

NiemanReports

January, 1961

Values of an Editor

Ralph McGill

Responsibility of the Reporter

Clifton Daniel

Responsibility of Ownership

Gordon Gray

The Campaign on TV

Robert C. Smith

The Change-Over in Washington

John L. Steele

Campaign by Press Releases

John M. Harrison

The Press Abroad:

Canada

Robert A. Farquharson

India

Chanchal Sarkar

Chile

Diane Stanley

Technical Editing

Harold K. Mintz

The Press in Taiwan—The Case of Lei Chen

Reviews — Scrapbook — Nieman Notes

Nieman Reports

VOL. XV., NO. 1

JANUARY 1961

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.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Iowa City; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; William G. Lambert, Portland, Ore.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Phila.; Charlotte F. Robling, New Canaan, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, London; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

The Campaign on TV

By Robert C. Smith

The prevalent notion that television coverage of politics will mature with a drying behind the years would have been cheering if anyone knew what the beast, full-grown, will look like. It would be even more cheering if anyone were talking about what it *should* look like and about the care and feeding necessary to bring it to this healthy majority.

Some nutritional ideas do emerge in the aftermath of the Great Debates of 1960 and what NBC's John Chancellor called "the floating indoor one-shot"—the 20-hour exposure to the Presidential election just past. A television show with a rating based on an audience of 83 million at peak (10:30 p.m. November 8) would seem secure enough and there is room for hope that the networks will improvise on the format before the next quadrennial installment.

It is not that the 1960 format was so bad. It was a good newspaper format: reasonably objective, comprehensive, coherent. But in one man's opinion it was also a little dull. The commentators were skillful enough and certainly the oracular tabulating machines, choking over the spoon-feedings of mere mortals, produced some diverting evasions. Yet the "one-shot" somehow palled even beyond its hours.

Robert C. Smith is associate editor of the *Virginian-Pilot* of Norfolk, now at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship.

Perhaps it didn't float enough; certainly it was remorselessly indoors. At best, the tallying of figures on a television blackboard is but a fancifying of radio. It supplies a glimpse at the all-meaningful figures themselves, just as technicolor made movie shrubbery green and spared its audience that minor gestation of the imagination.

So television "told" the election night story much as newspapers have "told" it since the dawn of movable type. But shouldn't television "show" the election? Isn't its real advantage not that it gets the results to its audience first (for it doesn't, as early headlines on the bolder newspapers proved), but that it can bring a continuity of *visual* excitement to its audience, a smell of history in motion?

The full texts of the Great Debates, for instance, served their newspaper readers as perfectly handy substitutes for watching the debates themselves. Yet the texts and even the accompanying stories could not begin to "tell" how Vice President Nixon looked on that first debate. You had to be "shown" on television to believe it. And that chilly, toothy guffaw Senator Kennedy registered in Great Debate III when Mr. Nixon invited him to cut his own political throat does not translate to print. Even the chuckles provided at television fireside when Mr. Nixon said that the nation "can't stand pat" (one wag commented: "We may have to stand Pat.") are smothered in the text the next day.

Small blessings, perhaps, but these are television's moments of revelation. They were all too few this campaign past. The debates themselves, conducted in antiseptic studios, were far too artificial. To one who conceives the role of television in politics as history's seeing-eye this criticism is as devastating as saying that their content was trivial. The suggestion that television should spend more time in 1964 stumping with candidates, catching them candidly (in motion and speech) with the great, unwashed masses as a backdrop, surely is not without appeal. It is not absolutely necessary that television manufacture history once it learns best how to report history.

Neither is election night coverage restricted by nature to reportage of figures real or prophesied. It might help television to think of the national election night as a considerable social occasion in American life involving—of all things—the marathon viewing of television. If the idea of television covering people watching television is not too appalling, one might even suggest that a roving camera in a convenient bar and in campaign headquarters in a few real, live cities could prove quite productive. The bevy of television announcers for the networks spent a good deal of time explaining that Senator Kennedy was pulling ahead significantly shortly before midnight and that Mr. Nixon was narrowing the gap significantly in the early morning hours. Isn't it possible that the expressions and

(Continued on page 11)

The Values of An Editor

By **Ralph McGill**

It is almost literally true that I left the planes of the contending Presidential candidates to pick up fresh clothing at home, hear the election returns, and then take a plane to this pleasant town and to this college with a well-earned reputation for excellence. I am honored and happy to be here.

Often in the past weeks I have thought about being here and the honor you had done me by designating me for this award. In the long plane rides by night, the candidate in bed on his specially equipped plane, and we legendary ink-stained wretches, restless in our reclining seats, I found myself often thinking about Elijah Parish Lovejoy, the manner of his death, and the convictions and values of our day.

It occurred to me that we, in our time, who complain of the complexity of our lives, perhaps give ourselves all the best of it. It has been 123 years since a mob, bent on silencing him by destroying his printing press, destroyed also his life. Certainly his life and times were enormously complex. I rather think life always is. And most of the time I am glad of it. It would be a dull life without complexities.

I found myself thinking, too, in considering this visit, of how little has been learned by those who oppose a moral force, be it large or small. And, of course, the mob mentality, be it polite and ruthless within the law, or angry and violent outside it, never learns anything. That night Lovejoy died he acted out of this strength and the mob out of its angry ignorance.

What we learn from Elijah Lovejoy, and from others before and after him, is that a moral force cannot be stopped with a mob, a murder or a jail cell. The mob, stupid, as they all are, thought that by destroying Lovejoy's press, they could preserve the institution of slavery.

I can best illustrate out of my own years.

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court reversed an old case in railroad transportation, called the *United States vs. Plessy*, handed down by an ultra-conservative-minded court in 1896. It thereby brought about a long-overdue end to educational segregation on the basis of race.

Colby College chose **Ralph McGill**, publisher of the Atlanta *Constitution*, for its annual Elijah Lovejoy Award, dedicated to freedom of the press. On Nov. 10, Mr. McGill gave the annual Lovejoy address, which he entitled: "Elijah Lovejoy Was A Believing Man." So is Ralph McGill. That is why it is printed here exactly as given, without even editing it from spoken to written style. The style is Ralph McGill.

Quite promptly, the KKK and White Citizens Council mentality set about to thwart it by suppression of discussion, by boycott, intimidation and violence.

Yet, we keep in mind that Lovejoy lost his life in 1837 and that slavery was the subject of the Lincoln-Douglas debates 20 years later, and was not truly ended until the 13th Amendment was ratified in 1865, we cannot say the progress since 1954, slow as it has been, is not without precedent. It is not yet a completed process, but it is a process, and it will be legally satisfied within a relatively short time. Then will follow the refining and humanizing of it. We are all ashamed that in our country it required court action to say what we, the people, should have said before.

Now we have the sit-ins, and again we see the same old formulae. Those who oppose a moral force rush to make laws and arrests, to intimidate, to suppress an idea. But the sit-ins, which have for their purpose the erasing of one of the most preposterous discriminations—namely, that a colored customer may buy everything in a store except that a sandwich and coffee or milk must be bought segregated, have already been ended in most of the places where these have been carried out. And they will win everywhere for the simple reason that they have moral force on their side. They seek to end a situation which affronts human dignity.

Have we given this force enough help?

I read psychologists and sociologists in books and magazine articles, who say that the adult generation of today is one of the most unselfish, generous and tolerant in history. But, they say, it wants to be left alone to enjoy its cook-out patios, its cars, its boats, its comforts of home, without any public responsibility. It does not, they say, wish to be involved. It wants to be secluded from problems. Therefore, it suffers fools gladly and it permits political corruption to thrive because it does not like to be drawn into noise or controversy.

And, just the other day, I met with a really eminent psychologist and at lunch he talked of the students at a very large institution where he is a renowned member of the faculty. He said that students there today were more mature than any in our history; that they were better informed; but that they were so bent on withdrawing from all but their own interests, that it was difficult even to obtain men to offer for elections as class officers, and that ambition for life after graduation for anything beyond a comfortable, average life was frowned upon. I don't buy all of this. I am, for all my frequent days of frustration and despondency, capable of optimism.

I remember my own smug, post-War I generation. It was not an admirable one. It was one accused of being soft and cynical and it was predicted it would spawn an even softer, more cynical generation. Well, I recall, as a war corre-

spondent, seeing them on bombing runs, on the lunge into Germany, and in the Pacific, and they looked pretty good most of the time, and magnificent when the need was there.

So, I trust and have faith in this college generation. I am sure there are Elijah Lovejoys in it—if the need arises.

I am old enough, however, to indulge for a while in the delight of the aging—namely, to moralize and reminisce a bit. You will indulge me patiently, I trust, as all young captive audiences have done before—and at other institutions.

Out of experience I am convinced of the need to have compassion and to believe. We presently are in the beginnings of a great surge of the industrial revolution and of growing competition between two great forces. But there are always those who, like the states rights stereotypes in the South—and their counterparts in other fields here and elsewhere—keep turning their eyes in search of a world that no longer exists. Too many of us continue to turn our eyes away from change, becoming petulant about it, instead of involved with its direction.

We newspaper men and women are equally guilty of this. I learned a lesson by being in Austria at the time the Germans moved there in the spring of 1938. For a newspaper man it was a sort of journey on the road to Damascus. There, for the first time, I saw all rights, guaranteed in a written, published constitution, disappear because the will for them had disappeared long before. I saw men and women arrested without warrant; I watched physical abuses of people because of religion; I saw books burned; and I saw magazines and newspapers from outside Austria removed.

None dared protest. There was no Elijah Lovejoy among the Austrians. In fact, so bad was the economic and political situation in Austria that a majority of the people cheered the arrival of Nazi totalitarian forces.

In those historic days I came to see with great clarity that a written law and constitution do not necessarily create a guarantee. Now, do not misunderstand me. We live by law. We are a government of law. But, all our laws are derived from the consent of the people . . . and the people, when they choose, can place themselves above the law, or, conversely they can by apathy and indifference, reduce a law, or even a constitution, to nothing at all, allowing it to be eroded away.

Therefore, in this country we enjoy a freedom of press, speech, and assembly only because, and as long as, the people will it, and defend it.

Sometimes I am disturbed because of a certain plaintiveness, even smugness, on the part of the press, and too much of an attitude of saying, "Let me alone. I am protected by the Constitution." I think if we do not use that freedom of press to participate in issues it will wither away like an un-

used muscle. But let me ask of you if this is not generally applicable. A great many people are inclined to say, "Oh, I don't worry about government or politics. After all, the Constitution takes care of rights." This attitude gives me great concern. I think it is necessary to recognize that our power comes from the people, who cherish the principles in our Constitution, and not from a law itself. The people to whom we newspaper people look are our readers. Therefore, while we must forthrightly move to meet, and defeat all threats to a free press, we must even more forthrightly see that we deserve it. We can do that only by using it.

The just-concluded elections were dramatized by television. The so-called great debates, which were really press conferences, each attracted gigantic audiences of from 60 to 70 millions and more. They enabled Sen. Kennedy quickly to introduce himself to almost half the nation's population. They quickly brought him up on even terms, in image and projection of personality, with the vice-president, who was much better known and established. People saw and heard them discuss issues. They were in controversy. They made controversy apparent.

I agree with those who think that both Sen. Kennedy and Vice President Nixon erred in discussing Quemoy, Matsu and Cuban policy.

Yet, it was by no means a dead loss. Millions of Americans who had never informed themselves on these issues, were made aware of them and their importance.

Nor do I agree that newspapers and the printed word in general were outdone by television. The two mutually assist one another. There was an immediate increase in newspaper readership as the millions turned from the TV questions to read full accounts, texts, editorials, and columnist-analyses of the high-level dialogue.

Indulge me if I paraphrase part of Sen. Kennedy's campaign to describe what I think the television debates, and the other dramatic uses of it, mean for newspapers.

We on newspapers, in radio and television, cannot be satisfied. We cannot remain on dead center. We must do better than we have. We must improve our writing, our interpretations, our comprehensive reporting. We must, in a sense, lose some of our deadening objectivity and return to a livelier, more personal sort of journalism. We must begin to move.

And, for TV and the printed word, we must learn to communicate. The citizen today is almost literally drowned in words. Daily papers, radio and television news commentators speak to them in verbal headlines at the half-hour and the hour. And yet, we continue to be miserably ill-informed.

Here is a problem and a fact which must give pause to all of us who deal with words—teachers included.

But, let us return to our central theme, which is the spirit of man and his capacity to believe—this was what characterized Lovejoy and others like him—he believed. He had values. His mind was not withdrawn on the issue. It believed.

In Russia with Vice President Nixon a summer ago, I visited the Baptist church in Moscow. It includes what is, in Russia's vast population, a mere handful, perhaps a half-million. I saw perhaps 1,200 of them crowded into one two-hour service. One who believes in God in Russia is called a believer. These persons, young and old, had given up all chance at a career to become believers. All their lives they would be restricted to some inferior position without hope of advancement, because they had chosen to be believers in a non-believing government. I was impressed with what I saw in fact—not theory. They had made a hard choice. For belief they had abandoned comfort, higher pay and promotion.

And then, a summer later, came the Francis Powers case. This young man, lonely and lost in a Soviet prison, has troubled me since his name first leaped out of the headlines.

I think he must trouble the conscience of all of us who deal with the task of communication—in words written, spoken or taught. And I thought of him in comparison with Lovejoy.

Powers, captured when he and his U-2 plane came down to earth in a manner still not clear, obviously did not consider himself a servant of his state. We must ask ourselves why.

Plato, in writing of the state, said that even in the ideal state, the moral convictions of citizens are not supposed to arise from personal insight. They rest, he said, more than three centuries B.C., on opinions implanted by education, and are thus taken on trust. The good civilian or soldier, after all, he said, is not living by a knowledge which is his own—the foundation of citizenship virtue must be insight into a system of absolute values embodied in the very structure of the universe.

Lovejoy had a set of values. He knew what he believed.

Powers did not. Perhaps we should be honest enough to say he had not had any opinions, or values, implanted by education, either formal, or that derived from association or participation in community life. He was, as he insisted, just a hired hand—a pilot—getting \$30,000 a year to fly dangerous intelligence missions. There was a quiet, frightened valor in him, but no hint that he regarded himself as representing his country's interests, or, worse, that he had any knowledge of those interests. Against the harsh possibilities of his dilemma he could use only that which had been absorbed by mind and spirit in the whole of his 31 years as a young American. He must have at least looked at a great many newspapers and heard some of the more competent

commentators on TV and radio. But there is no evidence any of us reached his mind.

He testified that he had “never paid any attention to politics in America”—had, in fact, “never voted.” He knew little of the meaning of his country.

Nor had he ever had any interest in learning anything about the Soviet Union, save to read in the papers about its scientific achievements.

Asked if he were “mentally prepared” to fall into Soviet hands, Powers said he was not. He had been told he could not be shot down at 68,000 feet.

He had, he said, “been proud and happy” to get the job with the CIA when he was turned down by the commercial lines.

His defense was a plea of political innocence and ignorance. “I was just a pilot,” he said. He did not know about the Summit meeting in Paris; he was not aware of the implications of his flight, which the President of the United States later was to describe as “vital to the defense of this country.”

Here we have a man turned 31 years old who could fly a plane but was uninformed about all else in his life. He had a nice wife. He was sitting pretty, making \$30,000 a year. And when that dream ended 1,200 miles inside Russia, he could say, with complete honesty, and no awareness of self-contradiction, that he was sorry he took the job he liked so well, that he regretted having made the flight; that he did not wish to do so, but was afraid of being thought a coward. And, anyhow, someone else was responsible for it all. “Blame those who sent me,” he said.

And so he answered up, and if his replies sustained all the major points of Russian propaganda against this country, he did not seem even to know it.

Do we have a picture of much of America today . . . immature, vague, uninformed, unable to rationalize self with events; wanting desperately to have all the comforts of life with none of the responsibility?

Powers reflects what has been imparted to him in his educational processes in America—in and out of books. And, we must add, newspapers too, as well as TV and radio. What has been our part in the lives of the millions with backgrounds like Powers? What is it in American life that caused every television station in America to receive protests during the showing of the two national conventions last summer? These thousands of callers were angry because they couldn't see “Gunsmoke” or one of the several Western or comedy shows.

Francis Powers had very little education. He represents, I am afraid, what we mean when we speak of a “mass audience.” There is but one state in this union, according to the last figures I saw, which has an educational average for its people as high as a secondary school graduate. The others

range down to as low as the seventh grade. It is from these that we receive protests about printing too much foreign news, too much highbrow stuff. If you come right down to it this is one reason why the democracies have so difficult a time with foreign policies. The Congress must pay attention to mass public opinion to be elected. And the State Department must pay attention to the Congress. And mass public opinion isn't interested in problems involving great decisions about international policy because it hasn't read about them, does not have the background of education and mental stimulation to care about becoming informed. We thereby threaten the strength and stability of the Republic.

So we come to a question.

Where have the media of information failed? Wherein has education failed, elementary, secondary, college?

We can peer into the future without a crystal ball. Population is increasing at the rate of about 3 million per year. Ten years from now it will be around 200 million. In the year 2,000, which is but 40 years away, we'll have a population of about 353 million. What will that mean to schools, churches, newspapers, and government, local and federal?

We are just started on a vast system of federal highways which will link every region of America. Feeder airlines already are becoming important. Will we develop two or three national newspapers which have publishing plants in each great region and transmit by new electronic devices the pages of the paper? Papers could be moved out from each great center on trucks and feeder airlines.

In the years ahead, the experts tell us, cities will stretch for perhaps a hundred miles or more—as is almost true now if we think of the great urban complex which stretches from Philadelphia to New York on to Boston. In the year 2,000 what will have happened, by way of change, to the present image of the local paper? How many of us are planning for distribution, for example, 20 years from now when there will be 60 million more Americans? What will local papers be doing?

It will be interesting to watch some trends already in evidence and see what changes newspapers will make. The news must always constitute the body of a newspaper. But how will we handle it? Will we wait until television forces changes—when it may be too late? But here again is something we know. There are a great many editorial pages which won't appeal to a reader after he hears and sees a top-flight professional editorializing on television.

There are papers which say, "We fit ourselves into community direction." And they do—even though the community government be corrupt, even though human rights

are unsafe, even though the school system be starved. They comfortably "fit themselves in." They avoid controversy. They do not use their freedom to speak out. What honest young journalism graduate would want to stay long on such a paper? And, unhappily, there are more than a few such papers.

Some editors are lazy. Others have lazy scrooges for publishers. About the only time a substantial number of America's editors get out of their home towns in the span of a year is to go to the ASNE convention. Must editors withdraw from life and events?

All this, of course, is old hat. Still, I want to say again—when the sale of a newspaper comes, or when a paper dies and is interred—take a look and see how much of the dying came from the inside rather than outside. What sort of management and direction did the deceased have? Did the paper try to live?

Let me admit that I am a sentimentalist about newspapers. I have liked every minute of my almost 38 years of work, including even the hangovers suffered in the cause in my younger days.

I believe, too, that newspapers ought to believe in the journalistic relevance of moral principle. I am sad that this has become a cliché, but it remains true. A newspaper, I firmly believe, must make its news and, equally, its editorials, a part of the tangible issues of the daily lives of its readers. It may thereby make some angry. It may lose some circulation. But even those who are made angry will know that what they read touched their lives.

In a speech of some months before the campaigns or conventions, Adlai Stevenson gave an anatomy lesson on politics. "All politics," he said, "is made up of many things—economic pressures, personal ambitions, the desire to exercise power, the overriding issues of national need and aspiration. But if it is nothing more, it is without roots. It is built on shifting, changing sands of emotion and interest. When challenged, it can give no account of itself. When threatened, it is in danger of collapse."

All this is the stuff of our labors—the reporting of it, the commenting on it. And, also with us, if it is nothing more, it is without roots.

After all, our story is man—

Newspapers, I believe, must never forget they serve man—not a state—but man and his Western civilization and the moral ethics of it—those papers which are interested enough will survive.

And in the process will appear those whose values are as firm as those of Elijah Lovejoy, whom we honor tonight.

The Change-Over in Washington

A Correspondent Estimates the Prospects.

By John L. Steele

Early in his campaign for Presidency, John Kennedy told me that his reading of history leads him to the conclusion that the entire tone, the major accomplishments of a national administration are marked up on history's score card during the first year of a President's tenure. And so far as legislation basically affecting the country is concerned, the most important period of all is the honeymoon with Congress, lasting—with a little bit of luck—ninety to one hundred days.

It is certain that the vital initial period, so far as the new Kennedy administration is concerned, will be doubly important, because the young Senator from Massachusetts emphatically did NOT receive a loud and clear mandate from the American people. He received no mandate to change sharply the direction of the conduct of American affairs. Mr. Kennedy's election by the unbelievable margin of less than two-tenths of one per cent in the popular voting was, it seems to me, far more attributable to the Kennedy personality and the technical effectiveness of the Senator's campaigning than to any really new concept, ideas, philosophy or government practice which Kennedy espoused in his campaigning.

I mean this in no belittling sense. Senator Kennedy's achievement was tremendous when one recalls that only a year ago he was a little known, rather lightly regarded politician, and certainly he then was an astonishingly long way from the office to which he now has been elected. Far from being a power in his party, the Junior Senator from Massachusetts was overshadowed by at least a half dozen of his colleagues and considerably less known than a half dozen Democrats outside of Washington. That he now stands at the apex of power in the free world is a tribute to his intelligence, his ambition, his skill, and his political courage. For those qualities Americans of both political parties salute him.

But President-elect Kennedy emphatically failed to bring to Washington on his coat tails a parcel of new and liberally oriented Senators and Congressmen through whom he might exercise legislative control in the years to come. Indeed, the Democratic power in the Congress which, save during the first two years of the Eisenhower administration, has sharply mounted, now has slightly receded, ironically at the very moment of the Kennedy victory. The Democrats will retain powerful majorities in the Senate and House, but they were somewhat reduced—two less

Democratic Senators, about twenty-two fewer Democratic House members. Even more significantly, many Democrats elected or re-elected to legislative office ran far ahead of Senator Kennedy; to name a few, Paul Douglas in Illinois, Maurine Neuberger in Oregon, Clinton Anderson in New Mexico and Hubert Humphrey in Minnesota. Rather than riding the coat tails of Senator Kennedy to victory, the general pattern is the reverse—local and state candidates helping Senator Kennedy, lifting him on their own coat tails.

Emphatically, there will be no influx of a new band of legislators elected to the office on a Kennedy program, imbued by a determination to launch a Kennedy New Deal. And there will remain, powerful and undisturbed by Jack Kennedy's election victory, the makings of an even more powerful conservative coalition comprised of Southern Democrats—many of them highly placed in committee chairmanships or on the controlling House Rules Committee.

The question arises as to the future prospect for Jack Kennedy in the legislative field, in the arena he needs to control to enact into law his "move America forward" program. What is the prospect? First, one must know what Jack Kennedy has in mind. It seems clear to me that the Kennedy program as now envisaged by the incoming President is a rather bland, but considerably more activist program than the Eisenhower administration. I see no revolution, commensurate for example with Franklin Roosevelt's first one hundred days. The times—as of now—would seem to call for no such extraordinary approach. An utterly changed atmosphere, if not makeup, in the Congress would be required.

Rather, I foresee a very moderate shifting of emphasis toward more federal government activity. This was the lesson of the Kennedy campaign; this was the Senator's line, garbed in attractive, challenging language. And this, in my belief, is why throughout the campaign Vice President Nixon was unable to draw clearly a set of issues separating himself from the young Senator.

Kennedy is for, and will work for, a Forand-type bill covering medical care for the aged into the social security system. Who is to say that this is a "radical" measure. It isn't; the social security system has become in the past quarter century an accepted part of our socio-government structure. It will remain there and no responsible Republican

has proposed otherwise. Kennedy can and will argue that covering the medical needs of the aged into social security is the un-radical, the conservative way of doing things as opposed to a system based on outright government grants even though such grants be used to under-write private insurance systems.

