside over a seminar of twelve students who have selected the lecturer's subject for intensive study. The remainder of the class will observe as a gallery.

The Spring Session, or second term, will be devoted to the development of the students' projects in research and writing, with the help of six one-hour seminars and individual conferences.

Twenty Years of Nieman Fellowships

By Louis M. Lyons

The 11 American Nieman Fellows now at Harvard are the 20th annual group of newspapermen to hold these fellowships. So this is perhaps a timely moment for the brief accounting of this enterprise that I have been asked to give.

Before the current group, 229 American newspapermen had been Nieman Fellows. They have been representative of a fine corps of responsible newspapermen and their collective record is a source of pride to all who have been associated with them. It has been my luck to be associated with all of them from the beginning.

It was in 1937 that Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of the founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*, left part of her estate to Harvard to honor her husband, and she said, to promote standards of journalism in the United States. President Conant used this exceptional gift—it came to about \$1,300,000—to invent the Nieman Fellowships, first awarded in 1938.

That is, he used the income on this special endowment to finance opportunities for a number of newspapermen to come into the university each year and strengthen their backgrounds by studies of their own choice. They could take the university on their own terms. They would come on leave of absence with jobs to return to. They would be already qualified journalists—of at least three years news experience. They have tended to have ten years experience at an average age of around 30.

They are selected on application by a committee, which for the past ten years has always drawn half its members from the newspaper business—publishers, editors or correspondents. They select the Fellows by their best judgment, from the ablest applicants, men whose experience, character, competence and proposals for study suggest that they are our best bets to strengthen the vital process of informing the American people.

Support by their papers and testimony of their employers are important factors in their selection. A key factor is their own work, for they write themselves into their stories. This is a resource for picking journalists which is perhaps not so available for any other calling. Then, of course, they must present plans for study that make good sense.

What do they want from a university? Some have sought specialization, or in the nature of newspaper work, have had specialization forced upon them. We have had a few science writers, a few labor reporters, a number of fine foreign correspondents. Two Fellows this year are preparing

This was a talk by the curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard, to the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline, at the annual dinner for the Nieman Fellows, Nov. 26.

This should be published with apology to all the Nieman Fellows not named in it. In a short talk names could be used only to illustrate points. Just as many others could have illustrated the same points. The Nieman Foundation is preparing a directory of Nieman Fellows for publication in this 20th year. All who have not sent requested data are urged to do so soon.

for assignment to Russia. One, Mary Handy of the *Christian Science Monitor*, the sixth woman Fellow, is specializing on reporting education. Some have been business or financial writers. More have sought further preparation in economics, to deal with the complexities of the national budget, taxation, the world bank and such problems.

Last year Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times*, already chosen by James Reston, head of the *Times* Washington bureau, for coverage of the Supreme Court and similar constitutional and legal stories, spent his year in the law school. The result is almost daily in the *Times* this year.

But for the most part, the newspapermen have tended to do their work in the background of public affairs, in history, economics and government. This is the solid stuff of journalism, its main stream. They may be editorial writers, reporters, city hall or state house or Washington political writers, or general reporters.

They have wanted to increase their capacity to deal with the public issues of every day's news.

A fellow whose plan of study was typical of some others was John Dougherty of the *Rochester Times-Union*, year before last. Already a veteran news editor, on the telegraph desk, he wanted to study foreign policy and foreign relations and the backgrounds of some other nations, the better to understand the importance of the foreign news that flowed over his desk. He went back and soon had established a weekly review of the news. They have now made him city editor. Similarly Ed Donohoe, a labor reporter in Scranton, a coal area, wanted to study some of the problems of his region. He was soon city editor and then assistant managing editor of the *Scranton Times*.

The editor of perhaps the most famous weekly in Ame-

rica is Houstoun Waring in Littleton, Colo. One of the men who has done most to make the West aware of its problems of land and water management and conservation is Ernest Linford, editor of the Salt Lake *Tribune*. They came to Cambridge to study regional problems of the West, as others have come to study economic and social problems of the South.

I am sure that President Conant was urged to use the fellowships to develop specialists. He did not. We have had some specialists but have no prejudice against the general newspapermen.

It can be argued that the American newspaper has done one of its best jobs in developing its own specialists from the common pool of the city room where all reporters start. It has shaped, selected or adapted political writers, financial writers, labor reporters, critics of the theatre and books, more recently reporters of science, and just, belatedly, starting, on education.

In its nature, a great part of the news is unpredictable. It is not easily classified. The newspaper must have a mobile staff or keep a part of its staff mobile, prepared to deal on short notice with the variety of events that range over the gamut of human activity.

What journalism needs is the kind of mind that can dig in, to specialize thoroughly on one subject this week—perhaps a hearing on our defense posture in respect to missiles—and next week or next month become as deeply involved in the problem of urban renewal or the difficulties of integration, or the organization of NATO.

It needs versatility without superficiality, a questing mind, an intellectual curiosity, a capacity to get one's mind around a new subject, understand it and write it so that it is informing and interesting to the reader.

The right man, launched in this calling, will find grist for his mill in a period of voluntary study in a field of his own choice, after he has been at work long enough to realize the gaps in his knowledge and the problems he faces in his work. A year of freedom in a great university can be invaluable to the right man.

Some of the former Fellows are well known to a Boston audience.

The first of these dinners in 1941 was in honor of Victor O. Jones, then sports editor of the Boston *Globe*. He is now managing editor, and the *Globe* had already marked him for executive news work when he took time out to broaden his base.

Another Fellow from the *Globe*, Robert Healy, who is covering this meeting, has just been assigned, his boss tells me, to be their Washington correspondent. Another of your Boston neighbors, Fred Pillsbury, developed a fine editorial page on our leading suburban paper, the Quincy *Patriot Ledger*, before he joined the editorial staff of the Boston *Herald*.

The newly appointed city editor of the *Christian Science Monitor* is Bob Bergenheim who was the most effective city hall reporter we have had here in my time. The newly appointed American news editor of the *Monitor* is Ray Brunn, who came in his fellowship as a reporter for them in California.

The chief impetus that has put Maine on the same election calendar as the rest of the country, and led them also to adopt a four year term for governor, is Dwight Sargent, editor of the Portland papers, who used his Nieman year to study political processes with a view to reforms in Maine, which he went home and pushed. Similarly the first published studies of local and county government in Tennessee were done by Nat Caldwell at Harvard. Nat has ever since roamed his state for the *Tennessean*, digging up facts that the Crump machine never wanted to tell the voters.

In Little Rock, Harry Ashmore is a Nieman Fellow. He has become this Fall a national figure for the way he has stood up for law and sense under the demagogic guns of Governor Faubus.

Hodding Carter in Greenville, Miss., has on countless occasions stood his ground under similar pressures and found time for novels and national magazine writing, and for a Pulitzer prize for editorials.

Elsewhere in the South, George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans *Item*, is a Nieman Fellow and so is his star reporter, Tom Sancton. So is the editor of what Senator Hill calls the finest weekly in the South—Neil Davis of the *Lee County Bulletin*. So is Red Holland, on the editorial page of the Birmingham *News*, and Sylvan Meyer, editor of the Gainesville *Times*, Ga., and Bill Townes, assistant managing editor of the Miami *Herald*, and Weldon James on the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, co-author with Supt. Omer Carmichael of *The Louisville Story*.

The Sunday editor of that paper, Cary Robertson, has seven other colleagues who have held these fellowships.

In Atlanta, the managing editor of the one Negro daily in the country, Bill Gordon, was one of half a dozen Negro journalists who have been here. Another, Arch Parsons, has been UN correspondent and Middle East correspondent of the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*.

The recently appointed editor of the *Trib's* editorial page, Bill Miller, was a Nieman Fellow.

His competition on the *Times* includes half a dozen, one, Tillman Durdin, their Far East correspondent, one Dana Schmidt, covering the State Department, another Harold Schmeck, science reporter, another Richard Mooney, reporting in the field of economics.

These are mostly in Washington, where there is a natural concentration of Fellows as correspondents. One of these, Edwin Lahey, most colorful of American journalists, is now chief correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News*

and has two other Fellows in his bureau. Another correspondent, Clark Mollenhoff of the Cowles papers, has won several awards for his aggressive digging for facts. One notable achievement of his was the forcing of a reluctant administration to clear Wolf Ladijinski of phony charges affecting his loyalty.

Anthony Lewis was awarded a Pulitzer prize for another case of persistent digging that cleared the name of a fine young officer and restored him to honorable rank.

Two of the editorial writers on the *Washington Post* are Nieman Fellows, Alan Barth and Carroll Kilpatrick. So are the two top men on the most vigorous page in America, Irving Dilliard and Bob Lasch of the *Post-Dispatch* in St. Louis.

The managing editor of the *Denver Post* is a Nieman Fellow and the managing editor of the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, and the assistant managing editor of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, and the city editors of the *New York Post* and the *San Francisco News*, the news editor of the *San Francisco Chronicle* and the assistant editor of the *Portland Oregonian*. These are strategic posts in producing some of our great newspapers.

In our great news agencies, Harry Montgomery is assistant general manager of the Associated Press and Watson Sims is in London for them. Henry Shapiro has long and very ably covered Moscow for the U.P. His interview with Khrushchev was published in our papers Nov. 17. Donald Gonzales covers the State Department for U. P. Fellows who had their apprenticeship in the wire services are now Washington or foreign correspondents for papers in Salt Lake City, St. Paul, Chicago, and for *Time* and *Newsweek* and *U. S. News & World Report* and the *New Republic*.

In broadcasting John Day is news director of the great C.B.S. network and one of their top correspondents is Alexander Kendrick. Tom Griffith and Bob Manning are senior editors of *Time*. The general manager of *Collier's* until the rug was pulled out from under it, was Vance Johnson, a Nieman Fellow from the *Amarillo Globe* in the Panhandle of Texas.

The general manager of the new TV station in Paducah, Ky., is Ed Paxton. His paper owns it and he moved over from associate editor.

Steven Spencer, a science writer, is associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*. Leon Svirskey is managing editor of *Scientific American*. Christopher Rand, former Far East correspondent of the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*, contributes some of the most luminous writing of our times in the *New Yorker*—including the current issues. His colleague Bob Shaplen too. David Botter is assistant managing editor, of *Look Magazine*. Volta Torrey, an old AP editor, and incidentally editor of the special communications issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* for December, was

editor of *Popular Science* until he recently joined the staff at M.I.T. where he produces the weekly presentation of science on Ralph Lowell's WGBH-Channel 2. (I hope Mr. Lowell, our honored guest tonight, will forgive me this reference. WGBH is indeed a station of all the talents of our educational and cultural institutions here, a true channel of the mind of Boston. But it would not exist without a Ralph Lowell. He is its bone and sinew, and most conveniently, its backer and banker.

A. B. (Bud) Guthrie, one of the notable authors of our time, escaped if you like, from journalism, through a Nieman Fellowship. In a writing course at Harvard with Ted Morrison, he began his first great novel, using his American history course with Fred Merk as his research laboratory and going on to win a Pulitzer prize.

But Bud Guthrie is a top feather in our cap, and we want to think of journalism as broad enough to embrace the reporting of America and the interpretation of its life and issues, thru whatever media, newspapers, magazines, broadcasts, books, films.

Quite a long shelf of books has been produced by Nieman Fellows, often books started or stimulated at Harvard, and some of them a direct product of their Nieman studies. A good book is a useful thing for a newspaperman to have under his belt, and I can think of no more useful exercise for a journalist that to organize his study and experience in a book.

But the most characteristic collective fact about the Nieman Fellows is that most have stuck to their journalistic last. Of the total 229 before this year, we have to subtract ten deaths and two women taken away by marriage, although two others after marriage have continued active newspapering. That leaves a net of 217. Just about half, 105 by my last count, are with the same newspapers or news institutions that gave them leave for their fellowships. Thirty-five more are on other newspapers, which means of course, on better jobs.

Some have gone from newspapers to broadcasting and vice versa. Of course it is all one job. Twenty are on magazines, mostly news magazines, as correspondents or editors. Eight are in education, chiefly in journalism schools. I am one of these strays myself. Fourteen are in government, including three senators' assistants, some 16 in public relations. These include our Bill Pinkerton, head of the Harvard News Office and two others similarly placed in other universities and the Encyclopedia Britannica.

The movement to other media over 20 years is relatively slight in a field where there is so much movement of young men, whose basic newspaper training is so much sought in all allied fields. We cannot deplore our professors of journalism at University of Michigan, Ohio State, University of Oregon and N.Y.U.

All professions have a responsibility to contribute of

their best brains and best leadership to government. Law by its nature and by its tradition has overshadowed all other professions in this vital role. The journalist has only recently been called on, in the expanding areas of government, for his talents. But some Nieman Fellows are filling key roles. Charles Molony, a veteran of the AP in Washington, is assistant to the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Frank Hopkins, old Baltimore *Sun* man, is in charge of the State Department's relations with UNESCO. Oren Stevens is an executive of the U. S. Information Agency.

William Stucky went from the Louisville *Courier-Journal* to be associate director of the American Press Institute at Columbia, supported by newspaper publishers for special training of newspapermen. Frank Kelly is vice president of the Fund for the Republic, effectively working to maintain American traditions of freedom in a time of stress.

Let me not overlook the journalists we have had added to our group each recent year from far parts. The Carnegie Corporation for the past seven years has selected and supported fellows from Australia, New Zealand, Canada and brought us some able and interesting people. Their first Canadian fellow is now Canadian editor of the Readers Digest. Our New Zealand Fellow of two years ago, Ian Cross, has published a notable first novel this year.

This is the third year that the Asia Foundation has similarly selected and financed associate fellows from Asian countries, three a year, from India, Pakistan, Japan, Ceylon, the Philippines.

These have added a dimension to our group discussions and established rewarding relationships with other lands.

I have had the great good fortune and satisfaction to be associated with all these newspapermen from the start.

Their achievements have extended the service of our university and shed luster on our foundation.

This selective summary of their records I suggest as illustration of the vital importance of their high calling. The university's interest in opening its doors to them and their zeal to broaden their own understanding suggests the importance of the task of informing the public in all those areas where sound information is essential to the exercise of judgment, on which our form of government ultimately must depend. This is suggestive too of the ever expanding role of education, of which we never have enough in an increasingly complex world.

Few things are more important than that we be honestly and adequately informed of the issues on which as an electorate we must act. Few things are more important than that our press corps be men of understanding with so high a regard for their role that they seek the fullest preparation for it. The purpose, of course, of the university and of the Nieman Fellows, and of their papers that permit them to take a year out for such an experience, is the better informing of the American public.

There is just one more thing to say about that. It is a two way street. My friend Lester Markel, editor of the N. Y. *Sunday Times*, once told a group of teachers, they must educate better readers. The reader also has a responsibility—to be discriminating in his source of information—to choose a paper or broadcast that will serve him to keep up with the score, to know what is going on, to see that the images created in his head by the impact on him of all that he reads or listens to will be images that as nearly as may be reflect *reality*.

It is his head and he must exercise some responsibility for what goes into it.

The All-Day Newspaper

By Victor J. Danilov

A comparatively recent development in the journalistic world is the "all-day" newspaper—a daily which is neither fish (morning) nor fowl (evening).

Six papers in the country today are classified as "all-day" newspapers by the Audit Bureau of Circulations, and there are indications that interest in the movement is spreading.

An "all-day" newspaper can be defined roughly as a daily which publishes editions during both the morning and evening hours, but does not designate them as morning or evening editions.

Excluded under this definition—and ABC rules—are the dozens of papers normally considered round-the-clock operations—the multi-edition dailies and the papers that publish morning and afternoon editions under different names.

Simon Michael Bessie wrote in his history of the tabloid press *Jazz Journalism*, that the morning New York *Daily News* became an all-day newspaper during the 1920's "since the first, or 'Pink' edition appears on the streets early in the evening."

Actually, the *Daily News* was merely pioneering in the now common metropolitan morning newspaper practice of coming out early in an attempt to increase newsstand sales.

The Sioux City (Ia.) *Journal* is credited with being the first newspaper to report to the Audit Bureau of Circulations on an all-day basis (March 31, 1931). The ABC, however, did not establish a special "all-day" category until some 10 years later, on April 25, 1941.