Kennedy is for, and will work for, a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour and broadened coverage. Here, so far as the minimum wage figure itself is concerned, a thin dime, just a dime, separates the Kennedy administration from the bulk of Republicans.

Kennedy is for, and will work for, a more adequate defense system. But he has yet to spell out what he means. It may mean more money, but I predict not a quantum jump in defense spending. It may mean legislation to try to make more sense out of the overlapping programs and bureaucracy in the Pentagon. If this riddle can be solved it will, I submit, be a step in the direction of conservatism, and not a radical measure.

Kennedy is for, and will work for, a program of federally supported school construction. This, one year a Republican program and the next year abandoned, is, I suggest, quite far from a "radical" program. It would NOT mean federal control of education, it probably won't even mean federal aid for increasing teachers' salaries.

Kennedy is for, and will work for, a broader public works program than that espoused by the outgoing administration—starts on perhaps a few new multi-purpose dams, an urban redevelopment program, new incentives for construction of low cost housing plus stimulation of middle class housing starts.

My concept of a Kennedy program is that it stands quite far from a radical new direction. There is no promise of broken crockery on the floor in Washington. There is no threat of any considerable new regulation of private business. Rather, I foresee a mild swing toward a more activist, and a somewhat more costly role, for the federal government in meeting today's problems. There will be efforts to lower credit rates, but that's been going on for some time now. There may be tax incentives for increased expansion of plant facilities—hardly a radical move. And certainly there will be new steps to try to check the outflow of gold.

Kennedy is, above all, a political realist who will temper his plans to the need of the country and to the practicalities of a rather hard-headed, conservative-bending Congress. He has given no sign of intent to shake the country or the world.

What then, beyond these quite mild expansions of existing programs can be expected from John Kennedy? First there is the matter of style. This will be a young administration. There will be new faces, new brains, fresh ideas to

be fed into the machine of government. There may be more derring-do in administrative and regulatory fields, in the conduct of our overseas propaganda efforts, in our handling of foreign aid, in our general conduct of foreign affairs. There will be a greater desire to do new things, try new solutions for old problems particularly in the non-legislative area. There will be less emphasis on why things should NOT be done, more on getting them done. There will be a freshness, a verve, a movement on the part of a new and post-war political generation which was not often found in the past administration, more bent on holding lines than on moving forward.

Abroad there will be renewed emphasis on technical and economic assistance, with special emphasis on more flexible programming, faster action, more obvious results. There will be a final effort to conclude a nuclear testing ban; there will—I predict—be another go at summitry, this within eighteen months. There will be more intense interest in economic upgrading of Latin American countries; there will be an effort to improve considerably our representation abroad, particularly in the trouble area of Africa.

Kennedy will be a "doing" President; a President more interested in movement, in ideas, in acting than in preserving the present. Kennedy, I believe, will be a working President surrounded by a working Cabinet. Above all Jack Kennedy will be the boss and everyone around him will know it. He may draw on advice, may invite the ideas of the professional and academic community, but the record, so far as the campaign shows it, indicates that the ideas, tactics, the grand strategy finally adopted, will be the new President's own.

Now in this look ahead it is well to take a glance at the Republican Party and its defeated candidate, Richard M. Nixon.

Though defeated, the Nixon run for the Presidency was a strong one; it could not have been any stronger and have remained a losing one. Nixon, come Inauguration Day, will be titular head of his party. But he will be a politician without an office, without an operating base. Vice President Nixon becomes merely Mr. Nixon, a middle-aged man in private life.

Mr. Nixon first faces the basic decision as to whether he desires to continue his party leadership against the day in 1964, when President Kennedy's job goes on the line in another national election. There will be a tip-off as to Mr. Nixon's intentions in fairly short order. It involves his choice of a job. Nixon is not a man of great personal wealth; he has been offered several lucrative partnerships in leading law firms—partnerships which would assure him an income of upwards of \$150,000 yearly, before taxes. If Mr. Nixon accepts such a position—as did Mr. Dewey before him—it will be a pretty fair tipoff that, like Dewey,

he is ready to call it a day in active politics. Such a position would entail corporate and international contacts which could prove embarrassing so far as a return to elective politics is concerned. Furthermore, if acceptance of such a position would entail residency in, say, New York, it would be a further tipoff that Nixon is cutting off his California home base; that he is through politically. There is another factor running through his mind. Pat Nixon, according to the Nixon biographers, was utterly pleased when on several past occasions her husband talked of giving up politics; the past campaign could not have altered her mind on this score.

But there could be a different kind of tipoff, one heralding Dick Nixon's determination to exercise his powers as titular leader of the Republican Party, and to continue his control of the party against the day four years hence when it meets in party convention to nominate a candidate once again for the Presidency. If such is Dick Nixon's determination he well could accept a job in the quasi-public field; say like the presidency of a university; as successor to Gen. Al Gruenther as head of the American Red Cross; or the directorship of some major fund or philanthropic organization. In such an eventuality, Dick Nixon would be passing up the big buck in favor of the big sounding board. Such a position would enable him to speak out on public affairs from a non-political springboard; his words, his writings would be watched minutely and he'd have plenty of time for the practice of the old political art of keeping his fences mended.

If Dick Nixon's choice of jobs is in this direction I shall take it as the clearest kind of tipoff that Nixon wants revenge, wants to run against Jack Kennedy in 1964.

There is an interrelated question of the future of the Republican Party. Much is being written about a battle for control of the party between Nelson Rockefeller, seeking to lead Republicans into a more liberal path, and Barry Goldwater trying to head it down a deep-dyed conservative roadway. Senator Goldwater at long last gives Republicans an extremely attractive, personable, conservative leader. But it is really not much of a debate, this Rockefeller versus Goldwater thing, aside from the noise and the fun involved. Goldwater already has claimed that Nixon carried Arizona because of Goldwater's conservative influence and lost New York because of Rockefeller's more liberal stand there. The Arizona Senator contends that had Nixon clothed himself in a more conservative garb he would have won the election. That is nonsense in my judgment. Nixon ran exceptionally well in the smaller, more basically Republican,

less populated, more rural, more conservative states. But Dick Nixon lost the election by that hair's breadth because he couldn't quite do well enough in the big metropolitan areas—the New Yorks, Chicagos, Philadelphias and Pittsburghs—the very areas where Barry Goldwater's brand of extreme Republicanism, extreme conservatism isn't enough. A Republican Party dedicated nationally to the Goldwater brand of Republicanism, the Goldwater brand of conservatism, never, but never, will win a national election. A Goldwater versus Rockefeller fight for personal and philosophical political control cannot and will not be won by Barry Goldwater, because the cost would be party political suicide.

But that doesn't mean that Goldwater, the jet pilot, the supremely attractive conservative man won't try. And this impending battle itself, which could split the party for awhile, might be one very important factor in keeping Dick Nixon in the political arena. Nixon knows that a deep-rooted conservative pattern for the Republican Party is a death warrant. And he proved this conviction by flying to New York, just as the Republican nominating convention opened, to confer with Nelson Rockefeller, to sign that so-called Treaty of Fifth Avenue, which went very far in the direction of placating Nelson Rockefeller.

Nixon well may see himself as the bridge between the Goldwater and Rockefeller Republicans, the single man within the party able to avoid a block busting intra-party fight, the man who can save the party from itself.

The big danger the Republican Party must avoid if it is to live to fight again is that of negativism. It cannot become the squabbling party of the late 1930s and 1940s, dominated by its congressional echelon and dedicated to the premise that its sole function in life is to oppose the programs set forth by the majority party. To oppose for the sake of opposing is not enough; it must not rest on the defensive, in the opposition. It must, on the other hand, be creative to survive; it must come up with its own alternatives, its new directions; its own way in life. Only through such a party stance can it hope to survive the next four years in health and stand ready to fight again another day.

John L. Steele, Washington bureau chief of *Time*, Inc., followed the Kennedy-Nixon election campaign closely, as he had the three preceding Presidential elections, and the course of the resulting administrations. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1952, then a Washington correspondent with United Press.

Campaign by Press Releases

Election Report from Iowa

By John M. Harrison

The complaint most often heard during and since the 1960 elections against the performance of the press here in the heart of the Middle West is not so much the familiar "one-party press" accusation. It is rather the failure to report what candidates in most contests below that for the Presidency were saying about issues.

Editorially the press in Iowa—as in most states in this area—is overwhelmingly Republican. Only three daily newspapers supported the Kennedy-Johnson ticket this year. But this is two more than endorsed Adlai Stevenson in 1956. The Des Moines *Register & Tribune* (which styles itself "The Newspaper Iowa Depends On," not entirely without justification) continued a long tradition of coming down hard on the Republican side in the Presidential election campaign, after 3½ intervening years of fiercely proud independence.

The campaign in Iowa developed one major "incident" which did stoke the fires under the "one-party press" kettle. The Cedar Rapids *Gazette*, which has a considerable reputation for fairness and objectivity in reporting political and government developments, was the newspaper involved. It declined to publish—either on its own or in paid space—a column by Drew Pearson, although his "Merry-Go-Round" appears regularly on its editorial page. The column in question purported to expose an anti-Catholic plot against the candidacy of Rep. Leonard Wolf, Democratic congressman from the Second Iowa District, for reelection. Pearson made direct accusations against individual residents of the district, in which Cedar Rapids is located. The *Gazette* contended it was libelous. Certainly it was on the borderline. Yet the *Gazette's* editors may have invited the charge that they are willing to give Pearson's allegations space, except when they are directed against residents of the Second Iowa District, or when they are favorable to candidates the newspaper opposes. Congressman Wolf has hit hard at this refusal to print the Pearson column, even as paid advertising. He lost the election by about 10,000 votes.

A major complaint concerning press coverage of the election in Iowa, however, has to do with its alleged inadequacy. Daily newspapers in the state, with perhaps an exception or two, seem to have granted equal space and news play to the two parties. Television stations likewise were scrupulous in granting equal amounts of time to op-

posing candidates and parties, though, in any given race, they were inclined to refuse to report what one candidate had said unless they had a balancing press release from his opponent on the same day.

Few Iowa dailies staffed the state campaign. It has been described as the "battle of press releases" by Kirk Boyd, political reporter for the Davenport *Democrat* who acted as press secretary to Edward J. McManus, Democratic candidate for governor, while on a year's leave to obtain an M.A. degree in political science from the University of Iowa. The effect, Boyd contends, was to make it impossible for candidates to express themselves adequately on issues. News releases had to be boiled down to four or five sentences to have any chance of being used. And the major issues—education, highways, taxes, etc.—can't adequately be analyzed and argued in a couple of sentences.

On a number of occasions when Candidate McManus spoke in towns where daily newspapers are located, Boyd declares, no reporter was present. Weekly newspapers did even less—not even availing themselves of press releases after candidates had spoken in their communities. The Des Moines *Register* staffed the last five days of the campaign, and a few other speeches in the Des Moines area. The gubernatorial campaign rarely made the *Register's* front page—a notable exception being the day the two candidates got involved in an argument before a Des Moines group over payment of \$180 to one of them from state funds for a disputed purpose.

It is the Democrats' contention that failures to give adequate coverage to speeches of the candidates of both major parties was, in effect, helpful to the Republicans. They advance two reasons:

1) Iowa is traditionally Republican, hence Democrats must overcome this tradition with favorable impressions made by stands their candidates take on specific issues.

2) In the 1960 election, Nixon obviously had a big advantage in Iowa, which Democrats could only offset by creating an impression in their own image.

The Democrats took to direct mail on one issue—increased appropriations for the state's educational institutions—contending they could not get a hearing in the press for adequate presentation of their views. Boyd contends this is the only chance Iowa Democrats have to reach the mass of voters with full and proper discussion of vital issues.

Another point with respect to press performance which deserves consideration, Boyd argues, is that though most owners of newspapers, radio and television stations believe the Federal Government is usurping the powers and functions of states, they refuse to give the people the knowledge of the issues confronting state governments which is essential to their proper functioning. In this

respect, they undermine the successful operation of government at the local level.

In this area, then, the performance of the press in the 1960 elections seems not to have been marred by deliberate efforts to distort, to give one party advantage over the other. Rather it has been subject to criticism for failure to keep the electorate informed at the level of state and local government, where American newspapers traditionally have prided themselves as indispensable in the past.

John Harrison is professor of journalism at the University of Iowa and publisher of the *Iowa Publisher*. He was a Nieman Fellow from the *Toledo Blade* in 1952.

The Campaign on TV

(Continued from page 2)

comments of some loyal party workers, the conversation of ordinary, interested Americans somewhere out there would have *shown* these moments of trend better than any announcer could *tell* them? Mrs. Nixon's tears when her husband, in Jack Gould's phrase, "took an option on a concession," showed the story of the vice president's defeat far better than any telling could have done.

With the advent of saturation coverage of elections by television, the role of the newspaper plainly undergoes some subtle changes. The simple telling of the story remains

the single, vital job, but new elements are introduced. For if only television could show Mr. Nixon's ghostly appearance on Great Debate I, only the newspapers could properly *explain* it. The one thing that several million television viewers wanted to know the next day was *why* Mr. Nixon looked the way he did. The newspapers that supplied the answers were fulfilling an important new role of the press—the coverage, not only of the election, but of the election as seen by television.

The shift of emphasis from the "who" and "what" of elections to the "why" may well underly the developing role of the press parallel to television. For television, fulfilling its natural function of narrating history cannot so well comment upon this history. The written word still preempts in this field. James Reston's observation, to pick just one example, that the Kennedy victory was achieved through a liberal platform that depended upon conservative Catholics in the North and conservative Protestants in the South is useful, non-visual analysis.

If we assume that television and newspapers must coexist in the general area of political coverage—and it is a comforting economic assumption—then we might as well assume that they can complement each other. If television ever discovers its full potential as a "visual" art, the press may exploit fully the intellectual sphere in which it can operate to elaborate, comment upon, explain—in short, make sense out of the elections.

It seems to me that this makes sense for television, the press, and the public.

How Not to Cover an Election

The way for a newspaper *not* to cover a Presidential campaign is to put news about the candidate it indorses on Page One and bury news about his opponent somewhere on the inside. Although the history of journalism occasionally has been marred by such behavior, it is a dishonest practice. It cheats the reader.

* * *

Strangely, though, some readers still seem to long for the old days when editorializing in the news columns was more common. Even in the wake of the 1960 election, which is being widely praised for fair newspaper coverage, a few "Letters to the Editor" contributors are critical of attempts at impartial reporting. Irritated Democrats asked Democratic newspapers why they "played up" Nixon,

and Republicans ask Republican newspapers why they reported the Kennedy campaign so conscientiously.

The answer is simple: no self-respecting newspaper lets editorial opinion dictate reportorial conduct.

If Senator Kennedy picks New York City for a major policy speech (which he did several times) while Vice-President Nixon is making a minor speech in Nevada, New York newspapers have no choice but to treat the former as a major event in the news columns and the latter as a minor event. The "play" would, of course, be somewhat different in Nevada newspapers. And if Mr. Nixon makes no major speeches in Democratic New York, newspaper coverage should reflect the situation.

* * *

In many communities Senator Kennedy was accorded greater space because he was not well known, whereas Mr. Nixon had been around before and was less newsworthy. In other areas it was the reverse. Here at the *Herald Tribune* it so happened, as it did on dozens of other American newspapers, that the number of column inches allotted to each candidate came out about even, but this sort of measurement is not the ultimate yardstick for editing. Final judgment should be based on whether a newspaper, be it a supporter of the Democratic or Republican ticket, has done its honest, objective best to inform the public about the activities of *both* candidates for the Presidency of the country.

We do not believe newspaper readers would *really* want it any other way.

New York *Herald Tribune*
November 27

Responsibility of the Reporter and Editor

By Clifton Daniel

A long, long time ago—maybe 35 years ago—I read one of those articles in a boys' magazine on "Choosing a Career."

It said that if you wanted to be a newspaperman, if you wanted to write, the best thing to do was to start writing. It didn't say anything about going to journalism school. It just said, "Send in something to the local paper."

So, I did.

As I remember, it was an account of a basketball game. It got printed. And I have been a newspaperman ever since.

It didn't occur to me then, and I have never since allowed it to cross my mind, that the only reason my piece was printed was because the editor had nothing else to fill the space.

Having one item published was enough to convince me that I was God's gift to journalism. I was pretty soon writing all the local news in the *Zebulon Record*. They paid me \$5 a week in the summertime. I went to high school in the winter.

I had other duties as well, and the chief one was working in my father's drugstore. That was a lucky coincidence, because there was no better place in town to gather news.

The chief of police and the deputy sheriff used to hang around there all the time. We took calls for the doctors. Visiting politicians dropped in to shake hands. Farmers talked about the price of tobacco and cotton. In fact, nearly everybody in town went down to the drugstore for one reason or another during the week.

I can still remember one night when a fellow walked in, apparently holding his head on with his hands. His throat was cut from ear to ear. I got a doctor for him and a story for the *Zebulon Record*.

In time, I became more interested in the news than in the place where I gathered it. I deserted the drugstore for the print shop. I am not at all sure that my father thinks I made the right choice.

When I was a student at Chapel Hill journalism occupied a single classroom. And there was one professor, O. J. Coffin.

It was not a school of journalism in those days, not even a department. It was just a course. There were no textbooks. And so far as I could tell, the course was taught entirely out of Mr. Coffin's head.

Whether that was a good system of pedagogy I cannot

say, but it produced a fair number of pretty good newspapermen.

However, times have changed. The demands on newspapermen are different. New means of mass communications have developed alongside the newspapers, and they call for new technical skills.

To be brief I could simply say that the responsibility of reporters is to get the facts straight and spell the names right. And the responsibility of editors is to fire them if they don't.

That is really not a bad creed for newspapermen, but there is more to it than that.

I began to be concerned about my responsibilities as a newspaperman on the college campus more than 25 years ago. I was a member of one of the political parties that we formed every spring to contest the student elections. I was asked to be my party's candidate for president of the student body. I declined because I already had the notion—perhaps somewhat presumptuous—that I was a newspaperman, and that newspapermen should stay out of party politics.

Looking back, I see that I was taking myself a little too seriously. I don't think the integrity of the Fourth Estate would really have been compromised. But the fact is that I have never since been seriously tempted to deviate from the rule I laid down for myself at the age of 20.

It's *my* rule. I don't insist on it for everybody. There have been great editors and great reporters who were active in party politics. In North Carolina the first name that comes to mind is Josephus Daniels. But, in talking about the responsibilities of reporters and editors, I begin with the basic assumption that journalism in America is a calling—not a trade, not a profession, but a calling—that is not necessarily above politics, but should certainly be apart from politics.

This may sound very austere and self-denying, but I mean it to sound that way. The man who embraces journalism as a career should be no less dedicated than the parson or the doctor. Like them, he should have his own standards—standards that are not subject to change by the shifting winds of public taste or political expediency.

"There is no sure guide for all situations," as my colleague Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times* said at Harvard last spring, "but I think it is clear that the reporter must not become entirely committed—an obvious special pleader. His instinct should be all the other way. If he has a concern for the public good . . . he must recon-

Clifton Daniel is assistant managing editor of the *New York Times*. This is from a talk at Chapel Hill, Oct. 21.

cile himself to satisfying that urge by uncommitted reporting. Justice Frankfurter has put it that the reporter is an educator, not a reformer. I accept that definition, with the proviso that the educator must be allowed to harbor within him just a little of the spirit of reform."

The reporter, Mr. Lewis says, must satisfy his concern for the public good by uncommitted reporting. To translate that into practical terms, a reporter may belong to worthy organizations, he may contribute to good causes, he may campaign for civic virtue and public betterment, but he should never commit himself irretrievably to one cause, one organization, one course of action.

In the words of the Code of Ethics of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, "Freedom from all obligations except that of fidelity to the public interest is vital."

Actually, the reporter who understands his mission has a higher destiny than mere dedication to a single cause. His function is to create and preserve an atmosphere in which all noble causes may flourish.

The press has been nicknamed "The Fourth Estate," and in this country it has been called "the fourth branch of government." Its importance to the structure of our democracy is certified in the Constitution. In fact, there would be no democracy without a free press.

Show me a country where the police can stop the delivery of the morning paper, and I will show you a nation of slaves. Show me a country where the reporter is prevented from digging for the truth, and I will show you a nation in chains.

These facts impose a peculiar responsibility on the journalist. It is a responsibility, not to his employer, not to a particular paper, not to a particular point of view, but to the public and to his own conception of the obligations of his profession.

The publisher, the man who meets the payroll, is not alone responsible for the conscience of the profession. Each reporter and editor is the keeper of his own conscience.

"The modern journalist," as Louis M. Lyons has said, "is an employee. But his responsibility remains to serve the reader as his client. That describes the responsibility and the whole of it. He departs from it or compromises with it at the peril of his soul."

Mr. Lyons' conception of the responsibility of the journalist is based on the premise that information is essential to people who propose to govern themselves, and that those who supply the information must be above partisanship and self-interest.

In other words, the duty of the reporter and editor, in Walter Lippmann's words, is to do "what every sovereign citizen is supposed to do, but has not the time or interest to do for himself"—that is, to gather information, pick out what is important, digest it thoroughly, and without

partisanship or prejudice relate it to the problems of the day.

If the press is going to discharge this function fully, it must be among the bravest and boldest. It must say what no one else dares say, what no one else can afford to say.

It must tell the people what they need to know, not what they would like to hear. If you ask me who decides what the people need to know, I can only say, "The editor." If he can't do that, he has no right to the title. If he allows someone else to do it for him—the government or some special interest—he forfeits his freedom.

There was a time when newspapermen seemed to be more outspoken than they are today, more contemptuous of authority, more defiant of restraints on their freedom. Nowadays, when we are engaged in a desperate competition with world communism, it is sometimes suggested that the newspapers should voluntarily restrict themselves.

This issue arose not long ago when it was proposed that the press limit its coverage of President Eisenhower's trip to the Soviet Union (the one that was cancelled in May) and of similar visits by Soviet leaders to this country.

A number of editors were questioned by the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. Nobody voted in favor of the press limiting its own freedom. One editor wrote:

... if anybody proposes to limit the number of newsmen accredited to cover important international stories, let him do it if he dares. If such restrictions are imposed and found to be disadvantageous, let the enterprising newspaperman evade and defy them if he dares. If these opposite interests clash—and what is 'the American life' but a cacophony of colliding interests under the law?—then let the courts and the Congress draw the line, if they dare. But let's not circumscribe ourselves with our own pencils.

I like that fellow's spirit. It is the spirit with which I think we should meet the problem of official restrictions on news.

Somehow, I feel we newspapermen complain too much about the concealment of news by official quarters—"top secret" labels on inane documents, closed meetings of city councils, secret sessions of legislative committees, and so on. And we rely too much on the politicians to open these doors for us.

The classic function of the aggressive reporter and editor—a part of the responsibility they owe to the public—is to open doors with the power of the press—pry them open, blow them open.

As Arthur Krock has said, "There is nothing that loosens up a news source like a good swift kick in the pants."

A lot of fun would go out of the lives of newspapermen if we were denied that function and that pleasure. Readers would miss something, too.

Of course, the issue of responsibility arises sometimes in matters more serious than a local political fight. It sometimes involves national security.

Obviously, American newspapermen must not be irresponsible in the reporting of news that might affect the safety and security of our own country, our own homes. But the primary responsibility for safeguarding our national interests must rest always with our government.

When Nikita Khrushchev arrived in this country in September, newspapers around the country received thousands of letters, telegrams and telephone calls urging them to boycott the visit, to ban Khrushchev from their news columns.

So far as I know, there was not a single daily paper in the country that ignored Khrushchev entirely. However, there was one that gave him only six paragraphs on his arrival in New York. The New York *Times* printed 27 columns, and a very angry woman in New York called me up and demanded to know why we published a picture of that "Russian Pig" on Page 1. She said we should have printed pictures of President Eisenhower and the American flag instead.

While I appreciated her patriotism, I tried to explain—although she was too angry to listen—what I felt the responsibility of the press to be. Restricting news of Khrushchev's visit presupposes that it is more important for the press to show its disapproval of him than to inform the public of what he is and what he is doing.

Perhaps the Russians would not have us so much on the defensive today if we had not, journalistically speaking, turned our backs on them for a whole generation and ignored what they were achieving in education, industry and science.

There are still people who think it is unpatriotic to call attention to the Soviet challenge or to publish news that is in conflict with the opinions and policies of our government.

What is the responsibility of the reporter and editor in *that* area? The answer is not simple, but it seems to me that, up until the time we are actually at war or on the verge of war, it is not only permissible but it is our duty as journalists and citizens to be constantly questioning our leaders and our policy.

Some people argue that newspapers should not print facts that might embarrass our government in its relations with other governments. But it may be that those very facts are the ones our people need to know in order to come to a clear decision about our policy.

In the Soviet Union, I discovered on a trip to Europe last spring, there is now a "Press Group" attached to the Premier. It is composed of the editors of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* and other journalists who regularly travel with Mr. Khrushchev. They do not merely report on the activities of the Premier. From time to time they issue statements supporting him. That is the ultimate in subservience of the press to the state.

In our democracy, the purposes of the press and the government are not necessarily always identical.

Although our government does not recognize Communist China and prevents the Chinese government from being seated in the United Nations, there is no doubt in my mind that American newspapers should have correspondents on the Chinese mainland. We need to know what the Chinese Communists are doing because some day they may be doing it to us.

It is nothing less than folly to let this great power grow up in the Pacific without our having any first-hand knowledge of its aims and accomplishments and its potential. Here is the most populous country on earth, and we have not a single diplomatic or journalistic representative there to tell us what is going on.

Looking back and second-guessing, I would say that we made a mistake in not sending our correspondents to China in 1956 when we had the chance. The Chinese government offered to admit a long list of newspapermen. But we declined. We did not want to embarrass our government. We did not wish to offend the sensibilities of those whose sons had died in Korea or were imprisoned in China.

I think we were wrong. I think we overlooked our primary loyalty which is, as I have tried to suggest, to the American public—to give the public the information it needs to make intelligent decisions on our national policy with regard to China.

Our government has since changed its mind. A certain number of correspondents are now free to go to China. But Peiping has also changed. The Chinese are not prepared to admit our correspondents except on terms that Washington is unwilling to meet.

Without going into the diplomatic intricacies of this question, let me say only that any effort by journalism or government to break this impasse and see that the American people are informed about China would be a contribution to our national security.

In an election year, there are inevitably proposals, from inside the profession and outside, that the newspapers should guarantee equal space and equal billing to the two candidates for President.

Of course, we should give them an even break. But the principle should not be carried to ridiculous extremes.

Newspapers should be edited not with a tape measure, but on the basis of the best news judgment of competent, serious, responsible reporters and editors.

A reporter knows pretty well when he is leaning toward one side or the other, and so does his editor. The only answer to that is: Don't do it.

Again and again these days we hear that factual reporting is not enough, that objectivity is out of date, that the news has become so complex that it must be explained, that interpretation is now necessary.

A good deal of this talk is nonsense. Of course the news should be explained. There is nothing new about that.

The news has always required interpretation, but interpreting the news does not exclude the possibility of objectivity in reporting it. As I have said, a reporter knows pretty well when he is being objective, and so does his editor. The important thing is that they should appreciate the need for objectivity, and its relationship to the role they play in our democracy.

I have said nothing about editors who comment on the news, who write editorials, who voice opinions of their newspapers. Frankly, I have very little to say about them.

It's not my line of work, but it is commonly said that the

editorial pages in this country have very little influence on public opinion and public policy. If so, I can suggest only that they do not say very much that is pertinent to the problems of our people.

Newspapers have to make themselves necessary to the people. Editors have to make themselves, and their leadership, essential to the community.

So, let me recapitulate, in a few sentences. What is the responsibility of the reporter and editor in our democracy? Stripped to essentials, it is: To serve the public—not the profession of journalism, not a particular newspaper, not a political party, not the government, but the public.

To put information in the hands of people who must be their own rulers.

To make that the supreme obligation of their lives.

To bring intelligence, skill and devotion to the task and, I hope, perform it with some grace and wit.

Those of us who are journalists, teachers of journalism or students of journalism must dedicate ourselves. We should bring to the practice of journalism the heartiest possible sense of responsibility and all the intelligence, skill, devotion, grace and wit that we can muster.

Responsibilities of Ownership

By Gordon Gray

We all believe in the indispensability of freedom of the press. It seems to me that this conviction should run so deep as to preclude the necessity for any further conversation about it. Thus I shall leave it there—except to state the obvious: that any freedom unaccompanied by the exercise of responsibility deserves to be curtailed. There may come a time of course when there is a true threat to freedom of the press but at this stage in our history I think we need to be concerned more about *quality* of the press.

I have asked myself how is responsibility defined? How does it operate? What are the obligations of responsibility in a newspaper context? Do owners in general meet their obligations of responsibility; or if they do not, what are their derelictions?

The accountability of the owner is multiple and diffuse. First, he must as a trustee of the public interest be accountable to his own conscience, which may be the equivalent of saying, in the words of former President Truman: "The buck stops on this desk." He must in a necessarily vague but constant way be accountable to the constituency of his newspaper; and yet there is no yardstick precisely to measure and appraise this accountability other than by

the acceptance of the product by the newspaper reading public. However, we must acknowledge that even the proudest owner in these days of increasing monopoly situations must from time to time ask himself what would be the acceptance of his product if there were an alternative to his product.

He must be accountable to all the members of his newspaper family—to give them the tools they need to do their jobs. He must be accountable to various echelons of government for taxes of many sorts, and for compliance with all the appropriate laws and regulations. And finally, along with his effort to assure the production of the best newspaper possible within unhappily shrinking resources and in the face of rising costs, he must be accountable to the whole institution of the free press by undertaking to conduct a profitable, self-supporting enterprise, to avoid being confronted by the necessity of subsidy either by individual, corporation, union, or government.

Someone must preside over this complex of accountabilities. Who, short of the owner, can?

However, I must say that I am not altogether certain about the magnificence of the discharge of owners' responsibilities

as a general proposition. I wish to pose some questions. And as a not very active nor up-to-date part-owner, you will understand that I address them also to myself.

In them are, I believe, stimulants not only for owners and publishers, but for editors and reporters as well; and for those who aspire to service in this profession—and of course for those who teach and train.

Are owners doing all they can to face up in a courageous way to meeting the problems of mounting costs, in themselves cloud signals for the viability and independence of the press? Have there been instances in which owners have suspended publication in a strike regardless of circumstances, including those of breaches of contract? Have owners really examined the question of whether what they have thought of as an inexorable trend towards monopoly situations can somehow be slowed and indeed reversed?

Generally, my other questions fall into three categories.

The first is those things that owners *do* which may constitute an abuse of the freedom to which we are all committed. Are owners correct, for example, in loudly invoking freedom of the press while resisting pressures and obligations which may be only economic or managerial in nature? Was the NRA, whatever one's judgment as to its wisdom, truly an infringement? Is minimum wage legislation? Realistic postal rates? Workmen's compensation? Do we cry wolf too often? Must owners not learn to stake out the real dimensions of freedom?

My second category involves those things that owners do *not* do, with a consequent erosion of trust and confidence. Here I must ask that I be allowed to state certain objectives, particularly as related to news columns. They must be characterized by integrity, fairness and objectivity. One may well ask whether, subject of course to human limitations which are ever present, these are standards to which all editors and reporters conscientiously repair; and if there is dereliction in this respect can anyone be long charged other than the owner? Must he not make and enforce hard and fast rules of policy?

In this connection I sometimes wonder if we have not become too addicted to the cult of personal and interpretive reporting, presented to the reader as news. A couple of weeks ago, just as a matter of interest I analyzed the front page of a great newspaper. Out of 13 stories, 12 were by-lined. Does the more than prolific use of by-lines, in some unconscious way tend to absolve the owner-publisher from his non-transferable responsibility for objective reporting? Also, are we encouraging reporters to write with one eye on the day-by-day reporting but with another glistening eye on prizes at both the state and national level? Does reporting under those circumstances not distort its own purposes?

I ask myself whether we are becoming one profession which has equated glorification of its own members with

service to the public. Can we not learn some caution from a sister medium in which interrogators have become performers and in which questions have become pronouncements? Has that medium become committed to the humorous motto, "I know all the answers but I just don't understand the questions."

My third category is the general subject of restraint. Isn't the insistence upon the exercise of restraint a part of the discharge of the responsibility of owners? First, what about good taste? Does a lurid rape or violent love triangle on the West Coast have real and constructive news value for those of us on the East Coast? Can owners continue to be indifferent to the wide-spread complaint that newspapers are first interested in selling copies and second in rendering constructive service? If this is a matter solely for editors, how vigorously are owners insisting that good taste be an integral part of day-to-day judgments? In any event, what about movie advertising, which the editor presumably cannot control? Is it a courageous and responsible answer to say that we cannot influence our competitors?

Further in the category of restraints there are questions which relate to the international situation, and to what is often spoken of as official secrecy. As for the former my simple question is: Do we as newspapers go well beyond the compulsions of integrity and comprehensiveness in the way we present international news?

As queries taken at random, have there been more printed words about Soviet ICBM shots of 7500 miles than of U. S. shots of 9000 miles? Has the American newspaper reader been given more information about U. S. space failures than U. S. space successes? To what extent are Khrushchev's reputed endless propaganda successes really creations of the press? What underlies a front-page picture in one of our important metropolitan dailies of Khrushchev and Castro embraced in a bear hug and described in the cut-line as "Two World Leaders." Have there developed tendencies almost imperceptible to all of us to feel that we serve the cause of freedom by emphasizing the bad rather than the good? I hope that there is no doubt in your mind that I am trying to raise questions of courageous and correct editorial judgment rather than of suppression.

As to official secrecy, I would hope that we would never do anything to impose a blanket on reportorial enterprise. I would also assert that I have no patience with efforts to cover up administrative error and thereby minimize official embarrassment. But I can say with certain knowledge that there are from time to time disclosures which do adversely affect our national security. It is in this area that I have the deepest concern. Let me be clear that I impute no disloyalty; I believe rather that competitive urge is the source of the difficulty.

I don't know that I advocate something like an "Official

Secrets Act," although this may be a fair subject for debate. Indeed, there are those who would argue that this underlying source of governmental reprisal is requisite for any voluntary action on the part of the press. But perhaps my question is this: Should voluntary restraints so familiar to us in time of shooting war be more onerous and less compelling in time of rugged cold war?

The questions I pose are of course not comprehensive, if one wishes to look at the American press as a whole. Perhaps some of them are not even legitimate questions. I believe finding the right answers would require more experience and wisdom than any individual can possibly have. Even if I thought I had the answers I would hardly dare to present them.

In the first instance each owner must answer these and similar questions to the satisfaction of his own conscience; but no one owner can presume to speak for or indeed very seriously influence the whole profession. Indeed, I suggest that finding the answers may lie only in concerted effort, in collective appraisal.

This brings me to what may be my single constructive suggestion. Perhaps I am simply refurbishing an old idea. Certainly, I do not claim authorship, but at least I can put it forward again.

If I am right in thinking that there is a need to develop a common conscience with respect to the quality of the press, then why should not the press through a "National Commission on the Press" address itself to this problem? Let me make it clear that such a Commission should be established by and of the press itself.

I have in mind an effort participated in by owners, publishers, editors and reporters. It should be unhurried and well-financed; and the financing should be accomplished by the press itself, independent of government or other influence. Its broad mandate would be to examine the press as it is and as it should be as we look forward from 1960.

I would not here undertake to spell out the details except to urge the imposition of one vital condition. The Commission should have a strong director, or Chief of Staff, whose function would be to assure the most thorough and searching appraisal of the problems, deficiencies, limitations, opportunities and potentials of the press in America. His responsibility would be to develop a staff presumably taken from various elements of the working press to ascertain facts, identify problems and recommend solutions as necessary. Clearly he should understand that the mission of the Commission should be neither to damn nor to praise with respect to the press as it has been, and as it is. The chips should fall as hewn.

This, I am aware, would be a major and difficult undertaking. It is obvious that it has hazards and pitfalls but I submit to you that it may have real meaning in the future

for the continued vitality and freedom, as well as quality of the press.

I should like to repeat that I believe that freedom of the press presently faces no real dangers. Indeed, I believe that only conduct which is less than correct can raise threats to this freedom.

Whether the mechanism I am discussing is necessarily the best, others will have to determine. But I do suggest that the annual meetings of the American Society of Newspaper Editors or the American Newspaper Publishers Association, regional meetings, state meetings, meetings of the Press Associations, etc., do not accomplish the kind of purpose I have in mind. However concerted their thinking and however sound their resolutions and their statements of purpose, the result is layered and compartmented.

In short, I am challenging the press as a whole to take a clear and honest look at itself.

In conclusion, I have a word for the students—you are training for an honorable profession. It should have for you the real rewards which come from public service. I believe that the owners with whom you will associate in your careers should do all in their power to assure for you dignity in your labors and adequacy in your surroundings.

But I think owners owe you one further obligation in the interests of quality and reliability of the press. They should make it clear to you that they expect you only to go out and write copy the best you can in accordance with the paper's policy—which should be that of accuracy and objectivity in the presentation of the news. The owners should not expect you to have overwhelming purpose beyond that. They should not expect you to bring some superior knowledge or moral quality into play; nor should they expect you to have a duty to view and report the scene so as to shape it to the ends of any personal philosophy. They should expect you to have courage; but this means the courage of rectitude—not always necessarily seeking scandal or taking the opportunity to cut some one down to size.

And finally, the owner alone must take the ultimate responsibility for all that appears in the newspaper. This responsibility includes such support for you as may be necessary in a difficult situation. This means then that you have a responsibility to him also; to let him be honest and convinced in meeting the inevitable assaults he will be subjected to.

Gordon Gray's ownership is of the Winston-Salem newspapers. This is from a talk at the dedication of a new building for the School of Journalism at the University of North Carolina, Oct. 21, 1960. He is assistant secretary of defense.

Two Versions of a Rumor in Vienna

AP Log, Nov. 3-9

RUMORS IN VIENNA—Shortly after 7 A.M. Nov. 4, London advised the New York Foreign Desk that Vienna was hearing reports of an anti-Khrushchev coup in Moscow. An urgent call to Moscow brought negative response; other checks developed only that the rumors were being heard in many quarters. In short order, they became so widespread and so detailed that, in our judgment, they could not be ignored. At 8:05 AES, an AAA story moved, labeling the reports as rumors "with no confirmation from any source" and saying Moscow was "calm" and "skeptical". . . The rumors proved groundless but, even in retrospect, there can be no serious question that they should have been reported. Faults can be found with the handling—particularly with early efforts to pin down the origin of the rumors—but the potential was so great and the re-

ports so prevalent that we would have been remiss if we had not told members about them. It wouldn't have been the first time that momentous news from Moscow leaked out through just such a side door. . . . Our responsibility is clear: When rumors become news, as in this instance, they must be reported—but properly surrounded with all existing doubts and questions.

UPI REPORTED that it first heard the rumor from a man who identified himself as a teletype operator in the Soviet consulate in Vienna. This character did not appear at our office. We first heard the reports when Austrian government officials began talking about them. Next day, the Vienna newspaper *Arbeiterzeitung* said in effect that UPI had started the rumors circulating, and accused it of irresponsibility.

U.P.I. Reporter

(For Telegraph Editors)

This is a footnote on gullibility and sensationalism, how they can prevail for a time over responsibility and common sense, and how newspapers can be imposed upon by a wire service.

Last Friday morning a stranger visited newspapers and wire service bureaus in Vienna. At the U.P.I. bureau he introduced himself as a telex operator in the local Soviet consulate. He said a coded message had come through reporting Premier Khrushchev deposed and under arrest in Moscow. A group headed by Malenkov and Kaganovich had taken over.

Good story—if true. But is this the stuff sensational bulletins are made of? Was there any reason to believe it? Was the stranger a valid news source? Did the fact that a newspaper in Vienna played the story make it authentic? Is the paper known to be sensational or cautious? These are questions a good reporter or editor must answer before filing a story that invites headlines around the world.

First word of the Vienna incident reached U.P.I. in New York Friday morning in a service message from Paul R. Allerup, London manager. His cable said:

"Informatively (meaning not for publication) we checking reports from Vienna Khrushchev arrested new regime took over in military coup with Malenkov Kaganovich heading new government. We informed

Reuters AP have same reports which came to us from man who inwalked Vienna bureau identified self as telex operator Soviet consulate there who intercepted coded message.

"We telephoned Korengold (Bud Korengold in Moscow) who assured us fars known all normal all familiar faces still on scene no signs trouble. Khrushchev himself due back weekendly from previously announced Caucasus vacation. Korengold and Shapiro (U.P.I. Moscow manager) will continue check. All sources here blank but London foreign office will run check for Thaler (U.P.I.'s diplomatic reporter). Present indications nothing to it. Unsee how at this point could storify. Suggest take soundings Washington."

In the cable quoted above Allerup conformed to the best traditions of his profession as an editor. The bigger the story the greater the caution.

At 8:55 that morning U.P.I. sent a confidential note to subscribers informing them of the Vienna rumor. Thus far, the note said, inquiries in Moscow and Washington had yielded nothing to substantiate it.

Then Allerup in London was heard from again:

"We are tipped," his cable said, "that AP has released a story along lines that 'rumors swept Vienna today,' etc. All our checks continue wholly negative. Still feel we should not storify until get unequivocal denial or better source. Be interested know if AP circulated story in states."

The AP had, enthusiastically, building the story up with references to previous signs of discontent with Khrushchev in Moscow. In early editions in New York the AP story

said, "There was no hint where the rumors originated." It made no mention of the afternoon newspaper in Vienna. That reference came out in later versions. No mention of the stranger who had made the rounds in Vienna. Although it described the rumor as unconfirmed the construction and urgency of this dispatch were in the familiar pattern of a world-shaker.

Meanwhile U.P.I. was sending two more advisories to its subscribers underscoring the odd circumstances of the rumor's birth and saying that no story would be released for publication until better information, pro or con, became available.

Then at 11:25 a.m. U.P.I. delivered a dispatch based on a flat denial by the Soviet agency Tass. The story told how the rumor was launched in Vienna and covered

the flurry of buying that its publication had set off in Wall Street. It quoted Shapiro in Moscow. It contained a paragraph about the Vienna visitor, and quoted police as saying there was no proof that he worked for the Soviets.

By next morning the rumor that had "swept the world," despite U.P.I.'s efforts to put it in proper perspective, had become only an item in the day's grist.

But a black eye for one wire service is a black eye for both. Very few readers notice credit lines, and one service can neither gloat nor profit by the other's mistakes. It can only remobilize its own vigilance and hope for the best. And surely telegraph editors cannot be criticized for playing a dispatch which omitted so many of the facts that would have branded it as a hoax.

EARL J. JOHNSON.

Printers' Errors, Ancient and Modern, and Not Always Accidental

By Max Hall

On April 27, 1960, the day after New York gave a hearty welcome to President de Gaulle and his lady, the New York *Times* informed its readers that Madame de Gaulle tries to avoid charitable works. Two days later the *Times* explained that a line of type had been accidentally dropped, and that the sentence, as written, had said she tries to avoid publicity but is active in charitable works.

The original statement, however, lives on in hundreds of libraries. It has been fastened between hard covers and solidified on microfilm. Nothing can ever expunge it from the reference materials of researchers, some of whom will be using the *Times* as trustingly as they use Webster's Unabridged.

Printers, of course, being human, have been making errors since printing was invented. Surely over 95 per cent and probably over 99 per cent of the *errata* of the centuries have been corrected before publication. And most of those that did reach the public eye were neither disastrous nor amusing, only irritating and messy.

But some have been whoppers.

For example, on March 5, 1730, Benjamin Franklin's newspaper, the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, reported under a London dateline that Jonathan Belcher, on being appointed Governor of the Provinces of the Massachusetts-Bay and New-Hampshire, kissed his Majesty's hand and then "died elegantly at Pontack's." Pontack's was a London tavern, and of course the word should have been "dined."

I do not take it as certain, however, that this particular

error was accidental. It set the stage for Franklin to publish in his next issue (March 13) a dissertation on printers' errors, in the form of a letter to the publisher, signed "J. T." This letter, which is printed in Volume I of the *Papers of Benjamin Franklin* recently issued at Yale University, was presumably written by Franklin himself; and it would not have been out of character for the sly young fellow (then 24) to manufacture the pretext for publishing it.

In his dissertation Franklin mentioned a certain edition of the Bible in which the printer, composing the line where David says "I am fearfully and wonderfully made," omitted the "e" in "made." This mistake, Franklin reported, "occasion'd an ignorant Preacher, who took that Text, to harangue his Audience for half an hour on the Subject of *Spiritual Madness*."

Franklin next recalled an even more egregious Biblical blooper. There was once run off in London an entire edition of the Bible which bluntly instructed the populace, "Thou shalt commit adultery." Though Franklin did not say so, this was the notorious "Wicked" Bible of 1631, printed by Robert Barker, one of His Majesty's Printers. Here again the error may not have been an accident. Miss P. M. Handover in a new book, *Printing in London from Caxton to Modern Times* (published in America by Harvard University Press), says it seems probable that a rival entrepreneur, bent on wresting the Bible patent from Barker, "suborned the workmen" to allow the blasphemous misprint to pass. The episode ruined Barker, not to mention possible peril to the souls of the more trustful readers.

Miss Handover also tells about a Bible of the early eighteenth century which was nicknamed the "Basketful of errors" (the printer was John Baskett). The same edition became known as the "Vinegar" Bible, from a misprint for "vineyard."

Another error described by Franklin went through a whole printing of Common Prayer-Books. In the funeral service, where it says "We shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," the printer left the "c" out of "changed."

But the natural habitat of typographical faults is not the Bible or Prayer-Book; it is the daily newspaper, whose editions must be hurled onto the street at the appointed hours, ready or not. Every newspaper office harbors memories of awesome blunders, real and apocryphal. Soon after I reported for work on the *Atlanta Constitution* thirty years ago I was told about a boner that had occurred in an earlier era because of the ambiguous penmanship of a *Constitution* editor. I think it was Joel Chandler Harris, but it may have been Frank L. Stanton. It seems that he scribbled a headline which he intended to be "Land Grants in Hall," meaning Hall County in north Georgia. The printer, however, saw it otherwise, and since the lateness of the hour left no time for proofreading, the version which appeared next morning at the breakfast tables of the town was "Loud Grunts in Hell."

A few years later I was eyewitness to a blood-chilling error in the Athens (Georgia) *Banner-Herald*. That paper had sponsored a cooking school, and had given the story the prominence ordinarily reserved for declarations of war and Presidential assassinations. The account jumped from page one to an inside page where it finally turned into a list of matrons who had attended the affair. Column after dreary column the list continued. Now, as all newspapermen and many other people know, every piece of copy sent to a composing room bears an identifying word or phrase, called a "slug," which is set in type but discarded when the story is correctly in place. Occasionally, though, a slug sneaks uninvited into the newspaper. And in the midst of the innumerable names of the ladies of Athens appeared not only the slug but also the editorial comment of a bored printer, thus: "ADD COOKING SCHOOL ———." The brief word I have modestly omitted is rarely seen in print, even in best-selling novels.