Present bureau rules state that "the selection of the (all-day) designation shall be the sole prerogative of the publisher," providing several conditions are met:

... there must be no difference in editions which would enable anyone to distinguish between them being editions of a morning or an evening paper (save by the insertion of later news).

... the use of terms in the "ears" or elsewhere of any edition, which implies "morning" or "evening," or the use of distinguishing characteristics whatsoever which are not common to all editions, shall disqualify the paper for the use of the "all-day" designation.

Under these ground rules, the New York *Daily News* of the roaring 20's could not have been classified as an "all-day" paper—even if it sought the designation—because its first edition was distinguished from other editions by being printed in a different color.

Other characteristics of the all-day newspaper are:

Mr. Danilov is director of public information at the University of Colorado.

1. It publishes at least one edition in the morning hours and at least one edition during the evening hours.

2. Despite multiple editions, subscribers receive only one copy—usually the edition printed during the evening hours.

3. The same features and editorials are used in all editions; only the spot news changes, and that only slightly in some cases.

4. The same head schedule, typography, and style is used for all editions.

5. Advertising is sold on a package basis, nearly always starting with the edition published during the morning hours.

The six newspapers classified as all-day papers by the the ABC are the Greensburg (Pa.) *Tribune-Review*, Hutchinson (Kan.) *News Herald*, Johnstown (Pa.) *Tribune-Democrat*, Manchester (N.H.) *Union Leader*, Owensboro (Ky.) *Messenger and Inquirer*, and Twin Falls (Ida.) *Times-News*.

Two of the papers went all-day in the 1940's (Hutchinson and Twin Falls, both in 1942), and four in the 1950's (Manchester, 1951, Johnstown, 1952, Greensburg, 1955, and Owensboro, 1955).

There have been others over the years, such as the Peoria (Ill.) *Journal-Transcript*, Washington *Times Herald*, Springfield (Ill.) *State Journal*, and Chicago *Sun-Times*, but they reverted to morning or evening status for one reason or another.

The Chicago *Sun-Times* is the most recent to abandon all-day operations, becoming strictly a morning paper on March 4, 1957. It had been an all-day paper since 1947 when the late Marshall Field III acquired the evening *Times* and merged it with his struggling *Sun*.

The *Sun-Times* was converted to an all-day newspaper in an effort to retain both the morning and evening readers of its predecessors in a highly competitive market.

At the time of the merger, about half of the *Sun-Times* total circulation of 672,000 was in the evening field. Since then there has been a steady conversion of evening *Sun-Times* readers to the morning edition; climaxed by the shifting of evening home delivery to morning delivery in 1951.

Russ Stewart, *Sun-Times* vice-president and general manager, explained that the change to morning status was part of a long-range plan initiated by Field at the time of the 1947 merger, and that the paper hoped to be fully in the morning field by the time it moved into its new \$15 million plant.

The six remaining all-day papers also came into being after mergers, but there are no plans to change to a morning or evening paper at some future date, as was the case with the Chicago *Sun-Times*.

The newspapers went to all-day operations because they believed it was the best solution for their particular area. They see three principal advantages in the system:

1. It is more economical than publishing separate morning and evening newspapers.

2. It increases single-paper circulation, enabling the newspaper to charge higher advertising rates.

3. It provides a special service for readers, and gives them a choice of morning or evening news.

The feelings of all-day newspapers are summarized by John F. James, executive editor of the *Johnstown Tribune-Democrat*:

"Rising production costs persuaded us to seek a streamlined operation by which we could continue to render morning and evening deliveries, yet eliminate much of the expensive duplication of effort and manpower."

Lawrence W. Hager, publisher of the *Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer*, pointed out that his company thought the switch to an all-day basis "would increase advertising and make a subscription price more palatable" . . . "and it worked out that way."

EDITIONS

Three of the six all-day newspapers (Hutchinson, Manchester, and Owensboro) published daily, Saturday, and Sunday papers; two (Greensburg and Johnstown) have daily and Saturday issues, and one (Twin Falls) prints daily and Sundays.

Five of the six newspapers have three editions on weekdays. The *Twin Falls Times-News* publishes two editions daily.

Three of the papers (Hutchinson, Johnstown, and Manchester) also have three editions on Saturdays. The other two having Saturday editions (Greensburg and Owensboro) publish only a single edition.

Of the four newspapers having Sunday issues, two (Hutchinson and Twin Falls) have two editions and two (Manchester and Owensboro) prepare a single edition.

Five of the six newspapers start their daily issues with a morning edition, coming out around midnight; followed by a second edition either about an hour later or at approximately noon, and concluding with a mid-afternoon edition.

The exception is the two-edition *Twin Falls Times-News*, which starts a new paper with a 2:45 p.m. evening edition and ends with a 1:30 a.m. morning edition.

CIRCULATION

All-day newspapers have a total average circulation of 218,907 daily according to the Audit Bureau of Circulations. Their Saturday and Sunday circulations average 196,842

and 133,369, respectively. (It should be remembered that one newspaper does not publish on Saturdays and two do not have Sunday papers.)

The *Johnstown Tribune-Democrat* has the largest daily circulation, totaling 58,580; followed by the *Hutchinson News Herald* with 53,195 and the *Manchester Union Leader*, with 46,993. The other papers have circulations of less than half this latter figure.

There appears to be little change in the week-end circulation of the papers, with the exception of the *Manchester Union Leader*, which drops about 10,000 on Sundays. There is a fluctuation of only some 1,000 in the other circulations.

As would be expected, the first two editions of most all-day newspapers are for mail, rural delivery, and newsstand sales, while the third edition is for home delivery in the city. Somewhat the reverse is true in Twin Falls.

Home subscribers receive one edition in all cases, and only the *Manchester Union Leader* and *Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer* give city subscribers a choice of morning or evening home delivery.

Four of the six all-day newspapers sell for 5 cents daily; the other two for 7 cents. There is no such uniformity in the four Sunday editions, which are priced from 5 to 20 cents.

By switching to all-day operations, all of the newspapers either gained in circulation or maintained the same level. It is uncertain, however, what effect the publication change itself had on circulation.

John P. Harris, editor and publisher of the *Hutchinson News Herald*, pointed out that the circulation of his paper has nearly doubled since it became all-day, "but it is impossible to say how much of this is to be credited to our publication plan."

ADVERTISING

The publication of an all-day newspaper—instead of separate morning and evening papers—has made the selling of advertising easier, while enabling papers to increase their ad rates. In general, however, there has been no major change in the volume of advertising.

Three of the six-day papers (Greensburg, Owensboro, and Twin Falls) have the same national display rate—a flat 12 cents per line. The others are in the 20's—Hutchinson, 22; Manchester, 24, and Johnstown, 27.

Most of the newspapers sell advertising on a unit, rather than split basis, and the ads must start with the first edition and continue throughout the day.

The *Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer* sometimes will accept ads for one edition—the evening run—providing the advertiser can show that he could not start in the morn-

ing edition for reasons beyond his control, or that the omission of his ad would work a hardship.

Two newspapers (Owensboro and Twin Falls) on occasion will permit advertisers to reverse the usual consecutive run of ads, but there must be good reason for the action.

NEWS

Later news usually is the only change from one edition to another of the all-day newspapers; the features, editorials, and advertisements remain the same throughout the day in almost all cases.

The extent of changes on news pages varies with the day's news and the policy of the newspaper, but every paper has a maximum number of pages that can be made over for an edition.

The Johnstown *Tribune-Democrat*, for example, will open up to nine pages of an average 30-page issue for developing news. The Greenburg *Tribune-Review*, on the other hand, averages making over six to ten pages from the first edition to the second, and two pages from the second to the third edition.

As would be expected, the most extensive changes ordinarily are made on the front page. There is a definite attempt to include later news and to give the page a different appearance from one edition to another.

The all-day newspapers believe the scope and quality of their news reporting has improved markedly since their shift to an all-day status.

"We have been able to utilize a greater number of reporters as specialists, and have improved the depths and perception of our news report with elimination of the duplicated effort," stated James of Johnstown.

All of the newspapers maintain day and night news staffs, but the greater percentage work days. In Hutchinson, for instance, there are 21 in the editorial department, and only five are on the night shift.

The day and night staffs normally complement and compete with each other on all-day papers.

Three of the newspapers (Greensburg, Manchester, and Twin Falls) receive both the Associated Press and United Press wires, while the other three have only AP service.

The Greensburg *Tribune-Review*, however, is dropping the Associated Press when the current contract expires, according to David W. Mack, publisher.

Four of the all-day papers (Hutchinson, Johnstown, Manchester, and Twin Falls) are considered "Independents," and one is "Republican" (Greensburg), and one "Democratic" (Owensboro).

All six-papers are standard-sized and are published in one-newspaper, small or medium-sized cities. The Chicago *Sun-Times* was the last tabloid and the last all-day paper in a competitive or metropolitan city.

CONCLUSIONS

The all-day newspaper, in general, appears to provide greater revenue for the paper and better service for advertisers and readers.

All-day operations seem to offer a possible solution to economy-minded companies now publishing both a morning and an afternoon paper in non-competitive areas, particularly the larger cities.

It is doubtful, however, if there is any real advantage to publishing an all-day newspaper in cities having opposition papers, unless they are merged.

Publishers of the six all-day papers are hesitant about advising others to switch to 24-hour operations, pointing out that there is no formula.

"The answer would have to be given on the basis of a study of individual production problems, community reading habits, and cost factors," according to one of the editors.

Nieman Postscripts:

(Too late to classify)

Lowell Limpus (1941) veteran of the New York *Daily News*, died in New York Dec. 19. He wrote his own obituary, carried in full in the New York *Times*, Dec. 20.

Frank Hopkins (1939) starts a new State Department assignment Jan. 15 as American consul for the French West Indies, to be stationed on Martinique.

Mort Stern (1955) managing editor of

the Denver *Post*, and Mrs. Stern, announce a new daughter, born Dec. 17.

Panel

The New England Society of Newspaper Editors invited four current Nieman Fellows to present a panel on newspaper editing at their Hartford meeting December 6-7. The panelists: John Armstrong, Sunday editor, Portland *Oregonian*; Hiroshi Ishihara, foreign news reporter on the *Yomiuri Shimbun*; William McIlwain, copy desk chief, *Newsday*; and John Ed Pearce, editorial page, Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

Editorial Conference

Ernest H. Linford (1947), editor of the Salt Lake *Tribune*, reports visiting at the National Conference of Editorial Writers at Oklahoma City with **Dwight Sargent** (1951), editor of the Portland, Me., papers, **E. L. Holland** (1949), editorial writer on the Birmingham *News*, **Francis P. Locke** (1947), of the Dayton *News* editorial page, **William Woestendiek** (1955), editorial writer on *Newsday*, and **Robert Campbell** (1957), of the Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel* editorial staff.

A British View

The Voice Of The West

By Alastair Scott

There is an old Scottish proverb which says:

"Sticks and stones may break our bones,

But words will never hurt us."

The grotesque untruth of this was demonstrated again last year when Sir John Glubb—"Glubb Pasha"—was summarily dismissed from his post as Commander-in-Chief of the Arab Legion.

The world may be grateful that neither misplaced modesty nor official reticence prevented him from letting off some steam about the incident, an incident which drew and deserved attention all over the free world.

He had many interesting and provocative things to say, including the following:

The theory that nations are either at war or at peace is today little more than a relic of the age of chivalry, and yet I cannot avoid the impression that the people of Britain are still under this impression . . . we do not seem to realize that cold war can threaten our existence as much as hot war.

Again:

In the Middle East today, the wireless set and the printing press are waging a relentless and merciless war. Britain should turn all her energies to these weapons. . . . I would never tell a lie. But tell them the truth—good and strong and loud. Truth is fatal to dictators and racketeers. . . . Britain today is being talked to death in the Middle East.

Shortly after the publication of these reflections by Sir John Glubb, the *New York Times* called for reports from its overseas correspondents on the impression the United States, and in particular its Information Agency, was making in the world. These reports were shot through with almost unrelieved gloom, and the general opinion was that the United States was losing the cold war, the war of words.

The correspondent in Colombo, Ceylon, said:

. . . there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be welcomed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. . . . It might help to prevent incidents like the one involving the member of the United States Congress interviewed at

the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

Summing up, James Reston in Washington wrote:

It is true that after years of experimenting with planning boards at the State Department level, and at the Cabinet level, psychological warfare experts, "cold war" specialists in the White House, and the National Security Council, the United States still operates largely on a temporary basis, one crisis at a time.

From time to time there are voices raised in all the free countries of the West to plead for better internal and external Information Services. In France recently the Abbé Pierre (who has done so much to relieve the distress of the poor in Paris and elsewhere) added his voice to others. Speaking of our extraordinary ignorance of what goes on, especially of the demographic facts of life, he concluded: "The Whites, who invented all the great means of information—printing, the cinema, radio, television—are in danger of perishing because of a lack of information. What irony of fate!"

This problem of information—both externally and internally—concerns the whole of the free world. In this setting I should like now to look at the Information Services which have been established by the United Kingdom. (In most parts of the world they are called "British Information Services.") With your permission I should like to tell you something of their origins and post-war development, something of the philosophy which created and now sustains them, something of the crises through which they have come, and finally something of what they do.

No one can say for sure how or when our official British Information Services started. Perhaps in Anglo-Saxon times when that remarkable man King Alfred decided to use the English language (rather than Latin) to frame and propagate his laws.

The need for a government or a local Council to communicate with the people it represented always existed, and many of our early revolts and rebellions were the result of a failure to recognize this.

The real beginnings of modern Information work may be attributed to the gradual spread of the printed word and the growth of education. The two grew and reflected each other's needs simultaneously.

When we get to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, a time when the freedom of the Press in Britain was by no means established and government was not yet representative, there are significant signs that the government recognized the importance of putting over its case to the public by means of men specially employed to do this. The talk then was of "managing the Press," and few could fore-

Alastair Scott represents the British Information Service in Montreal.

see the day when the Press would "manage" us! (As the American Press surrounded the Queen of Canada in Washington recently, President Eisenhower was heard to say, "The nearest thing we have to a dictatorship here.")

On 11th December, 1809, the Treasury issued a notice on the Press to government departments:

If the Treasury," this said, "is still to be considered as the Manager of the Press (& every Department is ready to blame the Treasury if attacked through this Medium) it is absolutely necessary that the Department of War, Foreign Affairs, & the Admiralty, should abstain from direct communication with any of the Newspapers, and should furnish the Secretary of the Treasury with the Intelligence or Suggestions which they now give to the favoured Paper.

As long as the Newspapers shall continue to be considered as important as they now are, some person in each of the three Departments ought to read the principal Newspapers every morning, & send to the Treasury . . . either a correct Statement of the Facts, if Facts are to be stated, or a Hint of the Line which it is wished should be taken.

The important step forward from the use of official Information techniques as a political weapon did not come till the beginning of the First World War. The necessities of recruiting, of rationing and other sacrifices, and of the changing social pattern, caused a number of government departments to establish Information sections. It also caused the formation of a body of propagandists to tell the world about the Allied, and particularly the British cause. Nearly all of this apparatus was dismantled at the end of the First World War, although a few departments retained Press Officers.

Then came radio and a revolution of techniques in advertising, and the creation of the documentary film as a new medium of visual reporting. In 1934 the Empire Marketing Board came into being, and British Information Services of today owe much to that now defunct organization, and to the General Post Office, which had obstinately clung to its Press Officer and now appointed a Director of Public Relations, Stephen Tallents.

Together these two bodies used all the new techniques and used them enthusiastically. The Empire Marketing Board sponsored all kinds of films, not merely those concerned with its function, and the Post Offices of the land were transformed. The days of clotted ink, broken pen nibs and torn and illegible notices were gone for good. One more reason for not writing letters—the difficulty of posting them—had vanished like the Black Plague, never to console us again.

In the days before the Second World War, the United Kingdom had no weapon to combat the vilification of the

German and Italian Press and radio. The Ministry of Information was, however, established shortly before the war, and after a chaotic start, became an important factor in winning it.