Startling, though not that startling, was an error that occurred many years ago in one of my own stories. After going on a trip with an eminent and energetic government official, then much in the news, I wrote a Sunday feature for the Associated Press in which, at one point, I said he "popped off the plane and kissed his wife, Myrtle." But a paper in Charleston, South Carolina, had me saying, with what must have struck Charlestonians as excessive

coolness, that he "popped off the plane and killed his wife, Myrtle."

Newspapers, of course, are not alone in being plagued with mistakes occurring in composing rooms. Magazines sometimes have them. Books, even those produced with loving care, hardly ever go to press without an error or two—or more—and occasionally there is a catastrophe. Thousands of arithmetic texts had been doled out to Texas pupils before it was discovered that the answers in the back of the book had been jumbled. (A separate booklet giving the right answers had to be distributed.) A New England bank, about to mail out its annual report, noticed just in time that the words "Assets" and "Liabilities" had somehow swapped places.

From an editor's point of view, one of the most anguishing things about a printer's error is that the correcting of it creates an opportunity to produce a new and perhaps worse one. The point is illustrated by the old anecdote about the "battle-scarred veteran" who was written up in a newspaper. In the first edition he was "battle-scared," in the second edition "bottle-scarred." Mistakes spawned by earlier mistakes are a deadly peril even for magazines and books, but again it is the newspaper that suffers the most damage. If you encounter a newspaper passage that makes less sense than you would expect of the person who wrote it, examine it to see whether two of the lines are almost identical. It may be that a minor error occurred, that it was detected by a proofreader, that a new line was set, and that a printer put this line in the wrong place, discarding an impeccable line whose only offense was that it started with the same word as the faulty line and thus fell victim to a case of mistaken identity.

Despite all this about printers' errors, writers have to concede—and I trust that the printer who sets this piece in type will note the concession—that nearly all of the confusion spread by the printed word throughout the centuries has been attributable not to the painters but to the waiters.

The "typos" that newspapermen collect are usually unprintable. Max Hall, old AP man, a Nieman Fellow of 1950, has happily a printable assortment. He is now an editor of the Harvard University Press where the proofreading is evidently so impeccable as to have yielded no items for his collection. But his article recalls to the editor of this journal a mishap in a telegraphed report on John W. Davis' Presidential campaign. The candidate was staying at a picturesquely old-fashioned inn. My copy described it as something between a first-class hotel and a *deanery*. But in the printed story it became a *beanery*, an institution evidently more familiar to the telegraph operator.

Editing—Unclogging Communications Pipelines

By Harold K. Mintz

Thanks mainly to the space age, competent editors are needed more than ever before, to help interpret science to readers. It matters not who their readers are—the general public, technicians in the Armed Forces, engineers and scientists in industry, doctors in research—editors can make it easier for them to understand scientific papers.

With the twentieth century scientific revolution changing the face of the world, scientific papers are cascading off printing presses in tidal wave proportions. Magazines, journals and newspapers now publish more science news than ever for an audience that grows steadily larger and more literate.

Such extensive coverage of science contrasts sharply with coverage in the past. For example, in 1807 Robert Fulton's steamship *Clermont*, by sailing from New York City to Albany and back, sounded the death knell of the age of clipper ships. But far more important, it stimulated and accelerated commerce and contact between nations. Yet, only one newspaper reported Fulton's achievement and this in just one paragraph.

Again, almost 100 years later, when the Wright brothers initiated the age of flight, most newspapers gave a cold shoulder to that earth-shaking event. (See reference 1.)

But to return to the current scene. Coupled with the previously mentioned trend of greater coverage of science by the press is a trend of deeper public interest in science news. In a public opinion poll two years ago, Dr. George Gallup found that medical news attracts more readers than any other type of news. (Ref. 1) This development is understandable because most people over 40 and many under 40 are increasingly concerned about the two major killers of Americans, cancer and heart disease.

In effect then, the two trends—deeper public interest in science and broader press coverage of science—mean simply this: that editors have a vital job to do.

Just what is editing? Mark Twain is reputed to have explained editing in these words: "To edit a manuscript, grasp firmly by the upper left corner and shake thoroughly to remove the commas."

Editing has been defined as changing someone's writing to make it better. I'd like to add a dimension by saying

that editing is changing someone's writing to make it better and easier for the reader to understand.

Last summer Nikita Khrushchev told a group of Western journalists that a real editor "must know not only the subject but also how to select who will write it so as to give it such a taste that you should want to lick your fingers as if after a good dish." On this score, at least, we must agree with Mr. K. (Ref. 2)

However, the authoritative statement on editing was uttered by Adolph Ochs, the publisher who built the New York *Times* from a provincial paper into a world-wide influence. In a speech to the Pulitzer School of Journalism in 1925, he said:

The most useful man on a newspaper is one who can edit . . . it is he who should be able to apply the acid test: Is it worth printing, and if so, how best can it be put in printable form . . . and brought within the understanding of the reader. (Ref. 3)

Where the reader lacks contact with the author, the editor has that contact. Thus, the editor is in a position to understand the author's message and then slant it so the reader understands it and, if possible, even finds it interesting.

An editor has three principal standards for evaluating a paper: its *content*, its *organization*, and its *communication*.

First, is the *content* timely and appropriate? Are the ideas meaningful to the readers? Does the treatment have depth, or is it an off-the-top-of-the-head discussion, a once-over-lightly job? Is the central theme original or threadbare?

Answers to these questions tell an editor if a paper is worthy of publication.

Now, *organization*. Is the material organized so that readers can grasp the core idea? Does the lead lure the readers into the body of the article? Are most paragraphs short and do they follow one another logically? Are the transitions between and within paragraphs smooth? (Ref. 4)

The third test is *communication*. Assuming that an article's content and organization are acceptable, the question remains—does the article "communicate" with its readers? In this age of specialization, even specialists sometimes have difficulty in understanding one another.

Harold K. Mintz, editor for the Raytheon Company, gave this paper before a Technical Writers' Institute at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, last June.

When specialists try to communicate with non-specialists or laymen, they sometimes find it hard to shed their jargon in favor of plain talk. And being untrained in journalistic techniques, they are at a loss to spark the interest of laymen. These techniques I will mention a little later.

Perhaps the solution to good science writing, as someone said, lies somewhere between the scientists' "incomprehensible accuracy" and the "writers' comprehensible inaccuracy."

In trying to achieve comprehensible accuracy, the editor owes the writer a certain responsibility. The editor should try to bring out the best in the writer, he should try to release the writer's energy and imagination, he should not put the writer in a straight jacket.

Scientists who can write like Faraday or Jeans, Whitehead or Oppenheimer, are few indeed. Yet many scientists and engineers have developed a readable style and the editor should leave it alone. He should not edit that style out of the paper; he should not recast the paper into his own style. It was in somewhat this vein that Lord Byron stormed to his publisher:

The poem will please if it is lively; if it is stupid, it will fail; but I will have none of your damned cutting and slashing. (Ref. 5).

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, said two years ago that the longest gap in journalism is the distance between the reader and his newspaper, between the listener and his radio, between the viewer and his TV. The age of the missile gap is approaching but the age of the communication gap has always impeded mankind's progress. (Ref. 6)

What can a competent editor do about this communication gap? There are many steps he can take, but underlying all of them is one commandment: slant the publication to the reader. The editor must always ask himself: what does the reader need to know and what is the best way to present it? This is precisely what Mr. Ochs said 35 years ago.

The editor must try to tailor the "you-angle" into the writing. He must appeal to the reader's self-interest, his home, family, job, pocketbook. He should try to stimulate what has been called the reader's sense of "social participation." It is this approach that typifies the Kiplinger Letter. It is this approach that underlies the success of TV audience participation shows.

Overestimating the reader's knowledge is a dangerous error. On this score Dr. Von Braun, labeling himself as a reader rather than a writer, has this to say:

I believe that the fallacy most prevalent among

technical writers and editors today is their assumption "that any amount of obscurity can be justified because the reader will understand; he is a technical man." In this way, all sorts of esoteric words and phrases, technical jargon and slang . . . pass through the editorial mill and are not sifted out. The result is all too often a poorly organized and meaningless hodgepodge of data which only deepens the reader's confusion and compounds his misunderstanding. . . .

The *Wall Street Journal* has chalked up an astounding success. Can one reason for its success be that it speaks the businessman's language? Sylvia Porter, the columnist on economics, is another case in point. She always asks herself this question when writing: "What does all this mean?" Then she translates her ideas into language that an intelligent housewife can understand. (Ref. 8) The point is this—language as a vehicle for ideas must be angled to a specific audience.

To adapt language for a particular audience, an editor must be a master of words, a student of words, a lover of words. He must have a sixth sense that makes him aware of audience reaction to words. Many factors condition an audience—nationality, for example. In the States the word "bloody" is acceptable, in England it is not. There the word "dame" is an honorable title; here it's another kind of title. We say "radio," they say "wireless;" we say "tube," they say "valve."

An audience is also conditioned by its surroundings. For instance, a "black and white" at Howard Johnson restaurants is not the same as a "black and white" at a cocktail lounge.

A competent editor must know how to maneuver such verbal nuances for the reader's benefit.

There is no need here to examine the value of *artwork*. Ever since the Neanderthal scratched pictures on the walls of caves many thousands of years ago, man has been fascinated by line and form, mass and color, combining to tell a story. A good editor uses artwork—photos, line drawings, graphs, cutaways, just to name a few types—to heighten the impact of the written word.

Witness the success of *Life* Magazine and the impact of the President's use of an aerial photograph in his report to the nation last May.

Another journalistic device, sadly neglected in science writing, is the use of *comparisons*. They are valuable in translating the unknown in terms of the known. Consider some helpful comparisons—paddle wheel satellite, crocodile clip, bathtub capacitor, ear trumpet, dish antenna.

Another type of comparison involves a complete sentence. For example—The intake of a jet engine is like an extremely powerful vacuum cleaner. Or you might use a

numerical comparison—The best frequency is 12,000 cycles, about the pitch of a high violin note.

The competent editor makes every possible use of *typographical aids*. Some aids that make text attractive and interesting to the reader's eyes are underlining, white space, all caps, italics, bold face, indention, rules and borders.

Even *anecdotes* may help get a scientific concept across to readers. If they do, then use anecdotes, but sparingly, of course. The good editor never lets these journalistic ideas overpower the central message of the paper. They must never be the tail that wags the dog.

Definitions of new terms are a must. Whenever a new, unfamiliar expression is used, it should be explained immediately. Otherwise, the readers may lose the thread of development and may even stop reading.

We all know how marvelously flexible and descriptive the English language is. Used with imagination and precision, it can impart force and vigor to technical writing.

We owe it to our readers to gain a *mastery of verbs*—they

are the muscle power of sentences. Verbs can create pictures. Weigh the advice of Stanley Walker, former editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, "to avoid adjectives and to swear by the little verbs that bounce and leap and swim and cut." (Ref. 3)

With all these journalistic tools an editor can brighten up many a dull, wearisome, technical paper.

REFERENCES

1. Nieman Reports, Oct. 1958.
2. Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 18, 1959.
3. City Editor, Walker, Stanley Stokes Co., N.Y., 1934.
4. Editing the Small Magazine, Ferguson, Rowena. Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1958.
5. Chemical and Engineering News, page 882, Feb. 20, 1956.
6. Journalism Quarterly, 1958.
7. Von Braun letter to H. K. Mintz, March 28, 1960.
8. Time, page 61, June 16, 1958.
9. STWE (Society of Technical Writers and Editors) Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1958.

An Editor's Tribute to Two Reporters

By Floyd Merrill

Within a few months there died here two of the ablest newspapermen the writer has known. They were Paul Hamilton Emery, retired, a reporter and night editor on the *Tribune* for 41 years, and Ralph Johnston, news editor of Colorado State College for the last decade, but who had been a *Tribune* reporter for 10 years prior to his acquiring an interest in the *Loveland Reporter-Herald*, of which he was editor for five years.

Both men had high aptitude for newspaper writing. This quality, difficult to describe, is easy to detect the moment a reporter goes to work. The percentage of news staffers so gifted falls far short of 100.

Emery and Johnston had in common the fact that they were great reporters. No higher tribute can be paid newspapermen by another. Both men were rightly proud of their reportorial achievements.

What does a top quality reporter have that many others lack? One asset is imagination, which makes possible reporting in depth. Without imagination, a reporter merely skims the surface. He doesn't even scratch it. Without imagination, a reporter can't really be curious, since he doesn't even think of the things he might ask about to disclose the truth under the surface.

Both men had a keen interest in all aspects of northern Colorado life—economics, agriculture, irrigation, ranch, oil, livestock, government, and politics at all levels. They early mastered the basic facts and their relationships in these diverse fields. They were quickly aware

that they were in a profession in which limitless information that might be of no value elsewhere is a virtual necessity.

Emery long before he became night editor distinguished himself by his penetrating coverage of county government, his diligence in behalf of the public interest, and his skill in unveiling for public scrutiny that which those in office would prefer to have overlooked.

Emery's news writing had a special quality. He was a master of plain English words. At his best, his stories were unadorned by lengthy words rooted in Latin and Greek. No one had any doubt about the meaning of such stories.

The sense of humor was highly developed in both men. Each had a keen eye for the feature story.

The writer will always remember Ralph Johnston for his coverage of the notorious Butler murder case including the joint trial of two accused, both being acquitted.

This rare material, in his hands, became such a fascinating story that an advertiser complained that the interest therein was reducing the value of his advertising. No such complaint had ever been made to the *Tribune* before, and to our knowledge, none has been made since.

The community is the better for both men having served on the *Daily Tribune* here.

Floyd Merrill is editor of the Greeley (Colo.) *Tribune*, which published his tribute, Oct. 1, 1960.

The Imbalance in Canada-U.S. News Flow

By Robert A. Farquharson

Canadian newspapers carry a tremendous volume of American news, while American newspapers report little about Canada. A seminar at Goddard College in Vermont reported that this resulted in "a dearth of information on one side of the border and a plethora of misinformation on the other." Quite apart from the justice of that verdict, I think it is fair to say most Canadians feel they understand a great deal about the United States, but repeatedly interpret what they read according to Canadian political terms and often come up with the wrong answers.

As a veteran editor, I had thought I thoroughly understood U.S. politics and even its complicated system of government. After six years in Washington I know that in Canada I was constantly misinterpreting what I read about the United States.

There have been improvements in Canadian communications with the United States. There are twice as many Canadian correspondents in Washington as there were when I arrived and there is a much greater flow of stories providing background necessary for understanding by Canadian readers. Unfortunately the great volume of news copy is still written by Americans, for Americans and floods into Canada as an uninterpreted, but inexpensive by-product.

The situation, so far as the United States' understanding of Canada is concerned, has shown less improvement. There has been virtually no increase in the number of Americans who sit in the press gallery in Ottawa. Not one American news service, not one radio or TV network, has a single man of its own in Canada. There is little misinterpretation of Canadian reports in the States because there is not the same urgency to read about Canada and the great part of what goes over the wire is just not printed. My observation is that editorial pages in the United States are more conscious of Canada than are news pages.

But the battle of the border is not lost—or forgotten. There are an increasing number of special articles being published. Magazines are definitely more aware of Canada. Financial pages and the special financial and commercial newspapers have developed a lively interest in Canada. There are two groups of business men carefully studying

sources of friction. One group is issuing frequent reports. A number of universities have annual Canada-U.S. seminars and even Congress, aware of the problems, has set up its own Canadian committee and meets twice a year with Canadian parliamentarians. In its relations with no other country has the U.S. arranged for meetings between Canadian and American Cabinet Ministers concerned with economic affairs and defense.

But in spite of prosperity, in spite of our comfortable cooperation that has developed between our two governments, I have just read a national poll which suggests that Canadian-American relations have deteriorated in the last five years. The reasons cited were unequal trade, increased control by American business over the Canadian economy, increased control of Canadian defense and, generally, a resentment of U.S. domination. But nearly half the Canadians interviewed had no grievances to cite.

As a Canadian living in Washington and following, as closely as I can, developments on both sides of the border, I am disturbed by any breeze that ruffles our relations, even if I have to come back to Canada to feel that breeze. In the United States, the fact that one is a Canadian is a passport to kindness, courtesy and hospitality.

When Canadian speeches or Canadian editorials make American editors aware that north of the border there exists unhappiness about relations with the United States, there is an almost immediate response. "Why irritate Canada, our best friend and closest ally," has in effect been the frequently sounded note of American editors. The number of editorials about Canada has doubled and tripled in the last five years.

On every single issue that has disturbed Canada, there have been warm and friendly editorials taking Canada's side. As recently as August, a group of American editors sprang to oppose Congressional increases in lead and zinc tariffs which could have hurt Canadian trade. The proposals were beaten. When there was a move to restrict the amount of Canadian oil which could flow to the south, editors right across the country objected and laughed at the idea defense was involved. The quota was lifted. Canada's position on wheat has been repeatedly supported, and this has led to regular consultations on what each government was planning. There have been scores of these friendly editorials and almost none that have been critical. I only remember one in the last year that was downright unfriendly and it was immediately answered by other American editors. I often wish that this was fully known in Canada.

Mr. Farquharson is chief information officer in the Canadian Embassy in Washington, formerly managing editor of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. This is from an address in Vancouver, Sept. 25, at a memorial to the late President Harding, first American President to visit Canada.

New Dimensions of the Indian Press

By Chanchal Sarkar

Among some journalists at least the current mood in America seems to be one of quiet despair. "Dying" and "fading" are how newspapers are being described in their unequal struggle against television and broadcasting and no light is seen flickering yet at the end of the tunnel. Less and less, it is feared, will people turn to newspapers for information or opinion.

If this be true and American newspapers are really dying on their feet then, by comparison, the Indian press is still struggling to be born. Though it has no competition at all from television and though total control by government has hemmed radio in to a bland and lifeless ineffectiveness, newspapers today touch only the fringe of the Indian population.

Superficially, things might seem not at all unpromising. There are about 350 daily newspapers in India with a total circulation of 3.6 million. A city like Bombay has over 32 dailies. Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Delhi together contribute 90, in various languages; the total of English language dailies is about 70. But even as this roll is called, the weaknesses begin to show: the Indian press is elitist and metropolitan, reaching those well educated or relatively so living in or around the principal cities; and English language papers remain by far the most influential.

It could be that this exclusive press already displays, in miniature, some of the problems of the fading American newspapers, but one hesitates to dub something the "Indian press" which does not reach even a majority of those who can read. In 1951 the Indian literacy rate was 16 per cent, yielding a potential readership of 40 million and some samples taken before the coming Indian census of 1961 predict a literacy rate of 30 per cent which, in a population now estimated to be 423 million, would push the potential readership up to 126 million. I should add one qualification; even though the circulation of the daily press is 3.6 million, that of the periodical press as a whole, including weeklies, monthlies, etc., is about 14 million.

The Indian press, then, faces a challenge to grow into new dimensions to become a truly popular press, to offer satisfying careers for alert and idealistic young people, to be a powerful and independent instrument of opinion, and to transmit India's character to other countries in Asia, Africa and the world. If I were deliriously optimistic

I would unreservedly assert what is in fact true—that the growth and expansion of the Indian press is inevitable and no one can hold it back. But mere expansion, as the press of many countries will testify, does not automatically imply influence, quality and responsibility.

The challenge, in all its aspects, is formidable. The popular press, for instance, which will be the symbol of the Indian press bursting its chains, will obviously have to be in the principal Indian languages (there are 14), not English. Only then will newspapers reach and speak to the man in the street and the woman in the home. Already this is happening. Indian language dailies and weeklies are steadily growing in circulation and are trying, in their content, to interest wide sections, like women and young people.

But who can predict that the eventual shape of the popular newspapers will not be like that of the tabloids of Britain, France and the United States? Even, perhaps like the newspapers of Ceylon and the Philippines? In size Kerala is the smallest of the Indian states but its literacy rate is, at something like 60 per cent, nearly double the national average. With nearly 27 daily newspapers (all in Malayalam, the state's language) Kerala comes closest today to having a popular press. By any criteria we choose to apply, however, such as truthfulness or responsibility, its quality is deplorably poor.

In anticipating a popular press I am not trying to suggest that the elitist press should disappear. In spite of several drawbacks it is among the best of its kind in the world. Though the future, in terms of rapid growth, lies with the languages press, English newspapers will represent, for quite a number of years, India's national as well as international press.

That is why the existing serious papers, although they reach a fragment of the people, must aim at higher quality. Thirty or forty years ago Indian newspapers were extremely good in argumentative polemics or rhetoric and were comparatively unconcerned about news and about general professional competence. This tradition, of being heavily political, persists even though news coverage has increased and improved enormously. Meanwhile, criteria for evaluating a popular press have not yet been isolated because no such press exists. But if its standards and quality were to be considered only after a bid for circulation had already been made, then India will have learnt little from the unfortunate experiences of other countries.

Chanchal Sarkar, now an Associate Nieman Fellow at Harvard, is assistant editor of *The Statesman* of New Delhi.

What impatient young journalists think comes out only in coffee house conversations and, occasionally, in the ruminative spell after dinner. Recruitment to newspapers has been haphazard, much more so in the language papers than in the English. And although great changes have come about in the last ten years and the press Commission of 1954 has done much to standardize minimum wages and conditions of service in the newspaper industry, journalism, barring a few newspapers, is still not a career that attracts the brightest.

Able young people, in newspapers and outside, bite their nails in impatience waiting for a growth in dimension which will demand more knowledge, skill and specialization from them. The columnist and his medium are still not adequately developed. There could be more investigative reporting than there is. Labor and science are sketchily reported. There is not enough use of photographs. Problems of the countryside are not deeply enough treated. Cartoonists are only starting to make national reputations, and although newspapers carry a lot of sports, writing is not yet distinctive. All these branches, it is true, are better developed in the English newspapers but often there is a touch of heaviness about them, the stuffiness of journalists who have to spread themselves thin because they write on too many things—in a language they know well enough but cannot manipulate at will.

If newspapers offer their recruits more, in wages as well as in prospects of an interesting life, then some of the best talent from the universities will move to them. This would be a more hopeful channel than the schools of journalism. Their position has not yet been clearly thought out; their contribution to the press is negligible and their quality dubious.

Journalists, being perhaps too close to the scene, cannot easily determine how much newspapers influence the public's opinion or change the government's. Whatever surveys there have been in India, however, suggest that at least the attention paid by the public to editorial views in the major papers is still flatteringly large. More the pity therefore, that Indian newspapers seem to be paying less and less attention to strengthening their editorial writing and staff. If they are becoming less influential in informing the public and in helping it to make up its mind, then it is, I think, mainly because newspapers are themselves surrendering this function and neglecting their opinion-inducing side.

Why this tendency to surrender and neglect? Partly because the control of Indian newspapers is often in the hands of people who have a variety of other axes to grind; for whom their newspapers are not specially important as revenue gathering instruments. They and, through

them, others exert pressures of several kinds. The pressures are steadily mounting and, to be independent and effective, the Indian newspapers must shake themselves consciously into the attitude of having on their mastheads what Pulitzer had inscribed in the city room of the old New York *World*: "The *World* has no friends."

This will not be easy, newspapers freeing themselves from the influence of industrialists, political parties and politicians. Maybe technological progress will make professionally competent newspapers cheaper to produce than now and so encourage an independence which is indispensable if the Indian press is to rise to the height it is capable of.

This height is not in relation to India only. Travelling abroad, specially in South and East Asia, one cannot fail to be struck by the deep interest in India which her neighbors show. And yet few Indian papers reach those countries and less news about them appears in Indian papers than Indian news in theirs. Up to now the Indian press and All India Radio (a government monopoly) are throwing away a splendid opportunity of increasing their influence in Asia as well as in Africa and the outside world. Very few Indian newspapers have correspondents in South Asian and African countries and cable charges (as the International Press Institute has often complained) are prohibitive. Here are some examples from an I.P.I. study: Tokyo to Delhi 14.2 cents a word; Delhi to Bangkok 9.2 cents a word.