The M. O. I. not only presented news and views of war-time Britain to the world, but exercised a crucial influence on the home front by keeping it informed of the progress of the war and the necessity for sacrifice, and also by keeping up its morale. It poured out endless articles and commentaries, books and booklets, photographs, documentary films (among the finest ever made), and exhibitions. It harnessed all the eloquence, energy, imagination, and technical know-how it could command to tell the world what the British war effort was, and to keep before the British themselves the promise of victory.

The essential supplement to the work of the M. O. I. was the work of the British Broadcasting Corporation, which brought the truth (as far as censorship would allow) into the homes of Britain, and then reached far out in all the principal languages of the world to assure listeners that Britain, though suffering, was not and would not be defeated.

The reputation acquired both by the M. O. I. and the B. B. C. for truth and accuracy helped to build up a tremendous prestige for the country, and as a direct result of their activities many British, I think, were genuinely surprised after the war to find in what high and warm regard they were held. A British passport, in those days, was truly a passport to popularity.

It is impossible now, and history will make it more impossible, to disentangle the threads which gave fibre to the British resistance in the war. But among them all, the unifying inspiration and the stability of the Information Services and the B. B. C. both at home and abroad will surely be given a very high place.

It was when the war ended that the soul-searching began. The U. K. had never had a Ministry of Information in peacetime, and the idea was abhorrent to many, probably to a large majority of the population. The peacetime excesses of the German and Italian Ministries were in everyone's minds.

The only point on which nearly everyone agreed was that if any of the elaborate Information machine was to be preserved, it must not be a separate Ministry. In these early post-war days it required a certain amount of courage to proclaim openly that it was nonsense not to have some kind of Information agency, both to present a picture of Britain abroad and to make sure that the population at home were in possession of facts about the conduct of government and about the outside world which the Government thought they should know.

You can imagine the disputation about this. Why, if

Britain had never had it before, should it have this official apparatus now? Why should the Government step into a field which private enterprise could easily cover? What would Government choose to tell the people: Obviously its successes. Wouldn't it hide its failures? With this powerful weapon, wouldn't the Government of the day convince people so thoroughly of its efficiency that it would continue in power indefinitely?

Some of these fears were justified, and some were merely hysterical. The real safeguard, as in any change in the art of government, was clearly in the character of the people governed. The hysterical missed the point completely that it was most unlikely that any system which led to abuses would for long be tolerated by the British people.

What emerged from the heated debates of those days was virtually the system we now have. A central production agency (which we call the Central Office of Information) producing material for all Government departments. The policy of what was to be produced to remain with individual departments. The Minister of each department would answer in Parliament for the Information work of his department. In practice, as far as the overseas departments are concerned, the Foreign Office is responsible for all Information work in foreign countries, the Colonial Office in Colonial or dependent territories and the Commonwealth Relations Office in the independent members of the Commonwealth (such as Canada).

I do not think you would be very interested in the detailed development of our Information Services since then, but I make one point. I doubt if any part of our Government services in Britain has had so many and such exhaustive investigations. Substantially, the pattern has not changed, but the Information Services, both at home and abroad, have had many ups and downs. The greatest critics of these Services (I mean in Britain)—and criticism is after all healthy—have never been able to shake that statement made in Parliament in 1946: "It is essential to good administration under a democratic system that the public should be adequately informed about the many matters in which the Government action directly impinges on their daily lives, and it is, in particular, important that a true and adequate picture of British policy, British institutions, and the British way of life shall be presented overseas."

Three years later one of many official investigations by independent authorities said: "The justification for some Government Information Services is beyond question. The citizen has a right to be told, and the Government has a plain duty to tell him, what it is doing in his name, and with his money, and why."

Similarly it has now been generally accepted that our influence abroad depends to a great extent on how accu-

rate a picture of what is happening in Britain can be given to people in other lands. This is what we are trying to do.

The latest independent report presented to Parliament last July says: "The primary emphasis (of our Information Services) should be placed on retaining the goodwill and understanding of our friends and on winning the respect of uncommitted countries."

How much do we spend on our Overseas Information Services: Including the Government Information Services, the B. B. C. and the important work of the British Council (the last not represented in Canada), this report's recommendations will take the cost up 15% to a total of about 41 million dollars. This sum covers all these services all over the world.

Being an official, I am unable to comment on this figure. I cannot say whether I think it is too much or too little. But I can at least pose a question, the same question which all our Governments, one after another, must answer: How much is it worth to us as a nation to make sure that our motives are understood by other peoples; that the way of life we like is understood; that our great social and scientific progress is understood; that the immense fund in Britain of goodwill to all, and the immense force for peace that Britain is, are also understood?

To assist in the defence of the free world, and to win the confidence of friends as well as uncommitted peoples, we know we must try to make these things understood. It is fortunate that there are many other individuals and agencies engaged in the same task of increasing understanding between peoples.

41 million dollars on the total of our overseas Information Services. A modern aircraft carrier costs about 55 million dollars.

What I feel certain about is that even nations which have been close to each other for a long, long time—let us say Britain and Canada—have a long, long way to go before the ordinary citizens understand each other.

Perhaps we should not be too pessimistic. Mr. Dulles had a nice story about Canadian-American relations the other day. He said they reminded him of the old couple celebrating sixty years of marriage. A young reporter asked the old man, "Tell me, sir, in all this long and wonderful association, did you ever think of divorcing your wife?" "Hell, no," said the old man, "but I often thought of killing her!"

The voice of the West is not always a united voice and it is not always a strong voice. You may remember the saying in the Bible, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare for battle?" To the extent, I think, to which we understand how important the "battle for men's minds" is, to that extent only will the voice of the West provide the clear leadership which is so badly needed in the world.

Denmark: The Labor Press Puzzle

By Max Awner

Few fair-minded observers of the American journalistic scene disagree with the thesis that, by and large, labor and liberal movements take a beating in the daily press. The press being Big Business, it is in the nature of things that it should tend to view the social, economic and political scene through Big Business eyes. Ergo, the traditional, the orthodox, the respectable and the comfortable generally find favor in its columns, while the daring, the radical, the troublesome and the visionary may expect a cool reception. There are many important exceptions to this rule, of course, but I do not think the rule itself will be seriously challenged.

If the reader is ready to draw the natural conclusion that the press of a country will generally reflect the outlook of the controlling economic interests or classes, let me present the case of semi-Socialistic Denmark and its press.

For a good many years (with a few brief and insignificant interruptions) Denmark has been governed by an informal coalition of parties of the Left (not including the Communists). At the moment this coalition consists of the Social Democratic or Labor Party, the Radicals, and the Justice League.

All during this period the Labor Party has been the single most important party in the country. The Radicals, belying their name, are only moderately progressive. The so-called Justice League, Denmark's Georgist party, is unique: Denmark is the only country in the world where the followers of the Nineteenth Century American economist Henry George and his single-tax theories have achieved official representation in Parliament. (In the May 1957 national elections the Georgists were the biggest proportionate gainers, increasing their Parliamentary mandates from six to nine.) The two parties of the Right, the Conservatives and the Liberals, though together they control almost half the Parliamentary representation, have not in recent years been able to exert an appreciable influence in the economic or social sphere.

The labor movement, represented primarily by the Danish Federation of Trade Unions, plays the dominant role in the Social Democratic Party. The unions, of course, are much more politically oriented than ours in America—though not more so than their counterparts in many other Western countries. For all practical purposes the labor

movement and the Labor Party are one and the same thing. Danish labor has never been militantly Marxist, and in recent years has become less and less doctrinaire Socialist. Its principal slogan is "Freedom and Welfare," and it frankly and proudly espouses the Welfare State. Under its impact Denmark may be held up as a prime example of a mixed economy. Danish social insurance systems and welfare provisions are unsurpassed anywhere in the world. And, although naturally there is some quibbling over details, the people—even those who don't consider themselves Social Democrats—by and large like what they have and wouldn't exchange their system for any other.

With such a social and economic structure, one might reasonably expect a vigorous and healthy Social Democratic or Labor press to play a dominant and even decisive role.

Far from it. Total weekday circulation of the fifteen or so daily newspapers published by the Labor Party is about 180,000, or twelve per cent of the overall national daily newspaper circulation. The conservative papers, as in this country, constitute the strongest segment of the press, both in terms of circulation and advertising.

Denmark is possibly the world's No. 1 newspaper-reading country. Literacy is of course practically universal. A recent survey by the Danish Gallup Institute indicated that only two per cent of all Danes between eighteen and sixty do not regularly read a daily newspaper, while twenty-six per cent read more than one paper each day. (By contrast, Italy shows twenty-two per cent who never look at a daily paper.)

Denmark, with its slightly over four million people, boasts 135 daily newspapers, or about one for every 30,000 inhabitants. Compare this with the United States, which has one for every 100,000, or Britain's one to 350,000.

Total weekday circulation of the Danish daily press is estimated at 1,600,000 copies, or about 1.2 copies per day for every family unit in the country.

This is not the place for a detailed study of the historical and cultural reason for the important place of the press in Danish national life. The great cultural and national revival of the mid-Nineteenth Century led by Bishop Grundtvig and his disciples (of which the famous Danish folk schools are perhaps the best known product) was a primary factor but not the only one. The newspaper has almost from its beginnings in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries played a central role in the political and cultural development of the nation.

In this framework, the labor press has historically mani-

Max Awner was editor of the *Colorado Labor Advocate* in Denver for six years, until he went to Denmark last year on a Fulbright Fellowship to study workers' education. This article is a byproduct.

fested a split personality, and therein lies its weakness as well as what some would call its strength. The labor movement (and I mean both the party and the unions) traditionally has seen its press as simultaneously labor's "voice" and a legitimate section of the regular daily press whose primary function was purveying general news and entertainment features.

Though practically all Danish newspapers are political in that they either are owned by or adhere rather faithfully to the fortunes of one political party or another, there has in recent years been a growing trend toward non-partisan independence in the editorial columns. And while news coverage has not been as objective and unbiased as the ideal aspired to in this country, the flagrant violation of the rules of factual reporting is becoming rarer.

To this encouraging trend the labor press has long been the conspicuous exception (not counting the single Communist daily). While everyday non-controversial news is covered in traditional fashion, these papers make little pretense to objectivity when it comes to reporting political news or other controversial matters. (In this respect the labor press in Denmark is not far different from its counterpart in the U. S. although there is little resemblance structurally.)

There are some fifteen labor-owned dailies in as many Danish cities and towns, each of them publishing a greater or lesser amount of routine local, national and world news, and popular features. There are no labor weeklies; in fact the weekly newspaper is an almost unknown phenomenon in Denmark.

Invariably, these papers will play a story, if it is at all controversial, according to its importance to labor. A recent pre-election rally of the Social Democratic Party, for example, covered most of the front page of the Copenhagen labor daily in story and pictures, plus a healthy portion of the inside pages. The other Copenhagen dailies gave it modest headlines and perhaps a dozen paragraphs far back in the paper. Curiously enough, the labor paper made no mention at all of the Communist Party rally held on the same day, even though it attracted over five thousand persons. The other dailies gave it only slightly less coverage than the Labor Party meeting.

Activities of the party and the unions in the legislative and economic spheres naturally rate major headlines and full coverage, while those of the other parties and their adherents are played down unless they happen to relate directly to something Labor is actively interested in, from a positive or negative point of view.

Danish newspapers generally are fond of the personal touch; they carry frequent thumbnail sketches of leaders in various fields, and other human interest material. But a labor paper, though it purports to be a "people's news-

paper," would as soon think of running a sympathetic or even uncolored portrayal of an opposition leader as it would, say, of the late (and much denounced, even in death) Sen. McCarthy. In justice, it should be said that conservative papers do not exactly leap at every opportunity to present labor leaders in a friendly light. Generally, however, they are given their day in court.

All these factors help to explain why the Danish labor press, journalistically, stands in an inferior position to the conservative press. But they do not explain fully why, in a labor-oriented country like Denmark, the conservative papers enjoy incomparably greater popularity. After all, in our own country, some of the worst and most biased examples of journalism enjoy some of the fattest circulations.

In Copenhagen, for example, the conservative *Berlingske Tidende*, the oldest and largest, and probably the most respected, newspaper in the country, has a circulation of over 200,000. The *Politiken*, published by the slightly left-of-center Radical Party, is only a step behind. The Labor Party organ, *Socialdemokraten*, however, shows up with a figure of about 44,000. And the picture is about the same in the other towns with labor newspapers.

On the whole, the conservative and middle-of-the-road papers probably maintain a more popular standard in their feature departments. And inch for inch, they probably carry more of this material. Women, particularly, are less considered in the labor papers.

But the difference is certainly not great enough to account for the wide gulf in circulations. To draw an analogy, a *Berlingske Tidende* is just as far from a New York *Daily News* in tenor as a *Socialdemokraten* is from a New York *Times*. Yet it is a fact that even many loyal Labor Party members do not regularly buy the local labor paper, and of those who do probably a majority take a conservative paper in addition. Total labor press circulation is only about twenty per cent of the total Labor Party vote in national elections.

The most logical explanation of this state of affairs would seem to be that the average Danish worker has somehow acquired a sense of journalistic discrimination which leads him to choose a newspaper that will serve his broad needs for enlightenment, rather than one which will merely tell him what he would like to hear or already knows. And this thesis is supported by the remarkable accomplishments of the Danes in the field of workers' education (a field, incidentally, in which American unions could learn much from them).

But, paradoxically enough, I have heard another explanation repeatedly advanced by Danes themselves, including some on the labor side of the fence. This is that, even in a labor-oriented country like Denmark, to be seen buying or reading a labor paper is not a mark of social prestige.

Thousands of working families would rather pretend to the slightly higher social status which somehow attaches to taking a conservative paper.

Personally, I cannot accept this as a major factor—knowing the Danes as I have come to know them. Class lines are too clearly drawn and accepted; what we know as “social climbing” is virtually non-existent. Yet, in view of its repeated voicing, it cannot be entirely dismissed. In some circles it may be taken as proof that, no matter what the economic and cultural tradition or discipline, no matter how well ordered and just the social system, the basic human yearning after *status* cannot be entirely suppressed, even where such “status” is meaningless or silly in terms of material satisfaction.

But such speculation could lead us far afield. What is the outlook for the labor press *vis-a-vis* the overall newspaper picture? There has been some agitation within the party in recent years aimed at reforming the labor press—to make it either fish or fowl instead of a cross between the

two. And perhaps some progress has been made in the direction of a more universal news approach.

But certainly the labor movement will never allow its press to drop its role as the voice of labor. Perhaps the ultimate answer will be to split the labor press into two divisions—one to compete with the conservative press in appeal to general readers (perhaps using British experience as a model), the other to carry the propaganda ball for labor and social democracy.

Such a development could conceivably see the beginnings of a weekly labor press along the lines of what we have in this country, supplementing the main labor daily press—though many Danes, particularly those familiar with the unsatisfactory status and slight influence of the American labor press, would undoubtedly argue against such an arrangement. On the other hand a strengthened daily operation would be very likely to augment the flow of funds into party coffers, something the present labor press has markedly failed to do.

Access to Quasi-Public News

By Charles-Gene McDaniel

When the president of the county Council of Community Services in York, Pa., addressed the annual meeting of her organization during the spring, she told the representatives of social agencies that their board meetings should be open to the press.

In doing so, Mrs. H. Robert Becker pointed up a news-gathering problem about which newspapers have expressed little concern.

There probably is no problem of newsgathering in a free society which has had more attention than that of access to information. By far the greatest amount of thought and words have been expended on the problem of getting the news from public (tax-supported) bodies.

Little has been said or written about the problem of gathering the news from quasi-public groups, those which are supported by the public through voluntary contributions. Yet here exists a major roadblock in presenting to the people important information about the “conscience” of the democratic society.

Social agencies comprise the great majority of the organizations supported by voluntary gifts. Perhaps the lack of interest by most newspapers in news from these sources is responsible in large measure for the lack of expressed concern over the barriers imposed by the professionals who run these organizations.

Mr. McDaniel is a reporter on the *Gazette & Daily* in York, Pa.

A few newspapers are concerned about the work of these groups, though, and make an effort at presenting more than the handouts and fund appeals of the agencies.

It is for these, of course, that the problem is greatest.

Mrs. Becker, who is quite out of step with others connected with social agencies throughout the country, asked, “How else can we let reporters get the proper background they need to tell our story unless we include them from the very beginning?”

“I can’t see what we have to hide or to fear from open board meetings,” she said.

Some good results even in cases where controversial matters get in the newspapers and board members find themselves disagreeing with what was said and reported, she said.

Mrs. Becker is no “ungracious pastor,” for she tried when her first term as council president began to have the board meetings of her agency open to the public.

She was voted down.

Despite this, she was re-elected for a second term and continues to work toward her goal with the support of some newsmen in her city even though she has not the support of her own board on this issue.

For the most part, social agencies are little interested in having the public know about them until it comes time for a fund drive. Then they come around with a series

of "releases" designed to keep their drive before the public for its duration.

In our society, the pressure is great on the contributors as well as on the newspapers. It is difficult for a citizen, even in good conscience, to refuse to give when all his neighbors advertise with stickers on their windows that they have given. It is tantamount to heresy and the declining citizen is almost a social outcast—until the next drive.

There are times when the citizen should refuse to contribute to certain charities, aside from considerations of his own personal budget. The agencies themselves give him a perfectly legitimate excuse by keeping from him things that he as a contributor is entitled to know.

One of the touchiest points is that of salaries. The agencies are willing in their drives to designate the percentage of their income that goes to their national parent body, the percentage that stays in the community, and the percentage for "administration."

But ask him how much their executive director, or whatever the head of the agency is called, is paid and there is clearing of throats, hemming and hawing, and finally a "NO."

Just as the people are entitled to know the salaries of public officials whom they support through taxes, they are entitled to know the salaries of those they support through their voluntary contributions.

As the source of contributions supporting the agencies has changed, the need for interpretation to the whole population has become greater. The time was when charities were supported by a small minority of the population—the wealthy.

But the base for contributions has been broadened and fund drives are looking a great deal to labor unions for support.

Responsible for the change to a large extent is the change in our society which has broadened the middle class and narrowed the extremes of poverty and wealth—though both are still very much with us.

Even though there is a broadened base for support, few agencies have changed the structure of their boards of directors accordingly.

The boards usually do not represent a cross-section of the community. They still are made up of dowagers, idle rich or upper class housewives, and a few wealthy business men.

The creation of the necessary evil of the community chest or the united fund drive also has heightened the necessity for social agencies to tell the people where their money is going.

The contributor experiences little of that tingly feeling inside himself when he gives to the nebulous united drive.

He no longer experiences the thrill of helping someone less fortunate. And he also no longer is humbled by the act.

To a degree, this evil can be lessened with the help of the newspaper. But it requires the cooperation of the various social agencies. Explaining where community chest dollars go can be a year-round project and not just a one-shot attempt while the drive is being conducted.

One problem contemporary social agencies have is that they are not strictly "charity," yet the general notion is that only the poor use the facilities of the agencies.

Newspapers with agency cooperation could help remove the unfortunate stigma that through the years has been attached to seeking help from an agency.

Many agencies charge fees based on ability to pay for those needing their aid. There is still a reluctance to go to the agencies though, on the part of those who can pay. Usually they do not know that fees are charged.

Newspapers also can help remove the stigma from "admitting" that one needs help to solve his problems, that seeking such help is "sissy"—a stigma which is part of the holdover of frontier "self-reliance" in this country. As many professional social workers point out, it is a sign of strength rather than of weakness to seek expert help when it is needed.

Agency officials too often bleat at any criticism, no matter how constructive, on the part of newspapers. A non-professional venturing an opinion on agency work enters the realm of the sacred and should be wary. The officials want uncritical acceptance of their work by newspapers and by the public. They want printed only what they want to tell; that is, they want to edit the news at the source.

When questioned about aspects of their work they reply that readers will "misunderstand" or "misinterpret." They fail to give credit to the intelligence of newspaper personnel and likewise to readers—the financial if not spiritual supporters of agency work. Enlightened newspapers do not seek to play up the plight of agency clients as personalities.

An exception to this is the social work done by newspapers—and they perform service in this realm too—such as the "Hundred Neediest Cases" in the *New York Times* at Christmas time or the small town paper soliciting furniture, food, and clothing for a burned out family.

The lack of criticism of agencies is to a large degree responsible for the ingrown characteristic of the social work profession today. Marion K. Sanders aptly pointed out contemporary weaknesses in her article titled "Social Work: a profession chasing its tail" in the March 1957 issue of *Harper's*.

She quoted Dean Fedele F. Fauri of the University of Michigan School of Social Work as saying: "A profession can become so intent on its inner development that it

loses its sense of accountability to the society which supports it and which it has been created to serve."

Mrs. Sanders writes that "Some (social work) projects never get off the ground, not because they are foolish, but because the laity finds them dull and obscure."

Here is where the newspaper could enter to translate social work jargon—another of Mrs. Sanders' criticisms—for the public and to extract the essence from the verbosity. Rather than being against social work, newspapers are very much for it and can do much to promote public support—if given the opportunity.

The insularity of social workers has received wider criticism. Pennsylvania's Governor George M. Leader last spring chided those attending the 84th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare for not making themselves heard.

The governor had particular reference to social workers' failure to speak out for the state's welfare needs when the Republican-controlled legislature curtailed the state's welfare budget.

Here, again, newspapers could have been used by social workers to take to the public the story of welfare needs and what would happen if money were not provided to fulfill them.

Hugh R. Jones, president of the Family Service Association of America, stressed to lay volunteers the need for promoting the value of social agencies in the community in an address before the last annual meeting of the York, Pa., Family Service Bureau.

Perhaps what is needed is a little casework with social agencies to re-educate them as to their responsibility to those who support them and to those for whom they exist. Somewhere along the line agency personnel also should be made aware of the role the newspaper does—or can—play in performing this function.

At any rate, it behooves newspapers to pressure agencies for the news to which they are entitled, to remind them of their obligations to the public. There is a right to know in the realm of the quasi-public also.

Getting Through to Newspaper Readers

By Byron H. Christian

Thirty years ago the late Robert W. Jones, professor of journalism at the University of Washington, was offering these pithy maxims to his newswriting students: Just tell what the folks said. Just tell what the folks did.

It was uncommonly good advice then and it still holds true for the mine run of the news today. But the world has changed in thirty years. The process of living has become vastly complicated. People seem caught up in a net of conflicting tensions and issues. It is harder to get through to readers. Wallace Carroll of the New York *Times* Washington staff put the problem bluntly in a recent address:

"If there was a time when a nation needed to be well informed, if there was a time when a nation needed good newspapers, this is the time."

Despite the trend toward interpretive writing, the basic structure of the news story has not changed in fifty years. It is still written for the hurried reader to scan and forget. We throw everything into bucket leads and headlines, leaving the reader to shift for himself in an incredible maze of minor details. All the suspense and drama of the events are washed out on a tide of dull facts.

What we need is a new prescription for newswriting,

a new formula—perish the word—that will make important news more readable, interesting and understandable. We need it because competing media—the news magazines, radio, television, books, pamphlets, etc.—are finding new ways not only to attract but to hold the attention of their publics. *Time* Magazine made history when it broke away from traditional news patterns.

This may not be a matter of immediate concern in the offices of successful newspapers today, but it is of concern to those of us teaching journalism in preparing young men and women for jobs on the newspapers of tomorrow. Even the latest textbooks on newswriting offer little help. Outside of a polite bow to depth reporting, the authors seem bound up with the mechanics of old.

After a quarter century of teaching journalism and fifteen years in the field, I'd like to suggest some principles of newswriting which certainly are not new but which, to my way of thinking, need more emphasis. They boil down to these: 1) Originality, 2) Localization, 3) Viewpoint, 4) Participation, and 5) Truth. Let's examine each point briefly.

Putting originality into writing means, of course, better and more thoughtful writing. It means more than names, identification, attribution, and clear and understandable English, although these are important. It means characterizing personalities, describing the scene, creating a living image in the mind of the reader, setting a mood for the

Mr. Christian teaches journalism at the University of Washington.

story. It will use suspense and drama where warranted. It will not impose on the writer, as Mr. Carroll pointed out, "a sort of prefabricated prose which will assure that any given event is made to read like any other given event."

We should be looking for that touch in a student's story that indicates a painstaking search for colorful statement, as for instance the youngster who wrote of a flash flood "that brought downtown traffic to a soggy standstill." Norman Reilly Raine of Tugboat Annie fame told me he spent an hour coming up with the phrase, "the insect threnody of a jungle night." And I'll always remember a wire service lead some years ago on a spring weather story: "Chicago skidded on a snowflake today and fell back into the lap of winter."

In extension of the next three principles, I'd like to borrow from the social scientists who have reached some interesting conclusions about reader behavior. With due credit to Rudolf Flesch for his rules of readability, I do not think they provide the answer to this problem of pulling the reader into the news and holding him there.

Localization of the news is a familiar term in the newspaper argot, but do we make the most of it? We may give the reader adequate coverage of the local scene, but we haven't done much to bring news from remote places closer to the reader's interests. The wire service story usually stands, with perhaps a weak local follow-up.

Rensis Likert, director of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, suggests fitting the news into the reader's "life sphere," and makes this further comment: "One of the reasons why only about one-third of the citizens of the United States have only the most meager information about world problems is that these issues are presented to them in concepts and terms which in no way enter into the most peripheral portions of their life sphere. Discussion of NATO seldom refers to taxes or the price of steak in Middletown although NATO and the world situation affect both."

Rewriting of standard wire service stories has been tried with considerable labor and without much success. Perhaps as George K. Moriarty contends in his article in *The American Editor*, it is a job of "creative copy editing." Or it could be a judicious combing of the news as is done by the editors of *U. S. News & World Report* in making up their section on "News That You Can Use."

I think particular emphasis should be laid on encouraging students to write from the reader viewpoint rather than writing from the viewpoint of their news source. Looking back on my own newspaper career, I wonder how often I was thinking of my reader first. It seems to be a common fault, especially among beat reporters, to think of that fellow who gave them the story instead of the fellow who is buying the paper.

Wilbur Schramm has rightly said: "A communicator must start where his audience is. He must choose the content of his message according to the best estimate of what the broadest class of receivers want and need." Our advertising colleagues recognized this principle long ago. The amazing growth and success of the *Wall Street Journal* in the last few years, it seems to me, can be attributed largely to this factor—the conscious effort to write business and financial news from the viewpoint of the lay reader. Many so-called business sections in today's newspapers, replete with handouts, could well copy.

What Likert and Schramm say with respect to localization and reader viewpoint applies with equal force to reader participation in the news. Schramm says that readers are drawn into the news primarily through such psychological motives as self-interest, self-identification, personal recognition and expectation of a reward. To these factors, Bernard Berelson adds social prestige or keeping up with their friends, social contacts with distinguished people, common interests, and "escape from personal problems." Hadley Cantril and Gordon Allport assert that reader-listener interest is dependent on the degree of "social participation" the subject feels.

All of which means that the reader selects his daily news diet, first, on the basis of what most concerns him—his home, his family, his job, his pocketbook, his health, etc.—and secondly, on what most interests the groups with which he is closely associated. I think it was Clarence Dean of the *Hartford Times* who was credited with calling it the Me-Angle in the news.

The traditional device for putting readers into a story, of course, is by the plentiful use of names, but this becomes more difficult as the circulations of metropolitan dailies grow and they assume a more impersonal and objective air. Another way is to use the "you" approach as done by the *Seattle Times* in a headline on the introduction of the Eisenhower budget:

U.S. Spending
Will Cost YOU
And YOU \$427

Kiplinger employs the "you" technique in almost every article in his *Changing Times* and it often creeps into articles in the *U. S. News & World Report*. I encourage my students to try it as a departure from the coldly objective third-person narrative. To break down inhibitions and taboos on style, I even let them experiment with on-the-scene first-person yarns occasionally. Through these approaches, the student begins to sense the fact that there is more than one way to tell a story and to recognize the importance of reader identification and participation in the news.

One of the weaknesses of the modern newspaper, it seems to me, is the insistence on rigid objectivity. Outside of the

"Letters to the Editor" column, very little is done to bring the reader into the news directly or indirectly. The stupidest audience-participation show on television will draw millions of viewers.

I am including the search for truth as the final principle in the series. Although it has very little to do with attracting and holding reader attention, it should be the foremost principle in teaching journalism. As Henry David Thoreau once wrote: "The one great rule of composition—and if I were a professor of rhetoric I should insist on this—is to speak the truth." Most newswriting texts stress accuracy in getting and handling the facts, as indeed they

should, but sometimes, I fear, at the expense of truth. Facts alone are often a distortion, as was so evident in the early reporting of irresponsible statements by the late Senator McCarthy. The truth is hard to find in many cases, but we should insist on an honest effort to dig it out.

Moreover, I contend that ethical practice should be the hallmark of our teaching if it is not always the stamp of our trade. If a measure of idealism is not instilled in young men and women at the beginning of their career, how can we hope that they or their newspapers will become responsible reporters and interpreters of the passing scene?

Whose Side Are The Professors On?

By Daniel S. Warner

L. M. Wright poses this as the final query of his article, "A Reporter Raises Some Questions," in the July *Nieman Reports*. Mr. Wright is (1) a newspaperman, and (2) bored.

He is bored with what some of the other people in the newspaper business have been saying for years and years. The particular statement that produces Mr. Wright's widest yawn is the reiteration by managing editors that too many talented college graduates are going somewhere other than to newspapers to get jobs. And the continued confirmation of this statement by professors at journalism schools, in speeches and articles, seems to make the yawn almost a spastic condition.

But not quite. Recovering, Mr. Wright points out that if this "questionable statement" is true, then the managing editors and the publishers should get together and consider how much reporters are earning a few years after they start in the business, as well as what they get as starting salaries. And as far as the journalism professors are concerned, they should be (1) hanging their heads, and (2) hastening to revise the curricula in their schools.

"Now," writes Mr. Wright, "the professors of journalism, to complete the list, ought, it seems to me, simply to be ashamed. If they are training journalism graduates whose educational background is so ambiguous that it permits them to go with equal grace (and at higher salaries) into (1) advertising, (2) public relations, (3) sales, or (4) trade

journalism, then it seems that the catalogs need to be rewritten."

It is presumptuous, of course, for any individual to answer a question or reply to a criticism that is directed toward all members of a group, unless he has recently polled a representative sample of the group. In addition, he should have the authority to speak for the group. I have neither the poll nor the authority. But an unhappier alternative would be to let Mr. Wright's observations be answered by the assumption of "No comment."

I am a professor of journalism—or rather an associate professor. And I am *not* ashamed. To set the record straight at the start, I doubt if Mr. Wright would by any stretch of his imagination qualify me as a professor of journalism, because I am one of those rascals who expose young students to the primrose paths of advertising. But I don't believe my colleagues who are "real," or "pure," professors of journalism are ashamed either. Concerned, yes. But they have nothing to be ashamed of. John Hulteng's article, "The Genuine Glamor of Journalism," also in the July *Nieman Reports*, shows quite clearly the positive stimulation toward newspaper work that journalism professors offer their students. There is more than a little reason to suspect that Mr. Wright is not very well acquainted with journalism professors.

Or with journalism schools. Is it his suggestion that the catalogs be rewritten (to remove that "ambiguity") in such a way that they include only the techniques that will qualify a student to start as a cub newspaper reporter? Surely he cannot mean this. The supply of graduates thus educationally-indentured to newspapers would certainly do very little to stimulate publishers and managing editors to consider how much reporters earn a few years after they start in the business. Too, there is reason to doubt that

A teacher of advertising at the University of Washington, Daniel Warner is this year at the University of Oregon, giving himself, he says, "an unofficial West Coast Nieman Fellowship to broaden my understanding of other areas of journalism and of psychology."

beginners with such a narrow background would last long in the newspaper business.

A possible interpretation of Mr. Wright's criticism is that the fields the wayward graduate chooses "with equal grace" have nothing in common with reporting for newspapers.