Perhaps I have been able to convey by now that the most exasperating drawback of the Indian press is the want of leadership and imagination; its most difficult problem that of persuading owners (who, especially of the major papers, have many other economic interests) to look fifteen, even ten, years ahead. The American and Indian press probably have a common effigy—the publisher or proprietor. An Indian journalist, prominent in the movement for professional unions, once told me a story about the newly appointed manager (the representative of an industrialist owner) of a newspaper he once worked on. On his first day the new manager was being shown round the news room and saw a teleprinter machine working. It was explained to him that news came in through the machine and was then printed in the paper. "Why," asked that puzzled man, "then do we need so many men to produce this paper?"

If the proprietor were able to understand and lead, then the press would almost certainly come into its heritage, but there are other difficulties as well. Today the Indian press functions in an atmosphere of freedom. The government and the ruling party do try from time to time to exercise indirect pressures; there are occasional complaints from the press about gagging or undue influence. It is also true

that a bureaucracy (particularly at the center) which is used to authority, often fails to recognize the function of the press or understand its purpose. But there are few federal laws about the press, the general law of the land being thought adequate. Compared to Turkey before its recent coup, South Korea, Taiwan or South Viet Nam, the Indian press is wonderfully free. Can anyone guarantee that this will continue to be so? This is one of the imponderables of the world.

Other imponderables are the trend in the pattern of ownership and the growth of the professional conscience. The Press Commission of 1954 found that private owners outnumbered public companies in owning newspapers but the public-company-owned ones were far and away the most important. Some papers were owned by trusts but they, too, made no significant impact on the general pattern where the ownership and control were part of general industrial interests. As long as newspapers are expensive things to start this trend seems likely to persist. Recently a cooperative daily paper started appearing in Madras

but the circumstances in which it was founded were somewhat unusual.

As for the professional conscience, it is neither as firm nor as coherent as it should be—but that is the case in almost every democratic country with a free press. Journalists' organizations in India are, at present, so obsessed by the fight for more wages and better conditions that the crisis in quality leaves them unmoved. The organization of editors seems to have passed into the hands of people from insignificant newspapers, with an inevitable decline in prestige.

There is only one more word to be said. If I should seem to have drawn a picture of unrelieved gloom then it should be instantly forgotten. Imponderables there may be but, looking back only ten years, the pace of change and improvement in the Indian press is amazingly rapid. Whatever I have said in criticism is an integral part of faith in the limitless possibilities of a press in a vast country struggling to fulfill itself in many different ways at the same time.

The Press in Chile - The Rectification Law

By Diane Stanley

The rights of the press in Latin America often depend less on the laws governing the press than on the President's interpretation of the laws. In Chile, notwithstanding a few laws that if enforced could somewhat restrict the press, there is a long and revered tradition of freedom of the press. Nevertheless, the President's ideas on the role the press should play bring to bear subtle changes that can mean either a tightening or loosening of restrictions. Most Chilean newsmen feel President Alessandri is friendlier to the press than was his predecessor Carlos Ibáñez.

Although he had been a near dictator during his first term in the 1920s, President Ibáñez had mellowed considerably by the time he again resumed office in 1952. However, reporters were often faced with news blackouts on government affairs, all radio stations frequently were forced to cede time to government programs and opposition newspapers occasionally had difficulties in obtaining import permits for newsprint. Although President Alessandri remains aloof from reporters, he seems to respect the press more than did Mr. Ibáñez, and though the chief executive may dislike criticism, he has not restricted even the most violent anti-government newspapers.

As appreciative as newsmen are of this friendlier attitude, they are not completely satisfied with Mr. Alessandri. Chilean reporters who are becoming increasingly desirous of regular contact with the President complain that Mr. Alessandri is not available to the press. Pointing out that it would

not be necessary to see the President as often as Mr. Eisenhower sees the White House press corps, reporters nonetheless would like a Presidential press conference at least once every six months. In the two years that Mr. Alessandri has been in power, however, he has never offered a press conference.

Perhaps the most important explanation for this seemingly hostile attitude toward the press is that there is no tradition for Presidential press conference in Chile. Early during his second term in office President Ibáñez twice invited the press in to tea in a gesture that might have evolved into regular Presidential press conferences. However, several reporters asked embarrassingly sharp if not rude questions; a few reporters even offered the President advice on how to run the country. President Ibáñez soon decided he was too busy to see the press, and President Alessandri, no doubt fearing the same treatment, has followed this policy.

Another reason for the President's refusal to see the press can be explained by his "psychology," as one newsmen termed it. The chief executive is a quiet, austere, almost regal man, and he does not care to put himself in a potentially embarrassing situation where he might be offended or questioned closely on a variety of topics. Thus Chilean reporters must content themselves with catching Mr. Alessandri during his five block walk to and from his home and the Presidential Palace. When the President does deign to talk to a reporter, however, he does not respond with

the verbosity or directness that characterize President Truman's morning constitucionals! Occasionally reporters submit written questions to the President, but the answers are usually long in coming (one reporter waited 28 days for three answers) and couched in general terms. Furthermore no one can be sure the President has formulated the answers.

Although some newsmen contend that the President's attitude toward the press is emulated by other high officials in the government, it is generally agreed that access to the ministers and important officeholders is good. However, the usual procedure for the distribution of government news is for reporters to pick up daily bulletins from each of the ministries. Many reporters write their stories from these government handouts. A few reporters with more time or initiative try to see the ministers to supplement and verify the bulletins. However, as was pointed out by Edmond Bannon, editor of *The South Pacific Mail*, the country's only English language newspaper, ministers and other important officials seldom give reporters off-the-record comments. As with Presidential press conferences, there is no real tradition for maintaining the secrecy of off-the-record remarks.

Even if S. E. (Su Excelencia), as he is referred to in the newspapers, will not see the press, it is clear that the President is vitally interested in what is published about the government. Law 425 (Abuses of Publicity) which embodies the country's press laws, provides that persons or institutions which have been misrepresented in a newspaper story may answer or rectify the story within the columns of the offending newspaper. By the law a newspaper must give the rectification, which cannot exceed 200 lines, the same position on the page and type of headlines as that given the newspaper's story. This right also applies to the government, and the Alessandri government uses the right almost daily to rectify stories the government considers erroneous or misleading. Mario Carneyro, editor of the pro-government *Tercera de la Hora*, says President Alessandri believes that only by constantly rectifying erroneous stories will the government educate the public as to which newspapers consistently misrepresent the truth. Of course the government or any private citizen who has been libeled can resort to the courts, but the proceedings are costly and slow, and the fines, which were established in 1925, are ridiculously small due to inflation.

Naturally enough the government's rectifications appear with considerable frequency in those newspapers that oppose the government—the Communist daily *El Siglo* and the Socialist daily *La Última Hora*. Government rectifications also are sent to all other Santiago newspapers whose editors may decide whether they are news. Most of the pro-government newspapers publish only those

rectifications which are particularly important to the government. The rectifications, which are signed by the Secretary General of the government, usually are limited to a discussion of the "erroneous" story. Upon occasion, however, if the Secretary General is especially annoyed, he may add such words as "habitually erroneous and sensational reporting"—all of which the newspaper must publish.

The truth of the matter is that the opposition papers often do publish unfounded if not untrue stories concerning government matters and officials. Nevertheless, the Secretary General often attempts to rectify facts that are correct and worthy of publication. Perhaps the best example of this was an exclusive story published by *La Última Hora* concerning the misappropriation of funds in one of the government departments. The Secretary General vigorously opposed this charge for several days. Later it was admitted that *Última Hora's* charges were well founded.

Whether the government is abusing its right to rectify is a moot question among journalists. Those who represent the opposition newspapers explain, as did Julio Fuentes Molina, political reporter for *El Siglo*, that the government's "insolent rectifications" have only one purpose: to intimidate the opposition. A more objective and perhaps correct analysis was offered by Rafael Otero, reporter for *Prensa Latina*: "The Secretary General is now at the ridiculous point of denying that a minister ate potatoes at a state dinner, as reported, and rectifying that the minister ate carrots. Nobody cares what the minister ate, and nobody bothers to read the constant rectifications."

Upon occasion government officials resort to less apparent but more direct measures to seek press cooperation. At a time when Chile and Argentina were involved in one of their continuous squabbles over ownership of territory at the tip of the continent, the Minister of Foreign Affairs called in all Presidential Palace reporters and requested a stop to the sensational handling of the story. All Santiago newspapers except one honored the request. Luis Hernández Parker, distinguished political analyst for the magazine *Ercilla*, claims government officials often seek—and usually with success—to silence or play down a story. Hernández Parker adds there are several taboos in Chilean journalism: one never attacks the Catholic Church, the armed forces, old and distinguished families and large corporations and banks.

One editor of a pro-government newspaper admitted that the Secretary General, who is a personal friend of the editor's, occasionally asked the editor to stop reporting a particularly sensitive government issue. The editor explained that for friendship's sake he usually agreed. Several journalists were frank to admit that many stories (and not only those dealing with the government) are silenced or given less play because of friendship with a government

official or private citizen. "For the Latins, perhaps more than any other people, loyalty to a friend is taken very seriously, and when a friend requests a favor it is a matter of honor not to refuse him," one reporter explained. In all fairness, however, it must be said that few government officials or persons in private capacities have enough power or influence to silence all of Santiago's dailies.

The President's political affiliation also brings to bear important influences on the press in Chile. Because all but one of Santiago's eight dailies have known political orientation the election of a President immediately establishes which newspaper will be in the opposition camp. Although Mr. Alessandri campaigned as an independent, he was supported by right wing parties. Thus he gained the support of *El Diario Ilustrado* (10,000 circulation)¹ which is owned by wealthy Conservatives. The President also has the support of Santiago's most sober and respected newspaper *El Mercurio* (44,000) which is of Liberal tendencies and allied to the Conservative party. Because the Edwards family, who own *El Mercurio*, also own the afternoon tabloids *Las Últimas Noticias* (24,000) and *La Segunda* (11,000) these two newspapers also are aligned with the government. Soon after his election Mr. Alessandri included the Radical party within his coalition and thus picked up the support of *La Tercera de la Hora* (33,000).

In the opposition are *El Siglo*, (5,000) one of Latin American's best Communist dailies, and *La Última Hora*, (20,000) mouthpiece of the Socialist party whose candidates in the 1958 elections came within 33,000 votes of defeating Mr. Alessandri. The capital's only independent newspaper is *Clarín* (25,000) a crime delighting tabloid that gives murders and scandals far more space than political news. The one newspaper that will always support the President, regardless of political affiliation, is the government-owned *La Nación* (15,000) which after every election gets a new staff of editors and reporters.

La Nación, *El Mercurio* and *El Diario Ilustrado*, called "la prensa seria" or the serious press, pay little attention to sensational news, instead concentrate on a well balanced diet of domestic and foreign (AP and UPI) news. "La prensa chica" or small press (because of the tabloid format) constitute the other five dailies in Santiago. Although *El Siglo* dramatically switched to a larger format the day President Eisenhower arrived last March, it is still considered part of "la prensa chica" because of its sensational handling of news. These five newspapers, for the most part poorly printed and characterized by large red, orange and blue headlines, give little space to foreign news. *El Siglo*, however, through the services of Prensa Latina, keeps its readers well informed (in a biased sort of way) on matters outside of Chile.

Cartoons and columns do not have much acceptance in most Chilean newspapers. All papers sell for a nickel and are sold for the most part by street vendors rather than through home deliveries. Few of Santiago's newspapers sell well throughout the country, and newspapers in other cities throughout the nation, with the possible exception of Valparaíso and Concepción, are not as complete or as vigorous as those in the capital.

Among the many magazines published (the majority cater to women, children and teen-agers) only three deserve mention. *Ercilla*, (29,000) a 30 page weekly news magazine which carries two or three articles of current national or international interest and an incisive, objective analysis of the week's political events in Chile, is one of the best magazines of its kind in Latin America. *Zig-Zag* (5,000) is a small weekly magazine that carries a variety of feature articles that are well written and accurate. *Topaze*, (7,000) a 20 page weekly, carries superb cartoons that poke cruel fun at the government and just about anyone else that comes under the editor's scrutiny. When President Eisenhower visited Chile *Topaze* ran a two panel cartoon showing "Ike as he sees us." The Chileans were depicted as bars of copper. The other panel showed "Ike as he see him." Mr. Eisenhower was shown as a large dollar sign. Ruben Azócar, editor of the humor magazine, proudly told me that Adlai Stevenson, who was in Chile this spring, confided that no such magazine existed or could exist in the United States.

The presence of an acknowledged government newspaper presents the question of whether the government gives the paper any preference in government news. Newsmen connected with the opposition papers contend that *La Nación*, because of better connections within the government, does get some preference, particularly in economic affairs. Marcos Chamudez, editor of *La Nación*, flatly denies the charge, and explains, "For me it is a matter of honor to publish a government story until at least one other newspaper has it." Most newsmen agree that *La Nación* does follow this policy. If *La Nación* frequently carries more complete government news it is only because it is to the government's own interest.

An overwhelming majority of newsmen with whom I spoke believe, for one reason or another, that the Government should get out of the newspaper business. One editor explained that under President Alessandri *La Nación* receives no news preference, but under another President the paper might get special consideration. Another reporter explained that *La Nación* is superfluous because there is no paper that refuses to report government news. Raúl Silva Castro, dour literary columnist for *El Mercurio*, contends it is not right for a newspaper to pay its reporters to report only one version of all government news.

A few newsmen, however, believe a government newspaper has a place in the nation's press. One journalist explained that the government is as entitled as any political party to have its own newspaper, and that the government should have a vehicle to the public. Another newsmen astutely observed that if the government were to sell *La Nación* other newspapers would come under increasing pressure from the government to report government news favorably. As it stands now, the reporter added, it is public knowledge which newspaper interprets the government's policies most correctly.

Nevertheless, no one will deny that *La Nación* is given preference in regard to government advertising. Furthermore because *La Nación* is the government newspaper, businessmen, who for political reasons prefer to advertise in the government paper, also give preference to *La Nación*. In fact most of the pro-government newspapers receive considerably more advertising than do the anti-government papers. This is true not only because of political reasons but also because newspapers like *El Mercurio* and *El Diario Ilustrado* reach a more affluent market.

How influential the big advertisers are is difficult to assess. Newsmen who will talk frankly admit that the most notorious influence is that exerted by sports promoters. Frequently before important soccer games newspapers receive what are known as "paquetes" or packages which pay for a story, even to its position on the page and type of headline. Movie advertisers also contribute to most newspapers for favorable reviews. Big advertisers like Coca-Cola, Panagra and Esso Standard Oil do not exert frequent pressure, the newspapers in which they advertise are pro-government, pro-U.S. and likely to attack "foreign trusts." However, when a train operated by the Braden Copper Company derailed and killed 25 persons even *La Nación* implied there had been some negligence on the part of the company.

Advertising and straight news are beginning to merge in the Chilean press through a new phenomenon—public relations. Because newsmen are so poorly paid (salaries begin at about \$60 a month) most journalists are forced to hold down two and sometimes three jobs. Increasingly large numbers of reporters are being employed by public relations firms, many of which are operated by the government. Caught between the demands of two employers, the reporters's loyalty is seriously divided. Frequently the public relations handout ends up with the columns of the newspaper.

Whether persons who work in public relations firms should be considered journalists has caused considerable controversy in Santiago. The subject has become even more polemical as the College of Journalists increases in size and importance. The College, which establishes that all

journalists must be accredited to obtain employment in any of the communication media, maintains that all persons who regularly prepare, write or illustrate news are eligible for membership. Until now this has included public relations employees, but many journalists do not believe membership should be extended to them. The argument is still being waged, but the chances are that public relations employees will remain within the College.

The College of Journalists, signed into law by President Ibáñez in 1956, is a legal entity that most Chilean journalists are immensely proud of. In many ways like the American Medical Association, the College, which operates through regional councils throughout the country, was founded to "guard the progress, prestige and prerogatives of the profession of journalism while maintaining professional discipline and offering protection for journalists." Within this broad range of powers the College does everything from setting wage scales to suspending fellow members who have been guilty of writing or broadcasting libelous material, retouching photographs, etc. Suspension usually is for only six months, but the College has the power to suspend a journalist permanently.

Although none of the journalists with whom I spoke believes the College could restrict the free exercise of the press, Raúl Silva Castro, one of the few journalists opposed to the organization, explained that the College was founded on a false analogy. "The College of Lawyers was established so that an aggrieved client might seek redress of unethical practices. In journalism, however, there is no such relationship as that between lawyer and client. Nevertheless if a person is libeled or misrepresented, he may seek justice either through the courts or through his right to rectify." Most journalists agree, however, that the College was founded primarily to improve Chilean journalism through positive measures and not through censoring or even suspending fellow members.

With this goal in mind the authors of the charter must be members of the College. To qualify one must meet certain requirements, the most important being a degree from an accredited school of journalism. However, the authors of the charter were realistic enough to know the impossibility of demanding that all members hold journalism degrees. Thus persons without a degree may be accredited temporarily for a period of two years, but at the same time, any person who has worked as a journalist for two years is eligible for permanent membership. Although newspapers are to be fined \$50 a month for every unaffiliated member, the College is not yet powerful enough to demand payment of these fines.

It is doubtful that the College will ever reach its goal of having all journalists accredited. Some journalists—refuse to organize, and certainly the nation's publishers—

vastly powerful in political and economic matters—will never allow any organization to dictate their choice of personnel. Nevertheless the College is growing in strength and importance. In time it probably will go far in improving the quality of Chilean journalism. And there is need for improvement.

Because most Chilean journalists are self-taught and because the school of experience has not always been the best teacher, some reporters persist in violating the most basic rules of news writing. Perhaps the most obvious is the use of redundant, overwritten articles that describe events in chronological fashion. Reporters of several newspapers, particularly *El Mercurio*, seem never to have heard of a lead paragraph that contains the proverbial five w's. Another basic violation is the frequent inaccuracy of facts and figures and the misspelling of names. The nation's two schools of journalism at the University of Chile and the University of Concepción are doing much to eradicate these mechanical errors.

But the quality most lacking in Chilean journalism is the desire and initiative to go after a story in all its possibilities and complexities. There are several explanations for this phenomenon; perhaps the most important is economic. Burdened with two or three jobs, Chilean reporters do not have the necessary time to cover all stories completely. Furthermore some reporters feel their scanty salaries pay only enough to get the gist of a story and that any extra work would not be compensated for materially.

Another explanation is that Chilean reporters seem to feel no deep loyalty to their newspapers. This may be because newsmen do have two or three employers, but also because many journalists do not identify themselves with their newspapers. This is often due to the political orientation that each newspaper espouses and that every reporter must abide by, but frequently, even if the reporter's political views are similar to those of his newspaper he is disturbed and frustrated by having to impose these ideas—and thereby often distorting the truth—on the stories he writes. In short he feels no real respect for the newspaper that demands his complicity, and ends up by saying, as one reporter bitterly told me, "As a messenger for the people I cannot do them justice. I have worked on six of Santiago's newspapers and on none of them could I write the truth."

Furthermore the average reporter has far less money, education or social standing than his editor or publisher. This deep socio-economic gulf, which means that the reporter seldom has any contact with the publisher or even the editor, brings about deep rapport with fellow colleagues on other newspapers who are in similar circumstances. They are a close, amicable group where professional competi-

tion does not enter with any great degree. Indeed this friendship and lack of competition leads reporters to pool good tips and information among themselves rather than to scoop a fellow reporter.

All these factors combine in such a way that the content of most newspapers, except for political orientation, sounds amazingly similar. Except for an occasional scoop (and usually of a scandalous nature published by a tabloid) there is little variation in news content. One gets the impression that all reporters heard about a story at the same time, got the same eye-witness account, interviewed the same persons and ended up with the same information.

How much the School of Journalism of the University of Chile can do to instill new vigor in the country's journalism remains to be seen. Although many journalists voice doubts about the school, a majority believe it can go far in improving the quality of the nation's journalists. Housed in a striking, modernistic building, the school is sadly lacking in funds. There are facilities for a printing press, but no press. The professors—and they all are working journalists, many of them capable and distinguished—receive no pay.

Until this year the four year program offered a maximum of technical journalism courses which were, for the most part, theoretical as the school has no printing, radio or photographic equipment. Under the able direction of Ramón Cortéz, dean of the school and a former student at the University of Minnesota School of Journalism, the school now requires a big dose of liberal arts courses during the freshman and sophomore years. The last two years are devoted almost exclusively to technical journalism courses. Certainly graduates of this school, and more than 70 have graduated, because of their university training can demand better salaries which may in turn make it unnecessary to hold more than one job. Once this is accomplished Chilean journalism can give all of their training, time and loyalty to their newspapers.

Because there is no organization in Chile that investigates and publishes circulation figures for the nation's newspapers and magazines, circulation figures are dependent on publishers' claims. The figures I have used are the results of a careful study made by a senior at the University of Chile of Journalism. Several newsmen indicated, however, that *El Diario Ilustrado's* circulation might be as high as 40,000, and that *El Mercurio* and *Clarín* might both be close to 80,000 circulation.

Diane Stanley, born in Guatemala, a graduate of the University of Missouri journalism school, is an editorial researcher in the Latin American section of *Time* magazine. She recently spent ten months in Chile on a Fulbright grant, to study the Chilean press.

Our Dangerous Gap in Communication

By John Hulteng

THE TWO CULTURES AND THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION. By C. P. Snow; Cambridge University Press, New York; 1959, 54 pages, \$1.75.

This little volume (54 small pages, the text of the 1959 Rede Lecture at Cambridge University) takes only a single, uninterrupted hour to read, but its theme is likely to trouble your thinking for a hundred hours to come.

Its author is a novelist educated as a scientist. And his thesis is that the "intellectual life of the whole of Western society is increasingly being split into two polar groups"—the literary intellectuals and the men of science. Across the gulf the two can no longer communicate, cannot manage a frozen smile of polite recognition.

His documentation for the thesis is precise and pungent. There's the scientist who warily confesses, "Well, I've *tried* a bit of Dickens." And the literary cocktail party where none of the intellectuals on deck can describe the Second Law of Thermodynamics, "which is about the scientific equivalent of: 'Have you read a work of Shakespeare's?'"

And Snow's estimate of the gravity of this lack of communication is chilling.

"The clashing point of two subjects, two cultures . . . ought to produce creative chances. In the history of mental activity that has been where some of the breakthroughs came. The chances are there now. But they are there, as it were, in a vacuum, because those in the two cultures can't talk to each other."

This picture of chances lost is bad enough. But there is a more immediate danger.

Because our two cultures can't communicate, we in the West can't grasp the challenges and opportunities presented by the onrushing scientific and industrial revolutions. We can't move, argues Sir Charles, to guide the advance of these revolutions into the great underdeveloped regions of the world. But our Soviet opponents can move, and will if we don't.

"It is technically possible to carry out the scientific revolution in India, Africa,

South-East Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, within fifty years. There is no excuse for Western man not to know this. And not to know that this is the one way out through the three menaces which stand in our way—H-bomb war, overpopulation, the gap between the rich and the poor."

We haven't grasped this basic truth of our times because two of the most significant elements of our society can't communicate with each other. And the points at which the effort to restore contact ought to begin include education, for the long pull, and the media of mass communications for more immediate results.

"Isn't it time we began? The danger is, we have been brought up to think as though we had all the time in the world. We have very little time. So little that I dare not guess at it."

It's worth the uninterrupted hour to consider Snow's message in full.