He has a point here as far as his "(3) sales" field is concerned. It is a reasonably safe assumption *today* that any journalism graduate who takes a job selling Fords, or life insurance, or ethical pharmaceuticals—selling anything, in fact, except an accepted advertising medium like a newspaper's white space—probably didn't belong in the journalism school to begin with. These sports turn up, oddly enough, in other corners of universities. Graduates in electrical engineering, pharmacy, and philosophy also turn to sales work. It isn't easy to be completely sure of what you want from life when you are 22—or 32, either. And, as Mr. Wright indicates, there is *some* motivation in the promise of greater financial return.

But the assumption that "trade" journalism, public relations, and advertising are so far removed from the newspaper field that a journalism graduate should be a misfit in any of the three seems naive.

I'm not quite sure just what "trade" journalism is. The implication seems to be that it isn't quite journalism. But if "trade" means "business," then the *Wall Street Journal* is an example of trade journalism—delivering a quality of reporting and writing that is matched by few metropolitan dailies.

In any case, there were trade journalists, public relations men, and advertising writers before there were any journalism schools. Where did they come from? From the staffs of newspapers, where they had learned to gather facts quickly and present them understandably to readers. The basic techniques for all four areas of specialization remain the same today, of course. And they comprise the basic technique portion of any journalism school curriculum.

The basic techniques, though, are actually a small fraction of the studies of any student in a good journalism school. Facts, information and ideas don't exist in a vacuum. They are always related to other things, and, of course, to the people who read about them. So journalism students today are encouraged—or required—to broaden their backgrounds with economics, sociology, history, literature, science—to understand better the world in which they live, and the people in it. Some find, for example, that they actually like science—and sometimes they would rather start to work as a technical writer for a "corporation," to use Mr. Wright's term, instead of becoming a newspaper reporter. Either they haven't sold their souls—or they must have gotten a satisfactory price.

Mr. Wright, it seems to me, rather over-stresses his distinction between newspapers and corporations. Both are businesses—and certainly some newspapers are just as corporate in their organization as Pan American Airways, or Parke, Davis and Company. And (without considering possible alternative systems) in our present socio-economic system of a market economy, both the corporation and the newspaper must operate at a profit or cease to operate. The newspaper as a business has, or should have, a definite social responsibility. But it doesn't follow that the abstract "corporation" makes no contributions to society, and per se denies any social responsibility.

Mr. Wright's impatience with those journalism graduates who prefer advertising jobs is a bit hard to justify, too. Advertising is a part, certainly, of any newspaper business. Courses in advertising fundamentals have been included in the curricula of most journalism schools, not at the request of Madison Avenue advertising men, but at the request of newspaper publishers.

The writing of advertising is no less honorable an occupation than reporting the news. Advertising is intended to be persuasive, and it comes out in the open about it. It tells the reader definitely who is doing the persuading, which can't always be said of news stories or editorials. To be effective, advertising writing requires the same sort of skills required by any other interpretive writing—a very real digging for facts that aren't on the surface, and an understanding of the reader's frame of reference—plus an extra skill not required of the interpretive reporter. This is the ability to visualize, to create the situation around which the entire story is written. Some journalism students find this more of a challenge than reporting, and no big gaps seems to show in their souls.

But this is boring Mr. Wright. Let's get to the point. Whose side *are* the professors on?

They aren't on the side of the newspaper or the "corporation." They are on the side of the student. They are trying to help the student prepare himself for a career he'll find happy and rewarding. And all the professors I know try to do this by giving their honest opinions of the advantages and disadvantages of the various job opportunities. Being human, the journalism teacher whose first love is the community paper will hope a promising student chooses that area. The professor whose background is with metropolitan dailies likes to see the graduate land with one. And the associate professor who thinks advertising is important, rewarding, and fun is pleased when a young man agrees.

But Mr. Wright can relax. We subversives of that last category are terribly outnumbered.

The Critic's Corner

The Plural Cavity

There is a cavity somewhere in the public schools—not the physiological pleural cavity of the chest, but the cavity in the teaching process, as to how to form plurals. Too many teachers do not know how to do it, and some of them have seized upon the apostrophe to solve all their problems. So the plural of Jones becomes Jones'.

So in the case of many newspapermen, younger ones at least, brought up in ignorance about a bit of mechanics they should have learned in the fourth grade.

Perhaps the schools are better now. My friend's nine-year-old son does know how to use what he calls the "spostrophe." But the millions of young people currently in college often have fantastic ideas about possessives and plurals, and they are even being graduated and going into newspaper work bearing their ignorance.

Repeatedly a women's-page story says "The Jones went to the wedding," meaning more than one Jones. Or, to dress it up a bit, "The Jones' went to the wedding," as if the apostrophe formed a plural; or "The Jones's went to the wedding," as if the apostrophe-s did the work.

The plural of Jones is Joneses. The plural of Moss is

Mosses. The plural of Greaves is Greaveses. The plural of Chavez is Chavezes.

Use of the apostrophe to form plurals of proper nouns ending in "s" apparently arose from its acceptable use in forming plurals of letters or symbols or words, as in "He flies B-52's," or "He earned 13 A's in college," or "There were dozens of but's in the sentence." Some of the papers have dropped the apostrophe in such plurals, again properly enough in cases where there is no ambiguity, but lots of newspapermen have transferred the use to proper names, and so such atrocities as "There are many Paris' in the U. S." come out in print.

As for the use of apostrophes in possessives (and their misuse)—that's another tale. I recently received a mimeographed letter from a teacher and school administrator of 25 years of experience who threw "spostrophes" in at random, but never where they were required. What chance have the kids got?

And what chance have the newspapers got, to build up staffs of literate reporters and desk men, if they have to attempt such teaching themselves? —Keen Rafferty

Rev. Smith, Meet Hon. Jones

"Rev. Smith," says a little black line under a one-half-column cut of a smiling man. And who is this? "Revolving" Smith?

Must newspapers follow common speech custom? If you are accustomed to shaking hands with the minister as you leave church and to hearing others of the congregation say, "A fine sermon, Reverend Smith," must you go back to the news room assuming that, somehow, "reverend" is a title for clergymen?

Is the senior United States Senator from your state "Hon. Jones?" Certainly one can be respectful to a senator by writing a letter to him addressed to "The Honorable John J. Jones." Does he then, in speech, become "Honorable Jones?" Indeed he does not. Why, then, is the Rev. Harry K. Smith automatically Rev. Smith?

Well, it is popular custom, and perhaps it does no good to write against it, for the habit is firmly ensconced, even in some papers. Cannot desk men and reporters grasp this

fact: that "reverend" is not a title, that no theological school bestows such a degree? Thus, it is proper to refer to "The Right Reverend George V. Miller," or "The Rev. Harry K. Smith." But it's never "Rev." or "Reverend" Miller.

The simplest thing in newspaper practice, having once called the man in a news story the Rev. Harry K. Smith, is to call him plain Mr. Smith or Dr. Smith thereafter in the same story, depending upon what degree he has, if any.

Otherwise, he's got to be, in the second mention in the story, "the Rev. Dr. (or Mr.) Smith."

Frank Colby has among his "superstitions" one that "Reverend" is the official title of a clergyman." Colby says many ministers themselves have the honest conviction that "Reverend" is an official title, like captain, or governor. He is especially horrified (in Grosset & Dunlap's *Practical Handbook of Better English*) at the phrase "Mr. and Mrs. Rev. Jones."

As for me, I am horrified enough at that picture in the paper with "Rev. Smith" under it. I still believe it means Revolving Smith, and that all deceased educated clergymen turn over in their graves every time it is used.

—Keen Rafferty

Professor Rafferty is head of the department of journalism, University of New Mexico, and often a contributor to *Nieman Reports*.

Tragic Drama: Segregation-Integration

By Walter Spearman

WITH ALL DELIBERATE SPEED: Segregation in Southern Schools. Edited by Don Shoemaker. Harper and Brothers. 239 pp.

NEITHER BLACK NOR WHITE. By Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely. Rinehart and Co., Inc. 371 pp. \$5.

What has happened in the South since the Supreme Court decision of 1954? How many public schools have actually become desegregated and what violence, if any, accompanied their desegregation? What have Southern state Legislatures done to speed or impede desegregation? What do Southern people, Negro and white, really think about integrated schools? How successful are the white Citizens Councils? How effective is the NAACP? What is the attitude of Southern politicians? Of Southern school administrators? What can we expect of the future?

These are questions being asked today not only in both North and South, but all over the world. Definite answers are hard to find, but two recent books are especially valuable in providing at least some of the answers. One is *With All Deliberate Speed* edited by Don Shoemaker of the *Southern School News*. The other is *Neither Black Nor White* by a wife-husband writing team, Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely.

Mr. Shoemaker's book gives the facts—in cold black and white. As Executive Director of the Southern Education Reporting Service, an objective, fact-finding agency established by Southern newspaper editors and educators to provide unbiased information on developments in education arising from the Supreme Court decision of 1954, Mr. Shoemaker is perhaps the best informed man in the country today on the problems of segregation-desegregation-integration in the public schools. An experienced reporter in each of 17 states and the District of Columbia sends the facts, not just opinions, into Nashville, Tenn., where they are digested, organized and edited for the *Southern School News*. This publication in turn goes out over the country to editors, educators and other interested readers who want the essential facts.

In a brief foreword, Editor Shoemaker calls his book "an accurate and unim-

passioned summary of three vital years' developments in the history of our times." He has asked his reporters to "park their opinions at some convenient curb" and to give the unadorned facts. They do.

Robert A. Leflar, former dean of the University of Arkansas Law School, contributes a chapter on "Law of the Land," sketching the history of the Supreme Court decision and noting subsequent action of federal judges in individual cases and in rulings on various state laws passed to prevent any integration whatsoever. His conclusion is of particular interest: "Vastly greater exercises of power by the executive and legislative branches could occur, but unless they do the role of the court is a lonely one."

Patrick E. McCauley, a Louisiana-Mississippi-Alabama newspaperman now assistant to the director of SERS, has a serviceable chapter on the legislative record of the various Southern states, which shows in alarming fashion how far many of the states are determined to go to prevent any crack in the wall of segregation—even if it means closing the public schools. From the six states that passed resolutions of interposition or nullification to the six states that authorized abolition of public schools as a last resort, this chapter illustrates an adamant will to resist. Other new laws include pupil placement, financial aid to students who wish to attend private segregated schools, abolition of compulsory attendance, and cutting off state funds to desegregated schools.

There is leeway for greater human interest—and for more distinguished writing—in those chapters which bring the reader closer to the people involved. Weldon James, former Nieman Fellow and an associate editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, views the entire picture in "The South's Own Civil War," where, as he says, "in the high mountain passes of conscience there was the clash of Christian steel on Christian steel, on one man's concept of civil virtue against that of his neighbor." He sees no unanimity of opinion in the South: white Citizens Councils rise up against the NAACP; churches often find their pastors and their members in disagreement; labor groups are confused; newspaper editorial policies differ.

A new hardening of resistance in "The Deep South" is pointed out by W. D. Workman, Jr., Columbia, S.C., newsman, who says that the phrase "with all deliberate speed" finds the deliberation all aimed away from desegregation. After explaining the efforts of eight Deep South states to equalize Negro schools and Negro teacher salaries before the Court decision, he traces the "hardening" process through interposition efforts (sparked by Editor James Jackson Kilpatrick of Richmond, Va.), the rise of pro-segregation groups, new legislative enactments, boycotts and other economic pressures, and a determined drive against the NAACP as the "cause of the trouble."

"Communities in Strife" by Wallace Westfeldt of the Nashville *Tennessean* gives a graphic description of the violence at Clinton, Tenn., Milford, Del., White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Mansfield, Tex., and Sturgis and Clay, Ky. In spite of these outbursts of violence, says Westfeldt, "there has been no real bloodshed."

Robert Lasch, former Nieman Fellow and now editorial writer for the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, describes what happened "Along the Border"; Edgar L. Jones of the Baltimore *Evening Sun* examines "City Limits"; Jeanne Rogers of the Washington *Post* and *Times Herald* gives an illuminating and very fair review of the Washington schools in "Nation's Show-case?"; Bert Collier of the Miami *Herald* digs into "Segregation and Politics"; Joseph B. Parham of the Macon *News* looks at the situation in Southern colleges; and Glen Robinson, who taught school administration at Peabody College in Nashville, discusses the puzzled plight of the school administrator.

Editor Shoemaker has chosen his contributors wisely, has edited their contributions skillfully. If there could be a summing up on *With All Deliberate Speed*, it might be Editor Shoemaker's apt quotation in his afterword: "Integration is more important to Negroes than the white man realizes, and segregation is more important to whites than the Negro realizes."

Each reader will inevitably draw his own conclusions from the facts so clearly presented. Some of the more obvious ones would seem to be that the resistance to de-

segregation increases according to the percentage of Negro children in the area; that integration will move in on the South from the border states but that stiff resistance will persist for many years in the Black Belt of the Deep South; that the federal courts will need help from the legislative and executive branches of the federal government if integration is to proceed with even "deliberate speed;" that the failure of political and religious leadership in the South to move people toward compliance with the Supreme Court decision made it possible for the Citizens Councils to fill the vacuum in their own fashion; that trouble in any particular area might be averted by wise preparation of the community before integration is started and prompt action on the part of local government to maintain law and order; that there is a real desire in the South to avoid violence—which may sting the consciences of the churchman or the pocketbook of the businessman.

In *Neither Black Nor White* Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely present the South in its varying shades of gray as far as segregation is concerned and in its full spectrum of color as far as the Southern way of life is concerned. They flesh out the statistics of the Shoemaker book by letting each "statistic" speak eloquently or sharply for himself, whether he be a Negro school teacher in Georgia or a frighteningly prejudiced motel operator in Mississippi.

Mr. Stokely is a Tennessee-born poet, his wife a North Carolina-born writer and author of *The French Broad* in the Rivers of America series. Together they have travelled through thirteen Southern states since the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and have recorded—and interpreted—the various shades of opinion they heard set forth. They succeed in giving the most perceptive picture of a changing area since William T. Polk's excellent *Southern Accent*.

"We knew that the South is not a place, it is many places," they said; "it is not a people, it is many people." What they wanted to do was to "record and interpret a realm of experience, a republic of the human mind."

They talked to everybody—and nearly everybody talked to them.

A taxi driver in Houston: "We don't have any integration here. We got a city full of niggers, they don't want these changes any more than we do."

A Negro professor in Atlanta: "Some white people were really amazed when a

poll was taken in one Southern city and the Negroes weren't for segregation."

A Virginia filling station operator: "There ain't a lawyer or judge that wouldn't sell his grandmother for a cash dime. White folks ain't got a chance."

A Negro insurance man: "We're just trying to get the white people to keep their own laws. We've not made any new ones or broken any old ones."

A Natchez man: "You know how long it'll be before the niggers down here go to school with the whites? Well, if somebody was standing in the Panama Canal

trying to mix half the Atlantic and half the Pacific together, dipping with a silver teaspoon, however long it'd take him to mix them up, that's how long it'll be before the blacks and whites mix down here."

And the authors themselves: "Today fear runs like a dark thread through an old pattern cut from new cloth. . . . If the majority of the region will turn to its oldest tradition of human worth and every individual's rights, then the South may become the real frontier for a renewed vision of democracy."

The Atlantic's Century

By Thomas G. Wicker

JUBILEE, ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF THE ATLANTIC, By Edward Weeks and Emily Flint. Atlantic-Little Brown, 742 pp. \$7.50.

"The richest time intellectually by all odds" that a Boston publisher named Phillips ever had came one May evening in 1857 when he sat down in the Parker House with Emerson, Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, the elder Holmes, John L. Motley, Francis H. Underwood and James Cabot. That conference lasted five hours; the magazine that grew from it has survived a hundred years and now looks forward with vigor to a new century.

And if *Jubilee*, doesn't provide quite the "richest time intellectually" one reader ever had, still it makes it obvious that any centenarian-plus who's been on the monthly's subscription list from the beginning has had no lack of brain stimulation.

Journalism, essays, short stories, novels, poetry, lecture transcriptions—all have appeared in the pages of *The Atlantic*. Though they were first printed anonymously ("The names of the contributors will be given out," intoned Emerson, "when the names are worth more than the articles."), *Jubilee* presents about the most impressive byline list imaginable—Americans from Mark Twain to Robert Frost, "imports" like Virginia Woolf and George Bernard Shaw.