The American Course

By Chanchal Sarkar

THE PURPOSE OF AMERICAN POLITICS. By Hans J. Morgenthau. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1960, 359 pp., \$5.00.

Professor Morgenthau's break-down of the purpose of American politics hangs very much on his own definition of that purpose, which is equality in freedom. This limits in no way the value of his discussion. Scholars might want to cross-examine him on his rationalizations of particular periods of American history, but his definition provides a convenient set of coordinates for plotting the graph of the politics and policy of a country that has had, in its history, phases of an almost irresistible impulse to retire into its shell and has now grown to be a gigantically powerful nation, unable to ignore the world.

In the hard world of Realpolitik his definition may seem a trifle idealistic, even romantic, but Prof. Morgenthau is unlikely to be apologetic as he sincerely

wants the United States to do much, much more than out-produce the Soviet Union; he would like to see it fulfil its true purpose by helping to establish equality in freedom not in America only but also in international society.

They work very well, Prof. Morgenthau's coordinates, in assessing the social and political evolution of America from the Declaration of Independence down to the New Deal and even to World War II. So skillfully does he marshal instances and arguments that almost all the principal trends and movements in the United States during that period are fitted into the picture of an America striving for its purpose, deviating from it and finding new ways of getting back on course. The penetration into the virgin depths of the continent, for instance, the absorption of wave upon wave of immigrants, the growth of vertical mobility when frontiers could be pushed no further—up to the crisis generated by the concentration of economic power and its malign culmination, the crash of 1929, eased finally by the salve of the New Deal. But only after the earlier Roosevelt and after Woodrow Wilson, whose "political thought . . . brought forth with unexcelled lucidity the necessary relationship between the restoration of the American purpose and social reform."

And so, mercilessly telescoping the contents of a book where many ideas and judgments jostle, we come upon the post-war age with the landscape changed beyond recognition. Prof. Morgenthau describes the shaky start, in 1947, of a foreign policy that begins at last to recognize, however dimly, the outlines of new responsibilities and challenges.

Prof. Morgenthau's great advantage is that, as a scholar and citizen already mature when he chose the United States as his country, he can look at it from within and also with the critical objectivity of an outsider. So he knows where the foundations, emotional and social, are weak. The catastrophic betrayal of the American purpose which McCarthyism represented, for instance; the islands of excellence set in a sea of mediocrity; the unfortunate dragweights of majoritarianism and conformity; the growth of bureaucratic feudalism; and the economic power of trade unions.

In speaking of the future Prof. Morgenthau's sense of certitude lifts. But discussing what the purpose of American politics ought to be—and not what it has been—he reaches perhaps the most valuable stretch of the book. He points out that the very standards of measurement have changed: “. . . The traditional relationship between domestic and international issues has been reversed: The paramount issues that put our ability to achieve the national purpose to the decisive test are no longer economic and social ones but concern the political organization of the world. We find ourselves today in an intermediate stage; the old domestic issues have lost their urgency and we have yet to become fully aware of the urgency of the new international ones. When we are so aware, the great political debates and decisions of the future will deal with the relations between America and the world.”

It is no fault of Prof. Morgenthau's that in describing the nature and the implications of America's new role in the association of the world's nations, he has no blue-print but only a list of environmental conditions that must be overcome and some guarded guesses about possible future developments. But who can be sanguine about the future. He speaks in the accents of liberalism, deriding not the conservatism of having a system of checks and balances (which, he says, are a universal principle for all pluralist societies) but the conservative view of vested interests that are out always to maintain the status quo. If the accents are liberal the language is of democratic socialism but the vocabulary is carefully American, taking care not to ruffle the sensibilities of a country where, too often, socialism=curbs on private economic initiative and therefore=totalitarianism=Communism.

Not unsurprisingly, Prof. Morgenthau has no formula for success except the fortuitous one of Presidential leadership. If this seems a somewhat wistful plea to a reader unversed in American political history, it is of small importance. For in *The Purpose of American Politics*, Prof. Morgenthau has written an important book, though not everywhere easy to read, which induces a recasting of perspectives.

Our Industrializing World

By John A. Loftus

INDUSTRIALISM AND INDUSTRIAL MAN, The Problems of Labor and Management in Economic Growth. By Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick Harbison, and Charles A. Myers. Harvard University Press. 331 pp. \$6.00.

Although the industrial society entered our world a century and a half ago, only recently have we become aware that the “patent rights” closely held by a few countries have run out. We are constantly confronted with the transformation of Russia from an agricultural to an industrial society. Russia just happens to be an obvious example. If you listen closely you will hear the wheels beginning to turn in the remote backwoods of every continent. The bushman, scarcely a generation removed from head-hunting, is driving a truck. What route is he going to take? Who will set the work rules and the pace? Industrial managers and labor leaders like ours? Intellectual revolutionaries like Russia's and China's? Nationalist leaders like Egypt's? A dynastic elite like Japan's?

Marx was sure that the way to an industrial society, in which the worker shared fairly in the product of his toil, was through capitalism to revolution. He has been proved wrong on more than one count. Russia was never Marx's idea of the starting place for his revolution. Americans tend to think that if the nations now on the march to industrialization do not accept our system they will necessarily accept Russia's, or have it forced upon them. Not so, say the authors. There are many roads to the industrial society. What works well here is not necessarily the best for some sub-Saharan country. We have already tried to export some of our institutions and found that foreigners could not use them.

Take the free labor unions of the United States. Our labor leaders seem convinced that industrial workers anywhere who are willing to settle for a union-management system different from ours are to be pitied or treated with contempt. This, one gathers from the book, is unrealistic.

Labor unions in the older industrial so-

cieties of the West are essentially protest organizations. But, the authors remind us, it is a long time since workers smashed their machines because they loomed as threats to men's livelihoods. Instead, people throughout the world are banging at the factory gates to get in. They are clamoring to industrialize. Protest has crested and is on the decline. Worker organizations will be more controlled than ours and, for them, that may be the rational course. Sneering at them is irrelevant. What we can do is to try to understand their problems and show them where they are heading if, under certain circumstances, they adopt such and such a course. That would be more tension-reducing than trying to impose private enterprise in a new country where capital formation has to be undertaken by the government or it won't get done at all.

That's what this book is all about.

What kind of world do the four authors see ahead? They are cautiously optimistic “As the conflict of ideologies is blunted and fades between societies, so also consensus develops within such societies as industrialize successfully,” they believe. “The labor force becomes committed to and settled into industrial life. It accepts the pace of work, the web of rules, the surrounding structure. The sense of protest subsides. The enterprise managers, left to their own devices, push less hard. Society provides more of the amenities of life. Men learn from experience how better to do things and the rough edges are evened off. Industrialization has been accepted. . . .

“The world will be for the first time a totally literate world. It will be an organization society, but it need not be peopled by ‘organization’ men whose total lives are ruled by their occupational roles. . . . Social systems will be reasonably uniform around the world as compared with today's situation; but there may be substantial diversity within geographical and cultural areas as men and groups seek to establish and maintain their identity. The difference will be between and among individuals and groups and subcultures rather than between and among

the major geographical areas of the world. Society at large may become more like the great metropolitan complexes of Paris or London or New York or Tokyo, urbanized and committed to the industrial way of life, but marked by infinite variety in its details."

This book is the fruit of a tremendously ambitious project. It should be understood that these four authors are not crystal globsters who simply cerebrated from lofty eminences at the University of California, Harvard, Princeton, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The

backbone of the project was the field work performed by scholars, American and foreign, under the direction of the four men who themselves did considerable traveling and interviewing. An essential specie of cooperation came from the Ford Foundation.

The book suffers a bit from unevenness. It could do with some editing for this and other reasons. The residue of economic jargon is digestible for those who care, and many should care. This could be one of the important and influential books of our time.

The Atomic Bomb Story

By Robert P. Clark

NO HIGH GROUND. By Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey, II. Harper & Brothers. 272 pp. \$4.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 6—The United States published today for the first time pictures of atomic bombs of the types dropped on Japan in 1945.

...

These pictures, recently pried out of official Washington 15 years after the awful event, came too late for Fletcher Knebel's and Charles "Chuck" Bailey's book. (It does have some other pictures.) But no matter.

The two Washington reporters, bureau men of the Cowles Publications, have used the journalist's stock in trade—words—to create an intensely dramatic and vivid story of how atomic destruction was born.

There is much more to the story—and to the book—than that morning over Hiroshima when "the world went purple in a flash" and Capt. Robert A. Lewis, co-pilot of the Enola Gay, uttered his now-famous "My God, what have we done?"

Knebel and Bailey probe into the ill-fated, behind-the-scenes efforts of Japanese and American diplomats in Europe to end the war in the early summer of 1945.

The writers summarize the efforts of troubled scientists, after the war in Germany had ended, to persuade Washington that atomic bombs might not be needed over Japan—that perhaps a demonstra-

tion should be given first, accompanied by a chance for Japan to surrender. Other scientists, and thoughtful men like Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, felt only direct military use would bring an early end to the war.

The grisly effects of the bombing are graphically told. Nothing was left of victims close to the burst "except their shadows. . . . Many people were picking tiny shards of glass from their eyes weeks afterward . . . or trying to wash out bits of sand and grit driven under their eyelids."

There is much more: the ultra-rigid security in the "Manhattan Engineer District"; something of the Oppenheimer case; the training of bomber crews for a strange, untold mission; the transport of fissionable material aboard the *Indianapolis*, which was torpedoed and sunk four days after it delivered its vital cargo to Tinian.

Knebel and Bailey obtained access to documents apparently not made available before, and in foreword they protest the Army's refusal to release certain others.

It would seem that practically all information on this most important project, which is now history and whose bombs are obsolete, should be made public.

Although much of the atomic bomb story has been told elsewhere, most other accounts deal with specific parts of the story. This is a graphic account that covers a great deal of ground. It is a fine reporting job.

Great Editors

At the end of November the New York *Herald Tribune* began a series in its Sunday edition on distinguished American newspaper editors. The first three of these were all done by former Nieman Fellows. The first was by Edwin A. Lahey on John Knight, publisher of the Knight papers. The second was by Sylvan Meyer on Ralph McGill, publisher of the *Atlanta Constitution*. The third was by Malcolm Bauer on Charles Sprague, publisher of the *Oregon Statesman* of Salem. Lahey is the Washington bureau chief of the Knight papers. Meyer is editor of the Gainesville (Ga.) *Times*. Bauer is associate editor of the *Portland Oregonian*.

Lahey was in the first group of Nieman Fellows (1939); Meyer and Bauer held their fellowships the same year as Dwight Sargent, editorial page editor of the *Herald Tribune* (1952).

Need More Informed Press

Improvement of the democratic process requires a constantly better-informed public. Mass circulation periodicals have opportunities beyond their current performance. Television, although it has improved, can do better still in communicating serious ideas. In far too many communities newspapers are inadequate in their coverage of significant public affairs. The problem of interesting and informing mass audiences, which most media must serve, is a constant challenge. The American people remain among the best informed in the world, but their sources of information must steadily be enriched to cope with ever more complex problems.

—PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON NATIONAL GOALS, NOV. 28.

Lindstrom's Criticism of the Press

Reviews

By Thomas Pugh

THE FADING AMERICAN NEWSPAPER. By Carl E. Lindstrom. Doubleday & Co., Inc. 283 pp. \$3.95.

In April, 1958, Carl Lindstrom, managing editor of the *Hartford Times*, writing in the *American Editor*, expressed heartbreak that "many small city dailies seem to prosper on mis- mal- and non-feasance in their obligations to the community."

By January, 1959, the *Times*, a Gannett chain property, had disassociated itself not only from the editorial but also from its editor, who took a job teaching journalism at the University of Michigan.

The Fading American Newspaper is Professor Lindstrom's commentary on "the prevailing character of the American press." The dust jacket inaccurately states that the book "talks plainly to the general newspaper reader, telling him what he is *not* getting for his money." It is plainly aimed at editors and publishers who are worried about the flight of readers and advertisers to television.

Unfortunately Professor Lindstrom has not discovered a panacea which can be tacked up on newsroom bulletin boards. He does, however, offer a compendium of the "mis- mal- and non-feasance" which he is convinced must cease if news-

papers are to stay in journalism, yet alone in business.

Here are some of the judgments he makes:

"A man no longer needs to read a daily newspaper to be well-informed."

"The exceptional newspapers are so few and so weighted geographically as to be conspicuous to the point of irritation."

The editor "has retreated to the citadel of local news, a noble fortress which may save his life—yet awhile; but this is at the cost of having made the American press the most parochial in the world, at a time when the United States is in a position of free world leadership."

"The press has made the clock a deadly enemy. This mesmerism is responsible for most newspaper costs, in terms of manpower, machinery, and communications. . . It is an illusion that news is only *now*."

"College professors (at least those surveyed at Michigan) are convinced that news writers are a group beaten down and compelled to write in journalistic style; that journalism suppresses creative talent; that the work brings beggar's pay; that circulation is the end aim of newspaper policy; that journalism is 'the lowest form of writing'; that newspapers have lost whatever prestige they may have had; that radio and television are infinitely more influential; that the press merely con-

firms prejudices; that newspapers yield to infinite pressures from such organizations as the American Legion, Chambers of Commerce, and religious groups; that news is slanted by advertising interests; that newspapers have no regard for the right of privacy and are only superficially and selfishly concerned about freedom of the press."

"The editorial page is dying by self-immolation. . . . The supposition that one can balance off various opinions against each other or purchase gift-wrapped views contrasting with the policy of the paper (if it has a policy) is a delusion, because most of the columnists are nearly as reactionary or as timid as the press itself."

"This is the era of good will. Its sun began to rise about the time personal journalism ended. In those days there were no guessing games, no beauty contests, no youth derbies, no community sings nor any of the manifold events called 'promotions in the interest of public service'—as though these were public services more important than providing readers with news."

Professor Lindstrom goes on and on. By the time he finishes he has made everybody mad. If his thesis is correct, nothing important will be done about the problem until some Edward R. Murrow produces a documentary.

Letter To A Young Journalist From His Father

By Barry Bingham

Dear Worth: As a young man in the early years of a newspaper career, I think you ought to expose yourself to a book called *The Fading American Newspaper*. You have already been around news rooms long enough for some of the writer's points to make you good and angry. But such anger can be a healthy thing, so long as it is not blindly defensive.

The book is by Carl Lindstrom, a professor of journalism at the University of Michigan. His strictures on the American press cannot be dismissed as the mouth-

ings of an egg-head theorist, however. Nor can they be brushed off as the work of an uninformed layman, as happened in the case of the *Report on Freedom of the Press* authored by the Hutchins Commission. Lindstrom is a newspaper man to the core. For years he was executive editor of the *Hartford Times*, an active and widely respected member of the profession.

His message is one that young journalists would do especially well to ponder. He tells us that the newspaper is not necessarily here to stay. "Electronic and film transmission of news, even new print-

ing methods are leaving it behind, and it is entirely possible in the not so remote future that it will go the way of the street car."

A Kind Of Shock Treatment

That statement is guaranteed to make newspaper people hot under the collar. No doubt he aimed to produce that effect. He is like a psychiatrist administering shock treatment, in an effort to shake up the mental pattern of a patient whose thinking has fallen into a dangerous rut.

Lindstrom notes that "journalism, the recorder of change, has feared change as if it

meant death." He argues that without deep-piercing change, the press may fade and die. He tells us that "indignation has an exceedingly low boiling point in editorial offices when the press critics start shooting." Then he begins to shoot.

He aims his shafts directly at some of the sacred cows of journalism. He deplores the familiar "pyramid lead" on a news story, the old demand to tell the what, where, when and why in the first sentences. He is scathing about the traditional display headline: "It makes correct quotation almost an impossibility; it accounts for most of the misconstructions and distortions; it offends intelligence and rips the envelope of context; it is a constant libel risk."

You can judge from these samples the nature of the fire and brimstone Lindstrom heaps on our heads. But he is not merely being a fuss-budget. He is making a salient point that the American newspaper is dangerously resistant to change in a changing world. He submits that the press itself has not recognized the movement from violent street-sales competition to "home delivery journalism," which is the order of the day in Louisville and in most American cities. He finds no sense in competing press services that will "run the risk of hypothecating accuracy to get there first even if with the least. Rivalry of this kind is old fashioned and amusing."

He is interesting on such matters as run-of-paper color: "It is a mistake to embark upon competition in which you cannot possibly win, unless the issue is liberty, patriotism, or moral principles." He makes a valid criticism of education reporting: "The progressive movement crested and subsided, and all during this critical period newspapers in general never took it upon themselves to go into the classroom and find out what was going on."

I like his statement that "the press, along with other printed matter, is the last bulwark of the language." That's why I think we have to strive for a more exact and meticulous use of language than 99 per cent of our readers would ever attempt. I like his quoting Franklin P. Adams that "nothing is too good for the newspaper." This is no pat on our professional backs. It is a way of demolishing the excuse that serious criticism of the arts, a liberal use of foreign news, and

adult writing are not feasible because they are over the heads of newspaper readers. I like his stressing the old saw: "Never underestimate the reader's intelligence, or overestimate his information."

Sometimes Lindstrom overstates his case, perhaps deliberately in order to stir up the sluggish animals of the profession. He is telling wholesome truth when he warns that newspaper circulation, while it is growing, is not gaining nearly as fast as the population of the country. He is being provocative without supporting evidence when he declares that "television is learning by its mistakes much faster than newspapers."

Old News-Room Prejudice

Some of his assertions make me long to sit down with him in one of those bull sessions dear to the hearts of newspapermen.

For instance, I find no justification in any poll of readership for his assertion that "women probably read editorial pages more than men do." I think he woefully oversimplifies the issue when he announces that "the crusading newspaper is not a money-maker, and this discovery profoundly changed journalism." Here he seems to be falling into the easy cynicism which is one of the journalistic traits he excoriates. I suspect him of an old news-room prejudice against editorial writers and their "Ivory Tower pallor."

You may disagree, as I do, with many other charges that flow from his typewriter. But Lindstrom is indisputably on the side of the angels. He is for better writing, higher standards of taste, more alert responsibility, a faster response to changing conditions which could save us from the fate of the mastodon (or the street car).

He writes in language that newspaper people understand and respect, though he is not immune to an occasional fancy word such as "hiodernal." (I had to look it up. It means "of the day.") He makes me seethe and want to talk back, but he also makes me want to do a better job, if only to prove him wrong in some of his nettling charges. I am in whole-hearted agreement with his conclusion that "the way to meet competition is not to cheapen the product. The way to meet it is to make the product better."

Your affectionate

FATHER.

OUR REVIEWERS

Book reviews in this issue are by: Chanchal Sarkar, assistant editor, *The Statesman*, Delhi; Thomas Pugh, assistant city editor, *Peoria Star*; Robert P. Clark, science writer, *Louisville Courier-Journal*; Joseph A. Loftus, Washington bureau, *New York Times*; John Hulteng, professor, journalism school, University of Oregon; and Barry Bingham, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, whose review is lifted, with admiration, from his paper. The first four listed are currently Nieman Fellows. Hulteng was in 1950.

Disaster in Fleet Street

The death in one day of two London newspapers, the *News Chronicle* and the *Star*, has dealt a blow to church life in this country. Both belonged to the Cadburys, the chocolate manufacturing Quaker family of the Midlands, and had long been regarded as organs of the Non-conformist conscience. The *News Chronicle*, a national morning newspaper, circulated from John O'Groats to Land's End, top to toe in Britain. On the day of its death its daily paid sales amounted to just over 1,100,000 copies. Its stablemate, the *Star*, was an evening paper whose circulation of 750,000 was confined mainly to Greater London.

George Cadbury, who bought the two papers about 60 years ago, used money that he would otherwise have given to charity to keep them alive so that he might fight for the causes of social reform dear to his heart. Though both were essentially "popular" papers, the *News Chronicle* was never in any sense a tabloid; it never forgot that it had been founded 115 years ago by Charles Dickens.

The *News Chronicle* was the only popular paper in Fleet street that had a church affairs correspondent on its staff. One of the greatest in a long line was Hugh Red-

wood, an Anglican lay preacher who in the '30s wrote *God in the Slums*, a best seller which changed for Britons their brand image of the Salvation Army. Another was Mudie Smith, whose census of churchgoing in Greater London, conducted in 1906, established that on any Sunday only 20 per cent of the population would be in church. The tradition of its religion reporting which this correspondent inherited when he took over from Redwood six years ago (Redwood retired then but is still very much alive) was ecumenical, liberal and tolerant. Now it has gone, and the reader of the mass press will find little about the churches except news characterized by the three S's—Schism, Smut and Scandal, of chapels disputing over bingo, of curates eloping with choir girls, and of lessons about sex in Sunday schools.

Aside from the churches, the political world has also suffered from the disappearance of the two papers. The reviving Liberal Party, which hopes to challenge both the government and the opposition at the next general election, suddenly finds itself bereft of its one popular organ. The situation now is that Labor has two papers, the semiofficial but technically independent *Daily Herald*, owned by a huge printing combine, and the tabloid *Daily Mirror*, erratic and unpredictable in its Labor allegiance. The Conservatives, however, are served from London by six mornings: the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Sketch*, the *Daily Express*, the *Financial Times*, and of course by Establishment's sacred cow, the *Times*. Instead of three, there are now two evening papers in London and both are Conservative—the *Evening News* and the *Evening Standard*.

More than 3000 newspapermen let out by the suspension of publications are scrambling for jobs in Fleet street, while the total number of people left without work—printers, packers, accountants, stenographers, messengers, cleaners, advertising salesmen, van drivers and what have you—reaches to around 3,500.

There was only one word in the minds of newspapermen on the night that the *News Chronicle* and the *Star* folded: Ich-abod, the glory has faded.

The Christian Century
November 16

How Robust is Fleet Street's State of Health?

By Jay Axelbank

While foreign correspondents in London can still read 9 daily newspapers with their morning coffee—9 if you include the *Daily Worker* and the *Financial Times*—many journalists and intellectuals felt the Oct. 17 death of the *News Chronicle*, with a circulation of more than 2,000,000, was far more important than the lopping off of Britain's 10th newspaper, the evening *Star*.

Ever since Charles Dickens edited the *News*, ancestor of the *News Chronicle*, the newspaper had a serious tone, a moral conviction to "lead" and in recent years its editorial views reflected Liberal Party policies.

The death of the paper—along with the *Star* and following closely on the heels of the merger of the *Sunday Empire News* with the monster, sensational *News of the World*—caused grief among conservative newspapers like the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Times*.

With the decline in Labor Party fortunes, it is the feeling of conservative segments of opinion in this sportsmanlike nation that an effective opposition to the reigning Tories is becoming increasingly feeble. A greater opposition role for the Liberal Party is envisioned but the loss of a mouthpiece like the *News Chronicle* is bound to be felt.

The news of the merger caused Liberal Party MP Jeremy Thorpe to shout "disgrace."

He charged that Liberal Party leaders had a vital interest in both the *News Chronicle* and *Star* and yet were not asked to intervene to prevent their destruction.

But L. J. Cadbury, chairman of the Daily News Ltd., which published the *News Chronicle*, pointed to the fact that the newspaper had been in ill health for years and that Liberal Party offers to save the paper were too meagre.

The fact that the *News Chronicle* was merged with the *Daily Mail*—a Conservative Party newspaper—and not saved somehow by a Liberal Party syndicate, caused the left-leaning *New Statesman* to declare that never had a newspaper "been buried so cynically."

Chagrin came also from the more than 3,000 editorial and non-editorial personnel who—like so many of their brother journalists in the U.S.—found themselves out of jobs as the result of a newspaper merger.

Jim Bradley of the National Union of Journalists described *News Chronicle* terms of one week's pay for every year of service "one of the worst" ever made in the closing down of a publication.