It is this quality of catholicity that, ironically, most limits *Jubilee* as a book. Further, some of the earlier pieces have had to be cut sharply, say editors Edward Weeks and Emily Flint, to conform to today's "nervous expectancy"; and even a judicious arrangement by topics, rather than by chronology, fails to make the book much more than a "bedside reader"

in which it is difficult to lose oneself in sustained reading.

But if *Jubilee* itself seems best fitted for start-and-stop reading, it still manages to impart a lively sense of the persistently big quality *The Atlantic* achieved in its first century—and the best proof of that would be a reprint of the list of contents.

There is hardly a controversy of lasting impact on American life that is not discussed in these pages. There is hardly an artist of stature not represented or written about searchingly, as in Perry Miller's moving portrait of "The Incorruptible Sinclair Lewis" or T. W. Higginson's "Emily Dickinson's Letters." In the short story, one finds Hemingway's "Fifty Grand" and Jessamyn West's "Lead Her Like a Pigeon." The businessman will find articles like "Stock Market Regulation" by William Z Ripley. Even fishermen and dog-lovers will find they have not been neglected.

One special attraction: a vicarious second-look for modern readers. Thus, one gets Carl Sandburg's contemporary view of Lincoln, immediately after having read Henry Villard's recollection of taking refuge with Honest Abe from a sudden rain—in an empty boxcar! And there is Thornton Wilder's illuminating Norton lecture on Thoreau, contrasted with Emerson's none-too-perceptive funeral oration for his Concord neighbor. Twain's "Old Times on the Mississippi" stands not far, in spirit or in print, from an excerpt from Richard Bissell's "A Stretch on the River."

Editors Weeks and Flint have given us in *Jubilee* only the cream of the crop, of course. But what a crop is indicated by such cream! And what a task has the next hundred years' *Atlantic* in meeting its tacit commitment to an extraordinary past.

The Press of '76

PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE. The Newspaper War on Britain, 1764-1776, By Arthur M. Schlesinger. Knopf. 318 pp. \$6.

Revolution begets robust journalism and vice versa, our history shows. Professor Schlesinger has dug through the newspaper files of our Revolutionary period to illuminate a vital chapter of American journalism. He shows the infant newspapers of the time carrying the ball for independence. They initiated and fomented the agitation against the Crown and they didn't let it die down. They were a consistent force to carry it through. In the process they grew in strength and developed in function.

The issues of the Revolution incited the "editorial" function of the newspaper. The editor first realized and exercised his role as an opinion maker under the stresses of revolutionary issues. He contrived new typographical tricks to emphasize his points, and before it was over, was even using embryonic headlines.

It is amazing in retrospect that a handful of little papers scattered over a widely separated chain of colonial towns, could concert such concentrated and continuous agitation and keep it in focus. The newspaper habit of "exchanges" accounted for this. They reprinted each other's opinions, and when a notable essay on grievances was printed in, say, the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* by a John Dickinson, it quickly made the rounds of the colonial press. It was soon read from end to end of the colonies and had the impact of a Walter Lippmann column in today's syndication.

The press was drawn into the struggle by the earthy issue of taxation. The Stamp Tax (1764) hit the press harder than others. The tax was a cent on every paper and on top of that a tax on advertising that took nearly half the advertising revenue. The printers-editors turned against government in defense of their own pocketbooks, as the owners of presses have been doing about ever since.

But it was a healthy response at the time and they soon got the habit and carried a torch for the grievances of all. They were fast to learn the techniques of agitation and propaganda and were soon launched in a crusade that carried all the way to independence.

In the course of this they learned the great principle of freedom of the press and taught it to their constituencies. Al-

though they forgot to apply it to their Tory competitors of the time, they did not forget to put it into the Constitution for the protection of their journalistic posterity.

The press grew under persecution in its rebel days. There were only 26 papers in 1767, but 38 by the Battle of Lexington. Boston editors set the revolutionary pattern. They were suppressed in the occupation of Boston and never regained their leadership. But they had passed it on.

Once the press got hot it stayed hot. They would not countenance any let up. They gave sanction to insurrection. They would not tolerate the many proposals for reunion. They provided the argument that rebellion was lawful and against unconstitutional oppression, which, then, as now, was so essential to the American mind. They asserted and exercised the freedom to criticize authority, which authority had never conceded. They provided solid support for the first Continental Congress and held up its hands.

"No one can doubt the role of the press" says Professor Schlesinger, after he has documented it.

"It was by means of newspapers," John Holt of the New York *Journal* boasted to John Adams, "that we received and spread the tyrannical designs formed against America, and kindled a spirit that has been sufficient to repel them."

Professor Schlesinger notes that the newspaper offensive unleashed by the tax impositions "made a permanent impress on American journalism."

"For one thing the prolonged agitation enormously enhanced the influence of the press, instilling a newspaper reading habit which has characterized all succeeding generations."

"The quarrel with the mother country also established with finality the opinion-making function of the press. . . The opinion-making role inescapably involved them in the issue of freedom of the press."

He is describing a press that had no reporters, in which the editor was printer and owner and advertising solicitor. It gave its readers a broad outlook on world affairs. Local news it took for granted that its small town readers knew already. It brought the news from the world capitals that came in by ship, and carried literary, political and general articles from the British papers and from local contributors. "Not until our own day," says the historian, "has the American newspaper covered the international scene so comprehensively."

Though at the beginning of the Revolu-

tion, the press used no headlines, they did not lack for means of emphasis.

They would on special occasion add to their four small pages, about 10 by 15 inches, a supplement, labelled "postscript" or "extraordinary," from which, we are told, came our "extra."

Within the limits of their clumsy slow printing, "the publishers commonly affected a typographical style that was extremely expressive to the unsophisticated 18th Century reader. That was to use upper case for the first letter of each key word or to set in capital letters or italics entire words and sometimes whole passages. The papers, as a contemporary observed 'employed *Italics*, SMALL CAPITALS and CAPITALS without number, that they might make the greater impression.' " This gave animation to inert print, our historian notes from his own immersion in it, "and the public was led to place the emphasis where the editor intended. Inasmuch as the reader had a full week to master the contents with little or no other reading matter to distract him, he did not need his paper to be sauced with headlines and illustrations."

Professor Schlesinger threads his way through the dusty Revolutionary archives with the insights familiar in his *Paths to the Present*. With infinite pains he has documented the press history of a dozen turbulent years from the Stamp Tax to Independence. It is a vital slice of our journalistic history, a seminal period, handled by a master of history. The historian's friend, Alfred Knopf, has put it up in a handsome volume, beautifully printed, another fine example of a Borzoi book.

One thing remains to be said of Arthur Schlesinger's latest addition to the crowded shelves of his history books. This one, the first product of his retirement from Harvard teaching, is dedicated "to the Nieman Fellows of Harvard University, Past and Present."

This will touch them but not surprise them. It marks a relationship that has been extraordinarily rich for these Fellows. Arthur Schlesinger has been a friend of all of them from the beginning. He has often said that he placed his activity for the Nieman Foundation second only to his profession of history. He served for years on the Nieman Committee and regularly attended the gatherings of the Nieman Fellows. Each Fall at the opening, for many years, he has scheduled a day to sit at the Nieman office and hold individual consultations

with each incoming Fellow, to advise him on his plans for study. The personal relationships thus begun have carried down the years and across the land.

History has of course a close relation to journalism, and as this book shows, has nourished it. History is, above all, an indispensable study for the journalist. Happily the newspapermen coming to Harvard found here a great history department, and historians hospitable to journalists and journalistic problems. The great lecturing of Harvard historians, the stimulating discussions with them and the dimensions of their own contributions to history have widened and deepened the understanding of an increasing corps of newspapermen to whom Arthur Schlesinger dedicates his book. Let me, as one of them, with a word, acknowledge it.

Louis M. Lyons

Issue in Algeria

By Stanley Karnow

LIEUTENANT IN ALGERIA, By Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber. Knopf. \$3.50.

Before he had reached thirty, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber was already a major figure in the French Press. He had written bylined editorials for *Le Monde*, the authoritative Paris daily, and in 1953 he founded *L'Express*, a brilliantly provocative weekly modelled after *Time* and the London *Economist*. He lectured extensively in the United States, contributed to American magazines, and when he wasn't writing, he found time for politics. As unofficial publicity director for Pierre Mendes-France in 1954, he helped make the Premier one of the most co-operative French politicians reporters had ever encountered.

Servan-Schreiber joined General de Gaulle's Free French when he was nineteen, and later became a fighter pilot. Since then he has managed to continue fighting in one way or another. After one particularly virulent attack on Finance Minister Edgar Faure a few years ago, he was challenged to a duel—pistols at dawn. The encounter was happily prevented in last-minute negotiations.

But for all his scrappiness, Servan-Schreiber is more than an *enfant terrible* simply trying to smash up the fragile structure of France. In his way, he symbolizes a younger generation in an old country, fed up with the Establishment—*le système*—and anxious to rejuvenate

many of the nation's ancient institutions. Significantly, some of his critics have accused him of attempting to "Americanize" France.

Early in 1956, through a series of murky political circumstances, Servan-Schreiber was cornered into volunteering for active duty as an officer in Algeria, where a French force of a half-million men has been fighting fewer than 50,000 Moslem insurgents for over three years. In his six months of service, Lt. Servan-Schreiber discovered a weird war in which extremists on both sides were senselessly destroying any chance of civilized reconciliation.

This thin book—it contains only 231 pages—is an exciting story of guerilla fighting. But threading through the adventure is a bigger theme: France's inability to cope with the problems of a changing world.

More than twenty new national states have emerged since the end of World War II. Some imperial powers, notably Great Britain, have kept pace with this anti-colonial trend, guiding their colonies towards self-government, and thereby retaining their friendship and co-operation within the Commonwealth. In her weakness and self-consciousness, France has failed or refused to recognize the rise of colonial nationalism. Time and again, in Indochina, in Tunisia and Morocco, she bled herself fighting against a spirit that was too strong and too elusive to be stopped by guns. Each time she lost, and each time she weakened herself even more. And each time, despite herself, she was displaying her worst qualities to the world: not her great culture or enlightened principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, but a narrow, backward defense of the privileged, colonial *status quo*.

Like her own Bourbon kings, who forgot nothing and learned nothing, France seems to be repeating the same tragic pattern in Algeria. Instead of providing for the aspirations of eight million Moslems, she preferred to protect the special rights of a million European settlers. "An army as big as this, straight from France, could have been an instrument of reconciliation with the ordinary people here," observes one of Servan-Schreiber's characters. "What the Arabs hated was the colonial set-up; they really didn't hate France."

France's problem in Algeria, as Servan-Schreiber explains it, can have a special relevance for Americans. In a way, its issues are not unlike those of our own Civil War. There is more involved in

this conflict than Moslem independence, just as Lincoln in 1860 was concerned with something beyond the freedom of the slaves. His object was to preserve the Union, to defend democracy against a form of feudalism. In Algeria today there are feudal forces—the European settlers. Like the slaveholders of our own South, their prosperity depends on their privileges. But because they are strong—or rather, because France is weak—they have succeeded in winning the governments of Paris to their cause.

Some observers feel that whether France wins or loses in Algeria, she will have lost. The bitterness and hatred of terrorism and counter-terrorism, tortures, fear and suspicion have, it is thought, permanently ruined the chances of Moslem and European communities ever living peacefully together. When he wrote his book, Servan-Schreiber seemed to think a liberal French policy might change the atmosphere. "At the end of the story, at the heart of everything," he wrote, "when all this business is over and amounts to no more than a line in the history books, what shall we read in that line: hate—or love? If countries have a soul, France's soul is here, waiting to be saved."

That was a year ago. It may now be too late.

Spain's Story

SPAIN'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM, By Lawrence Fernsworth. Beacon Press, Boston. \$6.00.

Lawrence Fernsworth knows Spain at first hand, and reported its travail in the 1930's that ended in the present dictatorship. So the more dramatic and recent story of Spain's struggle for freedom is eyewitness reporting. He has gone back to the beginnings for his history of the communal regimes of pre-Roman times and carried the story down to the present. He calls the present phase a triple partnership of State, Church and Army. This he regards as "a phase of transition toward a more durable era of freedom which must inevitably come."

Fernsworth traces the forces of liberalism and reaction throughout Spain's long and often tragic history.

Fernsworth's own experience as a correspondent in Spain in the years 1929-39 was only part of a career as news editor and foreign correspondent that began on the old New York *Mail* in 1922. Besides

newspaper work, he has contributed frequently to periodicals. Some of his research on Spanish history was done at Harvard during a Nieman Fellowship in 1943-44. After that he served the New York *Daily News* as a news editor, and in recent years has been Washington correspondent of the Concord (N.H.) *Monitor*.

"The thirst for freedom is in their blood" Fernsworth says of the Spanish people. "It is their heritage from their Iberian and Celtic ancestors and from the

peoples who followed them—men who formed the onswEEPing hordes from the East which came to rest in this great pocket of Spain; the fierce Visigoths who ruled between the periods of Roman and Moor, and who *elected* their kings; the Berber and Arab from North Africa, with the desert's free spirit in their bones. . . Spaniards did not say, and to the last have never conceded, that 'the king can do no wrong.' But their tragedy has been that tyrants, with the aid of powerful forces, have so often been able to prevail."

The World of Walter Locke

THIS WORLD MY HOME, By Walter Locke. Antioch Press, 171 pp. \$3.

Walter Locke lived only a few weeks after this record of the essence of his life was published. He was 82. Born in a West Virginia log cabin, he died in a pleasant suburb of Dayton where his work as a master journalist was best known. He was for 25 years the editor of the Dayton *Evening News*. Retiring from the editorship only three years ago, he continued his column, "Trends of the Times," which was carried in all the Cox papers, in Ohio, Georgia and Miami. He was one of the wisest editors of our time and a man of great soul, utterly uncorrupted by the pressures of modern commercialism that so inevitably beset such a career.

This quiet book discloses the sources of his inner strength, and suggests the extraordinary dimensions of his life experience. The span of the America he knew was even greater than the years would show. For the hills of his West Virginia boyhood had not changed from the earlier simplicity of rural American life. From there his family moved to Nebraska when it was a land of plains villages. Walter Locke grew up with *Pilgrim's Progress*, did the work of a country boy, taught district school, farmed, and began newspapering on the *Nebraska State Journal* in Lincoln, a grand school for journalism.

Everybody in his back hill boyhood was a Democrat and his father more so than most. His father renounced General Hancock when the defeated candidate of 1880 shook hands with the Republican President-elect. Walter Locke's first vote was for Bryan. But the political hero of his mature years was the great independent, George Norris. His chapter on Norris is an essay on political integrity that tells much also about Walter Locke.

But his book is not of politics or pri-

marily of journalism. It dwells on the deeper experience of boy and man—of the fine people he has known, most of them simple people, who made an impression on his life, of the great changes he has seen and his reflections on them. He tells with understanding of the prairie fires that Populism and later Townleyism lighted. He describes his first listening to Carl Sandburg and he tells with whimsical relish how regimented he and his neighbors felt when Government first regulated their lives with traffic lights.

He tells how he learned to accept Big Government as an alternative to rule by the Big Corporation and the expansion of public control as the only escape from private control. Walter Locke's philosophy emerges in his little stories of the things he has seen and what they have taught him. It develops as naturally as corn ripens. It is a book of ripening, a book that reflects on the great boon of life and of realizing its offerings. It is a book written in such quiet natural grace that you don't notice the writing until you have finished and realize that the style is a perfection of artless, mellow ease. It has warmth, depth, humor, humility, vitality, and it moves like a brook, reflecting the varied scenery and topography of the land it waters. Brooks Atkinson, in a preface, says it is a book by a poet and a prophet. "Technically it is autobiography. But it is also a social and spiritual history of America. It is written by the only man who has the experience, the purity of character and the literary skill to render such an account of our national life."

Mr. Atkinson's enthusiasm comes from the quality of Walter Locke's own modest setting down of the meanings he found in living. To the journalist it is a record for pride in what the calling can mean at its highest.