For many, the death of the *News Chronicle* was a sentimental shock. "It will hurt the newspaper industry for some time to come," said the liberal *Guardian* in an editorial entitled, "Need Newspapers Die?"

"It was the spirit of Dickens, Forster, Lucy and Gardiner which animated it to the end," said the *Times*.

Alligator in its Time

Ironically, the *News Chronicle*—the victim of a gobble-up—had been an alligator in its time. The original *News* had swallowed the *Morning Leader*, *Westminster Gazette*, *Daily Chronicle* and *Daily Dispatch*.

Now the *News Chronicle* continues to "breathe" slightly under the masthead of the *Daily Mail*, much as the *Sun* lives on in the New York *World-Telegram & Sun*. But how long the *Daily Mail* will continue to bill itself as incorporating the *News Chronicle* is difficult to say.

As far as editorial views are concerned and the extent to which the *Mail* might accommodate the more leftish, liberal views of the *News Chronicle*, *Daily Mail* owner Lord Rothermere said:

"Life is full of compromises but in this case I don't think it will be necessary."

Besides, he added, the *Daily Mail* has pursued a liberal and progressive policy for a number of years and intended to keep pursuing it.

Lord Rothermere, who appeared on a television panel shortly after the *News Chronicle* breathed its last, said competition in Fleet Street was fierce—"fiercer in Fleet Street, I suppose, than any other form of life and this is a very anxious time for all those interested in the production of newspapers."

Like the U.S., newspapers have come upon hard times in Great Britain. The reasons:

1—Advertisers are more and more concentrating their efforts on the top quality and top circulation newspapers such as the *Times* or *Daily Express*.

2—The higher cost of materials such as newsprint and wages.

3—Few technological changes which would permit cheaper or easier publishing of a mass circulation newspaper.

4—Dog eat dog competition for circulation, upon which the papers depend to a far greater extent than their American counterparts.

The *Sunday News of the World*, for example, sells approximately 9,000,000 on an average day. And it is only one among 9 other Sundayers.

5—The trend toward concentration. Before the merger of the *News Chronicle* with the *Mail*, more than 50% of the daily circulation newspapers in Great Britain were in the hands of three publishing groups.

6—This points up the scramble for doubling up on printing of newspapers.

"The industry's magazines," according to the weekly *Economist*, "are bent above all on making the best business-like use day-in and day-out of their modern printing plants."

Some Way to Go

The *Economist* hinted at possible future trouble on Fleet Street: "The regrouping of the press and its printing presses continues and still has some way to go."

With the *Guardian* planning to move its printing operations from Manchester to London, the *Sunday Observer* planning to print out of London and the *Daily Telegraph* preparing to print the new *Sunday Telegraph*, Fleet Street fortunes will depend to a large extent on how profitable—or unprofitable—printing operations pan out.

The hard times of the newspaper publishing world led the *Times*, with little troubles of its own incidentally, to say wistfully: "There must be something wrong in an activity which has become so geared in its economics and its costs that the struggle for survival leads it more and more into a position against the public interest."

"It is one of the paradoxes of our social history that the more complex and the more fraught with terrible consequences public affairs have become, the more the press has seemed to stray from its original role."

And by so saying, the *Times* appears not to have departed from that role in any substantial form.

Overseas Press Bulletin, Nov. 12.

The Press and its Warts

By John Crosby

The press is a slippery eel. Some years ago the Columbia Broadcasting System tried to tackle press criticism, but so cautiously and with such little vitality that nothing much came of it. Now *The Saturday Review* has added a once-monthly section of press criticism and comment. I wish it well. We need it.

Some weeks ago T. S. Matthews, the former *Time* man who has joined *The Saturday Review* as editor-at-large, took a crack at the subject, missing by yards. Matthews seems to suffer from two wild misconceptions. For one thing, he sees absolutely no difference between newspapers and the frank commercialism of

radio and television. Claims they're both in the entertainment business. This is hogwash.

The shape of a newspaper—any newspaper—still revolves around the importance of the news. The shape of broadcasting is still determined by the popularity of a program or type of program. The two media are miles apart in their thinking on how to conduct their affairs.

Newspapers are not averse to popularity but they still run their own affairs, decide—whether for good or ill—what news is important, what should be on the front page. Broadcasting turns its business over to Nielsen and his decimal

points.—The ratings and Madison Avenue determine what is on the air and when it's on the air.

But then Mr. Matthews really puts his foot in his mouth.

"Why talk about the majority? Let's look at the best representatives of the press, not the worst. Alas, dear readers of *The Saturday Review*, the New York *Daily News* counts for more than the New York *Times*. As good Americans we should not even permit ourselves that 'alas' and always remember that God must have loved *Daily News* readers. He made so many of them. . . . The vast majority of Americans pay no attention to this quality press—indeed, are hardly aware of its existence. . . . To believe in pre-eminence of the quality press, the minuscule minority of the whole, we have to suppose that it exerts an influence out of all proportion to its size."

That paragraph contains more misinformation and misunderstanding about the press than anything I've ever seen in a comparable space. To start at the top, the *News* does not count for more than the *Times*. It has millions of readers whom it has never managed to sway in any direction, particularly in elections. *Times* readers do take their newspaper seriously.

But not only does the *Times* and most other serious journalism have vastly greater impact on a qualitative level, they also have vastly more readers. Today the *Times* news service is in thirty or forty newspapers throughout the country. James Reston has probably ten times as many readers as Ed Sullivan. So has Walter Lippmann. Tiny fraction, eh? It's the *News* which is really minuscule in either readers or influence next to say, David Lawrence. (I can never remember agreeing with Mr. Lawrence about anything but Mr. Matthews must admit he's a deadly serious journalist.)

The "vast majority of Americans" are terribly aware of the quality press. Even if they weren't, the quality press exerts an influence 'way out of proportion to its size. The *Times* is read all over the world. So is the *Herald Tribune*. The *News* is the babble of the taxi drivers, and while they are a mighty vocal group, they don't write the nation's laws. The *Times* and *Tribune's* readers do.

It's not my business to criticize the press,

but if anyone is looking for an opening, there are many I could suggest. For one thing, the modern press—like our foreign policy—reacts rather than acts. This is a serious weakness, particularly under the Republicans, or under any passive administration. The press will cover the indictment when it comes. But they won't go smoke it out.

Today the press is still covering crime as if it were in the East 51st St. station

rather than down on Wall Street. Many of the news-gathering methods of the press are obsolete or obsolescent. This is a very serious hole in our free press and one that could take a lot of examination. Much of the daily fare of newspapers is written out of sheer force of habit and has long lost its urgency. There are many other areas of enormous importance that are not covered at all.

—N. Y. *Herald Tribune*, Nov. 28.

crowd in a public park, because, it develops, he suspects that a promotion or a trip abroad was canceled as a result of the friendship.

The point is reached not only when the manifestly simple truths about Soviet propaganda and totalitarianism become obvious, but also when you begin to understand the complexities of life in Russia and find yourself unable to communicate them to readers. . . .

It is time to leave Russia when the excitement of travel to remote regions no longer compensates for the annoying presence of official guides with official lies and for the horror of large interviews with minor officials.

A foreign correspondent in Russia is not only a secret agent in the eyes of the Government; to much less sophisticated Russians he is someone to whom every loose brick must be made to seem like an ingenious product of Russian engineering. This defensiveness, betraying a deep sense of inferiority, is in fact a national conspiracy of Face that has little to do with communism. . . .

With rare exceptions, an interview with a Soviet official is like reading the papers, attending a movie or any other public activity—an exercise in hypocrisy. You come away grateful, if, as the regional economic chairman tells you he has no problems, approves of all orders from Moscow and is overfulfilling every production goal, he at least shows a glimmer of a smile of recognition that he isn't fooling anyone. After all, that is just what he tells his Communist Party superiors, too—without a smile. Hypocrisy in Russia is bearable as long as all the participants know they are playing the game.

It is when you are innocently taken in, or when you fight back, stupidly demanding "the truth," that you are contemptible and loathsome in Russian eyes. But once you've learned this game and it is still the truth that you want, it is time to leave. . . .

In our first year in Moscow we liked the theatre and Russian movies because they were good practice for our language. In our second year, it was important to go because the whole Western colony and many Russian experts at home were excited by a speech at the end of Act II, ridiculing a rural party boss or a Young Communist League propagandist. By the

Fed Up With The World's Biggest Story

By Max Frankel

Contrary to legend, correspondents leave the Soviet Union voluntarily. They give up the excitement of the "biggest story in the world" and the glamour of frequent display on Page One and, if they are like us, they don't regret their departure.

My wife and I cannot recall exactly when we made up our minds; perhaps it was the day we discovered that a conversation with a Moscow cabbie, which had been an adventure in the first year and a lively debate in the second, turned out in the third year to be just a bore. We no longer cared about touting the beauty and economy of a Chevrolet and were tired of persuading him that Americans did not want war. . . .

We want to return some day when Russian life and policy are launched on an interesting new tangent. For the moment, we have had enough.

This is so even though Moscow is surely the most secure of the world's "hot spots." Ordinary Russians almost always greet a correspondent with elaborate, if superficial, courtesy. Official molestation is almost never physical. . . .

For those so inclined, Moscow could even be a comfortable place these days. Moderate but adequate housing is assigned to foreigners by the Government. So are household employees. No frantic hunting,

no advertising, no annoying decisions. Adequate stocks of food are allowed in from abroad, including untaxed cigarettes and liquor; foreigners eat well even when the local market gives out.

As for working conditions—well, you could look at it this way: if the Kremlin were to blow up one midnight, you would not even have to get out of bed. No one would tell you what happened until an official version had been composed for *Pravda* and the censor would blockade all stories until *Pravda* appeared. Ideal.

And that's the trouble.

Moscow is truly the place for scholarly contemplation of the news. Right in the midst of the great story, it is nowhere to be had. There's not an official in town—except Khrushchev—who will tell you anything that hasn't appeared in *Pravda*; and unless it is fit to appear in *Pravda*, even Khrushchev's words will be censored. So instead of chasing the facts, you think about what they might be. And unless you are the professionally thoughtful type—a scholar—there is a point of diminishing returns during service in Russia. . . .

The point of diminishing returns is at hand when you have worked hard to strike up a friendship with a young Russian and then find him recoiling from you as from a leper, even in a dense

third year, we came to dislike going, because the novelty of a blandly subversive line had worn off and what was left was sterile, bad theatre. Time to leave for a while.

It could be argued—correctly—that after three years in the Soviet Union we had only begun to understand a great and complex nation. Ominous and cheap rumors spread by the Foreign Ministry's Press Department that our stories were perhaps confirmation of the dawn of our understanding.

But too often this official reaction was merely a tribute to the laboriously developed talent of slipping things by the censor without at the same time confusing the editors and readers at home. The painstaking and time-consuming wrestling with the censor is the true measure of the Moscow correspondent's valor. . . .

If Khrushchev has just vowed to wipe the United States off the map with fifty-ton missiles, the correspondent writes: "Khrushchev threatened tonight . . ." and an hour later, back from the censor comes his story with the word "threatened" deleted. He tries again: "Khrushchev promised destruction tonight . . ." and out comes the promise of destruction. Out, too, comes his third attempt, "rattled fifty-ton rockets," and his fourth, "vowed to annihilate." The inspired pre-dawn attempt, "Khrushchev warned tonight," will finally clear, and the correspondent proceeds to repair his second paragraph.

The knowledge that a "warning" is okay when a "threat" is not, represents three years of experience on the firing line at Moscow's Tsentralni Telegraf. But three years also breeds the inclination to damn it all and simply write, day after day, that Tass said, Tass declared, Tass emphasized and Tass maintained. It's shell shock and it's time to leave. . . .

For the "greatest story in the world" is also the greatest secret in the world and the lone correspondent is a poor match for a giant, totalitarian government. The story is only rarely to be had on the scene. The scholars will have to dig out what really happened.

Times Talk, Sept.

Max Frankel was the New York Times correspondent in Moscow for several years until last Summer.

When Panic Disperses Reason

On the morning of October 13, a female political reporter for the Mutual Broadcasting System awakened with a fierce determination to obtain an exclusive interview with Premier Khrushchev before his scheduled departure later that night. Jumping past dozens of security guards on the sidewalk outside the Soviet Mission, Miss Lisa Howard faced Nikita Khrushchev, grasped his hand and urgently requested her interview. The Premier agreed on the spot. The confrontation took place later that day in a studio at the U.N. from 4:30 until nearly 6:30 P.M. Triumphant, Miss Howard raced back to her station with the tapes. The Network executives heard them, approved their contents, and even called a press conference where they played the interview (just three minutes of it was heard over Mutual stations that night) and praised Miss Howard profusely for her ingenuity. Miss Howard retired that evening feeling in her own words: ". . . like the heroine in a sentimental movie. The girl reporter with the scoop of the year."

Miss Howard was phoned next morning by a Mutual vice-president and to her utter bewilderment was told: "Turn in your credentials. You are suspended." As Miss Howard related the incident at the time: "I was stunned. When I asked for an explanation I was told the reason was a paragraph in a column by Harrison Salisbury saying I had received the interview by telling the Premier it would be a friendly one. The reason was ludicrous. I never said any such thing. They also questioned my methods in using U. N. equipment. This too was absurd. U. N. equipment is available to every network representative upon request. The real reason was obvious. There was pressure over putting Khrushchev on the air at all and the executives panicked. They needed a scapegoat and my suspension served the purpose. It was a pathetic gesture. We cannot fight Communism by knuckling under to those who would suppress our liberties here in America. There were issues involved of grave concern . . . of

free expression and individual justice. Naturally, I chose to fight back."

Miss Howard took her case to the press. The New York Post did a feature story that day on the incident and immediately the Network received scores of inquiries from other papers and magazines anxious to write up this abrupt suspension. But Mutual obviously wanted no further publicity regarding Mr. Khrushchev's unpopular presence on their airwaves. By the end of the day, Miss Howard was reinstated with Mutual claiming the whole thing was a mistake and a misunderstanding.

One aspect of this story we find especially puzzling is that Mutual based their dismissal of Miss Howard on her alleged use of the word friendly. Is friendly suddenly a subversive word when used in the presence of a Communist leader? The entire incident is so clearly indicative of the panic, fear and near hysteria that has accompanied Mr. Khrushchev's arrival in our midst. How can we wage a fight for freedom when our State Department directs our "free" networks not to interview Russia's Premier? This edict was equalled in stupidity and clumsiness only by the decision to restrict Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Castro to Manhattan Island—thus ensuring ever closer ties between them. In our desire to thwart the Communist thrust we continually hand them propaganda advantages. Miss Howard's travails were thoroughly reported in *Is-vestia*, revealing us as something less than the free nation we purport to be.

Miss Howard's suspension; Mr. Suskind's unsavory interjection of anti-Soviet propaganda during his interview with Mr. Khrushchev; Mr. Khrushchev's travel restrictions, are all part of a deep psychosis of fear and hysteria that prevails whenever we face the Soviet challenge. The resultant blunders render us far less effective in the struggle we have defined as a battle for survival. Miss Howard made a telling point when she said: "Let us oppose Communism with reasoned intelligence and with ever greater liberties in our own land."

New York Post, Oct. 20

NIEMAN NOTES

1939

Edwin A. Lahey was in Florida in December recuperating from an operation that alarmed his friends throughout the newspaper world. But they were soon relieved to learn the doctors' diagnosis was worse than Ed's condition, and they now look forward to seeing his column back again soon.

1942

Harry S. Ashmore has been appointed editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The editor's chair remains for the time at Santa Barbara where Ashmore has been working with Robert Hutchins on the staff of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Robert Lasch, editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, participated in the television debut of Fitzpatrick's cartoons, which appeared on that page through more than 40 years. The cartoon series had its first showing on many stations December 5, to continue as a weekly series. Lasch and Joseph Pulitzer discussed with Fitzpatrick some of his most famous cartoons, many of which accompanied crusades of the *Post-Dispatch*.

1943

A chance for a local Nieman reunion in Cleveland was seized upon by Robert Bordner (1945) and Theodore Andrica (1944) of the Cleveland *Press* when John Day, vice president of CBS, was back in Cleveland for the first time in 12 years, to speak to the City Club.

Thomas H. Griffith, assistant manager editor of *Time* magazine, took over the editing of the magazine in August, in the illness of the managing editor, and was in charge of *Time* through the Presidential campaign and through the rest of the year.

1946

Robert J. Manning returned to the United States in November, terminating his service as chief of the *Time-Life* bureau

in London, to set up his own shop as an independent writer in Washington. His first assignments were for the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Life*.

1948

Carl W. Larsen, director of public relations at the University of Chicago, was enlisted to assist the new Chicago police commissioner overhaul the police department. In the Chicago *Tribune* magazine, Nov. 20, Larsen has an article on Chicago's effort to clean up its police force: "Our Stake in the Crime Fight." Larsen is an old police reporter himself, formerly with the Chicago *Sun-Times*.

When *The Saturday Review* began a Communications Section last fall they got Robert Shaplen to do the monthly section on the press. His chief activity is for *The New Yorker*.

1949

F. Tilman Durdin, after 26 years in the Far East, 23 of them for the New York *Times*, came home at the end of the year to take a place on the *Times* editorial board.

1951

Capt. William J. Lederer (Ret.) the Far East correspondent of *Reader's Digest*, spent a month before Christmas in his old study at Lowell House, finishing a book on the American image in Asia. He led a seminar for the Nieman Fellows December 6th.

Francis P. Locke, associate editor of the Dayton *News*, was happy over the election of the Harvard football captain for next season. Alex W. Hart is one of the Ohio boys Phil Locke persuaded to come to Harvard. Phil is a member of the Alumni Council.

Wellington Wales, who operates television and bulldozers in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, was in Cambridge in November, to visit a son in Groton School. Duke claims St. Thomas is the most relaxing vacation spot in the hemisphere. He is news director of VI-TV.

1952

The University of North Carolina published in November a 20-page booklet on "The University and the Public News Media," a guide book to its information services, prepared by Pete Ivey, director of the University News Bureau.

1953

The Rochester *Times-Union* announced appointment of Calvin Mayne as associate editor in October. He had been chief editorial writer since April and with the paper ten years, the first four as city hall reporter.

Mr. and Mrs. William Steif announced a new baby, Ruth Hilda, born October 31 in San Francisco where her father is assistant managing editor of the *News-Call Bulletin*.

1954

Robert C. Bergenheim, now assistant general manager of the *Christian Science Monitor*, had a large part in setting up the arrangements by which the *Monitor* is now printed simultaneously at several points to secure national and international distribution on the date of publishing in Boston.

Charles L. Eberhardt returned to the Voice of America in October as acting deputy chief of the world-wide English division, broadcasting service.

A daughter, Amy Laura, was born August 23d, to Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Farrell in Paris where Farrell is bureau chief of McGraw-Hill *World News*.

1955

Television critics hailed Robert Drew's television production, "Yanqui, No," as a brilliant innovation in television techniques when it was presented on the ABC network Dec. 8. It was in the series called "Close-Up" which led John Daly to resign from ABC because the network had contracted with an outside producer.

Drew had begun experimenting with new techniques in television when he was a Nieman Fellow from *Life*. He now di-

rects a television unit sponsored by *Time*, Inc. With him is **Howard Sochurek** (1960) former *Life* photographer. Another former Nieman Fellow, **William Worthy** (1957) worked with Drew's team on "Yanqui, No."

Jack Gould called it a program of remarkable vitality and intimacy. "A viewer had an uncanny feeling not only of personal presence but also of emotional involvement."

Henry Shapiro received a distinguished achievement award from the University of Southern California School of Journalism and its Alumni Association for "incisive reporting from Soviet Russia over the past two decades." He is the chief Moscow correspondent of UPI.

Home on leave after months of report in the Congo, **Henry Tanner** of the *New York Times* was in Cambridge for a session with the Nieman Fellows December 14.

1956

Richard L. Harwood of the *Louisville Times* was a member of the American Political Science Association seminar at Austin, Texas, in December. It was attended also by **Lowell Brandle** (1961) of the *St. Petersburg Times*.

Asahi Shimbun assigned **Hisashi Maeda** from its home office staff in Tokyo to its Washington bureau last Fall, in time for the Presidential campaign.

1957

Marvin Wall joined the news staff of the *Atlanta Constitution* last Fall. He had been serving as acting executive director of the Southern Educational Reporting Service in Nashville for a year; before that was city editor of the *Columbus (Ga.) Ledger*.

The *Charlotte Observer* appointed **L. M. Wright, Jr.**, city editor a few months ago. He had joined their news staff two years earlier, moving from the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*.

1958

Peter J. Kumpa, in Moscow for the *Baltimore Sun*, reports in Christmas greetings that his three little girls "are the only American children in our large

'diplomatic' apartment house, but manage to coexist with their Indonesian, Argentine and Swedish pals by chatting in rather decent Russian."

1959

Mitchell R. Levitas left the *New York Post* staff to join *Time*, Inc., last Fall. His initial assignments have been in the "back of the book" areas.

T. V. Parasuram, United Nations correspondent of the Press Trust of India, came to Cambridge with the vice-president of India, Nov. 21, to mark the opening at Harvard of a Center for the Study of World Religions.

1960

Dom Bonafede reports that since his return to the *Miami Herald* he has been out of the country more than in it. He has spent much time in Cuba, and covered the Organization of American States meeting in Costa Rica in August, and then followed the news to Haiti and Santo Domingo. The *Herald* syndicated his Caribbean reports.

Satoshi Otani returned to *Sankei Shimbun* in Tokyo in December after covering the Fall session of the United Nations and visiting Cuba for a series of articles. He is booked to go to their London office in the Spring.

Letters

Taiwan and Its Press

To the Editor:

I have only just seen Shen Shan's article on "Taiwan and Its Press" in the July issue of *Nieman Reports*.

As he implies that the International Press Institute has been less than fair in its response to applications for membership from Taiwanese editors, and as he states that the press in Taiwan is free, I should like to send you Armand Gaspard's report written after his visit to Taiwan last April.

We find Shen Shan's article tendentious and full of gaps. It would take too long

to examine them all, but I'd like to mention three.

He makes no mention at all of *Kung Lun Pao* (*Public Opinion Daily*), the only newspaper in Taipei that is in Taiwanese ownership and after *Free China* the most outspoken in opposition.

He makes no mention at all of the various Control Bodies described by Gaspard.

He says that *Free China* keeps on appearing on all newsstands. Gaspard shows that this is not so.

Moreover, he says that the chances for a change in the Publication Law are bright. Gaspard does not think so.

Now that the Government has proceeded against *Free China* in a big way things perhaps look less rosy to Mr. Shen Shan, but no doubt he would take the Government line on this.

I hope you will agree that Gaspard's report is dispassionate and shows that there have been gains in recent years.

We do realize that there are difficulties which perhaps prevent the granting of press freedom in Taiwan, but apologists do no good in the long run by suppressing important facts.

E. J. B. ROSE

Director

International Press

Institute, Zurich.

[See IPI report this issue]

The Subversive Views of Lei Chen

To the Editor:

Here is the excerpt from the *Free China Fortnightly* edited by Lei Chen, who has now been sentenced to ten years by the Nationalist military tribunal in Taipei, about which I spoke to you. This translation was made in our office and is an accurate one. This editorial was cited in the indictment of Lei Chen as one example of his seditious activity. It seems to me it might make an interesting item for you to publish in *Nieman Reports*, both because of its history and also because of its actual content, which I think makes a lot of sense.

JOHN K. FAIRBANK

Chairman, Center for East Asian Studies, Harvard University

Excerpts from an Editorial in *Free China*, March 16, 1958.

"A Chinese view of the U.S. Far Eastern policy—a few forthright suggestions to the Taipei Conference of the American Far Eastern Mission."