Louis M. Lyons

Freedom and Defense

by Phil Kerby

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND THE COMMON DEFENSE, By Walter Millis. One of a projected series of the Fund for the Republic pamphlets exploring the principles of a free society.

This is a curious and contradictory work by a distinguished journalist and author. Mr. Millis, reviewing the vast internal security system developed in the United States during the past decade, attempts to strike a rational balance between "individual freedom and the common defense." He indicts the excesses in our drive toward security, but accepts one of the major assumptions that inevitably produced them.

Mr. Millis writes: "The subversives who, like the Communist writers who once stormed the Un-American Activities Committee, flaunting their constitutional rights as a means of concealing their own clandestine commitment to the destruction of those rights, need not as a matter of principle be granted all the immunities enjoyed by free men."

This is a sharp rejection of democratic theory, and Mr. Millis admits its hazards by adding: "But if this principle be accepted, it must at the same time be recognized as one peculiarly open to abuse; it cannot be applied in the suppression of any and every dissentient or 'disloyal' political faith. . . ." However, logic and the history of the past ten years show that once this principle has been accepted it must indeed be applied, in varying degrees, to every non-conformist.

If one segment of the community must be excluded from the full protection of the Constitution, what of the "fellow travelers?" Are they not equally—or even more—dangerous? And what of those who have no sympathy at all for Communism but whose ideas may parallel in some respects the party line? Must they not be restrained from, unwittingly, promoting the Communist cause? and must they not also be excluded from the "immunities enjoyed by free men?" In the realm of ideas, as opposed to overt acts, where is the line to be drawn?

These are not fanciful questions, and the author himself stresses the dangers of heresy hunting and suppression. "It was the impossibility," he says, "of proving—in any meaningful sense—a charge of

heretic or seditious belief, and the virtual certainty that process of this kind must run riot in persecutions, false confessions, mistaken condemnations, executions on mere suspicion or mob excitement, which led the authors of the Constitution to bar all such process from American practice. . . It was essential to the liberties of the free America which these men were trying to construct that its citizens be free in speech, assembly and belief, and that men not be tried for their private beliefs or thoughts, not condemned for heresies or seditious, whether they actually entertained such heresies or not." But, as Mr. Millis says, "by 1954 we had, in the name of national defense, built a vast system for doing just this."

Justification for "doing just this" is to be found in the premise that "subversives"—i.e., heretics—"need not as a matter of principle be granted all the immunities enjoyed by free men."

What has been the result of this new doctrine? For a decade, every American has been treated by his government as a security risk. The government has excluded from government employment all persons remotely suspect politically. The security system has spread far beyond the government itself so that today one-fifth of the entire working force of the nation is under security surveillance. Loyalty programs have cleansed the public school system of all heretical teachers. Most private schools and colleges have purified their staffs. Communists, from writers—who naturally are prone to evil ideas—to carpenters on the sets, have been purged from the motion picture industry. Television and radio have sifted their employees through a fine loyalty screen, and newspapers have discharged employees who have refused to confess and disavow their past or present political beliefs. Several hundred private organizations have been placed on the Attorney General's "subversive" list so that loyal Americans may steer clear of their blandishments. Travel abroad has been restricted to politically reliable persons. The House Un-American Activities Committee has become a roving grand jury to probe the minds of all citizens supposed to harbor bad thoughts. State committees have pursued the same scent and investigated, in many instances, the same quarry. Private groups, some with potent influence like the American Legion, keep watch in every community.

If our safety depends on the suppression of heretical ideas, we should be secure, beyond all doubt, by now, but hardly ever

has the nation revealed a greater sense of insecurity and frustration than at the present time. Our most orthodox, and hence most respectable, political leaders and commentators express continuing doubts that our foreign policy can cope with rising Soviet power and influence—but our State Department is staffed with men of unimpeachable loyalty. While sputniks circle the world, a missile to launch an American satellite blows up—but our scientists have been thoroughly cleared for security. No disloyal teacher is tolerated in any school, but the army must be summoned to protect from mob action a few boys and girls who seek an equal opportunity in education, and the nation presents a blurred image to the world.

It is against this background that the operation of our security system must be evaluated, and Mr. Millis' treatise is a worth-while contribution in this respect.

Books

Much Worth Reading

THE LONELY PEOPLE, By Ed Bell.
Edited by Robert Lasseter. Courier Press. Murfreesboro. Tenn. 166 pp. \$3.

Ed Bell was a Tennessee newspaperman who died last year at 47. He'd worked for the AP in Nashville and for the Nashville *Tennessean*. He was editor of the *Rutherford Courier* in Murfreesboro when he died. He was a sensitive newspaperman and a natural writer and he saw a story everywhere, in people and situations. These stories are folk tales. Their characters are sometimes white and sometimes Negro whose lives make the color and compassion and humor and humanity of small town and rural life, as Ed Bell knew it in mid-Tennessee. Some of them he wrote for newspapers and magazines. Most were manuscripts compiled for this volume as a labor of love by his colleague, Robert Lasseter, a Nieman Fellow of 1944. The gleaning of the byproduct of a writing man of insight and character and love of his people.

VOICE OF ISRAEL, By Abba Eban.
Horizon Press, New York. 303 pp. \$3.95.

The Israeli ambassador to the United States tells the story of the first decade of the new nation of his ancient people.

He raises basic questions and clarifies many neglected aspects of the vexing security problem. His discussion of the military establishment and secrecy in government are especially discerning, and he is at his best when he analyzes and deflates the spy-thriller concept of the dangers threatened by espionage.

But in a divided world, where the two greatest powers, one a truculent dictatorship, have achieved the means to destroy each other and the rest of humanity, the question remains: How can a free society defend itself and preserve its freedoms? The best hope lies in keeping the political process free, in maintaining a society where beliefs are not proscribed, where no man is punished for his opinions, where the immunities of free men are granted to the unbelievers. A government responsive to the needs of its people has little to fear from disloyalty and nothing to fear from the expression of ideas.

BACKDROP TO TRAGEDY: THE STRUGGLE FOR PALESTINE, By William R. Polk, David Stamler and Edmund Asfour. Beacon Press, Boston. 399 pp. \$4.95.

Three scholars, an Arab, a Zionist and an American, have examined the conflicting interests and emotional politics of the Middle East to describe its explosive elements as objectively as anyone is apt to do. They interpret with candid expertness the Jewish interests (Stamler), the Arabs (Polk) and the economic background (Asfour). They conclude that the problem is probably incapable of solution, but its chief present need is time for cooling off.

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN BOOKS.
Simon & Schuster, New York. \$1.45 each.

For the second year *Scientific American* has put up a package of five books that contain some of the best articles in that remarkable magazine, which under the creative editorship of Gerard Piel has been bringing an understanding of science to an ever-widening lay public of admiring readers. The five volumes group the principal areas of the year's output: The Universe, Plant Life, New Chemistry, The Plant Earth, Lives in Science. To take up just one, the *Lives* is a group of distinguished biographical essays on a dozen of the world's great scientists. This packet can do more than all the speeches of the Eisenhower Administration to make us aware of the importance of science and of how avoidable is our

ignorance of it. The series of five are boxed together but are priced separately at \$1.45 each.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE H-BOMB.

Beacon Press, Boston. 121 pp. \$1.

A book of protest against nuclear weapons and a policy based on them. The alternatives offer programs of creative statesmanship, by such distinguished and provocative thinkers as Lewis Mumford, Reinhold Niebuhr, Chester Bowles, Norman Thomas, Hans Kohn, Philip Rieff, Eugene Rabinowitch, W. Averell Harriman, Michael Karpovich and Salvador de Madariaga.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FOREIGN POLICY, By Henry A. Kissinger. Harper's, New York. 455 pp. \$5.

A book that immediately aroused national discussion about a practical military strategy in a divided world to support American foreign policy and avoid nuclear war. The book grew out of a group study by 35 leaders of American thought, sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations. But its shape and sharp focus and hard thinking through a complex of the terrible problems of our time are Kissinger's.

THE TRANSFER OF POWER IN INDIA, By V. P. Menon. Princeton University Press. 542 pp. \$8.50.

This solid history of a decisive and tragic era explains why British India became two nations of Pakistan and India. For no good reason either. It shows that the pettiness of politicians can be as destructive in the East as in the West. This solid volume is magnificent history and will stand as the record of its era. The author is not the Menon of U.N. controversy, but the scholarly Indian civil servant who was Lord Mountbatten's principal adviser in the transfer of power.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PROMOTION OF THE GENERAL WELFARE. The Brookings Institution, Washington. 1216 pp. \$8.75.

An invaluable reference for library, classroom and editorial desk. This is the United Nations that nobody knows—or hardly anybody. Its multiple activities against poverty, disease and ignorance, for human rights and the development of the not yet self-governing peoples.

In the Magazines

Excerpts from Articles by Nieman Fellows

Harper's, Nov., 1957

What Happened to the Farm Bloc?

By CARROLL KILPATRICK

History often is made without notice—even by those closest to the event. The Republican-Southern Democratic alliance, a powerful force in American politics since 1876, dissolved, perhaps for good, in the civil rights fight in Congress last summer.

Now another grand alliance, related to the first but never dependent upon it, is threatened with destruction, or may be already dead. It is the farm bloc, that conglomeration of commodity interests which has run roughshod in Congress for generations and which has decided many a Presidential election. In 1957, the commodity interests which make up the farm pressure groups were as surely split as the old Republican-Southern Democratic coalition.

But even in the Senate the basic power

of the farm bloc has been undermined by the already sharp drop in farm population. Every year should bring further attrition. Congress in the future is going to listen increasingly to urban and suburban voters, in other words, to consumers. And it may not be too bad for the farmer.

Consumer representatives in Congress, now that they hold the balance of power on farm legislation, have a responsibility to help find a workable farm program—one in the farmer's and the nation's interest. With the rapid decline in farm population, the heavy cost of a farm program no one really likes, the complaint of the consumer against mounting food costs, the merchant-middleman opposition to the soil bank, and the dispute between representatives of various farm organizations, the old pressure for handouts should diminish.

The New Yorker, Nov. 30 et seq.

"A Reporter at Large—The Puerto Ricans"

By CHRISTOPHER RAND

Last New Year's Day, by the estimate of city officials, there were five hundred and fifty thousand Puerto Ricans living in New York—a fourteenth, roughly, of the city's population. Nearly all of them had come here from their native island, or been born here, in the preceding ten years, though a trickle had been coming in since 1898, the year the United States took over Puerto Rico from Spain.

* * * *

The Puerto Ricans in the city have their choice of three Spanish-language newspapers. One of these, *La Prensa*, antedates the migration by many years; a conservative paper, with a sober format, it tries to serve the whole Spanish-speaking community here, which includes a great many businessmen, diplomats, and political exiles from various countries, and it carries much news of Spain and Latin America. A second paper, *El Imparcial*, is a special edition of the San Juan paper of that name, and began publication here

last summer, covering, for the most part, events on the island. The third, and jazziest, is *El Diario de Nueva York*, a tabloid founded in 1948; it is slanted expressly toward the Puerto Rican migrants of New York, championing them against the police and other city agencies, and plainly seeking to weld them into a political force. Through these papers, tidbits of New York journalistic fare are served up with a Spanish flavor. Maggie and Jiggs become Ramona and Pancho, Blondie becomes Pepita, Mickey Mouse becomes El Ratón Míquelito, and, in general, life around us takes on a new, Iberian aspect.

Of all the papers, *El Diario* is, not surprisingly, most inclined to forsake good Spanish usage for the patois that has grown up among the Puerto Ricans here—a new language, in some respects, and one that purists, of whatever Hispanic background, shudder at. I have seen in its pages, for instance, the un-Spanish-looking noun "super," meaning the superintendent of an apartment house—often an awesome figure to New York's Puerto Ricans.

Life, Nov. 4, 1957

A Southern Challenge and Epitaph for Dixie

By HARRY S. ASHMORE

What the South has been defending over the years is the right to be wrong—wrong, at least, as a substantial national majority pledged to the issues of slavery and segregation. It is, of course, a basic right, the one upon which an entire structure of law has been erected to protect minorities. But the South debased it by using it as a cloak behind which the local southern white majority denied the common rights and immunities of citizenship to the black minority. It was never enough to say simply that a majority wanted it that way and that their will, therefore, should prevail. It was clearly the duty of those who knew better to insist that the majority must recognize that a system which might be temporarily tolerable and even necessary would become intolerable unless it evolved with the changing times. To insist otherwise, to say that come what may the southern white minority would never concur with the national majority—as men are still saying—is simply to reduce the right of dissent to the right of revolution.

We have had important things to say to the nation, but as responsible men yielded to the irresponsibles in every season of southern crisis, we have been drowned out by our own footless argument over where a man should sit on a streetcar.

In any event, and for better or worse, the South must now find its future in the national pattern. The angry cries of defiance now sounding across the region do not echo a gallant past, only a contemporary tantrum. I have at hand a letter to the editor of the *Arkansas Gazette* which begins by dismissing all those who insist that the rulings of the United States Supreme Court are the law of the land as "pseudoliberals, pinkos, Communists, dupes and morons." And the impassioned writer continues:

"Harry Ashmore might refresh himself on the Second Amendment of our United States Constitution which says in part 'the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.' If reason and ballots do not avail us in the end, that amendment tells us what to do as a last resort. That amendment talks Anglo-Saxon. Cowardly people can't understand it."

Well, I have so refreshed myself. But when I look out the window of my edi-

torial office I gaze upon the bland stone facade of the local branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. And down the street I see the shining windows that bear the sign Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane. I can imagine many ceremonies taking place on the intervening stretch of asphalt—including a third term inaugural parade for Orval E. Faubus—but not my fellow townsmen lining up in double rank while the chairman of the local Citizens' Council checks their bandoliers in preparation for a second march to turn back the Federals at Pea Ridge.

No, history does not run backward, and it buries its own dead. I can only hope that in the new time the triumph of the thin-lipped men is not absolute—that somehow we in the South can carry over traces of the old qualities of humor and grace that once distinguished most of us, proud or humble, black or white. If so, Dixie's epitaph can read simply: R.I.P.

Atlantic Monthly, Dec., 1957

What a Journalist Needs

By LOUIS M. LYONS

Insurance against cynicism is a priceless asset for the journalist, for cynicism is one of the commonest faults of his craft. Who is to steer him to a sure source of values that will prove durable under the stress of his trade? Some men find philosophy in history, some in literature, some in the classics, some in science. Certainty about means can be treacherous, but exposure to possible means is the function of education.

The lessons learned, one hopes, will include ability to distinguish the important from the trivial, the real from the phoney. But this cannot be guaranteed. The faculty, like the coach, must have material to work on. Those who manage our communications media cannot escape responsibility for selecting people who have what it takes.

Journalism is a daily education for the man with any capacity for it. The incitement of journalism is its own incentive to learn. Great editors have been produced by the impact of life upon them as they

watched and described its activity. All is grist for the journalist's mill: he picks up a useful background almost in spite of what we call education. Often the kind of formal schooling he had seems to be a minor factor in his actual preparation. One way and another he has filled out a background for his job.

The training schools for journalism are as various as the news. Walter Lippmann began as a researcher (we'd say today) for a social reformer. James Reston began as publicity man for the Cincinnati Reds. James Morgan began as a telegrapher. Christopher Rand started in the insurance business. Edwin Lahey, leaving school in the eighth grade, used to read Dickens on his freight handling job and amuse himself by trying to write sentences like Dickens's. A generation of Chicago *Daily News* readers have had reason to be grateful for the color and movement of Lahey's model. Low, the great British cartoonist, couldn't get into college. He taught himself to draw.

So let no one be dogmatic about the studies of the journalist. Only give him a chance to fill up his mind. He will be drawing on that reservoir the rest of his life.

The student planning on journalism asks if he should not specialize in this age of specialization. Answer, Yes. Cultivate his special interest, but not exclusively too soon. Not until after a general education and some general experience.

Newspapers have done as well at developing their own specialists for their own purposes as anything. . . .

The field of one's keenest interest is almost surely the most profitable to study. To know something well is vital. To dig deeply into any subject is to discover unsuspected relationships with other fields. Relationships are perhaps the most important thing for a journalist to understand.