"... We believe that an important property [inherent] in U.S. Far Eastern policy is the American heritage and founding principle of democracy and freedom. However, this valuable property has not been effectively applied by the U.S. in concretely carrying out her Far Eastern policy. The moral force of the ideology of democracy and freedom has not been given full expression. Sometimes [the U.S. Far Eastern policy] even runs counter or is diametrically opposed to this ideology. For example, domestically the U.S. practices democracy, respects the rule of law; while in the Far East she has not promoted democratic, free politics, but has supported unfree, undemocratic politics. Domestically the U.S. strongly advocates the two-party system, championing fair competition between the parties. But in the Far East the U.S. has tried hard to maintain a single-party dictatorship. Within the U.S. the principle that the military should not interfere with administration is observed, as demonstrated in the recall of General MacArthur. But in the Far East the U.S. has tolerated or encouraged various forms of military dictatorship. Internally the U.S. holds the concepts of human rights, human dignity, justice, etc. to be the highest principles on which the republic was founded. In the Far East the U.S. has put aside these high ideals, including President Lincoln's idea of equality, President Wilson's path of the common people, and President Roosevelt's four freedoms. The Rooseveltian four freedoms were freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Today in none of the Far Eastern countries, with the exception of Japan, does freedom of speech exist, still less the freedom from fear. Inside the United States it is unthinkable that the government should encroach upon individual rights or interfere with judicial independence. In the Far East the U.S. has in fact supported

local regimes in their absolutist and extra-legal secret-service control of their people. . . . Domestically the U.S. is vigorously opposed to corruption and tries to enforce honest politics. In the Far East the U.S. supports corrupt governments so that they continue to act as they please. Secretary Dulles' speeches in foreign policy have stressed a moral and religious credo, but the ways of U.S. Far Eastern policy are far removed from the morality of the strong helping the weak among mankind and rescue of the helpless. . . .

* * * *

"... In helping the countries of East and South Asia to fulfill their first historical destinies, the U.S. has used the method of military and economic aid. Hereafter, if the U.S. is to support the East and South Asian countries in fulfilling their second historical destinies, she must adopt a new method which goes beyond military and economic assistance—a plan to give the East and South Asian countries political, cultural and moral assistance. This new aid program will mean the thorough development and realization of the ideology of democracy and freedom, which will have the effect of a strong spiritual moving force on U.S. Far Eastern policy. If in formulating her Far Eastern policy the U.S. can attach equal importance to political, cultural and moral aid as to military and economic aid and make the former a vital objective, then the dark, undemocratic and unjust conditions existing in the politics of the East and South Asian countries will quickly be rectified. Only in this way will the broad masses of East and South Asian countries gain a good impression of the U.S.; only in this way will a new stabilizing force be nurtured, which will enable U.S. foreign policy to acquire solid foundations in the countries concerned, which, in turn, can make U.S. military and economic aid to those countries produce a real effect.

"... True, the U.S. has in the past given some attention to these aspects [political, cultural, and moral assistance], but owing to errors in understanding or in method, American action in this respect has re-

mained a wish and a way of speaking, without ever becoming real foreign policy. What are these errors? 1) In the past, in East and South Asian countries, the U.S. has only attached itself to the upper stratum and operated through the bureaucracy. They have established close relations with the minority ruling class, and frequently knew them well personally. This gives the small number of privileged persons a chance to carry on endless chatter about American friendship and American greatness, and in the process the real people and masses are forgotten. In contrast, the international communists use an opposite method; they concentrate on working through the people; their efforts are directed at the lower stratum. In ordinary times the [East and South Asian] countries are often pro-U.S. at the top and anti-U.S. at the bottom; whenever an upheaval occurs, the U.S.-backed upper level can topple overnight, thus effecting an immediate change in relations with the U.S. The communists, on the other hand, have built on better foundations and can gain control of a country's people with no great difficulty. 2) In the past, with regard to East and South Asia, the U.S. has adopted a uniformly passive, short-term and conservative approach without taking active steps. Regardless of how bad a government is, the U.S. always shows willingness to support it. . . . From the point of view of the majority of people, this conduct is not only a manifestation of American ineffectiveness and diplomatic hypocrisy, but it also creates the misconception that the U.S. is in favor of bad governments. Under these conditions, it is idle to expect American propaganda and political action to result in a good impact. 3) . . . the U.S. seems to think that non-intervention in other nations' domestic politics will prevent their involvement in the vortex of internecine struggles and keep the various governments from bringing her their troubles. In actuality 'intervention' can be in differing degrees and in various forms. It is perhaps not necessary to interfere in all the problems of an ally, but for a nation like the U.S. whose policies and decisions can sometimes produce a profound effect on the life and death and destiny of another nation, the theory of complete non-intervention is not only unrealistic but unfeasible.

The Problem of Freedom of the Press in Formosa

Inquiry for the International Press Institute

Armand Gaspard

I. Political Background

If we want to understand the problem of freedom of the press in Formosa (Taiwan), we must never lose sight of the fact that Nationalist China considers herself at war with Peking China. The main objective of the Republic of China's army is not merely to defend Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu, which are under continuous bombardment: it is to reconquer the Chinese mainland. For this reason the Government believes it is bound to prevent anything that might undermine confidence in the political régime and the morale of the armed forces, in particular all criticism of its leaders and especially of its supreme head Chiang Kai-shek.

In some respects the present situation presents certain analogies with that in Israel, whose frontiers are equally threatened on all sides. However, judging from the elements of comparison available, press restrictions in Israel are far less severe than in Formosa. Here, though there is no acknowledged censorship, the restrictions extend far beyond mere military questions.

Whereas Israel has maintained her democratic institutions in actual fact, the Republic of China has done so more in theory than in practice. The Constitution has been infringed on several occasions. At this year's general elections, for instance, and when Chiang Kai-shek was re-elected President for a third term, which is directly contrary to the Constitution.

Actually, the political life of Formosa is dominated by the Kuomintang (KMT), though the party embraces various divergent trends, ranging from the totalitarian wing to the liberal wing. The minority parties—Young China and the Social Democrats—are of no importance whatever. They hold only 26 of the 503 seats in the legislative Yuan.

The political problem is further complicated by the fact that the entire Government apparatus, which coincides with that of the KMT, is in the hands of Chinese who arrived from the continent with the officials and army ousted by the Communist advance. This mass, numbering some two million, impose their rule on some eight million Taiwan islanders, who are also Chinese. Though relations between Continentals and Islanders have improved in the last few years, the balance has not yet been established. This is particularly noticeable in the press, for in Taipei there is only one important daily which is genuinely

Taiwanese. And it is no mere chance that it is most critical and censorious of all.

II. Symptoms of Liberalization

All observers agree in admitting that the political situation, and consequently that of the press, has eased in the last few years. There was a time—about 1950—when the term "terror" could be applied without exaggeration to the KMT. Dozens of journalists had been imprisoned on a charge of being Communists or fellow-travellers. Many suspects had "disappeared." Nothing of this sort is reported nowadays. However, a certain number of journalists are still being held in custody without trial.

Now the press can express opinion more freely. Privately owned newspapers have gained ground, thanks less to the tolerance of the authorities than to the will and work of their editors and staff. One symptom of improvement is that for some time newspapers have been able to receive directly the services of the international news agencies; these used to be filtered by the Central News Agency, which had a monopoly in news distribution.

At present Formosa has some thirty dailies, half of which are published in Taipei, the capital. Circulation totals about 500,000 copies, or 50 copies to every 1,000 inhabitants. This proportion is very high for Asia and is only exceeded in Japan. There are also several hundred magazines of all sorts.

Although circulation figures are not published, it is known that most dailies print 10,000 copies or less. The record is about 50,000. It is held by *Tsun Yang Jit Pao* (*Central Daily News*), the chief journal of the Kuomintang. An independent, i.e. privately owned, paper, *Lien Ho Pao* (*United Daily News*), runs it a close second. Another important paper, whose name will be mentioned many times in this report, is *Kun Lun Pao* (*Public Opinion Daily*); it is the only daily entirely in the hands of the Taiwanese and for that very reason the most critical of the Central Government.

Most worthy of mention among the many magazines and reviews is the fortnightly *Tsi Ho Chung Kuo* (*Free China*), which is the most liberal and progressive on the whole island and as a result has had a great deal of trouble with the authorities and the KMT.

Numerous newspapers from other countries of South-East Asia are on sale in Taipei, in particular the Chinese

language papers from Hong Kong. Some of them sell one-fifth or one-tenth of their circulation in Formosa. Others, and not only the Communist or near-Communist ones, are banned. Even so liberal a periodical as *Motherland* is often confiscated on arrival; this also happens to the independent *New Life Evening Post* (in Chinese) edited by Sydney Liu, a member of the I.P.I. Sydney Liu himself was repeatedly refused a visa to enter Taiwan though his parents live there, and it was only after the Tokyo Assembly that he succeeded in visiting Formosa for the first time in many years. It should also be mentioned that Japanese newspapers, except those printed in English, are also banned. (From the beginning of the century until the end of the last war Formosa was annexed to Japan and most of the islanders read Japanese.)

III. Press Legislation

A new law on the press, more restrictive than that formerly in force, was passed in 1958. Considering only this aspect of the situation, one might get the impression that the press in Formosa is worse off now than it was a few years ago. Actually, the contrary is true.

The Publications Law of the Republic of China, of July 1958, empowers the Ministry of the Interior to suspend (after three warnings) for a period not exceeding one year, or prohibit the sale of, a publication considered guilty of sedition or treason or of instigating others to commit those crimes. The same applies to writings offending public order or morals.

This law has been regarded as a great nuisance owing to its restrictive clauses. The entire private press, and even part of the semi-official press in Taiwan, has often spoken out against it in no uncertain terms. And when the I.P.I. decided at Tokyo against admitting the Formosa candidates, several newspapers demanded the abrogation of the law, stating that it was the chief cause of the I.P.I.'s refusal and was giving Nationalist China a bad name.

In Taipei I met Dr. Samson Shen, head of the Government Information Bureau, who holds the rank of Cabinet Minister. He gave me no hint that the law might be abrogated and insisted that the press of the island was free. However, the law has *never* been implemented. As far as I know, press offenses are still tried in the courts. Official circles insist that the only purpose of the law is to prevent the publication of scandal sheets ("mosquito papers") and Communist propaganda. But the press as a whole considers it an impediment and a deterrent to its freedom.

IV. Control Bodies

The greatest impediment to the freedom of the press is not the law in question but the control bodies maintained

by the Government, the army and the KMT, which are both numerous and varied. They are:

1. the National Security Bureau (Military Intelligence),
2. the Defence Ministry Political Department,
3. the Taiwan Garrison Command (Peace Preservation Department),
4. the KMT Intelligence Headquarters—Section VI.,
5. the Police,
6. the Government Information Bureau.

The KMT has a special committee—Section IV—in charge of newspaper and book publishing. At present its head is Tai Shi-Shen whose predecessor was Huang Shao-ku, now Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The existence of all these control bodies is a secret, but an open one in Taipei. It would seem that at present their control over the press is not continuous and absolute, but rather slack and often contradictory, reflecting the ebb and flow of the rival factions within the KMT. This is the usual picture where a single party dominates the political scene and is all to the advantage of freedom of the press.

These control bodies have their agents in the printing shops and on the editorial staffs. In 1957 the editor of *Kung Lun Pao*, interviewed by the correspondent of *Time and Life*, said that on his staff of 180 there were 23 "security agents." Asked by the American journalist how he could quote such an exact figure, Li Wan-chu replied: "I was in that type of work myself for eight years, so I know who they are, but I don't pay attention to them!"

Another important duty of the security services is to issue directives and warnings to the editorial offices. Before 1959 such directives were often in writing—I was unable to get hold of a copy—but since then they have been given verbally (by telephone).

Impediments to the Freedom of the Press— Specific Cases.

I. *Kung Lun Pao*, (Taiwanese) daily newspaper (Interview with Editor Li Wan-chu).

Li confirmed that freedom of the press was far from complete in Formosa but said the situation had improved steadily during the last two or three years. Directives and warnings are still received and the KMT exerts a certain amount of pressure (not on newsprint distribution, which is free, but on the distribution of the paper itself—by intimidating and molesting vendors, etc.). A few years ago *Kung Lun Pao* had serious difficulties with the authorities; his paper was sometimes confiscated and the edi-

torial staff arrested. The most serious case occurred in November, 1957, when leader-writer Ni Shih-tan and another member of the staff were arrested on a charge of Communist conspiracy. They were tried in the summer of 1958 and are still in jail.

Ni Shih-tan had incurred the enmity of the authorities by his critical editorials. However, he was not arrested for a press offense but for having omitted a most important formality to clear himself of having been a Communist in his youth. He had complied with that formality on the mainland in 1949, before the Nationalists' defeat, but neglected repeating it in Taiwan, as stipulated by an order of 1955. It is hard to understand how a well-informed journalist could be ignorant of that regulation. By catching him in the wrong on this minor point the authorities were able to get rid of a troublemaker.

In a situation of that sort the authorities always try to "get" a troublesome journalist in a context that has nothing to do with his professional newspaper work. If necessary they provoke a brawl involving the journalist they want to get rid of, and then charge him with disorderly conduct in the street, or have recourse to other "tricks" of the same kind. In that way freedom of the press is not infringed. I have received reports on the use of such "tricks" from various sources.

Li Wan-chu protested extremely vigorously in his paper against Ni's arrest and his editorials became more and more critical. The fortnightly *Free China* also took up the cudgels in defence of Ni and other journalists who had been arrested.

According to Li and other sources, several journalists suffered arbitrary arrest up to and including 1958. Half a dozen of them belonged to the *Kung Lun Pao* staff. Some are said to have been badly beaten up.

I have been told of:

the imprisonment of a reporter, a few years ago, because he had revealed a military secret by reporting a passage of troops which had already been announced by no less a source than the Government radio station;

the imprisonment of a printer from the *Central Daily News*, the KMT newspaper, for having made a printer's error by mixing up—allegedly on purpose—the symbols for Tsun-Kung (Communist) and Tsun-Yan (Central).

II. *Free China*, fortnightly (Interview with Editor Lei Shen).

Free China has had more trouble with the authorities than any other periodical published in Taiwan; but it still appears regularly nonetheless. These difficulties are due

to the fact that it is the most authentic opposition periodical, although there is no doubt whatever of the anti-Communist principles of its publishers and editorial staff. They are genuine democrats imbued with liberal ideas and their paper is definitely popular.

It is the only one published in Formosa that does not content itself with direct or indirect criticisms in matters where a certain leeway is allowed, but has dared to attack some fundamentals of the régime.

Free China has launched attacks against:

the part played by Chiang Kai-shek's eldest son, General Chiang Ching-kuo, head of the Defence Ministry's political bureau;

the practical monopoly enjoyed by the KMT in the political life of the country;

the part played by the KMT's political commissars in the army, comparing it with that of the political commissars in the Soviet army;

the inadequate pay received by army officers and other ranks, etc.

Here is an example. In its issue of January 16, 1959, the magazine printed an editorial entitled "We must cancel the party control"; an open letter from an army officer on the degrading situation in the army (insufficient pay, etc.). The officer in question retracted later and *Free China* published a correction, but Lei Shen was nevertheless charged with "slandering" the army.

The case was dismissed because the authorities were afraid of opening a public debate on a subject that was taboo.

Free China has frequently been put under heavy pressure by the Government on account of its attitude. But thanks to the support received from certain quarters, e.g. Prof. Hu Shi, former Ambassador to the United States, who is still a friend of Chang Kai-shek's for all his liberal views, *Free China* has never been suppressed purely and simply. The Government has tried indirect measures, among them attempts to persuade printing shops to refuse to print the paper. The first of such attempts was made in 1957, but the printer passed a photostat copy of the KMT's order to Lei Shen. The latter went to see the head of the KMT information committee, Huang Shao-ku, now Minister for Foreign Affairs, and threatened to make a scandal by divulging the secret order of which he had a copy. Authorization to print was renewed for one year. When it expired in 1958 there was more trouble, which was settled following Huang's intervention with the secret services. A year later, in March, 1959, the Generalissimo himself decided, at a meeting of the Central Committee of the KMT, that the periodical should be suppressed. On that

occasion it was Prof. Hu Shi who saved the situation by writing a letter to the Minister for Foreign Affairs threatening to start a scandal. Thus *Free China* was safe until the expiry of its printing contract in May, 1960.

But according to Lei, the printers have orders to send all copy intended for the paper to the secret division of the military command within 30 minutes. This copy is returned to the printers within two hours after photostats have been made. To get round this difficulty Lei himself goes to the printers on the last day with the most important copy and personally supervises typesetting and printing in full sight of the secret service agents detailed to the printing shop.

Here is proof that copy is transmitted to the secret service. An article on the elections of the Provincial Legislative Assemblies, the manuscript of which was forwarded on March 11, 1960, was quoted from and commented on in the *Independence Evening Post* of the following day . . . but the issue of *Free China* containing the article only appeared on March 16. Lee Yu-chia, editor of the *Independence Evening Post*, confessed to Lei (according to Lei) that he had received the text from the secret service with an order to publish it.

So far *Free China* has managed to come out pretty regularly with a fairly large circulation (averaging 10,000-12,000 copies and rising to 20,000-25,000 for special issues). And Lei says he has never had any difficulty with the allocation of newsprint. But serious obstacles have been put in the way of the paper's distribution, though less in Taipei than in the provincial towns. It is banned in principle by the army; civil servants are advised not to read it; and KMT agents seize it periodically.

On March 31, 1960, only the day before the I.P.I. observer reached the scene, *Kung Lun Pao* reported that the latest issue of *Free China* had been banned at Taichung on account of its comments on the campaign for the elections of the Provincial Assembly. The report stated that the authorities had instructed the employees of the schools and the regional administration to hand over to the police any copies of the periodical they came across. Besides which, officials visited the villages throughout the region to collect copies of *Free China* even from private persons.

III. Further Instances

Two other political reviews have also had difficulties with the authorities.

Tse Tze (Self-Government), a fortnightly that was published at Hsinchu since 1957 by members of the Taiwan Provincial Council, mostly reprinted the minutes of the Provincial Assembly's debates during which strong criticisms were often levelled at the authorities and the régime but made little impression. The review, which defended

Taiwanese interests and criticised KMT control, was a great success and its circulation reached 30,000 copies. The Government intervened and started by confiscating copies displayed for sale, later suspending certain issues of the review, which has now ceased publication. Finally, at the end of 1958, the editor and publisher, Sun Chyu-yen, was arrested on a charge of "being a rascal."

Free China protested vigorously against this infringement of freedom of the press in its issue of December 16, 1958.

Ching Chin (Politico-Economica), also a fortnightly, was published in 1959, by Kim Shao-hsin and a group of members of a more or less dissident, progressive wing of the KMT. No. 7 of December 20, 1959, was seized because it contained an attack on the electoral system, calling the deputies "good-for-nothings" and an article by Prof. Li on "How the Government Secret Service is using students as tools." At the end of 1959 the review put out a double number 8/9 and then ceased publication.

IV. Freedom of Criticism

In Formosa freedom of expression and criticism is restricted by a certain number of taboos:

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, his sons and their families;

Prime Minister Chen Cheng;

the army;

anything that might assist Communist Propaganda. For instance, it was forbidden to publish reports on the prosecution in the United States of one of Chiang's grandsons for speeding.

Criticism of local government measures, economic affairs, the Four Year Plan, American aid, etc., is tolerated. The denouncement of corruption is permitted.

In recent months criticism has been allowed more scope, and this has been taken advantage of by privately owned independent newspapers. For instance, criticism of infringement of the Constitution at the last general elections and the Generalissimo's recent election for a third term as President.

The press has also criticized, to good effect, the complicated formalities involved in entering and leaving Taiwan, and in particular the currency regulations. But, as we have seen, *Free China* is the only publication that dares a frontal attack on certain basic principles of the régime.

It is followed by *Kung Lun Pao*. As early as 1957, after the editorial writer Ni Shih-tan was arrested, the editor Li Wan-chu had the courage to print some very strong articles censuring the KMT monopoly, the control and faking of the provincial elections in April 1957, cases

of corruption on the part of high-ranking officials, etc.

On February 17, 1960, *Kung Lun Pao* printed the text of a question in the legislative Yuan which stated that the Government's economic policy was a suicide policy and that, on account of the low salaries, "Corruption and malpractices are rampant in the Government organs," and that "administrative efficiency is deplorably low."

On March 14 the same journal expressed doubts of the elections having been on the level and said: "Unless members of parties not in power are invited to participate in poll supervision, the performance of fairness is very doubtful."

After the last elections other dailies expressed views that were equally critical though couched in less vigorous terms.

Some periodicals, and not only *Free China*, have shown more energy. For instance, *Time and Tide*, the review of the Social Democrat Party, wrote on February 29, 1960:

... "We discover that the ruling faction of KMT is carrying on illegal activities in an attempt to destroy the Constitution."

... "The ruling faction of the KMT have in the past abandoned the principle of leniency and tolerance by arbitrarily revising the Publications Law to control the press, and are now going to put even themselves into an illegal position by attempting to destroy the Constitution and extend the presidential term of office. If this deplorable action cannot be stopped, the anti-Communist force that maintains constitutional democracy would certainly divorce the ruling faction of the KMT in Taiwan."

But the most astonishing of all the non-conformist articles published in Taiwan was undoubtedly the report printed on page 1 of *China Post* on April 5, 1960, at the end of the I.P.I. observer's visit. Speaking of the communes in Communist China, this article admitted the consolidation of the rural communes and quoted—but not by name—a high-ranking official of the KMT as stating that "the urban communes might meet with success if they were applied with greater moderation." This caused an uproar in Taipei, for such a statement published in such a way was almost tantamount to a treasonable action. However, as far as is known, the paper has not had any trouble.

A great many censorious articles dealing with the freedom of the press have also been published. Particularly when the Publications Law was passed and when the I.P.I. Assembly at Tokyo issued its decisions. Several newspapers took advantage of that opportunity to break a lance for freedom of the press and demand the abrogation of the Publications Law.

Among them were *China Post* (English language daily),

United Daily News (Taiwan's second most important daily), and *China News* (English language bulletin published by Stanway Cheng). *United Daily News* wrote on March 26:

In Taiwan today it is true that much more is desired concerning freedom of the press. . . The best gesture will be for the new Government to publicly announce the abrogation of the press law and replace it by some other positive legislation. . .

And on April 4 *China News* said:

. . . The Government is urged to exercise more tolerance of unfavourable and even hostile press reports. Unless matters of great national emergency are involved, there should be as little 'request' for press cooperation as possible. The tactic of peddling official influence on the press should be eliminated, while license of newspapers, instituted at a time when supply of local newsprint was low, should be discontinued. The Publications Law, which was huddled through the legislature in 1958 over violent press opposition, should be abolished. The law, which has not been invoked in a single case in the last twenty months after its promulgation, is just as dead and should be buried alive.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Freedom of the press is still far from complete in Formosa. Owing to the state of war and the predominant role of the Kuomintang, the situation there is peculiar. There is no censorship in the formal sense, but a number of very active control organisms. The press is not censored or muzzled as in the totalitarian countries proper, but "directed" and "inspired"; this is true even of the privately owned papers. *Free China*, a Chinese language fortnightly, is the exception that proves the rule among the periodicals, as *Kung Lun Pao* is among the dailies. For all the vexation they have to bear, their editorial independence is so complete and their freedom of expression so great that they could not possibly exist under a real dictatorship.

2. A restrictive law on publications in force since 1958 was, and still is, attacked by the press as a whole. As a matter of fact it has never been applied. There are equally severe laws in some countries from which the I.P.I. admits members—Pakistan, for instance.

3. A consolidation of the privately owned press and a broadening of freedom of expression have been noted for the last several months, even over the last two or three years. Conversely, the number of arbitrary acts, arrests of journalists and seizures of newspapers has diminished.