Our Reviewers:

Walter Spearman, professor of journalism at the University of North Carolina, and Phil Kerby, editor of *Frontier Magazine*, are at Harvard for a year on grants from the Fund for Adult Education.

Stanley Karnow, after ten years in France for *Time*, Inc., and Thomas G. Wicker, Washington correspondent of the *Winston-Salem Journal* and *Sentinel*, are Nieman Fellows this year. Louis M. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

John Clark: Life of a Young Editor

JOURNEY OF A JOHNNY-COME-LATELY, By David Bradley. Dartmouth Publications, Hanover, N. H. 213 pp. \$6.

The title of this book is from a column which John McL. Clark wrote in the Claremont (N.H.) *Eagle*, a paper he bought in 1947 and edited until his untimely death in a flood in 1950.

John Clark was then just 40. He had just come to the productive years of a career of high promise as one of the representative editors of his time. He had an excellent education, broad experience and the qualities of high intelligence, independence, courage, keen interest in public affairs and a zealous concern for the best interest of the community he had made his own.

The community paper he had soundly launched has continued to serve Claremont under the direction of his widow, Rhoda Clark. Their five children are growing up in the home he established there.

An extraordinary group of friends from Dartmouth days, drawn to the rare personality of John Clark, determined to publish a memorial volume of his editorials. This grew, by its own significant record, and under the fortunate authorship of David Bradley (*No Place to Hide*) it falls no further short of true biography than did Clark's foreshortened life of a full career.

It is a fine profile that makes full use of materials that proved more adequate than would have been expected. It shows real insight into the character and purposes of a young man's crowded life. It is a sensitive and modest chronicle and a faithful record that carries its own justification.

John Clark came of a comfortable, secure New York family which was well connected with Dartmouth College where John went from St. Paul's School, to become a popular student, class leader and honors graduate.

He was graduated, 1932, into Depression, but from his traditional background, was hardly aware of it.

He was aware of a career problem. Chief editor of the *Dartmouth*, he looked to journalism, which, however, showed no interest in him. Big business sent its talent scouts to the college in June, but not Journalism. Twenty-five years since 1932 has seen little change in this. John

went home to New Canaan, Connecticut, by then his family's home, and started a new weekly with no less a sponsor than Henry B. Thayer, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company. Dedicating his paper to the community and to independence, John supported Herbert Hoover. His first letter of protest was from his sponsor, a realistic man. But Mr. Thayer's realism led him to abstain from interfering with his protege. John did not abandon the Old Deal through the Depression decade. But in the next decade he was pioneering a New Deal of his own, for South America.

Less than two years of a country weekly and John had a chance to join the *Washington Post*, new under Eugene Meyer, and setting out with a staff of all the talents—Mark Ethridge, Raymond Clapper, Felix Morley, Elliott Thurston.

John wrote well, learned fast, soon caught on as a reporter and found his way about Washington. Within a year, a vacancy opened up a place on the editorial page. The *Washington Post* has become one of the great editorial pages in America. But this was back in 1934. If Felix Morley in the 30's knew his own direction or that of his paper or of his world, his staff never found out. Certainly John Clark never did. By 1938 the shape of the world made it more important to know. By that time Mark Ethridge, Raymond Clapper and other stars had left a paper that had not yet found itself. John Clark had married his Vassar graduate on \$40 a week and had his first child.

The Nieman Fellowships opened at Harvard, a chance to specialize as he never had, and he missed having a specialty on a page where others were specialists. He applied to Harvard for a Nieman Fellowship, to study Latin America.

"John knew now he wanted to escape from the *Washington Post*," writes Dr. Bradley, "and a Nieman Fellowship might offer him a chance to do it gracefully."

Escape was the last thing the Nieman Committee wanted to offer, then or any time since. Walter Lippmann, Ellery Sedgwick and John Stewart Bryan were the first Nieman Committee. Among 309 eager newspaper applicants, they chose John Clark and eight others. I was one of the others.

Their selection of John Clark was a

mistake in their own terms, for their task was to select young journalists who showed most promise for future service in journalism. Yet he must have looked, at 28, like the best bet of the lot. Felix Morley wrote as though he felt so. Other support came from distinguished quarters. Pres. Ernest Hopkins of Dartmouth rated him as highly then as he does now in an affectionate foreword to this book.

When, at the end of that year, John left journalism to pursue his new specialty in South America, I was appointed curator of the Nieman Fellowships. One of the first items to come to my desk was a letter from Walter Lippmann protesting to Harvard John Clark's departing from his journalistic last. As if Harvard could do anything about the choice that Mr. Lippmann's choice had made. More than one such protest has come since about a Nieman Fellow's change of course. Not all changes have been as justified as John Clark's. But more than one has ended as did his—in eventual return, after wide experience of the world, to journalism.

Well I was there with John in 1938-39 and he talked to me often about his career problem. The situation was not at all what Mr. Lippmann thought. The late Frank Knox, publisher of the *Chicago Daily News*, had encouraged John with the prospect of a correspondent's position in South America. Eventually, Mr. Knox, following the course of most other publishers, decided against covering South America. John was not to be the only Nieman Fellow who was disillusioned about this field after intensive preparation for it. It remains one of the lapses of American journalism.

Into this vacuum came his friend and old St. Paul's teacher, John Winant, who wanted a knowledgeable assistant to help him carry the work of the International Labor Office to South America. John took the card catalogue of the more than 300 books on Latin America he had studied in his Nieman year to the I.L.O. office. Later this catalogue was to become a basic reference file for the State Department's war effort in South America. John surveyed social conditions in South America for Winant, helped him set up the I.L.O.'s hemisphere conference at Havana in 1939.

By then Nelson Rockefeller was starting a more dynamic and immediate approach to building a stronger relation

with South America. He got John to join him as one of the charter members of his office of Inter-American Affairs. The war made this work important. John's studies paid off. He initiated some of their key work in health and economic development. He had a strategic role in this effort. He broke it off to enlist in the war.

When the Army discovered Private Clark they put him into O.S.S. and moved him to Europe where he was in time to share in the stratagems that were a prelude to General Patton's Third Army push into Germany.

He came out of the war with offers to rejoin the *Washington Post*, to become a foreign correspondent for the *New York Times*, to go to the *New Republic*, or to team up in a new South American development project with Nelson Rockefeller.

But John Clark had his own fish to fry. Frank Knox was dead. He had owned the biggest paper in New Hampshire. John Clark wanted to buy it and run it. With some friends and solid supporters he raised the cash and credit for the million dollar venture.

At the last minute, to his bitter disappointment, Mrs. Knox accepted an offer from one William Loeb, supported by Ridder money which Mrs. Knox had refused to let John seek.

"Worse still" records Dr. Bradley, "she had not bothered to examine the two newspapers that Loeb already operated in Vermont. 'We wouldn't mind so much except that the guy runs a lousy newspaper' he quotes John Clark. 'It is a strident pamphleteering sort of thing.'"

"These remarks", Bradley continues, "as it turned out were no more than prophetic. In Vermont Mr. Loeb had had to compete with two better newspapers. In New Hampshire the entire state was at his mercy. Mrs. Knox soon learned that the worst of Boston's papers could never hold a scandal to Loeb's *Manchester Union*."

This was indeed a sad day for New Hampshire.

John Clark looked around for some other paper to buy. The *Waterbury Democrat* in Connecticut was going on the block. He went after it. But it was sold out from under him to its local competitor in the now familiar merger.

The stockholders of the *Springfield Republican*, irked by a disastrous strike against Sherman Bowles' eccentric management, employed John Clark as consultant and his hopes were built to become

editor of this honorable paper of long tradition as independent, if they could get rid of Bowles. But Bowles outsmarted them, as always, and ended by letting the paper of four generations of Bowleses go out of existence, because there was more money in combining just two of the other Springfield papers.

Other doors invited John Clark.

"The Boston *Herald* offered him an editorship, a tempting possibility which he turned down. . . ." His reason for turning it down, as the biographer explains, was simply that the possibility did not seem to him to be there. He felt that the editorship did not carry the authority that the title implies. Another Nieman Fellow who accepted the editorship found that John's intuition about it was right. The blow-up that followed only dramatized a situation that had already become general. In the modern structure of the newspaper, the publisher is really the editor. Any authority the editor has is a concession from the publisher, and in the clutch it has no status. In the case of the Boston *Herald*, the publisher was soon to make that explicit by announcing himself as both editor and publisher. This is not an unusual role and is a realistic description of the seat of authority.

As John marked time in his search for a paper to run, Dartmouth made him a proposition in 1946. President John Dickey wanted to start what became Dartmouth's Great Issues program for seniors. He hired John to help shape it up. The shapeup took on much in its pattern from the Nieman seminars and more from John's journalistic experience. It is in its core a course on how to read a newspaper so as to be informed about public affairs.

He kept on helping John Dickey until next year came the chance to buy the *Claremont Eagle*.

In his initial editorial, he told his readers "Newspapering being the only trade he knows, the publisher aims to earn a living by running *The Daily Eagle*. There is no other motive, political or otherwise. His ideas cannot always jibe with those of all his readers. He has never voted a straight ticket or entirely agreed with any but one or two social theories. When his views rankle too much or his facts are askew, he will consider it a favor if his readers will tell him so, preferably through the Open Forum column."

In short, he announced himself independent and uncommitted. He remained uncommitted, though deeply influenced by the practical idealism of John Winant.

He stood against the corrupting influence on the legislature of the race track lobby, as his grandfather had fought the legislature's corruption by the railroad. It was inevitable that he should tangle with Senator Bridges, the cynical heir of John Winant and Robert Bass. When it was disclosed that Bridges, while a United States senator, had been taking a salary of \$35,000 a year as a trustee of John L. Lewis' miners welfare fund, John Clark summed up this "blow to public confidence" in New Hampshire's political leadership with an editorial headed "Bridges Should Resign." Clark weathered a threat of a libel suit by Bridges and went on to support the independent Senator Tobey against a protege of Bridges. When Tobey beat Bridges' man by only 1200 votes, Clark had the satisfaction of realizing that his was the first and almost the only newspaper support Tobey had in the State. Such margins can even a small town editor effect if he owns his own soul. He served on the commission to reorganize the State government.

He supported a change to a city manager form of government and then supported the city manager. One of his last and most satisfying projects was a community swimming pool.

He too had to be publisher and editor, and had all the daily bread and butter problems of circulation and advertising to divert his mind from the editorials that never got written. He settled finally for a weekly talk to his community about its affairs and his interests in a column on Saturday: "Journal of a Johnny-Come-Lately."

His daughter, Linda, has told of those days: "As soon as we finished supper, he'd be off to a meeting or back to the *Eagle* to work until very late. At times our dinner would be interrupted by irate subscribers whose newsboys hadn't brought their papers. He always answered them with quiet patience and in the same way he politely but firmly explained to another caller why her husband's motor accident couldn't be withheld from the news."

"Whenever business men or old friends came to visit, he always took them on a tour of Claremont. Then he would drive on up Green Mountain to a very special spot, where the road wound past a meadow clearing. There he'd show them the spread of Claremont below in the valley under the shadow of purple Ascutney. This was his town and he was proud of it."

Louis M. Lyons

Nieman Notes

1939

The biography of John McL. Clark, late publisher of the Claremont (N.H.) *Daily Eagle* was published by Dartmouth Publications in December and is reviewed in this issue.

Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* was a speaker at the inauguration of Richard G. Gettell as President of Mount Holyoke College, November 9, and spoke to the Nieman Fellows that night.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, was a speaker at the first conference of New Hampshire Newspaper Editors November 15, and at the annual meeting of the International Labor Press Association December 3 at Atlantic City, where the name of Edwin Lahey proved an open sesame.

1941

One of the liveliest Nieman dinners this season was with William J. Miller, a few weeks after he left *Life Magazine* to become chief editorial writer of the New York *Herald Tribune*. Miller's first prescription for a good editorial is that it be "unpredictable."

During Newspaper Week, Bill Miller expressed his views about editorials:

"Reading most newspaper editorials these days is like eating boiled watermelon. They are dull, even worse, they are bland. Our whole society has become bland, and most people seem rather ashamed to say anything forcefully any more.

"The old fashioned American capacity for outrage or indignation is so often absent as to seem almost archaic. We intend to restore it."

1942

Robert Lasch became editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* in November, succeeding Irving Dilliard (1939), who continues as editorial writer. Lasch was Dilliard's own choice to fill his own spot when he became editor in 1949, and their close relation on this distinguished page continues. Lasch began newspaper work on the Omaha *World-Herald* in 1931 after a Rhodes Scholarship. He joined the Chicago *Sun* in 1946 and was chief editorial writer there when he left for St. Louis. Dilliard has been 30 years on the *P-D*, an editorial writer there since 1930, a career that has made its vigorous mark on American journalism.

1943

James M. Daniel joined *Time*, Inc., as a business section writer in November, moving to New York from the Washington bureau of the Scripps-Howard papers. His 1943 Nieman colleague, Thomas Griffith, a senior editor of *Time*, is on a six-month leave, in Southern France, doing a book.

1944

Charles A. Wagner has been appointed editor of the New York *Mirror* Sunday magazine by King Features Syndicate. He has been with the *Mirror* 25 years, much of the time with the Sunday edition, serving also as book and art critic.

1945

Robert Bordner, public works editor of the Cleveland *Press*, and one of the founders of his home-town Peninsula Library and Historical Society, has established the Bordner Historical Collection within that library.

Local history has been one of his main interests since he ghost-wrote two chapters of the Centennial History of Akron in 1925.

Recently he has been serving on the public relations committee for The Program For Harvard College for the Cleveland area, under Ellery Sedgwick, Jr., chairman.

1946

Frank Hewlett, Washington correspondent for the Salt Lake *Tribune* and other papers, to the Memorial Commission to construct a monument to the veterans of the Corregidor-Bataan campaigns in the Philippines, which Hewlett covered to become a prisoner of the Japanese on the fall of Corregidor.

1949

Grady Clay is the new president of the National Association of Real Estate Editors. Clay covers all city planning, housing and area development news for the Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

Robert R. Brunn was promoted to American news editor of the *Christian Science Monitor* in November when his chief, Saville Davis, became managing editor.

1950

Max Hall resigned from the State Department December 31 to join the staff of the New York Metropolitan Region Study. Address: Room 2020, 205 East 42nd Street, New York City.

Melvin Wax moved from the staff of the Chicago *Sun-Times* to the San Francisco *Chronicle*, where among other Nieman Fellows his 1950 colleague, William German, is news editor.

1951

Next year Maine joins the rest of the country in accepting November as the month for elections. Maine hereafter will elect a governor for a four-year term. Both these reforms were initiated by Dwight Sargent, editor of the Portland papers. He first made these suggestions in a series of editorials on returning to the page from his Nieman Fellowship, spent in the study of government.

Ann and Roy M. Fisher, assistant city editor of the Chicago *Daily News*, announce the birth of Sarah, a fourth daughter, November 5.

1952

John M. Harrison left the Toledo *Blade's* editorial page at the end of the year to join the staff of the School of Journalism at the University of Iowa to develop special services for newspapers of the state. Address: 721 12th Avenue, Caralville, Iowa.

1953

Calvin Mayne is doing a bi-weekly column for the Gannett papers and writing editorials and features regularly for the Rochester *Times-Union*.

1955

Selig Harrison, associate editor of the *New Republic*, set up the program on Communications for the UNESCO Conference in San Francisco in November.

A joint post card describes a surprise reunion in Warsaw. Henry Tanner, foreign news correspondent of the Houston *Post*, touring Eastern Europe, walked into a hotel dining room to run into Henry Shapiro, on tour from his Moscow station with UP. Shapiro had a long interview with Khrushchev in U. S. newspapers of November 27. Soviet newspapers published its full text and Moscow radio took 55 minutes to report it.

1956

The Elks Club of Louisville has honored Richard Harwood for his articles on the public schools in the Louisville *Times*.

1957

The Boston *Globe* has taken Robert L. Healy off the city news staff to assign him to Washington as national correspondent. His first story was the explosion of the Vanguard test satellite.